

# Appendix 2e

## Responses by Consultation point 24-Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Proposals and Sites

Pages 2 to 570

## 24-Berkhamsted Proposals & Sites

Pages 571 to 1799

# 24 Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Proposal & Sites responses

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS38
<b>Person ID</b>	1261933
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathy Brooker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the above development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Traffic exiting the new proposed link road travelling in the Leighton Buzzard direction would adjoin traffic on the B440, Leighton Buzzard Road which backs up to a standstill to the fixed speed cameras and beyond from the Hemel Hempstead direction at peak times. This is due to the narrowing at Water End bridge where traffic is restricted to a single directional flow. All the houses at Water End are kerbside which would cause more pollution and noise to the occupants with an impact on health and well-being.</li> <li>2 Traffic leaving the new proposed link road travelling to Potten End, Berkhamsted, Tring direction would use Potten End Hill just off the B440, Leighton Buzzard Road. This road runs into a 30 mph zone at Potten End with a school at the crossroads leading to the narrow streets of Berkhamsted with a dangerous bend at the junction of Gravel Path, the site of numerous accidents. This route is always busy with cars and delivery vehicles and is exacerbated at peak times.</li> <li>3 Building on Green Belt countryside can only have a detrimental impact on the natural environment and our health. Once we have destroyed these areas they will be lost by the impact of insensitive development.</li> </ol> <p>I urge Dacorum Planners to re-think this proposal of major development before paper plans become a stark reality with adverse consequences.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS68
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH01;</b> Will the Dacorum education support centre be returned to the function as a primary school along with the planned new primary school (3ha). Under the Social and Community to create a new district/local/neighbourhood centre, does the inclusion new retail and community facilities to serve the day-to-day needs of new and existing residents list a family restaurant. Flood Risk and Drainage modelling of small watercourses will need to be completed to determine the extent of flood risk across the site. Will this need a better maintain river Gade to make sure that it doesn't flood surrounding areas due to any potential drainage increase. <b>Growth Area HH04:</b> where will the Dens food bank be relocated to or will it diversify out into separate areas within the communities. <b>Growth Area HH08/9:</b> with regards to the development height of between four and eight storeys. A proposal for taller buildings in excess of this may be considered in accordance with <b>Policy DM41</b> is already a contentious issue. This doesn't stay within the style of local trend and will tend to become another concrete blot on the landscape. <b>What is the standing on ref11.1</b> <i>"to allow communities to develop—11.2 for the community to have a significant say in its location and specification—11.3 for communities to shape their local neighbourhoods—</i>. <b>Growth Area HH11</b> There is mention of retaining the existing businesses with in the encompassed area, Such as The car dealerships, a Major DIY store and the Builders yard. Are these staying? <b>Growth AreaHH13:</b> With traffic congestion already being a major issue in Apsley has any feasibility study been given to what the added traffic from this development would be? And don't go on about people using public transport, walking or cycling to work. <b>Growth Area HH17:</b> Where are the refuse trucks, the Lean, safe and clean vehicles depot moving to, <b>plus where will the Dacorum CCTV operations be relocated to.</b> <b>Growth Area HH21:</b> Ref Urban Design Principles to # Optimise the potential for views across the Bulbourne valley# Limit buildings to two storeys normally# Design the</p>

development to the highest sustainability standards possible# Take the character of buildings in the Chilterns area as a guide to high quality attractive design# Use traditional materials, such as red brick, clay tiles and timber boarding, where feasible# Arrange buildings and routes to achieve natural surveillance, good pedestrian access to facilities and an attractive relationship to open spaces# Design, layout and landscaping to mitigate the impacts on the archaeological, heritage and ecological assets within and adjoining the site and safeguard those adjoining the development. Then plan to waste land building 7 Traveller pitches in an area where you want to take the character of buildings in the Chilterns area and arrange buildings and routes to achieve natural surveillance, good pedestrian access to facilities and an attractive relationship to open spaces. Another concern regarding the travelling community is there nature of not contributing to the local community and causing disruption even in the schools and local amenities like has been experience in woodhall farm shops and the cupid green garage and in the village of Redbourne. Why not build 14 to 20, 2 tier apartments for local people, maybe ARCH owned to reduce the long waiting list applications on the housing waiting list. There is no mention of the possible effect on the 2 flood plains the one opposite the adventure play ground on the one on Shrub hill common. **Growth Area HH22: As again with Growth Area HH21** with regards to the Traveller pitches. **Growth Area HH28:** A much needed requirement that has been asked for, for many years.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS164

**Person ID** 1257378

**Full Name** Jackie Jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>My comments are respect of HH08:</p> <p>* buildings of up to 8 storeys (and possibly more) would be very much out of character with the neighbouring area. This site is right next to moorland/common land which runs alongside the river/canal - this gives the area a very rural and countryside feel, which is enjoyed by many residents who take recreation and exercise on the moor - and wildlife/animals use the moor. The current station buildings are low-level and cannot be seen well from the moor, and do not impact on the enjoyment of the moor.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS206
<b>Person ID</b>	1257490
<b>Full Name</b>	Lucy Muzio
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS220
<b>Person ID</b>	1257608
<b>Full Name</b>	Jack Burnham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253972
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Camelia Smith
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Thrive Homes as a leading regional provider of affordable homes is uniquely placed to engage with key stakeholders to contribute to the delivery of the target of around 1,550 homes identified for the proposed allocation at North Hemel.</p> <p>Thrive Homes has a strategic interest in the land at Oatfield (centrally positioned within the HH01 site allocation) and proposes to work collaboratively with adjoining landowners; including the HCA and the Crown Estate to deliver the aims and objectives (including the necessary social and physical infrastructure) identified for the North Hemel Growth area.</p> <p>The land at Oatfield, off Dodds Lane extends to approximately 3.12 hectares and does not comprise any listed buildings. An indicative assessment indicates that circa 60-70 new affordable homes could be accommodated at Oatfield, whilst retaining the buildings at the north western edge of the site (providing a developable area of 2.8 hectares).</p> <p>It is proposed that the redevelopment of Oatfield would incorporate a design and layout that aligns with the principles in the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Spatial Vision and the Strategic Masterplan Guidance and Transformation Plan.</p> <p>National planning guidance advises that with regards to Local Plan-making, “<i>plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change</i>”. It is recognised that the HH01 allocation would make a significant contribution to meeting Dacorum’s objectively assessed housing need.</p>

The North Hemel allocation represents a sustainable Green Belt release, that is appropriate and is coherent, given the proximity of HH01 to the existing adjoining built-up area of Hemel Hempstead including the new allocation- LA1 at Marchmont Farm and Piccotts End.

The proposed HH01 allocation provides an excellent opportunity for the location of a new Garden Community, marking an evolution in strategic planning principles and the reimaging of the original 'New Towns' concept founded at Hemel Hempstead.

Thrive Homes supports the proposed North Hemel Growth Area site allocation HH01.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS284
<b>Person ID</b>	1258939
<b>Full Name</b>	Ed Shedd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We have a number of key concerns about the development of the HH Garden Communities Phase 1 and Phase 2.</p> <p>First, there appears to be an over reliance on aspirational growth strategies and partnerships which have not been subject to public consultation and scrutiny.</p> <p>Second, it is unclear why extra housing is required when the local authority itself agrees that it cannot provide employment for all these new residents? Whilst we understand the interplay between St Albans and Dacorum here, it feels somewhat</p>

unbalanced. If we have confidence of creating an enviro-tech hub in the midst of the Oxbridge London Golden Triangle then surely we can create the jobs for the housing we are developing? If not, we should reduce the new housing, as having no jobs to provide them/relying on another local authority to provide runs the risk of failing the economic criteria in your Sustainable Development Policy.

Third, is the overprovision of housing. Related to the above point especially, but more generally, how robust are the growth assumptions used to drive the local plan? In a world where we can monitor and update demand in an increasingly agile way, it feels a blunt instrument to use a top down planning assumption, generated from data pre the COVID pandemic and resulting shift in work, live and play.

Fourth, is the impact on infrastructure, both traditional and environmental. In particular why are we not clear about the multi-modal transport network that will encourage residents of the new HHGC's to travel to work without using a car? We seem to be building the greatest number of new houses in HH distant from the jobs the residents will be working at, and from other transport hubs, such as the railway station. Equally, given our dependence on chalk streams for our water supply, are we clear that there is an adequate plan for mitigating the effects of new housing and a hotter climate?

Fifth, the silence that shouts the loudest. A seeming absence of clarity on how the local plan will ensure both net environmental benefits in the HHGCs, as well as ensuring that an attendant increase in net environmental benefits will be made in the Green Belt, the CAOB and the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation.

To use a current, live example to illustrate our point. We live in Nettleden, and in 2020 we have (quite understandably) seen an increase in car traffic to and from the Ashridge estate, as lockdown families seek to visit this important green lung. With an additional 5,500 houses in the HHGC alone, with an average of 2.4 people per household, the increase in traffic alone should necessitate, to use but one example, changes to the routes people can use to reach these green lungs, such that the country roads do not get overloaded. And yet there appears to be little or, indeed, no mention as far as we can see of an explicit assessment of the impact and how to mitigate.

Equally, as with many of the large scale agricultural fields to be found in the CAOB around Nettleden e.g. farms above Nettleden, in St Margarets and down to the Leighton Buzzard Road, the silence is deafening. Why is there not a similar focus on the areas not being developed, with attendant measures in place to mitigate climate change, increase biodiversity and to ensure that the polluter pays within the countryside. It is this silence which we found truly frightening. Whilst we may not agree with contents of the Local Plan in its entirety, it is, at the very least, a plan which can be reviewed, refined and measured. There appears to be little or no plan for the countryside, no plan for villages such as Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which already experience heavy traffic to and from Ashridge estate, no plan for the scarce water resources, chalk streams and water meadows, which will be used by an increasingly number of inhabitants. This makes one both angry and incredibly sad. Our countryside is literally disappearing whilst we have our attention focussed elsewhere. It is a shameful fact that much of the farmed countryside landscape, within and without the CAOB near London, has lower levels of biodiversity than some of the areas of the "big smoke" itself.

We strongly support the development of higher levels of recreational space and new country and destination parks which will ease pressure on the CAOB and Ashridge in particular. Plus, we acknowledge that there will be a need to agree further mitigation measures with the National Trust to ameliorate the adverse effects of visitor pressure in this area.



There needs to be active management of the transport systems, covering, but not limited to a) encouraging traffic to reach Ashridge via the main roads, rather than the small country roads within the estate b) closing off some "rat runs" across country which are used to reach Ashridge and also by commuters travelling across country. c) increased provision of sustainable public transport and park and ride schemes, especially in HH. d) the increased provision of (electric) bike access e) increased open spaces outside Ashridge and the CAO B f) increased landscaping and biodiversity increase measures e.g. increase in hedgerows to scrub road pollution, smaller farming fields focussing on preventing the soil erosion which accumulates in valleys such as are found around Nettleden, both clogging up the drains and reducing agricultural effectiveness. The list goes on, and the absence of specific measures in the local plan shouts out loud. All the focus seems to be on the economic and social roles and not on the environmental.

Sixth, a failure to specifically address climate emergency issues, over and above point four. Living in Nettleden, we see year in year out the impact that over farmed, industrialised farmland has on our environment. More frequent flash floods, caused by water hitting parched fields and simply flooding down into the valley, with attendant soil erosion and clogging of drains for example. Walk up the footpath via the old oak tree from Nettleden to St Margarets and one simply walks for about a mile over silent, natureless ploughed fields. There don't even appear to be 6 metre nature corridors which one sees in many other farms. Whilst one might object to the aesthetics of the above, that is only a small point. It is clear that the agriculture being practised in this valley will not be able to continue as climate change impacts the area. We need a plan to address this as well as a plan to address the impacts of development in both the green belt and urban areas.

Seventh, an unease that you have underestimated the potential brownfield regeneration opportunities. Is it really correct to say that all brownfield regeneration opportunities have been covered in the plan? That there is no ability to increase the use of that land, before having to take green belt land?

Eight, a specific point about being a resident in Nettleden. As one of the few communities in the country yet to experience the joys of high speed broadband, and surrounded by large farmed fields of limited bio diversity, with substantial amounts of soil running off those very same fields during times of heavy rain, which then block the drains, we appear to be treated as "rural" by the local authority and utilities in our day to day activities. At yet, at the same time, in this local plan, appear to be invisible. Whilst understandably your focus is on the new HHGC's, there appears to be limited thought given to how Nettleden, only a mile or so away from the new HHGC's might be affected, how some of the negative impacts might be mitigated, and indeed how some of the positive impacts might be shared. We are not arguing to be central to the plan. That would be an imbalanced perspective, but we do believe for example that the local plan should be able to articulate how you will mitigate impacts or indeed ameliorate the social and environmental aspects of living in Nettleden across a number of areas such as:

- Transport and a review of the road systems in the light of the multi-modal transport systems indicated for HHGC and the increased number of inhabitants looking to access Ashridge, the green lungs of this immediate area, light pollution, landscaping and re-wilding, net environmental benefits in the countryside, water usage, pollution, the ability for the local neighbourhood to propose local initiatives, flight paths etc..

Nine, in the "Allocated for" table, we see reference to the development of a new, car based, carbon economy road as a strategic corridor route, but no mention of land for use with the multi-modal transport systems indicated for the HHGC's.

This despite the fact that the development of the site "should seek to achieve a 60% of sustainable transport modes by 2050". Given that you are developing both Phase 1 and Phase 2 together (on the assumption presumably that the Phase 2 will absolutely go ahead, despite it appearing to be on a post 2038 development schedule) one would expect there to be specific land purchases/land allocation decisions pertaining to sustainable transport systems to be clearly articulated within the plan.

Ten, what is the exact process by which the preferred route for the new 40 mph strategic corridor route connecting the Leighton Buzzard road, a B road, to North Hemel, will be chosen?

would clearly be inappropriate, but I would contend that an excellent Local Plan would consider both the newly enlarged HH and the villages which are on its periphery?

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS387
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The extensive use of the Greenbelt for development between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead goes against the purposes of the Greenbelt as described in the NPPF. Specifically, the Hemel Garden Communities project will see urban sprawl into the Greenbelt and the narrowing of the gap between Redbourn and Hemel Hempstead. In addition, the extensive

use of the Greenbelt will damage the local environment and ecology adding to the problems of climate change. On these issues, Redbourn Parish Council objects to the draft Dacorum Local Plan.

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

No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS414

**Person ID** 1260243

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs Peacock

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I write with reference to the Dacorum Local Plan (to 2038).  
I have read it and seen that it includes the Shendish Manor Golf Course as a potential site in which to build.  
It states on the chosen site you wish to build;

- 900 homes
- with 40% set aside for affordable housing
- Open space
- Cycle and footpath links
- Employment space
- New primary school and contributions towards new secondary school

- Contributions towards wider infrastructure improvements for the town

I oppose this on the strongest possible terms.

I remind you this site was put forward in the past and rejected for good reasons - none of which have changed yet since then there has been a massive estate created (Aspen Park) putting huge extra demands on the roads and traffic in the morning (all of which have to enter/exit the estate via a single lane bridge and residential single lane road leading to London Road).

Further to this traffic on the A4251 has increased substantially. As I mentioned the only existing access to the site is by a bridge over the West Coast Main Line and this would clearly be inadequate for a development of this size.

Please consider elsewhere - this estate has done more than enough to assist with population growth and we already have a school on the estate (Two Waters Primary) as well as footpath and cycle path links along with affordable housing within the new estate.

Please email me back to confirm you have received this and that it will be officially entered as being taken in to account when considering a decision.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS467

**Person ID** 1260627

**Full Name** David McCann

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This proposal is much too close to the border with the AONB and will require unacceptable building on green belt / agricultural land. It will fundamentally change the rural nature of a number of adjacent communities, put pressure on local schools, services and roads. It will bring extra congestion, noise and traffic to the area. This seems at odds with the proposals for the Chilterns AONB to become a National Park.
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS484
<b>Person ID</b>	1258240
<b>Full Name</b>	Adele Giles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>At lot of these proposals seem to rely on a 'pack them in, stack them high' strategy. I don't think any new build should be anywhere near as high as the old Kodak building. I believe that should still stand out and not blur into multiple high rises. Some sites are well overdue an overhaul such as the old market place. However, building on the Old Town site would be a mistake and would affect the character of that area.</p> <p>What is a hospital hub? What role will this play? There doesn't seem to be any provision for a new modern hospital, fit for purpose in these plans. This will surely be needed with the massive increase in population proposed.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS515
<b>Person ID</b>	1207090
<b>Full Name</b>	Land Department
<b>Organisation Details</b>	British Pipelines Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>maps showing the area we affect, please note these are for guidance only and do not provide details of the pipelines and how they may affect any key future developments. (map received but not made public due to sensitive data)</p> <p><b>The list of Affected are as follows:</b></p> <p>The Rest of Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Maylands</p> <p>Two Waters</p> <p>North Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Kings Langley</p> <p>Bovingdon</p> <p>Tring</p> <p>In these area's listed above BPA and Fina will need to be consulted as we may affect any new Key Developments.</p>

**List of Not Affected Areas:**  
 Berkhamstead  
 Hemel Hempstead Town Centre  
 Markyate

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS521

**Person ID** 1207090

**Full Name** Land Department

**Organisation Details** British Pipelines Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

maps showing the area we affect, please note these are for guidance only and do not provide details of the pipelines and how they may affect any key future developments. (map received but not made public due to sensitive data)  
**The list of Affected are as follows:**  
 The Rest of Hemel Hempstead  
 Maylands  
 Two Waters  
 North Hemel Hempstead

Kings Langley  
 Bovingdon  
 Tring  
 In these area's listed above BPA and Fina will need to be consulted as we may affect any new Key Developments.  
**List of Not Affected Areas:**  
 Berkhamstead  
 Hemel Hempstead Town Centre  
 Markyate

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS524

**Person ID** 1207090

**Full Name** Land Department

**Organisation Details** British Pipelines Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I have had a brief look at the areas concerned and have found that both BPA and Fina Pipelines will affect some areas concerned.  
**The list of Affected Areas are as follows:**



The Rest of Hemel Hempstead

Maylands

Two Waters

North Hemel Hempstead

Kings Langley

Bovingdon

Tring

maps showing the area we affect, please note these are for guidance only and do not provide details of the pipelines and how they may affect any key future developments. (map received but not made public due to sensitive data)

In these area's listed above BPA and Fina will need to be consulted as we may affect any new Key Developments.

**List of Not Affected Areas:**

Berkhamsted

Hemel Hempstead Town Centre

Markyate

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS525

**Person ID** 1207090

**Full Name** Land Department

**Organisation Details** British Pipelines Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I have had a brief look at the areas concerned and have found that both BPA and Fina Pipelines will affect some areas concerned.</p> <p><b>The list of Affected Areas are as follows:</b></p> <p>The Rest of Hemel Hempstead  Maylands  Two Waters  North Hemel Hempstead  Kings Langley  Bovingdon  Tring</p> <p>maps showing the area we affect, please note these are for guidance only and do not provide details of the pipelines and how they may affect any key future developments. (map received but not made public due to sensitive data)</p> <p>In these area's listed above BPA and Fina will need to be consulted as we may affect any new Key Developments.</p> <p><b>List of Not Affected Areas:</b></p> <p>Berkhamsted  Hemel Hempstead Town Centre  Markyate</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS563
<b>Person ID</b>	1260936
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Hadden
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	It is proposed to build a new road linking HHGC (and it follows Redbourn Road and the M1) to B440. From there the most direct route for traffic heading for the A41 (and traffic from the A41 heading for the M1) will be via narrow country lanes such as Potten End Hill, Nettleden Road and Hudnall Lane and then via steep narrow roads, crossing the canal and railway via narrow bridges or height restricted routes under the railway, into Berkhamsted or Northchurch. All of the foregoing routes are wholly unsuitable for high volume traffic or HGV traffic. Why is this new road even being built (on Green Belt land) rather than encouraging traffic to use the existing major roads and dual carriageways from the M1 to the A41 at the Hemel junction?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS572
<b>Person ID</b>	1261023
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Brash
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>1 The development to the north of Hemel is based on a falsely perceived need to develop a large area of green belt</p> <p>2 The proposal includes a plan to build a new road from the junction of the M1 at junction 8 to the Hemel/Leighton Buzzard Road (B440). It is not clear where the junction with the B440 will be. The maps suggest somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End. If it is south of Water End, the bridge at Water End can hardly sustain any more traffic and has a weight restriction on it.</p> <p>If the aim is for the traffic to go to Berkhamsted via Potten End or to Leighton Buzzard via the B440, both these possibilities would lead to unsustainable additional traffic pressure.</p> <p>If the proposal envisages a bypass of Water End, that will involve the additional land acquisition not provided for in these proposals and the destruction of an historic landscape.</p> <p>For traffic travelling north, the obvious route to avoid the bottleneck at Water End is to go via Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which would cause unsustainable disruption to these villages.</p> <p>The B440 is not now a trunk road and there are several villages north of Water End which could not sustain the significant additional traffic that any new link road to the M1 would involve.</p> <p>3 If the new road is not intended to be a link with the M1 but is intended to be an internal road servicing the new Hemel Garden Community, there will still be significant additional traffic generated on the B440, which will still have the effects outlined in 2 above.</p> <p>4. The Strategy assumes that large areas of Green Belt land east of Hemel Hempstead and in St Albans District will be allocated for residential and employment development as part of the Hemel Garden Communities project. The St Albans Submission Local Plan has recently been withdrawn from Examination as the Inspectors advised that it would not be found 'sound'. The proposed sites north of Hemel Hempstead (5,500dw) in Dacorum must be called into question if there is any doubt about the future viability of the Garden Communities project as a whole.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS665
<b>Person ID</b>	1261122
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS699
<b>Person ID</b>	1249904
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Ridley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><i>24.1 The work on allocations is still evolving and we have reflected as much detail as we possibly can at this stage in the Plan. In particular, we have not been able to include all forms of proposals that might emerge in the settlements. We set out our current understanding of allocations in more detail in this 'Proposals and Sites' section of the plan</i></p> <p>Why are we being asked to comment on this plan when work on allocations is not yet finished? Will there be another consultation when plans are finalised?</p> <p>It is extremely worrying that even more development is being considered, most of which is on Green Belt land. Why would the council agree to more houses being built if we already have more than enough housing planned to satisfy government requirements? I really fail to understand why the council is obviously so delighted to build more and more houses and, as a consequence, ruin our town's best asset – the countryside which surrounds it.</p> <p>According to responses received during the consultation in 2017 on the draft (Issues and Options) Local Plan and summarised in the Housing Policy (Supply and Delivery) Topic Paper:</p> <p><i>"5.11 There was significant support from key stakeholders, Town and Parish Councils, individuals, resident action groups and other organisations for protecting the Green Belt from development", showing <b>that majority of people in Hemel Hempstead are opposed to development on the Green Belt</b>, so why are our elected representatives agreeing to such a plan?</i></p> <p>Since the government worked out the housing formula last August, Robert Jenrick has withdrawn this demand on local councils. It was realised that the formula led to an excessive demand for new housing in the south of England, and that a levelling up of house building throughout the country was more realistic (see Guardian article 'Ditching Jenrick's 'mutant algorithm' is a win for localism' December 16th 2020).</p> <p>Surely it can now be argued that building so many houses in Dacorum is totally ill-advised, due to the special and fragile biodiversity in the area, including the Chilterns Beechwood, ancient woodland, bio-diverse farmland and globally rare chalk steams. <b>A strong case could be made that so much housing on this area of Green Belt can no longer be justified.</b></p>

In any case, this is the wrong time to fix definite numbers of house building for the future. We are in the middle of a pandemic which is influencing work patterns, probably for ever, and Brexit is only just beginning to show its hand. There is a strong possibility that many of these planned developments will not be needed. DBC should be making sure that local inhabitants of Dacorum have a truly affordable place to live and any other plans should be left until a future date. By all means build houses for local people on Brownfield sites, but leave our precious Green Belt intact until the true picture of housing need emerges in years to come.

### **Hemel Garden Communities**

This planned development is **far too large** and makes a mockery of any pretence of sustainability.

#### ***Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:***

- *Undertake a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure that no significant adverse effects take place on designated/European sites where pathways exist*
- *Deliver Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on-site to offset potential adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC arising from recreational pressure. The scale and form of this SANG will need to be agreed with Natural England in advance of the submission of an outline planning application.*

There is no explicit explanation about how the losses to biodiversity in the Garden Community site will be mitigated. Improvements to another greenfield site should be made in compensation, but no suggestions have been made. Surely, in a development of this size no attempt at offsetting could be viable.

The following arguments have been made against this development in the topic papers:

Site Number: 74 North and North-East Hemel

*'Pockets of Ancient Woodland and Local Wildlife Sites exist both within and on the edge of the site. A substantial development of this scale could give rise to possible impacts on European designated sites in the area, such as Chiltern Beechwoods SAC. Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) may be needed on-site to offset any likely impacts.*

*Historic Environment Development of this site would have an impact on designated heritage assets located on and within the vicinity of the site. Due to the scale of the development, the impact on the setting of a number of listed buildings and other heritage assets on site should be mitigated through careful masterplanning and design.*

*Highways Impact Development of this site would likely result in a significant increase in traffic to and from the site at peak hours, when compared to alternatives.'*

Similar arguments have been used to decide not to develop other areas, such as near Fields End Lane so why has a decision been made to build on this environmentally sensitive area? I note that consideration of the Gaddeston estate was rejected because of the sloping valley sides.

*Site Selection: Appendix A Summary of Site Selection*

*Gaddesden Estate 149L The site is located adjacent to Site 74 which is carried forward for detailed testing, however AECOM identified that the sloping land of the Gade Valley is unsuitable for development. As this parcel is also located on the slopes of the valley, it is considered to be unsuitable for development and not carried forward for detailed testing.*

Shouldn't the same consideration be given to the slopes of the Gade valley where the Garden Community is planned? Even more shocking is the glee with which the council officials propose these plans. Why are the people we elect so intent on destroying Hemel's best assets – our beautiful countryside, and the small villages which are in close proximity to our town? What is the attraction of building more and more properties?

How can they come to the conclusion '*The site is the largest considered through the selection process for the Local Plan and with that, it performs relatively poorly in relation to a number of constraints such as Green Belt, landscape sensitivity and highways impacts*'

when the argument has just been made that it will probably have an impact on the ancient woodland, wildlife sites and Chiltern Beechwood, and also on the heritage assets, and actually the valley is extremely beautiful?

And even with so many homes planned, there is no guarantee that the families on the Council's housing list will be able to afford to rent or to buy these properties. When 'affordable' is based on 4 times the average income (MHCLG), most of the houses built will only be affordable to the relatively well off.

Furthermore, as mentioned above, a recent survey by estate agents has found that at least 25% of houses sold in Hemel are being bought by people from outside the borough. Dwellings on the side of the Gade valley will fetch a high price and will attract people from outside the town to move in, causing congestion and more strain on our services.

This whole project makes me feel extremely cynical. One cannot help but come to the conclusion that **the council is being led by the demands of the developers rather than the demands of local people.**

There seems to be some discrepancy in the plan as to the borders of the proposed Garden Community. In the DBC Topic Paper - Site Selection - Appendix B second round, the map for North Hemel, Site 74, has hatching marking "constrained land" and under "**Officer recommendation**" is written:

*"Officers agree with the AECOM Site Assessment Study recommendation that the western part of the site is unsuitable for development due to heritage, landscape and visual and coalescence impacts on Piccotts End and the undeveloped Gade Valley."*

However, the map of the boundaries of the Garden village in this part of the plan appears to come down as far as the Leighton Buzzard Road. Surely the advice of the AECOM Site Assessment recommendation should be followed, and **the shaded area should be left as Green Belt.**

### **West Hemel Hempstead**

With around 1,150 houses planned, this development can hardly be described as a '*small-scale development*' with '*modest levels of new build development*'

Furthermore, the plans for this development have already been approved, so why are we being asked to comment on it?

The quoted principals in this section are misleading. The text reads:



*'Design the development to the highest sustainability standards possible'*

But the developers are refusing to commit to these high sustainability standards. I know (as I have been present at meetings with the developers) that the dwellings are to be built without solar panels or heat pumps and are only going to be built to standards specified by the government when the plans were made in 2019. When asked if the houses were going to have solar panels, one of the developers replied that buyers don't want them.

Dacorum has declared a state of climate emergency. Why are the highest sustainability standards not being demanded **now?**

The **environment and biodiversity** section of the draft plan states:

**18.4** *The previous Natural Environment White Paper set out aims including halting biodiversity loss by 2020, supporting 'healthy functioning ecosystems', and establishing 'coherent ecological networks'.*

And In the topic paper: Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices

under Environmental Factors: B.1.4 Issues and opportunities

We are told aims are:

- *Protection of existing networks of natural habitats including buffer areas, migration routes, stepping stones and landscape features of major importance for wildlife.*
- *Linking and connecting isolated and fragmented habitats, important species populations and landscape features through creation of wildlife corridor (greenway) networks.*

However, although Martin Hicks, the ecological advisor to Hertfordshire has advised making a wildlife corridor in this development to connect Shrubhill Common with the wider countryside, preferably alongside the Chilterns way footpath, the developers are refusing to make such a corridor, so no functioning wildlife corridor is planned for this site.

**This is unacceptable as it goes directly against the specific aims of the New Local Plan.**

### **Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted**

#### **Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:**

*'As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site.'*

I have been unable to locate a Wildlife Site in this area on the OS map. A clearly labelled map of all the nature reserves and wildlife sites in Dacorum would be very useful, as would a hyperlink on this page taking the reader to the map. Indeed, such a list was suggested by James Doe at the Council Scrutiny and Oversight committee at which the pre-consultation NLP was accepted.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS796
<b>Person ID</b>	924793
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Stanier
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	I wish to object to the consideration of the vast use of agricultural land in the Green Belt in the area around Dodds Lane for the housing plans.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS862
<b>Person ID</b>	1144601
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Kelvin Archer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>My house looks out over the beautiful fields and countryside across from (address removed). Daily I see walkers, riders, runners enjoying getting out of main Hemel. It is something that has grown immensely during Covid-19 lockdown often with family groups, old and young alike. People have discovered the public footpaths and the marvellous views over the town as well as the abundant wildlife. From my house I see deer, foxes, badgers and hares as well as a plethora of birdlife.</p> <p>I am very troubled by the suggestion of 1,500 houses being built on what is often mentioned as the nicest part of Hemel. I have lived here in Dodds Lane for 26 years. Please do not spoil this lovely area with unwanted urban sprawl. I do not know who sets the new housing targets for Hemel but the amounts proposed are way out of kilter with what will be sustainable. Covid-19 alone will change things immensely and this needs to be thought out. Shops and offices in the town will not be required and can become housing. People will choose to work from home. There is the opportunity to create homes on the brownfield sites that will become available and these can be high density areas which will easily service the needs of a sensible future Hemel population.</p> <p>You refer to this area as North Hemel. It is a very long way from the train station and the M1. You talk about a Northern bypass but we do not need it and should not need it. You talk about removing this area from the green belt but once it</p>

is gone it is gone forever. If this is a lovely part of Hemel, keep it that way. This is just not the place and if you wreck this lovely area it will be a crying shame. Have you thought about the amount of water that runs down the hill here. When it rains Dodds Lane often looks like a river. You need to add climate change to this too. I did not see the level of water running down Dodds Lane 20 years ago that I see now and this will worsen. Please think again as it just does not add up.

To make it plain I wish to object to proposed housing in North Hemel near Dodds Lane. Piccotts End is a special and historic place in Hemel Hempstead and needs to be protected for the benefit of the town and its inhabitants.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS897

**Person ID** 1261504

**Full Name** Nicholas Hankey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

**Hemel Hempstead HH08**

I work in Hemel Hempstead and I have always felt that the station was too far from the rest of the town and Maylands and I support the Station Gateway plan. When we are recruiting in Maylands we find that candidates cannot easily get to Maylands from the station or neighbouring towns in a time effective way. Please ensure that plans for the transport hub increase public transport options to where the work is.

**Hemel Hempstead HH39**

The traffic on Maylands Avenue in peak times is already terrible (outside lockdown) as is the traffic up to the M1 and going into town. Additional offices will only make this worse. Two considerations: will there be adequate parking in new office developments as public transport is poor and Maylands is too far for most Hemel residents to walk. Secondly, in view of an expected increase in home working are these developments necessary? (Although the small industrial units on Maylands have been a hive of essential industry during both lockdowns).

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS910

**Person ID** 926372

**Full Name** Mr Michael Nidd

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

The suggestion that the Council depot at Cupids Green (on the edge of the industrial area and backing onto a household waste centre) should be developed for housing and for a new centre to be incorporated in the first phase of the now-greenfield development at North Hemel appears poorly justified and also perverse, as is the suggestion that a 40mph road should be built to join Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road.

The North Hemel development itself is a prime example of urban sprawl, and one which is a significant distance from the town centre, and about as far removed from the railway station and the key transport link of the M1 as it could be –

an unsustainable location. It would cause immense damage to views of the upper Gade Valley – cladding large areas of Grade 3 agricultural land with new-build housing. The proposed removal of North Hemel Phase 2 (though outside the ambit of this draft Plan which concludes in 2038) risks an extent of urban sprawl ribbon-building which would cause the coalescence of Dacorum with Redbourn: something which the provisions of Green Belts are intended to prevent.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>An allocation dating from two previous Plans has disappeared: h/h111 – Henry Wells Square, in the centre of Grovehill. Dacorum owns the land and at one time had produced its own plan to redevelop its current somewhat decrepit and inefficient layout and in the process gaining upwards of 200 dwellings but this somehow escaped inclusion in the somewhat data-free Grovehill Neighbourhood Plan. It now appears to have been forgotten.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS923
<b>Person ID</b>	1261540
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Claire Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Environmental reasoning is woolly at best within the documentation, what is going to be done to protect the skylarks that have been sighted along the left fields of Dodd’s lane? The proposed housing development would eliminate their natural habitat in the area, on a bird that is protected under Section 41: Species and Habitats of Principal Importance. Also, what should be the impact on the red kites that are present in the area? Will there be areas for them to remain? The environmental cost accounting (ECA) should be disclosed for each area of the proposed development.</p> <p>The release of the green belt area proposed backing onto Piccotts End goes against all the reasons that green belt areas were created, and ‘unrestricted sprawl of urban areas’ is exactly what these plans entail by conjoining various separate areas within Hemel Hempstead north of the old town, where households will rely on private cars for transportation.</p>

During the COVID-19 pandemic the village has been particularly busy with walkers across the green belt areas which the council is proposing to develop, as per the current proposal this would be a very large new housing estate. A pedestrian crossing from the public footpath from Piccotts End across the Leighton buzzard road would be required to ensure visitors and residents would be able to safely cross to the remaining green belt areas on the opposite side of the Leighton Buzzard road, a reduced speed limit for this road would also need to be introduced for motorists to safely come to a stop for a pedestrian crossing. This needs to be implemented if the plans go ahead to ensure the safety and the availability of access to green belt areas that residents are not only used to but have specifically moved to the area for is maintained.

The proposed housing development backing on to Piccotts End is too far away from the train station for new residents to walk there and the current public transport from the area to the train station is not sufficient for commuters. If the new data confirms the same level of housing requirement, the largest site in the proposed plan is too far away from the station to travel without a private vehicle, exactly the opposite of what the council is trying to achieve. The impact of 1,500 houses is 1.4 vehicles per household

(<https://www.statista.com/statistics/314912/average-number-of-cars-per-household-in-england/>) within the South East therefore the council should provide the noise and air pollution impact of an additional 2,100 private vehicles in the local area and confirm how they intend to neutralise this impact as per the objectives of housing to be net carbon neutral.

The road infrastructure proposed in the plan in the Piccotts End area creates only one new road, multiple traffic calming's would need to be introduced in Piccotts End village to deter new residents from using the road through the village which is narrow and often flooded reducing the wear and tear and impact on the current residents.

As a resident in a conservation, green belt and area of historical importance (Piccotts End Murals) it would be prudent of the council to conserve this area for future generations, by supporting this tourism destination, and look to innovative solutions for the housing need to be met.

The final item I would like to raise is the flood zone within the Riverbank housing area in Piccotts End, this is designed to take the water that runs from the surrounding fields from Dodd's Lane, building housing will increase the level of water running from this area of land as the natural agricultural land will no longer retain the majority of the run off. At present this flood zone is impacted during the winter months, what will be the additional water impact on this area and the houses within it, will building houses increase the flood risk to these residents, if so how does the council intend to eliminate this? If all the houses built had living roofs (the environmental consideration stated in the Sustainability Appraisal report) how much water would this retain and divert from this flood area?

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS972
<b>Person ID</b>	1207613
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Nina Crabb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Adviser The National Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The National Trust supports the provision of a new country park. This should be a multifunctional space with a range of facilities and delivered early in the plan period in order to reduce recreational pressure on the Ashridge Estate.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS985
<b>Person ID</b>	1207090
<b>Full Name</b>	Land Department
<b>Organisation Details</b>	British Pipelines Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I have had a brief look at the areas concerned and have found that both BPA and Fina Pipelines will affect some areas concerned.</p> <p><b>The list of Affected Areas are as follows:</b></p> <p>The Rest of Hemel Hempstead  Maylands  Two Waters  North Hemel Hempstead  Kings Langley  Bovingdon  Tring</p> <p>maps showing the area we affect, please note these are for guidance only and do not provide details of the pipelines and how they may affect any key future developments. (map received but not made public due to sensitive data)</p> <p>In these area's listed above BPA and Fina will need to be consulted as we may affect any new Key Developments.</p> <p><b>List of Not Affected Areas:</b></p> <p>Berkhamsted  Hemel Hempstead Town Centre  Markyate</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS1000
<b>Person ID</b>	211239
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alan Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I live in (street name removed) and I have a number of comments in respect of the growth strategy for Consultation and my local councillor suggested that I email my comments here.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lack of detail in respect of the Hemel Garden Communities is giving me great anxiety, as it refers to some 4000 dwellings out from the back of our house, possibly, which is not a positive thought.</li> <li>2. It is hard for someone not very computer literate to find out additional information a to the precise area covered.</li> <li>3. Is it impossible/possible/probable that you are going to build on Grovehill playing fields?</li> <li>4. What additional transport links are going to be developed to the areas? Will there be a rail link to the main network to cater for the large development?</li> <li>5. It refers to cycling, but a large percentage of people cannot ride a bike or are not able to ride in traffic, so that caters for a minority.</li> <li>6. What are you going to do so as to keep the good views and the walks in the area?</li> <li>7. Given the fact that there is a pandemic and that there has been a large increase in the number of deaths, how has this effected the need for additional developments. Also Brexit is also likely to reduce population levels, so has this been accounted for?</li> <li>8. A number of people including me, feel that the major negative effect on the environment is the increase in the last 100 or so years in human population levels. Is this increase in dwellings, encouraging population growth and therefore has a negative effect on the environment, even if the development is done in an environmentally friendly way.</li> <li>9. What are the results as far as the development in respect of potential flooding in the area, as the water level has seemed to be increasing in the area and with excessive rain the grovehill playing fields has a river flowing through it.</li> <li>10. The drainage in the area could be improved, do what effect will additional housing have as far ad that is concerned?</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1095
<b>Person ID</b>	1261696
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen and Carolyn Wise
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We contact you in relation to the Draft Plan for Dacorum. We object to the proposed development which shows little regard for the impact on the environment, infrastructure and effects on climate change. There will also be significant adverse effect on the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>The level of proposed new housing will cause a massive impact on water supplies, notably affecting our precious chalk streams which run dry in drought conditions and are at present already over-abstracted. The required waste services would also cause huge disruption as they are not adequate at present.</p> <p>The road system would be inadequate and anyone approaching from the North would encounter the one way bridge at Water End which is already congested.</p> <p>The changes caused by the current epidemic have obviously not been anticipated and there is likely to be retail and brownfield sites available for development and these should be considered.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1096
<b>Person ID</b>	1261696
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen and Carolyn Wise
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We contact you in relation to the Draft Plan for Dacorum. We object to the proposed development which shows little regard for the impact on the environment, infrastructure and effects on climate change. There will also be significant adverse effect on the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>The level of proposed new housing will cause a massive impact on water supplies, notably affecting our precious chalk streams which run dry in drought conditions and are at present already over-abstracted. The required waste services would also cause huge disruption as they are not adequate at present.</p> <p>The road system would be inadequate and anyone approaching from the North would encounter the one way bridge at Water End which is already congested.</p> <p>The changes caused by the current epidemic have obviously not been anticipated and there is likely to be retail and brownfield sites available for development and these should be considered.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1111
<b>Person ID</b>	1261723
<b>Full Name</b>	David Matthews
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Why are you ruining the town. Hemel wasn't built for this level of occupancy. You will be known forever as the people who ruined a lovely place to live. You can't just keep building on more and more green land without massive infrastructure projects to the town. Major road junctions in the town are already a bottle neck. Build some of the in town projects, not the green field sites. Your job is to look after the best interests of Hemel Hempstead and it's residents, these proposals are not doing that.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1121
<b>Person ID</b>	1261741

<b>Full Name</b>	Daniel Gilbert
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Where does the council justify the exceptional circumstances which would allow it to so severely erode the green belt? Policy SP11 states that the greenbelt will be amended as the council believes there to be exceptional circumstances allowing it to do so, saying this is explored in the sustainable development strategy. The paragraph on sustainable development however only sets out a general set of values to which the council will aspire. I believe the garden communities (HH01 and HH02) to be an unacceptable encroachment on greenbelt land. Policy DM27 states that any development should conserve, restore or enhance the prevailing quality, character and condition of the natural and historic landscape. The development would represent a significant reduction in the rural area of the borough, and a significant addition to Hemel Hempstead's urban sprawl. The development would remove any kind of buffer zone between the urban area of Hemel Hempstead and the Chilterns AONB. There is already a problem with flytipping in the rural areas bordering the AONB (where the development is planned) and this development would encourage this activity to move within the AONB. The area of green belt between Hemel Hempstead and the AONB also allows wildlife such as deer and birds of prey to be seen. Such species would be driven away by the close proximity of dense human population, with a detrimental effect on biodiversity contrary to policy DM30. Light pollution from the town is already significant and visible within some parts of the AONB, and the new development would unavoidably cause large amounts of light pollution from both streetlighting and dwellings which would be visible far into the AONB. The effect of this is detrimental both to the enjoyment of the AONB at night and to wildlife, and is at odds with policy DM35.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS1165
<b>Person ID</b>	1261837
<b>Full Name</b>	Kimberley Bond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Far too much development, too intensive, the roads and utility network will not be it for purpose, the impact on existing residents will be negative, too little thought in the community space - appears to be an after thought behind the drive for a significant number of additional houses which will see population density increase significantly, particularly in the areas earmarked for intensive development (new town and Two Waters) in a way which is totally detrimental to the lives of the resident population, but which (beyond a roof) will bring limited benefit to people who choose to move to Hemel as a result. Too many houses.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1292
<b>Person ID</b>	1259116
<b>Full Name</b>	Tring in Transition (TinT)
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1357
<b>Person ID</b>	772477
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Roy Warren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Manager Sport England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth Areas HH01 and HH02 North Hemel Phases 1 and 2</p> <p>The Social and Community requirements of these allocations should specifically include new outdoor and indoor sports facilities to provide clarity to all stakeholders that on-site sports facility provision will be expected. These are some of the few allocations in the Borough that would be large enough to justify on-site sports facility provision being made to</p>



meet the additional needs that the development will generate. Opportunities will exist for meeting such needs in the Country Park and schools proposed in the allocations. While its is not necessary to quantify the amount or type of sports facility provision at this stage, the need to make provision should be made explicit to avoid misinterpretations at a later date that there was a not a need to make any on-site provision because it was not specified in the policy.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1518
<b>Person ID</b>	1262216
<b>Full Name</b>	George Godar
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>1 This development is taking a large area of Green Belt land and is too close to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>2 Under Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport, there is a reference to an access road linking this development with the North Hemel development and the allocations to the east, in effect providing a link road from Junction 8 of the M1 to the B440, meeting the latter somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End. This has the potential to provide a rat run (and therefore increased traffic) from the M1 to Berkhamsted through Potten End, and to the north through Nettleden. Little Gaddesden, Ringshall and Dagnall (avoiding the narrow bridge at Water End).</p> <p>It is therefore important that traffic management is introduced to ensure that this new access road is used only as such and not as a link road between external areas so generating unsustainable traffic increases.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1534
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>2. HH09 National Grid Land</p> <p>This is a brownfield site that I would like to see developed but again there is an issue with it.</p> <p>A. The proposed height of the buildings is too high and there are too many flats. In the light of the Covid-19 pandemic it would be better if this development was less</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1535
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>4. HH10 Whiteleaf Road</p> <p>I am happy for this brownfield site to be developed but there is an issue.</p> <p>A building in this development has been half demolished for months and months creating an eyesore. (although due to the pandemic I have not driven past site for a year). Please can you make sure that this development is completed as soon as possible and not left in this dreadful state indefinitely.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1558
<b>Person ID</b>	1262260
<b>Full Name</b>	Gordon Ferguson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HHO1 and HH02 sites constitute an excessive use of green belt land. The traffic pull from Leighton Buzzard, Berhamstead and environs will cause much harm to the hamlets of Water End, Piccotts End & Great Gaddesden. This traffic will likely be through traffic for access to the M1 (new road) and the M25 via A41. The bridge at Water End is already a pinch point and an accident black spot. Flooding is a regular occurrence between the 2nd crossing and the Red Lion PH. Traffic calming would be necessary on Potten End Road and through Potten End. There is no provision in the plan for alternative cycle routes and little the preservation of established footpaths and established walks (eg Varney's Wood through River Gade & Water End)
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Varneys Wood Path.PNG</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1664
<b>Person ID</b>	1262334
<b>Full Name</b>	SUSAN HARRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am appalled that acres of green belt are being reclaimed for housing and development.</p> <p>The building on this land will cause major traffic congestion, pollution and will have a major impact on the local wildlife in an area of outstanding beauty.</p> <p>The Leighton Buzzard Road/ Dagnall Road is already overused, the bridge at Water End cannot cope with the amount of traffic and is a hot spot for accidents.</p> <p>The impact this development will have on the area will be catastrophic.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1665
<b>Person ID</b>	1262334
<b>Full Name</b>	SUSAN HARRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am appalled that acres of green belt are being reclaimed for housing and development.</p> <p>The building on this land will cause major traffic congestion, pollution and will have a major impact on the local wildlife in an area of outstanding beauty.</p> <p>The Leighton Buzzard Road/ Dagnall Road is already overused, the bridge at Water End cannot cope with the amount of traffic and is a hot spot for accidents.</p> <p>The impact this development will have on the area will be catastrophic.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1668
<b>Person ID</b>	1262337
<b>Full Name</b>	SALLY BENINGFIELD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am writing to vehemently oppose the proposal for the building of 1550 houses in Hemel Hempstead by 2038 and a further 4000 after 2038.</p> <p>Having lived in Water End for 47 years I have seen many changes to the local area and not many of these have had a positive effect.</p> <p>It is impossible to believe that the local council are seriously considering such a huge development during these extremely challenging times when green space has been found to be so important for people's wellbeing and mental health. It is quite clear that either no lessons have been learnt, if they have, they are being ignored. The plan fails to consider the likely impact of the coronavirus pandemic and the recent changes to planning which may free up more sites in town centres.</p> <p>There is absolutely no credible reason for green belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty to be compromised by such a hideous development, the surrounding villages in which people choose to reside because they are quiet (ish) these days will be destroyed beyond any recognition and this is totally unacceptable and simply cannot be allowed to go ahead.</p>

The narrower roads and small bridges in the area are not designed to cope with the huge levels of traffic such a huge number of houses would bring, not to mention the extent of both pollution and noise. The villages of Water End and Piccotts End would be destroyed and the residents' home life shattered.

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS1669

**Person ID** 1262337

**Full Name** SALLY BENINGFIELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I am writing to vehemently oppose the proposal for the building of 1550 houses in Hemel Hempstead by 2038 and a further 4000 after 2038.

Having lived in Water End for 47 years I have seen many changes to the local area and not many of these have had a positive effect.

It is impossible to believe that the local council are seriously considering such a huge development during these extremely challenging times when green space has been found to be so important for people's wellbeing and mental health. It is quite clear that either no lessons have been learnt, if they have, they are being ignored. The plan fails to consider the

likely impact of the coronavirus pandemic and the recent changes to planning which may free up more sites in town centres.

There is absolutely no credible reason for green belt or areas of outstanding natural beauty to be compromised by such a hideous development, the surrounding villages in which people choose to reside because they are quiet (ish) these days will be destroyed beyond any recognition and this is totally unacceptable and simply cannot be allowed to go ahead.

The narrower roads and small bridges in the area are not designed to cope with the huge levels of traffic such a huge number of houses would bring, not to mention the extent of both pollution and noise. The villages of Water End and Piccotts End would be destroyed and the residents' home life shattered.

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS1676

**Person ID** 1262338

**Full Name** PAUL HARRIS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am appalled that acres of green belt are being reclaimed for housing and development.</p> <p>The building on this land will cause major traffic congestion, pollution and will have a major impact on the local wildlife in an area of outstanding beauty.</p> <p>The Leighton Buzzard Road/ Dagnall Road is already overused, the bridge at Water End cannot cope with the amount of traffic and is a hot spot for accidents.</p> <p>The impact this development will have on the area will be catastrophic.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1677
<b>Person ID</b>	1262338
<b>Full Name</b>	PAUL HARRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am appalled that acres of green belt are being reclaimed for housing and development.</p> <p>The building on this land will cause major traffic congestion, pollution and will have a major impact on the local wildlife in an area of outstanding beauty.</p> <p>The Leighton Buzzard Road/ Dagnall Road is already overused, the bridge at Water End cannot cope with the amount of traffic and is a hot spot for accidents.</p> <p>The impact this development will have on the area will be catastrophic.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1681
<b>Person ID</b>	1165136
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs J.D Battye
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Phase II of the North Hemel project should be brought forward and integrated with Phase 1 (SP16.23.70-77)- the site offers the best opportunity to create sustainable housing. Larger sites are also more capable of delivering custom and self-build housing(14.14). There is a recognised shortage of homes in Dacorum at present; who knows what the situation will be in 20 years' time? The site should be fully exploited at the outset. Indeed the NPPF states at 139 that permission to develop safeguarded land should only be granted following an update to the plan.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1704
<b>Person ID</b>	1262341
<b>Full Name</b>	Hugh Vinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The Housing development area to the north of Grove Hill playing fields, north of Wootton Drive, needs to be curtailed to above an elevation due to the frequent flooding at lower levels.</p> <p>Many times this winter, the lower levels have been deeply flooded. When the housing development has taken place, the run off from the 'concreting over' of the area will increase the risk of flooding many times over. The exact elevation to the build line is probably going to be somewhere near 2m above the lowest point. This will not take much area out of the indicated area and this could be usefully planted to extend the current hedge line with trees and shrubs.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS1984
<b>Person ID</b>	1262709
<b>Full Name</b>	Adam Griffin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development as I am very concerned about the local development plan that you have published and the various impacts it would have on the parish of Great Gaddesden. I would also question the timing of this at a time, given the current government imposed lockdown, when it is impossible to practically engage the wider community in any form of real discussion.</p> <p>The plan also has a number of inconsistencies in its approach and shows a lack of awareness and understanding of a number of fundamental issues.</p> <p>The plan would, if allowed, result in the urbanisation of a parish that is predominantly composed of agriculture land and woodland and sits in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB). The proposed development would cover almost 18% of the parish and reach right to the border of the AONB demarcation line. Environmental impacts of sound and light and noise alone would do significant damage to the natural beauty of the AONB. There can be no hiding from the fact that the plan would have a very significantly detrimental effect on the green belt and also on the Chiltern's area of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The area is already suffering badly from the creeping urbanisation as littering and fly tipping and traffic have become major problems which are not being successfully addressed.</p> <p>Whenever I drive through the borough I am struck by the potential number of brownfield sites available and although there is evidence that some thought has gone in to its utilisation we are at a stage of urban development when inner city retail sites are increasingly underutilised and occupied and could and should be used to boost the housing supply without further damaging the natural environment.</p> <p>It appears to me to be vital that all brownfield options are fully explored and maximised before reducing the hard-pressed green belt land further.</p>

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

Although more housing is required I understand that the central government target that lies at the heart of this plan is out of date (2014) and was withdrawn and substantially lowered for the rest of the South East of England and I would expect Dacorum to fight for the same degree of respite. More recent figures I gather show a much lower house building target requirement, approximately half that of the 2014 figure.

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

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

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

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

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

I believe the plan does not pay due attention to all of these very important issues and, at a time when there are talks about the area possibly becoming upgraded to a National Park, shows little regard for the understanding or appreciation

of this beautiful area. It is working towards an out of date and overestimated housing target and is needlessly damaging to the environment.

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS1985

**Person ID** 1262709

**Full Name** Adam Griffin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Although more housing is required I understand that the central government target that lies at the heart of this plan is out of date (2014) and was withdrawn and substantially lowered for the rest of the South East of England and I would expect Dacorum to fight for the same degree of respite. More recent figures I gather show a much lower house building target requirement, approximately half that of the 2014 figure.

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

Ponds that have existed for hundreds of years have been drying up each year and often remain dry through the winter and I now know this is partly a result of the long term over abstraction from our local River Gade which has of course impacted on the aquifer underneath us and lowered the water table very significantly. It has also put the surrounding

beautiful chalk streams at risk. Further development can only put yet more pressure on this fragile resource and have a serious and permanent environmental impact.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS2228
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2309
<b>Person ID</b>	488516
<b>Full Name</b>	mr hugh siegle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH01 should be combined with HH02 for overall development now rather than HH02 being held in reserve
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2310
<b>Person ID</b>	610662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Antony Harbidge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2)</b>  Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now and safeguarded for development post 2038. Given that the Council aspire to Garden City status, HH02 should be combined with HH01 now to provide a new vibrant, dynamic community of 5400 new homes and 21st century infrastructure which will boost the Garden City plan and meet all the Council's strategic objective.

Such an extension to Hemel has the scale to help regenerate its New Town core but also provide significant benefits: Accessible location. Provide benefits of scale development- sustainable, minimise energy consumption, enable renewable energy technology, decentralise heating, support public transport initiatives and avoid harm to environmental assets.

BRAG accepts that this could be a real opportunity for the Borough to develop a vibrant 21st century extension which will help regenerate its New Town core, but not by delaying and destroying Berkhamsted and Tring in the meantime.

**HH03 Hospital site.**

Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear sustainable NHS strategy for this part of Hertfordshire (incl. Watford and St Albans) which recognises the current unsatisfactory provision and allows for population growth, is confirmed and initiated.

**HH06 Civic Centre Site.**

Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion.

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

No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS2433

**Person ID** 1227518

**Full Name** Mr John LOWRIE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>it's just too big.</p> <p>It's not required by Dacorum but required by the government.</p> <p>It"s entirly on important green belt land</p> <p>It's the easy option to place a massiveestate on green belt. More effort on smaller brown field sites, changing shops and offices to housing is the btter option.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2456
<b>Person ID</b>	1262981
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Mabley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Scale is nothing short of urban sprawl and impacts the water course
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2474
<b>Person ID</b>	1263080
<b>Full Name</b>	Russell Emson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2503
<b>Person ID</b>	1263098
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Flockhart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	These comments relate to the greenfield sites the west of hemel hempstead. The nature of the towns west of Hemel are defined by green field gaps between them - Hemel, Berko, Tring etc - all need gaps between them. Continuing to build on the next field to the last development will see development creep up the valley spoil the character of the area that your planning guidelines refer to in numerous sections - the Bulbourne valley, the AONB, the villages and the market towns of the valley. Please stop developing greenbelt.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2532
<b>Person ID</b>	1263148
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Fletcher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Not enough space allocated for green areas or gardens not all of us want to live trapped between floors a flats without a separate outdoor space for drying washing or just being able to sit and be. One and 2 bed houses with garden. Eco friendly heating and water systems. Hybrid parking in front of dwellings to future proof.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	One or 2 bed houses with gardens for those who to downsize. Where is the eco friendly environment considerations and hybrid parking bays in front of dwellings. The hospital should not be given over to residential housing until the new hospital is built. Or is this another sell out by local gov
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2583
<b>Person ID</b>	1261636
<b>Full Name</b>	James Lane
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Phase1 and Phase 2 - North Hemel

You have proposed building on green belt and farm land. Lands that are now needed more than ever. Not to mention the environment impact on the local area, even now the local Grove Hill Playing Fields floods to the point that a river can be seen running across the field east to west with heavy rain. The proposed development will not take this into account and it will be to the local not the developers or council when it starts affecting health, lives and property.

With no development of J9 of the M1 there has been no thought in this growth plan as to how 5500 new homes will impact the local roads of North Hemel. It seems that all the development will happen at J8 which will not help or service the North Hemel residents (new or old) which will greatly impact lives and health.

This development will also box in the local communities swallowing the area in to the town. Many residents moved to the edge of the town to be near countryside and open spaces for health reasons only to have that taken away.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS2626

**Person ID** 1205289

**Full Name** unknown

**Organisation Details** Tower Farm  
Felden Park Farms Ltd

**Agent ID** 864650

**Agent Full Name** Mr  
Derek  
Bromley

**Agent Organisation** Partner  
BIDWELLS

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



**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

We act for Felden Park Farms the owners of the proposed employment allocation referred to as Growth Area HH16: Two Waters /A41 Junction Employment Site.

Our client supports the proposed allocation and we have been in contact with the Council officers, Herts Highways and Boxmoor Trust. The gathering of information has comprised a topographical survey, ecological survey, highways access report and proposals and first stage master planning.

Discussions have been held with Herts Highways and it is agreed that the access to the site is from Two Waters and in principle as part of the Local Plan this is acceptable. We are currently awaiting a further response from Herts Highways before preparing access amendments.

The Ecology Report confirms there are no noted mammals, birds, reptiles or insects on the site. The grass sward is fairly recently sown, the land having been previously cultivated for arable crops. The report confirms that 10% net gain biodiversity can be achieved on site.

The initial Master Plan demonstrates how approximately 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace can be accommodated on site. Since the officers response to the Master Plan this has been amended, but before the second draft Master Plan is produced we are waiting to finalise the access arrangements.

Discussions have been held with Boxmoor Trust and we believe we can accommodate an area of land within the site to suit its need. In addition it has been confirmed that the Trust would like 10 car spaces made available for public use and have suggested a location. The number of spaces had already been in the Master Plan and we are reviewing the location.

It is expected that between the Reg 18 and Reg 19 Consultations, further work will produce a scheme demonstrating the site is deliverable and proposing mitigation measures where appropriate.

Considering the Reg 18 site specific requirements

- It has been demonstrated that around 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> of floorspace can be accommodated on the site, this takes into account refinements to the layout as suggested by officers. If further amendments are required due to constraints this may impact upon the level of floorspace.
- The mix of units in compliance with the site policy has also been demonstrated
- A road access from Two Waters has been produced and we are awaiting Herts Highways response to an amendment to the design before progressing. The Master Plan shows provision for a new footpath/ cycle route along the northern boundary, this will provide a better route for users of the footpath on the Boxmoor Trust land ( possibly a Footpath Diversion Order could be approved which would avoid the footpath on the Boxmoor Trust land). The Cycleway could then continue along the route of the existing public footpath which lies and within the site to the A41. Improvements to a short length the footpath west of the railway line before it diverts into the site can be achieved by cutting back the bank and re surfacing. Due to the width of the footpath over the railway bridge and the changes in the land levels to the east of the railway, it will be necessary for cyclists to dismount and push their bikes up and down the steps. With the agreement of the Highway Authority it is proposed to make this more commodious for cyclists by providing a ramp at the side of the steps. In addition improvements can be made to the footpath with an upgrade to a new cycleway from Featherbed Lane within the Adopted Highway or land owned by the Council. A further possibility which will be subject to Boxmoor Trust agreement is to provide a better surface

to the Byway Open to all Traffic to the north of the SSSI and upgrade the footpath alongside the A41 to a cycleway to connect to the site and the footpaths and cycleways proposed within the site. More radical improvements to the footpath and cycleway infrastructure network in the locality for the benefit of the town residents may require the co-operation of the Council and use of the Community Infrastructure Levy. In summary there are a range of possible improvements which can be made to the footpaths and access for cyclists.

- We have viewed the site from the surrounding countryside, but given the land form, trees and hedges the site is not visible from public vantage points. Indeed from our inspection it is really only visible from the A41 Featherbed Lane Bridge and the urban area. In the circumstances whilst strengthening the landscaping within the site is proposed this is to mitigate views from the countryside beyond and to the west of the A41.
- The initial Master Plan provides for a cordon sanitaire to the SSSI and discussions have been held with the Boxmoor Trust relating to this area.

The above deals with the matters arising from the site specific policy.

In addition para 138 of the NPPF refers that when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, ways should be set out in which the impact of land removed from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land. Our client has extensive landholdings to the west of the A41 and land which adjoins Sheethanger Common/ Bury Wood (Boxmoor Trust land) which can be made available for compensatory improvements which are proven to be necessary. The Initial Master Plan proposals provide improved footpath and cycleway connections to the open countryside and a public car parking area, thereby offering greater accessibility for the residents to the Green Belt. In addition land (approx.1.5 acres) within the scheme could be made available for public use. The NPPF does not guide, restrict or limit how improvements can be achieved. A commuted payment to a single larger offset improvement may be considered more beneficial to be funded by a number of schemes around the town. In the circumstances in order to address necessary offset compensatory provision we suggest a site specific wording is added to the policy to address the point.

We will continue to chase Herts Highways for a response regarding refinements to the access arrangements, whereupon we will be able to produce a revised Master Plan.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS2629

<b>Person ID</b>	1261094
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna Crawford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to strongly opposed the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the proposals for new housing on Green Belt land on what is 17% of Great Gaddesden Parish land. I have lived in Great Gaddesden for the past 32 years. The amount of additional housing proposed appears to be more that required by government. It talks about providing green spaces, but it will be using Green Belt, which are existing green spaces which should be preserved for future generations.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the proposed new link road through the development will lead to more congestion on existing narrow roads with pinch points over Water End Bridge.</p> <p>I am in total agreement with the objections from Great Gaddesden Parish Council who have responded in more detail.</p> <p>Whilst I recognise the need for additional housing, I believe every other opportunity should be exhausted, by using brownfield sites or developing existing buildings before encroaching onto precious Green Belt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS2631
<b>Person ID</b>	1261094
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna Crawford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to strongly opposed the proposed plans.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the proposals for new housing on Green Belt land on what is 17% of Great Gaddesden Parish land. I have lived in Great Gaddesden for the past 32 years. The amount of additional housing proposed appears to be more that required by government. It talks about providing green spaces, but it will be using Green Belt, which are existing green spaces which should be preserved for future generations.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the proposed new link road through the development will lead to more congestion on existing narrow roads with pinch points over Water End Bridge.</p> <p>I am in total agreement with the objections from Great Gaddesden Parish Council who have responded in more detail.</p> <p>Whilst I recognise the need for additional housing, I believe every other opportunity should be exhausted, by using brownfield sites or developing existing buildings before encroaching onto precious Green Belt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2727
<b>Person ID</b>	1263254
<b>Full Name</b>	Teresa Finnigan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	way to much development on the north side of hemel, building in redbourn parish and pretty much joining up to it, which is totally not acceptable and one of the 5 objections in the GB policy, no coalescence!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2791
<b>Person ID</b>	1263104
<b>Full Name</b>	charlotte grange
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I support the maximisation of the use of brownfield sites here, such as HH13, HH27 (a good way of bolstering the local economy through retail at Jarman Park) HH17, HH18, HH19, and HH09.</p> <p>I am fully opposed to the development at HH12, Two Waters Moor. This forms part of the Box Moor, and is a widely used recreation space, providing access to open space for a huge variety of people. I am also fully opposed to HH16 (widely used as important open space by dog walkers, joggers etc), and HH21, HH22, and HH26. The vast scale of the growth at HH01 and HH02 is unacceptable, and entirely unsustainable in the current ecological crisis. I lived in Gadebridge for some time and made, along with many other residents, extensive use of the adjoining fields for leisure and mental health. This would be built over, according to this plan. I appreciate the need for development of brownfield sites and even some release of greenbelt, but the sheer scale of these first two developments is ecologically and socially unsound, and far exceeds ONS projections for actual housing need.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>The Town Centre, particularly the empty lots and the failing Marlowes Centre could become a vibrant mixed-use habitation and shopping community centre.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2801
<b>Person ID</b>	924793
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Stanier
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I wish to object to the consideration of the vast use of agricultural land in the Green Belt in the area around Dodds Lane for the housing plans.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2823
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The Hemel Garden Community (HGC) (23.6 – 19) envisages the development of 5,800 houses over the next 20+ years of which the majority fall within the parish of Great Gaddesden which currently has 450 houses spread across five hamlets in an area which is entirely either AONB or Green Belt; this represents an overwhelming and completely negative transformational change in the nature of the area (see attached map).</p> <p>The plans envisage development right up to the AONB boundary and although we have been told that the development will be phased as it approaches the AONB to incorporate a country park and other open spaces we see no details of this in the Plan. It seems incongruous that Green Belt land is being withdrawn for development only for assurances to be made that some of it will be left “green”. Why withdraw the Green Belt in the first place?</p>

The Schedule of Site Appraisals for large Green Field sites of October 2017 for the equivalent Site HH-h1b North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 and 2) had under the Technical Studies Assessment "Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt". What has changed?

The proposed HGC site appears to be directly in conflict with the Council's proposed Policy DM50.2.a which states that: "Locate development in areas that provide good levels of access to sustainable modes of transport and can make provision for its improvement."

This site lies between 4km and 8km from Hemel Hempstead station. In the absence of any transport plan it is impossible to see how this can be defined as having "good levels of access to sustainable modes of transport".

We have already expressed our significant concern at the impact and feasibility of the new link road from J8 of the M1 to Leighton Buzzard Road which forms part of the proposed development.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[Local plan impact on GGPCv3.jpg](#)

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS2841

**Person ID**

1263355

**Full Name**

Colin French

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH26, HH25, etc ;- 'Leverstock Green' currently has the benefit of being a distinct village community, it being of a manageable scale with a distinct identity;- it has the benefit of a cricket pitch, pubs and amenity centre as a focal point. The village is currently all to a scale which engenders a sense of place and a sense of community for its residents, The proposed developments around Leverstock Green risk changing the character of the village to its detriment whilst simultaneously afflicting additional strain on local amenities and infrastructure, ie roads. I assume that the green belt was intended to prevent sprawling urban development, to safeguard the environment and retain a distinct sense of place, rather than linking up towns and villages. It would appear that this is now at risk.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS2995
<b>Person ID</b>	1258924
<b>Full Name</b>	Natalia Maghdoori
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3085
<b>Person ID</b>	1263499
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Angela Burgin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS3108
<b>Person ID</b>	1261485
<b>Full Name</b>	Douglas Adams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	Surplus brownfield office space.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3117
<b>Person ID</b>	1145755
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Anthony White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

Please see below ref some comments and questions I have regarding the North Hemel development two phases and my objections to the Dacorum draft plans.

- 1) I find the evidence used to declare Dacorum an area for accelerated growth poor and outdated. I can find no evidence that Dacorum has taken in to account the more updated and considerably lower figures provided by the Office of Government statistics for housing growth requirement. Instead the much higher 2014 estimated figures are still being used. Where is the evidence that Dacorum needs this many new houses? Where is the justification for such a large loss of Green Belt?
- 2) The government is shifting from wanting development in the South east to other parts of the country - "Northern Powerhouse". I see no evidence this is taken into account in these plans. Where do the proposals take the new balance / levelling into account?
- 3) Where is the detail ref the road link between the Leighton Buzzard road and the Redbourn Road?
- 4) I am concerned about Waste water and supply of water. How will these developments affect drainage? Have any studies been carried out that take into account the effect on the water table? Where is the water supply for these new houses coming from? I can see no concrete solution to the water supply.
- 5) The North Hemel development is the very definition of "urban sprawl". It is too far to walk into the town. It is too far to walk to the railway station. 1500 new home occupants will have to drive everywhere. I see no evidence that makes me believe North Hemel will not become even more gridlocked than it currently is!
- 6) No potential changes in the way we work and live as a country post Covid are taken into account. Are the needs moving forward the same as they were 6-7 years ago?

The policy background for Green Belts as set out in Section 13 of the national Planning Policy Framework states the Government attaches great importance to green belts and the fundamental aim of the green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 143 of NPPF states that inappropriate development is, by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.. Paragraph 144 adds that "very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other planning harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations".

The North Hemel development plans put forward by Dacorum use old information and inappropriate logic. Dacorum has declared itself an area for accelerated growth based on information and reports that are now outdated. Dacorum is justifying destruction of the Green Belt based on outdated criteria. The plans do not answer several practical and important questions.

Once these Green Belt Areas have been lost they can never be recovered. The Borough will be much the poorer for their loss and Dacorum needs to urgent review its development needs and plans before it destroys the Green Belt.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3238
<b>Person ID</b>	1263566
<b>Full Name</b>	Frances Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Apart from the ridiculous term "Garden Communities" I am opposed to proposals HH01 and HH02 ( North Hemel) as this is largely in the Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS3354
<b>Person ID</b>	1263683
<b>Full Name</b>	Tracy Holford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I have concerns about the traffic impact on Two Waters road of proposals HH11, HH12 and HH16. The Main Street through Apsley is already very busy and additional hosing will make this worse.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3370
<b>Person ID</b>	1012318
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Hennell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Area Planner Canal and River Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH01 It is noted that elsewhere in the plan in more detail that there is an intention to provide links to the Grand Union Canal towpath which will increase its use both as a recreational resource and as a commuter route towards the town centre. Proposals for this allocation should be required to provide mitigation and improvement either via S106 or CIL and should be specifically referenced as part of the site specific requirements.</p> <p>HH10 Previously a S106 contribution was agreed for this site to allow improvements to the closest access point to the Grand Union Canal towpath (at Two Waters Way) to allow it to be used as a sustainable transport route linking the site to other parts of the town. This is still considered a necessary enhancement and contributions to canal towpath may be required.</p> <p>HH11 Improvements to the access to the canal &amp; towpath, as mentioned in HH10 required. Public realm enhancement at Boxmoor Wharf welcomed but should be fitting to the industrial heritage of the canal and former wharf use. Car parking should remain available for access to the canal. Opportunities to provide access points and facilities for water based recreation to be explored with the Canal &amp; River Trust and local sports groups.</p> <p>HH12 Improvements to the access to the canal &amp; towpath, as mentioned in HH10 required.</p> <p>HH13 Improvements to adjacent towpath to tie in with works funded by adjacent site S106 required. Opportunities to provide access points and facilities for water based recreation to be explored with the Canal &amp; River Trust and local sports groups.</p> <p>HH15 Improvements to towpath to tie in with work funded by previous development and allocation HH13. Opportunities to provide access points and facilities for water based recreation to be explored with the Canal &amp; River Trust and local sports groups.</p> <p>HH21 Recognise the increased use of the canal towpath as a result of this development and ensure that the impact from additional usage is mitigated via S106 or CIL.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3409

<b>Person ID</b>	1263763
<b>Full Name</b>	Adam Kindred
<b>Organisation Details</b>	CBRE
<b>Agent ID</b>	1263757
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Adam Kindred
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>There is no disputing that Hemel Hempstead is an appropriate location for growth in Dacorum, however, it is important that sufficient contingency is built into the Draft Local Plan to ensure that the extent of reliance on Hemel Hempstead does not compromise other objectives. A key component of Paragraph 11 of the NPPF (2019) is that Local Plans should <i>'be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change.'</i></p> <p>Town centre regeneration sites can be complicated and unknown factors at the allocation stage (e.g. remediation, viability) can often make such sites unviable to bring forward policy compliant levels of affordable housing. Such sites are often complicated by their nature and history. For example, the proposed redevelopment of Hemel Hempstead Hospital may face potential changes in direction and timescales brought about by wider changes following the pandemic. More broadly, the changes being considered at Hemel Hempstead Hospital are not being driven in isolation, but form part of a wider interdependency with other hospitals (notably Watford and St Albans) that fall within the West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust.</p> <p>It is also unclear how the suggested allocation for 450 new homes fits against the press-release published by the West Hertfordshire Hospital NHS Trust for the site:</p> <p><i>'Hemel Hempstead Hospital would become a planned medical centre, including a newly provided urgent treatment centre. The Hemel Hempstead facility would be redeveloped into a centre for looking after people with long term conditions and the next stage of planning will look at opportunities to bring additional primary care and community services onto the site. In this way the Hemel Hempstead site will become a hub for accessing a range of health and care services.'</i></p> <p>A number of the town centre sites included within the Draft Local Plan already benefit from site allocations through the Site Allocations DPD (July 2017), including the Hemel Hempstead Hospital. The lack of progress that has been made on these sites in the four years since the adoption of the site allocation document highlights the issue of significant reliance on town centre regeneration sites as a cornerstone of a delivery strategy for the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Against the current uncertainty for the site, it is clear that the proposals in the Draft Local Plan for the Hemel Hempstead site do not meet the threshold of 'developable' as required by the NPPF (2019). To be 'developable' sites should <i>'should</i></p>



*be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.'*

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

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS3444

**Person ID** 1263124

**Full Name** Andrew Criddle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

*Sites HH01 and HH02 and HH21 offer once in a lifetime opportunities for the development of significant new multi-sport hubs and sporting facilities for existing clubs in the town or new clubs to be formed by allocating space within the developments for these facilities.*

*With many community sports clubs proving to be an exemplar model of modern community centres these sporting hubs could also be an effective enabler for engaging and bringing these new communities together. They would also provide the necessary open space and can provide casual play space as well as organised play space – as well as potential access to additional funding (e.g. from NGBs and Sport England etc.) to make development of such facilities viable and sustainable.*

*All the above applies to other later phase development within HGC.*

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS3450

**Person ID** 1263798

**Full Name** Claudia Jones

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

Please stop building blocks of flats in Apsley especially along the London Road and Two Waters Road. The infrastructure for the roads supporting the additional volume of cars that will be created by all these flats is non existant, it's already dreadful trying to drive through Apsley through rush hour or the weekends.

Two waters road is always flooded putting more flats here will take away what little natural drainage is left, since the latest block has gone up the flooding has got worse and the road is now a ford rather than a road. please think more carefully about where the flats are going rather than shoving them on whatever sapce you deem large enough.

We used to have bats on two waters they have now gone, the water voles have left it's all very sad.

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

No

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3478
<b>Person ID</b>	1263804
<b>Full Name</b>	Vicky Hewlett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I oppose building on greenbelt land. There is also not enough capacity on the trains and roads to cope. This excessive development is making me want to leave Hemel Hempstead for good.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3555
<b>Person ID</b>	1263821
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Isherwood

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This development would take out a large area of Green Belt land and is too close to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3619
<b>Person ID</b>	1145631
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alastair Greene
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Clerk Little Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The Leighton Buzzard road has insufficient capacity to have another 1500 homes (3000 vehicles) utilising it. The bridge at Water End would need to be bypassed to avoid having constant queues here during rush hour.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3620
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction to Proposals and Sites</b></li> </ul> <p><i>“24.1 The work on allocations is still evolving and we have reflected as much detail as we possibly can at this stage in the Plan. In particular, we have not been able to include all forms of proposals that might emerge in the settlements. We set out our current understanding of allocations in more detail in this 'Proposals and Sites' section of the plan</i></p> <p><i>24.2 We are working towards incorporating a full list of allocations for the next stage of the Plan (Regulation 19). We will undertake this work in progressing discussions on individual development proposals with landowners and developers, our partners and other key stakeholders and through taking forward linked work on infrastructure requirements in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.”</i></p>

In other words, more sites could be added after close of consultation, and residents and concerned groups will not have had an opportunity to comment on these.

DEF is particularly opposed to the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities and the developments in North Hemel. In particular, the development on the West side, from Piccotts End to Lovetts End would be a tragic loss of visual and recreational amenity, especially when viewed from North Gadebridge (Halsey Field), and when walking /running from Grove Hill to Gaddesden Row.

For our full response see:

The attached document if you are receiving this by E-mail

The link below if you are viewing this online

<http://dacenvforum.org.uk/> and look under "Consultations etc."

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS3729

**Person ID** 491172

**Full Name** Mr David Stanier

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	RE: DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020-2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH - CONSULTATION I wish to object to the consideration of the vast use of agricultural land in the Green Belt in the area around Dodds Lane for the housing plans.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3753
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS3815
<b>Person ID</b>	1263959
<b>Full Name</b>	Susie Hurst
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I write in response to your consultation on the above and respond primarily on the proposals for North Hemel Phase 1 &amp; 2.</p> <p>I object to the proposals in your Draft Development Plan and would comment as follows, in no particular order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of this greenfield site would result in soil sealing. The site is located on Grade 3 agricultural land.</li> <li>• Development of the site would extend Hemel Hempstead into open countryside and would have a significant adverse effects on the local landscape in this part of the borough.</li> <li>• The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss or damage to some habitats.</li> <li>• Supporting farming and countryside practices enhance the wider biodiversity and landscape quality by economically &amp; socially valuable activities. At a time when we should be encouraging opportunities for enhancement of biodiversity and avoid fragmentation and protect our woodlands and hedgerows. Your proposal removes land from farming.</li> <li>• The role of the local authority must be to protect and enhance the land and townscape, this proposal significantly reduces the diversity and quality of the landscape.</li> <li>• The sensitivity of the site abutting the Chilterns AONB designated to protect "dark skies" from light pollution and promote less invasive lighting sources.</li> <li>• The development would result in the loss of greenfield land and areas of woodland which have biodiversity value.</li> <li>• Townscape Development here would erode the gap between Piccotts End and Hemel Hempstead and the site is considered to have moderate -high landscape susceptibility.</li> <li>• The site has poor accessibility to local facilities, especially primary schools. This could all mean that the use of the car would increase and there could therefore be adverse effects on air quality from vehicle emissions.</li> </ul>



- The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss of some habitats. The boundary consists of a mature hedgerow with trees.
- Whilst a new settlement would be expected to provide some new services and facilities there would still be a need for travel to access higher order services and facilities. Given the limited public transport it is likely that the majority of trips would be by private car, thereby resulting in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions.
- The likelihood of increased car uses to access higher order services could result in exacerbation of air quality issues.
- Resiting Cupid Green Refuse site which currently has good "feeder" roads able to handle the weight of traffic. The proposal would necessitate the introduction of further "A" road to the area, increasing car usage as mentioned above .

### **Heritage, legacy and protection of the Green Belt**

- The proposals call for removal of land from the Green Belt, which should be protected for future generations. The essential characteristic of Green Belt is openness and permanence.
- Use of previously developed land has not been fully accounted for and must take precedent over Green Belt.
- The detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and an area containing historically significant buildings of a development of this size has not been given sufficient consideration. The area is significant in terms of its historical and archaeological heritage, and these are recognised and protected.
- How does the proposal recognise the importance of the many footpaths across the land, encouraging access to open space, surely this is a resource to be protected? Encouraging walking and cycling.
- The size of the proposed development of this area is inequitable in one site as opposed to development across the borough. There is a significant danger of this development leading to urban sprawl. The borough should consider use of urban land to recycle developed land pockets across the borough. The decision for which land to use must be objectively assessed.
- The National Policy Framework states that green-belt land can be developed only in "exceptional circumstances". These include:• the proportionate extension or replacement of a building • limited infilling of villages • limited affordable housing. I cannot see that any of these criteria are satisfied by these proposals .

### **Socio Economic and the future of Hemel Hempstead post COVID-19**

- We should be supporting the declining rural infrastructure of farming diversity which helps to maintain the character of the landscape - this proposal would significantly reduce the farm land in this localea.
- One of the many impacts the recent pandemic has had is to increase the need for working from home. There has been an increase in people wanting to move out of our of our towns as it is no longer necessary to commute into cities to work. This would inevitably support the government's desire for levelling up, the South East will not be the hub it once was as regional towns and cities become more attractive. This brings further into further question the need for increased housing in this area.
- A recent report by KPMG looked at the way Covid-19 will transform our town and cities *"The high streets of the future will need to become multi-purpose locations, combining retail and hospitality amenities with residential,*

*education, healthcare, cultural, technology, community and more. Office space will need to be transformed for three main purposes: collaboration, creativity and culture, with less space devoted to tasks that could be done remotely."*

- The impacts of Covid-19 bring into focus the government levelling-up agenda, further bringing into question the need for new housing in our borough. The borough must incorporate the changes brought about by the pandemic into its future strategy.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS3920

**Person ID** 1264024

**Full Name** Stacey Shaw

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I have recently been made aware of this housing development they are trying to do on green belt land which is of outstanding beauty and home to so much nature and wildlife, This will be an absolute tragedy to loose this beautiful land and am appalled it could even be considered, also this area can not cope with the traffic all ready that goes through it

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

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4013
<b>Person ID</b>	1207786
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2)</b> Capacity 4,000 - reserved for development beyond 2038.</p> <p>Why if we need development now? If the proposed numbers are on over estimate, as everyone seems to believe, judging from Feb Council meeting, does reserving this area in favour of development in other areas, not risk the garden community with all its benefits not being completed ?</p> <p>Surely including this area at an early stage could only contribute to the regeneration of Hemel, and would mean development in an area with infrastructure to cope with the numbers, unlike the proposed developments in Berkhamsted and Tring.</p> <p>It would also bring forward the aspiration of Garden City status for Hemel.</p> <p><b>HH03 Hospital site.</b></p> <p>Given the sad state of Hospital provision in the area, the difficulty in accessing the currently proposed facilities in Watford, and the pressure for a new more easily accessible hospital site it would seem short sighted to lose this site to development whilst Hospital proposals are still up in the air.</p> <p><b>HH06 Civic Centre Site.</b></p>

As previously mentioned there is a profound lack of any proposal for a cultural/ music/ arts venue in the plan - as valuable to all as sports facilities which have much consideration. Would this not perhaps be a good site for a Pavillion replacement ?

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

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS4077

**Person ID** 1264201

**Full Name** Philip Hughes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

HH08 - buildings 4 or 8 storeys are too high for this area. It will ruin the attraction of Boxmoor common. Traffic is already very congested on this section of the A4251. Number of new dwellings should be limited, which precludes tall buildings. Over 8 storeys would be a complete eyesore.

HH21 - This area has many paths crossing it and is beautiful countryside. It would be very detrimental to the environment and existing residents of West Hemel to develop this huge area. Local roads Boxted Road, Long Chaulden and Northridge Way would be overwhelmed by traffic. These roads are already dangerous due to the small number of pedestrian crossings. The proposed size and number of houses for this area is ridiculous.

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

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4078
<b>Person ID</b>	1259583
<b>Full Name</b>	Marc Best
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH15: Ebberns Road</b> This road has already been over developed there should not be more houses here. The parking on this road is already past its limit</p> <p><b>Growth Area HH08: Station Gateway</b> Eight story buildings are too tall to fit in with the character of the area, it will ruin a good part of the Boxmoor trust land. London Road by Hemel Hempstead station already struggles with traffic, adding more dwellings here will only add to that</p> <p><b>Growth Area HH21: West Hemel Hempstead</b> Over development in the West of Hemel Hempstead, this will have a big impact on Chaulden</p> <p>Overall there is too much development on Green Belt land which will take away a large part of the open space and will ruin large parts of Hemel Hempstead</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4146
<b>Person ID</b>	1264210
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	myself
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264200
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If the St Albans joint proposal has been withdrawn as unsound then this whole project is under question too
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4343
<b>Person ID</b>	1264334
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Stafford

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Phase 2 I am concerned that we are eating away at green belt land to build housing. I though there was a drive to increase biodiversity and increase the planting of trees to support a greener planet. This seems to go completely against that for a perceived need for housing.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4354
<b>Person ID</b>	1264325
<b>Full Name</b>	Olivia Halper
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

Query why this section is required for the Growth Area sites, as this somewhat duplicates the requirements set out in the previous section of the Policy. Furthermore, some of these requirements – particularly the urban design principles may need to be revisited following the outcome of the HGC Framework Plan work.

Titles and references throughout this chapter to ‘Hemel **Hempstead** Garden Communities’ are incorrect, should read ‘Hemel Garden Communities’.

Urban Design Principles

- It's not the case that design codes will be developed alongside the Local Plan.
- See above comments on Framework Plan (not ‘masterplan’).

Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport

- The provision of sustainable transport infrastructure improvements will play a vital role in the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport within and between Hemel Garden Communities to achieve a 60% mode share by 2050. The first bullet point within the policy needs to be re-worded accordingly to reflect this,
- North Hemel Phase 1: The requirement for the strategic corridor roads to be designed to 40mph standard is potentially prejudicial to the outcome of the Transport Plan and Framework workstreams, and potentially counter to good placemaking and ‘15 minute neighbourhood’ aspirations of the Spatial Vision. Slower speed roads are likely to be safer and more conducive to creating attractive and healthy places. In any case the opportunities and constraints of different approaches for these roads should be considered fully. We suggest removing this 40mph requirement from the policy.

Landscape considerations

- Is it necessary to conserve and enhance/restore field patterns and boundaries? This could be very constraining to design
- North Hemel Phase 2: vernacular and use of materials of existing farmsteads is urban design, not landscape, consideration

Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

- What is a ‘project level’ HRA?

As mentioned above, there is not allocation here for Gypsy and Traveller Pitches – we feel that the location of new accommodation in Hemel should be considered by the HGC Framework Plan to determine the best distribution and location of new pitches within the Growth Areas.

There is only one reference to MMTI in this section (in Two Waters). More references are needed given a town-wide network is planned: add Town Centre, Station, North Hemel Growth Areas as a minimum.

Proposals Map: There should be reference to HGC Programme Area and HGC New Development Areas/new garden communities in this map.



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4422
<b>Person ID</b>	1264369
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Wynn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Senior Planning and Enabling Manager Homes England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Homes England support the allocation of Growth Area HH01</p> <p>Homes England support the need for masterplanning and design codes in the delivery of HH01</p> <p>Parcel 21174, shown edged blue on the attached plan, falls within HH01 and is eminently deliverable as an extension to the Marchmont Farm scheme and provides the opportunity to provide the early delivery often lacking on major allocations.</p> <p>In order to facilitate this the allocation should be amended to allow for early release of parcels where they do not compromise the ability to achieve an overarching masterplan.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">HE allocation boundary.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4457
<b>Person ID</b>	1264367
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Swaysland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Reference to the proposals for 90 dwellings HH23 Old Town. I am strongly against development within this area which is currently an extension of Gadebridge park and the old town. The negative effects of creating a housing estate the side of the hill which currently provides scenic views to the users of the park and for many households that overlook this beautiful part of the park far outweigh the benefits of siting just 90 dwellings which from a development perspective will be difficult with the slope and associated drainage implications. This part of the park provides habitats to much wildlife (birds, badgers and the like) and the enjoyment that the neighbouring households and park users currently experience from this wildlife and the beauty of the site will be destroyed. This contravenes Dacorum policy of conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the countryside, particularly given the visual impact that this development has being situated on the side of a hill in a picturesque part of the town
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	Brownfield land industrial estate

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4465
<b>Person ID</b>	1160525
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Hislam
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH08 - Station Portal</b></p> <p>The Council appear to have overlooked the needs of the communities on the south side of the station who wish to access the station. This includes residents of Felden and possibly Bovingdon. There is a pedestrian subway beneath the A41 linking Roughdown Avenue to Roughdown Villas Road. Access to the station can be via Roughdown Avenue but I do not know how often the gate is open or whether users require a pass or key.</p> <p>This area is presently in an extremely poor condition. The above roads need improvement, and a cycle store could be useful be situated near the station at the end of Roughdown Avenue.</p> <p>There should also be a pedestrian / cycle access from Roughdown Avenue (north side of railway overbridge) to the station car park, hence allowing pedestrian access for the residents who live on the south side of the railway . This includes residents of Felden and possibly Bovingdon. As I am a volunteer to our local Neighbourhood Plan, I am aware that there is a desire for a pedestrian / cycleway between Bovingdon and Hemel Hempstead Railway Station. This should be included in your plan</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4501
<b>Person ID</b>	1264395
<b>Full Name</b>	R Jane Dickson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>My comments have been prepared from reading the pdf documents available on the Dacorum website and I note that the bullet points on the information provided here are different in both number and wording...</p> <p>P266 – Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport – bullet point 3 “Safeguard sufficient land to provide for a new strategic corridor route (40mph) which will connect the Leighton Buzzard Road to North Hemel (Phase 2) and the allocations to the east (St Albans City and District Council Local Plan).”</p> <p>Whilst the Leighton Buzzard Road is still designated as the A4146 on e.g. the maps in your summary document, it is no longer an A Road north of the Galley Hill roundabout but is now designated the B440 (which you acknowledge in p266, Access etc, bullet point 2). However, if this “new strategic corridor” links from e.g. Junction 8 of the M1, it has the potential to provide a rat run for traffic from the M1 to Berkhamsted via Potton End or to Leighton Buzzard via the B440. Neither the bridge at Water End, which already has a weight restriction, nor the road through Nettleden, which is very narrow, nor the centre of Little Gaddesden, where the road is very busy and has two dangerous bends, nor the B4506 back down to Dagnall, on a steep, winding hill are suitable for such potential traffic increases. Very careful traffic management will be necessary to ensure that the “new strategic corridor” is an access road and not a link road.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4542
<b>Person ID</b>	1261836
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Sutton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4571
<b>Person ID</b>	1262255
<b>Full Name</b>	AJ W
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH02 & HH01 should be combined to give cohesion and economies of scale, it will also enhance opportunities for regeneration of Hemel. To not release this land now means that the inherent character of both Berkhamsted and Tring will be destroyed.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS4687
<b>Person ID</b>	1264497
<b>Full Name</b>	GARRY LANGLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I have recently had sight of a document outlining proposals for the further development of Hemel Hempstead. I would like to express my opposition to these plans. I am sure I am not alone in being opposed to yet more apartments etc being erected upon every patch of greenery our town can provide. Surely our town is crowded enough? Add to this the absence of a fully functional Hospital and yet more pressure will be piled upon Watford General Hospital. We want our open fields and green spaces left alone for us to enjoy not to watch a digger turn them over and have concrete poured in. With the ever increasing size of our population any sense of local community spirit or 'belonging' seems to decrease.

I have often seen comments relating to Hemel Hempstead being an 'ugly' town or a 'terrible' place to live. Perhaps we should seek to look after what we have for the population as it is instead of laying more bricks.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS4897

**Person ID** 1264524

**Full Name** Karen Kang

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

HH08 - The proposal to have 4-8 storey building as part of residential developments by the train station seems to be contrary to both the housing requirements in the area (there is a larger requirement for family homes) and protecting the environment. Buildings that high would look out of place and inappropriate for the area. Also the infrastructure in the area is currently poor, will worsen with the developments already approved past Chaulden and there is nothing in the plans that is a realistic plan of how to manage the increased traffic. Development is key but it should be in keeping with the area.

HH10 - Building plans for 16 storeys are completely inappropriate for the area. Once again as HH08, the infrastructure and traffic management is already poor in the area and nothing in the plan seems to be a real solution.

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

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5098
<b>Person ID</b>	211327
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Sara Leno
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I am concerned that any development around the Old Town may affect its character adversely.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5123
<b>Person ID</b>	1250013
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Nikki Bugden



<b>Organisation Details</b>	Clerk Nash Mills Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The plot allocated for the crematorium at Bunkers Lane has a red border that incorporates part of Bunkers Park, including the access road and car park. We would like to confirm that the area of Bunkers Park shown is not under threat of further development and that the car park and access route to reach the car park will still be available for users of the park.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5236
<b>Person ID</b>	1264608
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Beadle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5306
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5346
<b>Person ID</b>	1264620
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael West
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This development - HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) - will put further pressure on Potten End villlage through traffic heading to and from Berkhamsted, given the enormous number of additional vehicles that this development will generate. I also object to the this development in green belt land.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5388
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This is an inappropriate use of greenbelt. This area is beautiful and offers great routes for cyclists.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5469
<b>Person ID</b>	1262731
<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Battersby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I use Hemel Hempstead mainly to shop but frequently pass through on my way to St Albans and Abbots Langley. I have not had an opportunity to study these proposals in sufficient detail as the consultation time available was too short, so please do not accept a lack of comment on any area as acceptance of that site proposal. I use Hemel Hempstead mainly to shop but frequently pass through on my way to St Allbans and Abbots Langley and I am finding the recent taller developments unattractive and off-putting.

However, I broadly support HH4, HH6, HH8, HH9, HH10, HH14, HH15, HH17, HH18 and HH28 site development proposals.

I am strongly opposed to development of HH12 - Two Waters Moor is an area of character that compliments Box Moor and historical Apsley and should be retained. I am horrified at the thought of more tall or taller building being sited there.

Although I acknowledge the need for Traveller Pitches, and hope more will be incorporated into other sites, I object to the HH21 development. The scale and invasion into the current rural area is excessive and leaves only a small area of separation between both Potten End and Berkhamsted.

With regard to HH20 preservation and enhancement of hedgerows will help to support biodiversity as this green space will currently be a refuge for wildlife and with this in place I would support its development. Regarding HH13, if there are suitable 10m minimum natural buffer zones retained at the edges of the water courses I would also support development of this site. In respect of HH23, I would add that as many hedges should be retained as well as trees and the height should usually be restricted to two with no more than three storeys rather than four, so as not to risk the character of the setting. On this basis I would not oppose development of this site.

On all other sites in the Hemel Hempstead proposal I put in a plea for hedge retention with verges where those hedges are mainly native species and former farmland/ rural hedge boundaries or species rich, particularly in areas such as HH22 Marchmont Farm, HH02 and H01 North Hemel

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

No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS5507

**Person ID** 1264647

**Full Name** Richard Burnell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5554
<b>Person ID</b>	1264363
<b>Full Name</b>	Roselyn King
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The proposed North Hemel development Phase 1 will totally ruin the setting and character of Piccotts End. It will do the same for Piccotts End Lane, which is currently an attractive way for pedestrians to walk from Grovehill to Piccotts End/Gadebridge Park/Hemel Old Town and town centre etc. I have used it a lot and have seen a number of other people using it. It is lovely to be able to walk down it in the middle of the countryside. It would be horrible if it was surrounded by housing. As you aim to encourage people to walk more and to make Dacorum's residents happier, you should not be making the use of this lane a far less attractive option.

Furthermore, the countryside in the North Hemel Phase 1 area is extremely beautiful (I have walked through much of it). You yourselves refer to "areas which share characteristics with or create the setting for the Chilterns AONB" and other features which it would be undesirable to lose. I very strongly feel that this land should not be built on at all. Once we lose our beautiful countryside, we will not get it back. Green Belt land is supposed to be protected. If you can remove large areas of land from the Green Belt, the whole concept of the Green Belt becomes meaningless. I am definitely not the only one who appreciates this particular part of the countryside. I have seen other people walking or jogging through it. There is a place at the bottom of Dodds Lane where cars can park and some people use it as a starting point for walks. The area is also easily reachable on foot from Piccotts End and Grovehill. Many people would be extremely upset if you went ahead with your proposals to build.

The North Hemel Phase 2 development would completely destroy the setting and character of Holtsmere End by surrounding it with housing. It would also destroy areas of the countryside where many residents of Grovehill and Woodhall Farm currently enjoy exercising. In fact, when I went for a walk in this area during the first lockdown I encountered so many other people that I decided that maybe it wasn't the wisest place to go to while there was a lot of coronavirus around. There were also a couple of cars parked by the side of the road at the edge of the countryside, which suggests that people from other parts of Hemel also enjoy this area. Personally, I have come to appreciate the countryside on my doorstep a lot more during the last year, and maybe other people have too. Please don't take it away.

Re Wood Lane End: please make sure that past problems with sinkholes in that area are taken into account and that the land is only developed if you are absolutely certain that it is safe to do so.

Re Jarman Park: as I've said previously, I think this land and part of the rest of Jarman Park could be used for housing, with leisure uses in the "Leisure World" complex moved to the town centre.

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

No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS5570

**Person ID**

1264491

**Full Name**

Paul Wade

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5700
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5778
<b>Person ID</b>	1144878
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Moore
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5794
<b>Person ID</b>	1264460
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Nicholls
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I think I may have arrived at the right page to leave this comment as I live here.. Firstly I must say that the journey to get here and leave any comment has been most difficult and confusing. This is certainly not the easiest of consultation forms to complete. It has been made particularly difficult, i.e negotiating the wood to find the trees and I am still uncertain as to whether I have arrived at the right place.</p> <p>I have formed the impression that the proposed plans for this obscene mass house building proposal is going to be forced on the residents of Dacorum Borough with or without proper consultation and whether we like it or not.</p> <p>My Family have lived in North Hemel Hempstead i.e Wootton Drive for 40 years and the reason we moved here was the tranquility of the area, the adjacent peaceful countryside with its profusion of amazing wildlife and the open habitat of many species of birds and wild animals. All this to be destroyed on the <i>false demand</i> that it is required by the government to build thousands of new homes in the vicinity of North Hemel Hempstead where there is insufficient water supply, no definite plans for hospitals and medical centres, schools and much more.</p> <p>Life here for the next 18 years will be impossible, with the amount of building work required, new roads carved into the farmland, thereby destroying the environment. So reluctantly we will have to leave Dacorum after being so happy here. House prices will certainly fall. The proposed area to be built on, is also crossed by ancient bridleways and woodland which will be permanently lost. I don't know whether anyone in the council is aware that the area is also a flood plain as has been recently proved by the huge lakes formed in the nearby farm fields to Grovehill playing field, being partially under flood water too. It is obvious that the strata of heavy clay cannot absorb the amount of rain liable to fall at certain times of the year. I have many photographs to prove this although it seems I am unable to upload more than one. You have been warned.</p> <p>I urge you to think again. The quality of life as we know it will be lost and the unique character of our pleasant town destroyed forever by this mass building programme of which everyone I speak to opposes most strongly.</p>

	Jonathan Nicholls.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">DSC00013.JPG</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5898
<b>Person ID</b>	1261255
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Lightfoot
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1261248
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Sarah LIGHTFOOT
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I support the comments made by BRAG. DBC should be demonstrating that they have the necessary planning vision to enhance Hemel and develop the whole of the proposed Garden communities in this planning period, not holding back a large proportion until after 2038.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	As above.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5912
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5933
<b>Person ID</b>	1262737
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Cassels
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS5982
<b>Person ID</b>	1264795
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Stanley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Hh08 station gateway proposal is too many dwellings and too high. Would ruin beautiful rural area and turn it into urban landscape with associated issues
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6112
<b>Person ID</b>	211105
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susanna Selman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The further expansion and destruction of the precious green belt areas of Hemel Hempstead will negatively impact the natural environment and quality of life for all.</li> <li>2 Noise and traffic pollution will reach dangerous levels.</li> <li>3 Hemel Hempstead already has an inadequate infrastructure in terms of schools, doctors surgeries, green parks, access roads, facilities for families and children - allowing further development will totally overwhelm services.</li> <li>4 The impact of traffic on the mediaeval villages of Piccotts End and Water End will be exacerbated by traffic using the villages further as rat runs. I don't see how the old houses in both villages will continue to be in existence and maintain their Grade 1 and 2 protected status. The character and nature of these villages will be negatively impacted by the increase in traffic volume.</li> <li>5 The Leighton Buzzard Road and Link Road are unable to cope with traffic at rush hours right now; adding yet more traffic to this area will increase pollution, noise and destruction of the precious River Gade environment in Piccotts End and Water End.</li> <li>6 Destruction of endangered wildlife habitats will further increase beyond retrievable levels.</li> <li>7 Gadebridge Park is already in an over-use capacity in terms of parking and the volume of children using the skatepark, people walking dogs and families using the playground. Adding a further unnecessarily large load of residential buildings will overwhelm sensible usage of what is a very small park for the size of Hemel Hempstead.</li> <li>8 Wouldn't it be better to allocate these areas for expanding Gadebridge Park into a country park for the benefit and well being of Hemel Hempstead residents rather than line the pockets of developers.</li> </ol>

Overall, the drive to destroy the green belt and ancient village environments in and around Hemel Hempstead is a policy which future generations will badly regret.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS6155

**Person ID** 1145998

**Full Name** Mrs Pauline Hughes

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6274
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6276
<b>Person ID</b>	1264889
<b>Full Name</b>	anthony hawes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the plan for c1,500 new homes and amenities in the HH01 area (North Hemel Phase 1) and the c4,000 homes in HH02 (Hemel North Phase 2).</p> <p>Firstly, any strategy to build this many new homes in a London commuter town should be reconsidered given the dramatic change to the way people work as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The 'need' to develop this many new homes in such an area is clearly not as significant as it may have been 12-18 months ago. Going forward, with so many employers expecting to permit working from home, the attractiveness of commuter towns such as Hemel will decrease. Until the full extent of this is truly known, this proposal and any similar ones should be placed on hold at the very least. My understanding is that the housing need prediction is also based on old data, the actual housing need is closer to circa 400 houses per year, which is significantly less than the suggested amount.</p> <p>The decision to build on green or rural sites must be condemned. These sites are so precious to wildlife, recreation and wellbeing and should be protected at all costs. Once such developments are permitted, we lose that rural space forever. Living in close proximity to this site, I know well the amount of wildlife we are lucky enough to have here. I also know how many walkers, cyclists, horse riders and dog walkers enjoy the numerous footpaths and bridleways. Removing this will not only impact this site, but will encourage yet more people to travel to overused sites such as Ashridge and Ivinghoe for their recreational needs.</p> <p>I must also comment on the environmental impact of this site. The site is close to an AONB, and given its prominent hill top location would be viewable from Potten End, Water End and Gaddesden. It is also located at the total opposite side of Hemel to the where the train station is, and thus encouraging people to drive rather than use the train, or at least to drive to the train station.</p> <p>I also have concerns on the impact to roads in the surrounding area. Being in a rural location, the roads surrounding the site are not suitable for large volumes of traffic. Roads such as Red Lion Road, Potten End Hill and the Leighton Buzzard Road will see a significant increase in traffic. These roads are narrow, bendy and popular with cyclists and walkers. Having more traffic will increase the risk of accidents and fatalities. In particular, the road in Water End as it crosses the River Gade is a single bridge. Accidents here are not uncommon, and will only increase with more traffic. The village there too is not suitable for large volumes of cars or larger vehicles. The proposed link road connecting Leighton Buzzard Road to the M1 and Redbourn will encourage traffic further to these roads. In particular, I can foresee traffic from Berkhamsted using Potten End Hill to access the link road up to the M1. Potten End Hill is narrow, and having a national speed limit will be an attractive route for some. But it is dangerous. There are a number of properties on this road with cars often pulling out with limited sight of the road up or down due to the hedgerows and bends in the road. The junction from Potten End Hill onto the Leighton Buzzard Road is hazardous as traffic coming from the direction of the Red Lion are not seen until very late due to the bridge. This bridge is also often flooded, which forces traffic onto the other side of the road, which is dangerous if the volume of traffic should increase. The volume of traffic on the Leighton Buzzard Road</p>

(especially during peak times, rush hours) encourages cars exiting Potten End Hill to edge out and force cars to give way to them.

Lastly, Hemel Hempstead does not have sufficient infrastructure to deal with this amount of housing, we do not have our own fully functioning hospital or an accident and emergency department, which would be needed to accommodate the increase in housing.

The numerous concerns raised here hopefully help the Dacorum planning strategy to be reconsidered. If the need for housing in the area was to be reassessed following the impact of Covid to the demand on commuter belt housing, it would be clear that planning proposals of this scale are not required, and instead the use of smaller brown field sites will become much more viable.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS6282

**Person ID** 1208040

**Full Name** Mr Julian Wells

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment** Re Area HH08  
 I object to proposal HH08.

The idea that the development could be 8-storey or higher seems completely out of keeping with the adjacent Boxmoor grassland. A tower block overlooking horses and cattle grazing the land. Surely you can see how daft this is? May I request that the "landscape and visual impact assessment required to accompany a planning application for this site" is opened to the public for inspection and comment?

If you are really trying to deliver a next-generation transport interchange and promoting pedestrian & cycle traffic, why oh why are you talking about building a multi-storey car park?

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS6416

**Person ID** 1264750

**Full Name** Neil Joyce

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6429
<b>Person ID</b>	1264964
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Heaphy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><i>1 This development is taking a large area of Green Belt land and is too close to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB.</i></p> <p><i>2 Under Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport, there is a reference to an access road linking this development with the North Hemel development and the allocations to the east, in effect providing a link road from Junction 8 of the M1 to the B440, meeting the latter somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End. This has the potential to provide a rat run (and therefore increased traffic) from the M1 to Berkhamsted through Potten End, and to the north through Nettleden. Little Gaddesden, Ringshall and Dagnall (avoiding the narrow bridge at Water End).</i></p> <p><i>It is therefore important that traffic management is introduced to ensure that this new access road is used only as such and not as a link road between external areas so generating unsustainable traffic increases.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6468
<b>Person ID</b>	1264982
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heaphy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><i>1 This development is taking a large area of Green Belt land and is too close to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB.</i></p> <p><i>2 Under Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport, there is a reference to an access road linking this development with the North Hemel development and the allocations to the east, in effect providing a link road from Junction 8 of the M1 to the B440, meeting the latter somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water End. This has the potential to provide a rat run (and therefore increased traffic) from the M1 to Berkhamsted through Potten End, and to the north through Nettleden. Little Gaddesden, Ringshall and Dagnall (avoiding the narrow bridge at Water End).</i></p> <p><i>It is therefore important that traffic management is introduced to ensure that this new access road is used only as such and not as a link road between external areas so generating unsustainable traffic increases.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6506
<b>Person ID</b>	1264726
<b>Full Name</b>	Annie Heaton

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the proposal to build on the Green Belt land north of Hemel with the Garden Communities plan for <b>North Hemel developments phase 1 and 2</b>. My personal experience provides an example of the recreational and health value of Green Belt that would be lost if it were developed into the proposed new Garden Communities. I have a debilitating knee injury, so cycling is the only outdoor low impact way for me to exercise. I regularly cycle in and through Green Belt land around Boxmoor where I live, and across Dacorum. Top of my list of favourite routes is to the north of Hemel through Picotts End, up Dodds Lane, past Lovetts End Farm and back round to Hemel via Redbourn. Dodds Lane is unique as one of the only lanes within easy reach of Hemel that is not edged by hedges, and so the open view of the countryside on either side provides me with a particular sense of space and freedom. Throughout the Covid lockdown I have found this incredibly important for my mental as well as physical health. It also provides a wonderful and unique rural view, from Wood Farm back to Hemel and beyond to the hills of Potten End and Bovingdon (see photo 1). And I am not alone – on an average one hour weekend ride, I pass some 30 other people enjoying the same amenity on foot and on bikes, and around 20 on a weekday. This suggests that over the course of a year over 50,000 person hours are enjoyed on that tract of Green Belt alone. This free amenity with its unique view provides access to carbon neutral means of exercise (no buildings or power required!) and an invaluable way of enabling people's mental and physical health. Removing its Green Belt status and building the proposed 7000 homes here would destroy this value to me and many other local residents. The provision of formal exercise opportunities would not compensate for this loss. And to take advantage of something similar, I might have to resort to driving out of Hemel to start my bike ride, with associated CO2 and traffic implications.</p> <p>Furthermore, unless the sustainable transport options envisaged for the Garden Communities is guaranteed, I fear that the local topography of the North Hemel garden communities sites would discourage the use of active travel modes and so run counter to the sustainability assessment framework objectives “to develop in sustainable locations” and “to reduce greenhouse gas emissions” which were used to assess the plan options [Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report].</p> <p><b>Station Gateway HH08</b></p> <p>The Urban Design Principles cited indicate that "Development should normally be between four and eight storeys" but that "Proposals for taller buildings in excess of this may be considered". As a resident of Boxmoor, whose house looks out onto the Felden hills, I would strongly object to any development at the station being taller than four storeys since this would seriously destroy the value of the green visual amenity of Boxmoor, which gives it its unique character.</p> <p><b>Area HH11:Two Waters North</b></p>

On no account should this plan incorporate the land currently leased to the Hemel Food Garden, which provides extremely valuable services to the community, including daily provision for people with learning disabilities, training for other young people, promotion of sustainable food and energy, cafe, organic food shop, as well as the potential to do so much more.

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

Yes

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

Bovingdon airfield should be considered instead of North Hemel. In terms of visual and physical amenity, other than for an outdoor market which could be relocated, its value is currently minimal.

**Included files**

[North Hemel developments phase 1 and 2.docx](#)

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS6581

**Person ID**

1264994

**Full Name**

Adam Pereira

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

HH23 Old Town - As a resident of Cherry Bank, part of the Cherry Bounce and Chapel Cottages area that looks on this site, We find it extremely concerning that a proposal for 90 dwellings exists for this location. Firstly, with the Old Town being a crown jewel of Hemel Hempstead, an area often photographed, filmed within ( to recent critical acclaim with After Life) and visited, it would be completely against the Character, architecture and landscape of the setting, including spoiling the landscapes of Gadebridge Park, another treasure of our town. Indeed, in the Dacorum Local Plan Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices - November 2020 (PDF 4MB), Appendix E20 -9 states "Development of the site could impact on the unspoilt valley landscape and its interface with the Old Town" and lists as a negative to building. Secondly, a small part of this site is within a conservation area (again, see Dacorum Local Plan Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices - November 2020 (PDF 4MB) E20 -8) and I can also speak first hand of existing habitats,

both bird and bat, that I see regularly in the area. I would like to know how the inclusion of 90 dwellings (which is more than the original recommendation of 80) is going to preserve this area and habitat?

Thirdly, with the Old Town one way system becoming increasingly busy, often having cars at a standstill, I would like to know how the inclusion of 90 dwellings directly at the end of this system is going to help the flow of traffic through the area and help the Old Town thrive with visitors to both shops and restaurants when they cannot physically get up the road?

Lastly, as a resident who looks on to this greenland and enjoys the views, the people walking their dogs, kids playing, sledding at winter, picnics at summer and natural wildlife, I would like to know how building 90 dwellings on this location is not going to impact local residents enjoyment of this area? It is an area of good footfall and part of the Gadebridge Park experience. For those in the know, you can sit and look on a beautiful area of Hemel from this location. With the current Covid 19 pandemic seriously impacting local business and their lack of need for larger locations due to work from home a descaling, would this small amount of residential dwellings not be better suited to be built on vacated buildings around the area? I can't imagine the HH23 site is going to be particulary easy to be built on anyway due to its steep landscape.

In my opinion, what would be gained in 90 houses being built would be infinately less than what would be lost from this wonderful location if plans were to go ahead.

I look forward to your response.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6589
<b>Person ID</b>	1264908
<b>Full Name</b>	Henry Smart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Hemel Hempstead will disappear as a community and become part of the urban sprawl which will be a great shame. All the local green spaces will no longer exist which is one of Hemels truly special features. Hemel does not have the infrastructure now for all their residents especially a hospital, schools, doctors and other social amenities. I do not see any plans for these to be increased to cope with the level demanded by the new housing areas planned.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6631
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment	
Included files	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6704
<b>Person ID</b>	1264998
<b>Full Name</b>	Claudia da Silva
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH23: Old Town</b></p> <p>I choose to live in the Old Town because of the character of the area and the availability of green spaces nearby. Although I appreciate that additional housing is required in Dacorum, I feel compelled to express my concern with the proposal to build 90 dwellings on this green space which I, like so many other local residents, enjoy daily. I understand that some green space would remain but the view will be forever diminished by any housing being built on the proposed site. Point 9 re landscape/townscape of Appendix E-20 <a href="https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/assets/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-items-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6ab0c9e_4">https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/assets/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-items-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6ab0c9e_4</a> is the <b>unspoilt</b> landscape, but fails to acknowledge that this would be lost forever if the proposed housing growth goes ahead on this site.</p> <p>Nearby Gadebridge Park is often congested, particularly during the current public health climate where people are rightly eager to enjoy time outdoors as much as possible. We must take responsibility for the conservation of green areas and protection of natural habitats for local wildlife, not only for ourselves but for the future enjoyment and wellbeing of generations to come.</p>

The Old Town already has issues with traffic flow and parking. Many use the narrow High Street as a cut-through (and, worryingly, more often than you'd think, in the wrong direction down a one-way system). Whenever there is an event held locally, the effect is a huge increase in traffic and inconsiderate/dangerous parking by those who travel to the area. In periods of snowy and/or icy weather, a number of the steeper and/or smaller roads around the Old Town become extremely difficult and treacherous to navigate. The building of dwellings on the proposed site would certainly compound these issues on a permanent basis. Although there is some public transport routed via Fletcher Way, the remainder of the Old Town has very little in the way of public transport so there would be a huge increase in vehicles for such a small area. In points 4, 5 and 10 re climate change, air quality, and health and wellbeing respectively, of Appendix E-20 [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-interim-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6abe0c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-local-plan-interim-sustainability-appraisal-report-appendices-november-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=6abe0c9e_4), the topography of the landscape is indicated as a reason that walking and cycling may be discouraged. This points to a likelihood that building housing on the proposed site will mean an increase in vehicular traffic which is more convenient for the potential new residents but overall of huge detriment to the area. The relative quiet of the area would be disrupted by the building of dwellings on this site - all of my comments above refer the longer-term effects but also, I dread to think how terribly our access to existing residences and amenities will be impeded during any potential construction period.

I note also the proposal to build 385 dwellings in nearby Growth Area HH22: Marchmont Farm. The proximity of these two sites is of concern, as all negative impacts will be compounded owing to the large increase in additional housing, potentially on both sites.

Owing to COVID-19 there are a number of areas in Dacorum which are now not being used for their previous intentions. Rather than developing housing on green-belt land of which we have precious little, the aim should be on redeveloping existing built-up areas which already have the buildings and transport infrastructure to support new homes.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS6708

**Person ID** 1261231

**Full Name** Bayard Beling Morales

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	In general it is difficult to see in the plan how the infrastructure of the town will be able to cope with such a increase on the demand due to the increase in population.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6743
<b>Person ID</b>	1265062
<b>Full Name</b>	Kev Nash
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The new housing will strip the area of natural beauty, the current infrastructure is not coping already, I understand there will be new roads but the area will not cope will the capacity proposed. There is so much natural beauty and wildlife that will be destroyed. There are also protected plants that will be destroyed in the process.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6744
<b>Person ID</b>	1207873
<b>Full Name</b>	Phill Lewis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH08: Station Gateway</b></p> <p>Whilst I agree that development of the site is the right thing to do for the town, maximising the use of sustainable modes of transports is likely to mean insufficient parking spaces for any residential usage and therefore a subsequent degradation of the areas within a mile of the station much as has happened with development of the Kodak building and other high density properties in the area. The impact of this must be carefully considered as the council would likely have to add further residential parking controls in the locality at cost to the local community.</p> <p>In addition, the plan itself fundamentally ignores the challenges associated with the railway bridge on London Road which is inadequate for traffic and unsafe for pedestrians, particularly the elderly or those with children. If the plan is to truly encourage sustainable modes of transport, including walking and cycling, then access under the bridge towards the Boxmoor Lodge area of London Road should be improved to facilitate safe travel.</p> <p>As per the considerations, aesthetically pleasing buildings at a sympathetic height (4-5 storeys) which reflect the environment of the moors would be appropriate.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6793
<b>Person ID</b>	1265073
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Nash
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I live in Grovehill currently, and absolutely love that even though I live in Hemel, within 5 minutes walk I can be in the countryside. I have an allotment down on the Grovehill Allotment sites, and my children and I walk everyday through the footpaths around the fields in Grovehill. As a family we are all devastated about the news of the developments. The children who (content removed) absolutely love being able to get out into the countryside for walks, and they themselves have commented that they are so cross about the land being built on and the pollution that comes with that and the loss of wildlife. We have seen so many different species whose habitats would be disrupted due to the building works, and then even if they did stay, the increased traffic would likely drive them out and kill them.</p> <p>I am not sure, but it looks from the map like the allotment site is included in the development, which is extremely distressing and I hope I am reading the map wrong. Me and my fellow allotmenters have poured so much time and effort into those plots, years of work would be undone in a moment. It has to be protected.</p> <p>Whilst I am pleased that some effort has been taken to protect ancient woodland etc, I am concerned that if the boundaries to Greenbelt can be rewritten in exceptional circumstances, whose to say that we wouldn't find another set of exceptional circumstances in another 30 years? It seems a very slippery slope and the protection afforded to the land does not seem very robust.</p>

At a time in the world when everyone is trying their best to reduce their carbon footprint and care for the environment, this kind of development seems totally at odds with the care we need to extend. Personally, our family would be extremely likely to move out of the area if this development goes forward because the reason we chose Grovehill was because we can feel like we live in the country but still have all the benefits of the city, and this would be taken from us when the development goes forward.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS6826

**Person ID** 1265036

**Full Name** Tom Burrows

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No  
No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6841
<b>Person ID</b>	1264937
<b>Full Name</b>	Danny Killeen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>There is no detail of how road traffic capacity enhancements will be made. East of the planned HGC there are further open fields to potentially accomodate connection to J8 of M1. West and North there is no current road capacity to accomodate any increase in traffic. The Water End one way bridge is an obvious bottleneck which cannot be overcome without the full replacement of the bridge and likely distruction of houses to the East/North of the Bridge to accomodate that (and these houses are in a conservation area).</p> <p>An alternative route for the road East and North of the Gade river would make sense, but in an AONB is this likely or even possible? So what is the answer? The roads leading either way through Potten End are narrow and only lead to futher narrow roads when entering Berkhamsted. Avoiding Berkhamsted (which is advisable) would direct traffic along Leighton Buzzard/Dagnal Roads and encounter the one way bridge. Again, what is the answer to this - this proposal cannot progress without a definitive plan to address the throughput of vehicles in the area. The current road infrastructure will not cope, and does not cope with queues for the one lane bridge regularly back past the Water End Garage.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6913
<b>Person ID</b>	1264946
<b>Full Name</b>	Shaun Pope
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to any proposals for development of the following sites</p> <p>Growth Area HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1)</p> <p>Growth Area HH02:North Hemel (Phase 2)</p> <p>Growth Area HH04: Paradise/Wood Lane</p> <p>Growth Area HH12: Two Waters /London Road</p> <p>Growth Area HH16:Two Waters / A 41 Junction</p> <p>Growth Area HH18: Kier Park</p> <p>Growth Area HH20: Breakspear Way/ Green Lane / Boundary Way</p> <p>Growth Area HH21: West Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>Growth Area HH22: Marchmont Farm</p> <p>Growth Area HH23 Old Town</p> <p>Growth Area HH24: Land at Turners Hill</p> <p>Growth Area HH25:land to R/O St Margarets Way/ Datchworth Turn</p> <p>Growth Area HH26: South of Green Lane</p> <p>Growth Area HH28: Bunkers Park Crematorium Allocation</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS6929
<b>Person ID</b>	1264617
<b>Full Name</b>	Victoria Latham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The expansion of the physical plot of Hemel Hempstead seems incompatible with ensuring that residents can access amenities on foot or by public transport; the area proposed for the 'garden communities' is far from the town centre, railway station and major amenities. It would seem more sensible to increase the residential density in the town centre, particularly as it is likely, post pandemic, that there will be vacant office/ retail space which could re-purposed. This would encourage a diversity lacking within the current town centre and prevent the kind of soulless, suburban sprawl which blights areas of Milton Keynes.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7054
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7088
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7128
<b>Person ID</b>	1265146
<b>Full Name</b>	David Gibson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I oppose this because it involves the destruction of an area of greenbelt land along an environmentally sensitive river valley. This area should be protected and houses built elsewhere.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7150
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This is a disgrace. Total destruction of the Valley . It must not be allowed to happen.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7277
<b>Person ID</b>	1265027
<b>Full Name</b>	Saba Poursaedi
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	This would be a travesty, that area could not possibly hope to sustain the extra burden on the roads. Where will all these people work? How will they get there? WoodHall Farma nd Grove Hill are busy enough, if you've ever tried to commut in the morning you would know this is a bad idea for Hemel.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	Theres a big mix, but developement of Brown fields site is OK by me
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7353
<b>Person ID</b>	1265340
<b>Full Name</b>	STEWART MILLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>In particular , the large scale development of Piccots End to the M1 with 10688 new homes will lead to significant expansion of Hemel Hempstead, and with the proposed link to the M1 lead to a massive impact on local roads to the north of this area.</p> <p>There will also be other negative impacts on the water supply and fragile Chiltern chalk streams, as well as recreational use of Ashridge.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7395
<b>Person ID</b>	1265375
<b>Full Name</b>	LANYING BURLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

I am writing to object to the proposed development. I am very concerned about the development plan that has been published and the impact it would have on the parish of Great Gaddesden.

I appreciate that things should continue in lockdown but for something as important and as significant as this should be done when people have the freedom to engage and discuss this issue which will adversely affect so many people. A proposal to increase housing in the borough by 25% on 2000 acres of Green Belt , countryside and urban green space is a major plan which needs to be fully considered by everyone involved . I hope that this is not being pushed through at a time when people cannot easily take a stand or get together to voice their opinions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7505
<b>Person ID</b>	1265568
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN SHULVER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I formally object to the building of many hundreds of homes on green belt/recently downgraded green belt around Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>My reasons for objection are,</p> <p>Lack of water resources.</p> <p>Most of the water comes from sub surface aquifers. These are under stress now and the proposed new Reservoir planned for Abingdon will help the situation as it is now, but all the extra housing will just push us back to where we are now.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure.</p> <p>All these extra homes will add to congestion and pollution in the area, this combined with loss of green spaces - lungs, if you like will be to the detriment of all residents.</p> <p>Why are not more brown sites on the building plans?</p> <p>There are many ex industrial sites that could be used for housing - the old gasworks, old school sites, disused parts of the hospital, the old market square</p> <p>Is this being done to maximise the profits of building firms to the detriment of local people.</p> <p>There is nothing about doing more to empty homes - the government estimates in excess of 600,000 empty homes in the UK and homeless charities claim more.</p> <p>These developments will put further strain on local infrastructure, such as health and wellbeing, whilst at the same time removing easily access able green spaces for many, schools health and medical services.</p> <p>Also, in this Post brexit world, the population is dropping, combined with the tragically high covid deaths, there may well now be a reduced (or different, in terms of what is built) need for housing and before committing to destroy the wonderful</p>

green belt around Hemel (& other towns) I strongly suggest that the local housing need be re assessed in light of what has happen in the last 18 months.

Please consider these points, along with other objections before deciding upon the plans you are currently promoting.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS7516

**Person ID** 1265573

**Full Name** DAVID WARREN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

I am writing to express my profound disappointment and to object in the strongest possible terms to the Local Plan as promulgated by the Dacorum Borough Council. Not only are the plans for Hemel Hempstead disproportionately high in terms of numbers of houses proposed but it clearly shows that absolutely no account has been taken of the effect on the environment and the disruption to existing communities by the imposition of this travesty.

With reference to the plan for Berkhamsted, the concentration of proposed development in the Shootersway area, namely the area between existing housing and leisure facilities and the A41 Berkhamsted Bypass will seriously degrade the amount of Green Belt land remaining in and around Berkhamsted. The increase in traffic caused by the development of Bearoc by Taylor Wimpey , which is already having a detrimental effect on the safety of inhabitants, will be multiplied

several fold by the proposed development. In addition, further development will place an intolerable strain on schools, services and amenities such as medical practices and care for the aged.

It is quite clear that the Dacorum Borough Council is being unduly influenced by the desires of developers rather than the concern of the people whom they are supposed to represent.,

I look forward to your comments and a redraft of the Local Plan.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS7622

**Person ID** 1207710

**Full Name** Penny Bennetts

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I was alarmed to see the Hemel Hospital site is included. I would rather have a hospital in the town rather than a housing estate. Obviously we need a hospital that is close and accessible particularly as it seems thousands more people will be living in Hemel Hempstead and nearby.

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

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	I think there should be a lot fewer homes built so there would be fewer and smaller sites and less impact on the green belt and services that are already overstretched such as water
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7664
<b>Person ID</b>	1250022
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Ridley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Further to my previous submission, I wish to state my utter disbelief that DBC plan to build across this distant vista, aka HH01 North Hemel, (phase 1):
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<b>2 DBC appears to be prepared allow even more development than the NLP proposes</b> Some development sites have already been granted planning permission for more homes than proposed in the plan, and others sites are being actively pursued by developers even though the sites are not in the NLP. The Public deserve to know where homes will not get planning permission, in addition to the site allocations in the NLP. I refer specifically to plans by Thakenham Homes, SE of Berkhamsted, and land north of Gadebridge, where an archaeological impact assessment has recently been conducted.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Mike Ridley - Photo - P1150795 (3).JPG</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS7727
<b>Person ID</b>	1265774
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Abrahamson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I am just writing to express my concern about the local plan and development near the train station. I believe a high rise development would seriously impact on the area, and takeaway the beauty of the area and impact negatively on local facilities and transport networks.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7829
<b>Person ID</b>	1265104
<b>Full Name</b>	Darren Eldred
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Secondly, the concentration of the majority of the new homes in the Hemel Hempstead area will disproportionately deprive the town of open spaces on the green belt which have especially proven to be so valuable to local people during the pandemic as well as putting unfair stress on local services, transport, water etc. It is especially concerning for the development to the north of Hemel which unlike the other 3 sides of the town does not contain major roads or railways, so the development will remove a large area of open space that is a habitat for wildlife that has already been lost in other parts of the area.</p> <p>Finally, there remain areas within the existing boundary of Hemel, especially land formerly used for commercial uses around the Marlowes that are underused that could be used as brownfield development sites. Given the well publicised decline of town centres, these areas are in need of development but don't seem to be well addressed by the plan.</p> <p>I would ask that the plan should be amended to reduce the number of homes in total, reduce the proportion of those homes located in the Hemel Hempstead area and focus on making better use of the underused commercial space within the current boundary of the town, so reducing the amount of existing green belt land to be destroyed.</p>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS7845
<b>Person ID</b>	1265143
<b>Full Name</b>	Abigail Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I live in Boxmoor and I am so frustrated that tall buildings of at least 8 storeys high are proposed at Hemel station. I was at the consultations a few years ago and we made it clear that we didn't want any buildings above 4 storeys. Why have we not been listened to? This may not be attractive to developers for their profit margins but the people of Hemel should be more important than this. I love walking on the moor by the station and am there walking my dog most days. It is a place that makes me feel happy and peaceful and after living in cities I really appreciate the feeling of space. If there are buildings towering over it, it will ruin the view from the Moor and the view up to Felden which is a magical place. I believe that this is totally inappropriate on the edge of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These flats are aimed at the commuter market, not local residents and so will not contribute towards the affordable housing needed by the 7,000 people on the housing list. I don't think a shopping centre should be built there as we need to be encouraging people towards the town centre where more and more shops are closing and to the shops on St Johns Road in Boxmoor instead of the station.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8018
<b>Person ID</b>	1266026
<b>Full Name</b>	DEBORAH WHITMAN-JONES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Buildings surrounding the Boxmoor Trust land should be no more than 4 storeys High in order to preserve as much as possible the areas natural beauty for both residents, nature, wildlife and grazing animals.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8026
<b>Person ID</b>	1266032
<b>Full Name</b>	NANCY CULLEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I would once again urge the council to reconsider plans for 8 storey buildings around Hemel station - whilst we all understand the need for housing (specifically near stations) we also need to protect and preserve the inherent beauty of this part of Hemel.</p> <p>This is a town which I have lived in for 56 years and which has been hugely let down by poor planning decisions in the past. The infrastructure required to support the increase in traffic alone is enough to make the building of tower blocks unsatisfactory without other local infrastructure considerations. I would urge the council to reconsider their views and to look at low level high quality buildings to stop this town being so widely criticised for its lack of planning integrity</p>



Boxmoor is a charming part of Hemel Hempstead and the area near the station currently remains unspoilt - please consider the inherent benefits of this green space in the context of the needs of the whole town and reconsider large scale high rise developments ruining the vista

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8116

**Person ID** 1266070

**Full Name** Geoff Ingleby

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

The above site is a home for wildlife and used by many parts of the local community.

I consider there are many other more accessible sites than this for development in and around the area, based on my wanderings round these parts.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8129
<b>Person ID</b>	218981
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Sue Valentine
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I'd like to state my objections to the plan in relation to HH08 to HH12.</p> <p>The roads and infrastructure around London Road from Westbrook Hay through Boxmoor and Two Waters to Kings Langley is already over congested and significant improvements to the highways and services will be needed in order to accommodate the extra traffic.</p> <p>In particular I am really disappointed about HH12. How could anyone think building on common moor land would be acceptable? There's very little green space left in Dacorum and this is a step too far.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8151

<b>Person ID</b>	1266092
<b>Full Name</b>	Valerie Tyne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I wish to lodge a complaint re the plans but more specifically the proposed developments in Two Waters and Boxmoor.</p> <p>One of the main appeals of living in Hemel Hempstead is all the green spaces. Your plans are encroaching on a lot of our surrounding countryside and also green areas inside the towns existing area. I feel very strongly about the proposed redevelopment of the area around the station. Boxmoor still has a village appeal with a mixture of properties. To consider putting up to 8 storey buildings there is diabolical. It will be totally out of keeping with everything else around it. By all means put flats but no more than 3 or 4 stories to be in keeping with the flats on the other side of the canal.</p> <p>All these new homes will bring increased road congestion and pollution across the borough.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8191
<b>Person ID</b>	1207825
<b>Full Name</b>	Claire Hobson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am responding to the consultation on behalf of myself and the X adults who live with me.</p> <p>I gave up trying to use the portal as it was impossible to work through all the documentation to answer the questions - why wasn't a simple questionnaire set up, separate from the documentation? This is one of the worst examples of a system set up for the benefit of the people receiving and collating responses rather than making it easy for citizens to reply. This is an unacceptable barrier to responding.</p> <p>I have lived in Boxmoor for over 23 years, I went to senior school in Warners End and until the pandemic commuted to London daily. I brought up my family here and have loved being close to the town centre, the canal and plenty of green space that sets Hemel aside from many post war developments.</p> <p>My response lacks detail as there is far too much information to go through on top of an office job, caring for an elderly mother with dementia who ahs been unable to attend her days centre since April last year, two close relatives suffering from recent and historic trauma, running a small local business that has been busier due to more people working from home during the pandemic, and my role as a local councillor. The consultation is not very accessible or easy to digest on a screen, even for me an IT literate person who has a professional office set up at home, with a large screen/keyboard/mouse etc. For those who only have a tablet or phone it is impossible to engage in any meaningful way with the consultation. I apologise in advance for any typos - I am exhausted from all the extra work I have had to do in the pandemic due to public services being closed for a year and more people in the house and community to look after.</p> <p>I am educated to MSc level, a formal Senior Civil Servant, and am computer literate - for the avoidance of doubt when reviewing my complaints about how hard you have made it to reply and engage with the process for the citizens of Dacorum.</p> <p>I urge councillors and officers to take a step back and put themselves in the shoes of residents when designing huge and life-changing consultations. This has not put the council in a good light. Some local councillors have taken to social media to publicise the consultation but there was very little from the council. This consultation should have been postponed or extended to beyond lockdowns and school closures to enable a full and open review and engagement with the whole community.</p> <p>We support the responses of OneVoice, Chiltern Society and the Liberal Democrat Group, among others, so I will not seek to duplicate their detailed points here, but focus on the main points of concern for a long time resident of Boxmoor, a jewel in Hemel's crown.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Greenfield/greenbelt</a></u></p>

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

#### Housing requirement and council tactics (Q1)

Too many houses, too few affordable homes.

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

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

#### London Road development

4 storeys max at the station.

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

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

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

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

Who are the new homes for?

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

Commercial/retail at the station

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

Sustainability/climate change

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

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

Infrastructure

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

In summary

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

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

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

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden**

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

**Communities Other sites  
comment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Greenfield/greenbelt

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

Housing requirement and council tactics (Q1)

Too many houses, too few affordable homes.

It is absolutely clear that the number of houses supposedly held to our temples is far far too many on any rationale and evidence-based up to date analysis. The plan is woefully short on ensuring a large proportion of social/affordable housing, which is what residents of Dacorum need. The council has failed its citizens by refusing to face up to the Government

and push back on the numbers. To throw the pass to the community in the middle of a pandemic with a consultation that proposes an eye-watering and irrevocable destruction of greenbelt and increase in town sizes of Berkhamsted and Tring is incomprehensible. This is an incredibly risky strategy in the middle of a pandemic when you will not have reached a significant proportion of the community due to pandemic restrictions. There are still more people in Dacorum who don't know about the consultation or its life-changing implications than there are who do know. And of those who do know, how many of them will have the time or energy to reply substantively? Please, on behalf of your residents, fight back at the government figures and listen to us. To ignore any criticism as politically motivated blinds you to listening to what we have to say *as people who live here and will live here, hopefully alongside the next generation, for the rest of our lives - decades* is rude at best and incredibly insulting and not in the interests of what's best for Dacorum at worst. Other councils have fought back, why didn't we? Why didn't you agree the tactics with the residents whose lives will be affected by the new Local Plan?

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

#### London Road development

4 storeys max at the station.

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

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

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

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

#### Who are the new homes for?

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

#### Commercial/retail at the station

Lockdown has impacted local businesses heavily and the council should be very cautious about approving retail space at the station that could take business away from Boxmoor village centre or town centre, the latter having taken a huge hit from multiple lockdowns. With the town walkable for the majority of people who would live in starter apartments like



those proposed for the station development and regular bus services to town, there is limited rationale to have a supermarket or too many restaurant or food businesses at the station location.

#### Sustainability/climate change

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

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

#### Infrastructure

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

#### In summary

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

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

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

### **Included files**

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

<b>ID</b>	EGS8197
-----------	---------

<b>Person ID</b>	1266146
------------------	---------

<b>Full Name</b>	Samantha Wignall
------------------	------------------

### **Organisation Details**

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

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

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

<b>Yes / No</b>	
-----------------	--

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Train station - Any development around Hemel train station must be sensitive to the surrounding area - both areas of beauty & residents! Buildings should not exceed 4 stories, any higher would compromise both. Developments should be suitable & reflect the local area - avoiding modern / out of keeping architecture.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8227
<b>Person ID</b>	1207978
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Sexton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH01 and HH02 – these proposals include massive numbers of dwellings and risk biodiversity and our cultural and historical heritage. I call for a rethink as to whether development on this scale is necessary. The special and unique character of Piccotts End must be protected along with the ancient woodlands and the established hedgerows.</p> <p>HH03 and HH04 - if we are losing our hospital then development makes perfect sense. Losing our hospital however makes no sense whatsoever.</p> <p>HH21 – Excessive numbers of dwellings are proposed here, threatening biodiversity, archaeological interest, and heritage. I have to question the rationale of this. If it is for some reason essential, I maintain it is not, then I am relieved to see that a limit of two storeys will be imposed and materials used will mimic existing local housing, red brick, timber frames</p>

etc. I applaud the intention to extend Shrub Hill Common, hopefully for the entire length of the site. There are many mature trees and established hedgerows here which should be kept as habitats, anti-climate-change measures, and noise reduction between built up areas. Improvement of bus travel provision is mentioned here, I suggest that bus connection to Berkhamsted as well as to Hemel Hempstead is considered.

HH22 – this development threatens the character of Piccotts End and should be carefully reconsidered. Traveller sites are proposed in HH21 and HH22 and I suggest that careful consideration is given to the location of these sites. Perhaps they should be further away from more general residential areas. I do however agree with the size suggested, limiting each site to just 5 dwellings is a good idea.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8229

**Person ID** 1207978

**Full Name** Alison Sexton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

HH05/06/07 - It makes sense to allow evolution of the use of these sites, but I strongly suggest changing the proposed ground floor retail, which I contest is not required in the modern, post pandemic world. The retail should be replaced with ground floor housing for the elderly, these are ideal locations within walking distance of small supermarkets, the library and post office etc.

HH08 – Suggestions here of high-rise buildings seem very much out of keeping with the local area and as a gateway to the town it would be a shame to compromise the attractiveness of the moors and Roughdown Common. This is the first of several areas of the local plan which contain possible archaeological interest. I am relieved to see that archaeology will be explored prior to development. I further suggest that any findings are incorporated into the development, allowing the public and visitors to the town to enjoy the heritage of the area. Something along the lines of the building housing the Roman hypocaust in Verulamium Park would be an asset to Dacorum.

HH11 – there is talk of “green corridors” please do not make this an exercise in paving over paths on the moors, please take any additional cycle and pedestrian routes around and not through our beautiful natural areas.

HH16 – as above in my overview, I have to question whether this is actually needed.

HH17 – it is a shame to have to create a new depot in the HH01 area, but if that has to happen then it makes sense to utilise this area sympathetically.

HH20 – Do we need this kind of development at all? It would be better to use this area for residential purposes rather than HH21 or HH01/02. Again, something interesting could be made of any archaeological findings.

HH27 – I believe there is no need for any retail here, it is not required in the modern world. Use this space for residential developments and preserve some of the more attractive spaces such as HH21/22/01/02.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8232

**Person ID** 1207978

**Full Name** Alison Sexton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH09/10/12 – This is an opportunity to improve the visual appeal of this entrance to the town, with the biodiversity of the moor and rare plants found on Roughdown Common. Development here should not be high rise and urban in its feel. We have the opportunity to create a pleasing impression at this gateway not a high-rise urban environment. The Trees should be protected.</p> <p>HH13 – the new pedestrian bridge is a good idea, but please preserve the trees.</p> <p>HH14 – Development here is a good idea so long as it is in keeping with the attractive and historical feel of the area.</p> <p>HH15 – Also a good idea, make this in keeping with the attractive local terraced housing, not high rise.</p> <p>HH18/19 – development here makes sense, again it should be in keeping with the surroundings.</p> <p>HH23 – The two-storey limit is good. Consideration is needed with regard to the historic and cultural environment and to protected trees.</p> <p>HH26 – another potential opportunity to make an interesting amenity with regard to any archaeological finds.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8272
<b>Person ID</b>	1266165
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicky Kaleniuk
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I have lived in Apsley for 16 years and in that time I have seen a lot of changes, and a loss to a lot of green areas surrounding the village.</p> <p>The local plans for the area, and of boxmoor do nothing to alleviate my worries about this, and fills me with dread!</p> <p>The roads around apsley and boxmoor are gridlocked a lot of the time, there are school place shortages and mite and more of the green spaces are being built on.</p> <p>The proposals to build up to 8 storey buildings around the Boxmoor trust area near the station will seriously damage the look and feel of the place, and will have a detrimental affect on the traffic congestion, air quality and noise pollution spoiling an area of outstanding beauty enjoyed by all of the local residents.</p> <p>The housing that is being built at the moment in these areas is too expensive for most local residents and attracts more and more people moving out of London which does not then help the young people in our town who are on housing lists and need properties to rent.</p> <p>There are not enough school places for all of the children on the new Aspen park estate as it is, meaning that children have to get in card to travel to school exacerbating the problem of local traffic at peak times.</p> <p>Soon I fear that there will not be anywhere for us to walk our dogs without getting in a car to drive to places instead of being able to walk from our houses as all of the green spaces are disappearing.</p> <p>Please consider residents views and stop the overdevelopment of this wonderful area.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8324
<b>Person ID</b>	1207813
<b>Full Name</b>	Graham Hale
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>Why do I have to register to make a response ?  Is this a bureaucracy wall to prevent comment? Is it comment suppression ?  Here are my comments anyway. Please register me and ad my comments to my registration.</p> <p><b>General comments.</b></p> <p>Developments like this make the South East ever more overcrowded and unhappy place to live.  The government should follow a strategic plan of building new housing and industry in the north.  A new town could easily be built in Yorkshire around the east coast main line and MI/A1 near Selby where communications and land are plentiful.</p> <p>I think it is wrong to try to add so much development on to the town so quickly. Services and transport will inevitably become over stretched and the quality of everything suffers.</p> <p>There seems to be no measure of the quality of life impact on residents . High densities like these lead to social problems like crime and health problems both physical and mental.</p> <p><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p>Rather than bolt industrial zones on to urban areas creating a sprawl, site these on existing suitable spaces in the wider countryside such as farm yards and other existing agricultural buildings . Match the rural architectural style and add landscaping.</p> <p>Relocate the proposed industrial area beside the A41 . A 414 Two Water Road junction . This is on a hill top and will be an eyesore right across the town. Plus these fields are adjacent to the Boxmoor trust SSSI , they are wildlife rich and the development will impact massively on wildlife there. They should remain as managed meadow or incorporated into the Boxmoor Trust land as a Nature reserve zone on the urban edge.</p> <p>Targets for affordable sustainable low carbon houses to apply to all developments</p>

Consideration to be made to any development to fit in to existing urban scale building height and townscape.  
 Commit to re wilding of surrounding areas on a scale to the green land lost in order to balance loss of wildlife habitats.  
 Create targets for tree densities and hedgerow lengths within the Dacorum urban boundaries to protect mental health of Dacorum people and wildlife habitat.  
 Create a target for a minimum distance to green space from each doorstep. Say 200m  
 Make a definition of what constitutes green space based on area of land, fraction planted and variety of planting done

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8346
<b>Person ID</b>	1266200
<b>Full Name</b>	ROGER HANDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth Area HH01 North Hemel – 1550 houses on the Gade valley side ... will permeable hard standing areas be installed, will swales and suds be installed with an appropriate maintenance programme? Will low water use and grey water use fixtures be use das standard? Will there be silt traps for surface water drainage?</p> <p>The Civic Centre and Market square sites will also affect the River Gade (see comments for HH01 site).</p> <p>HH09 Nation Grid Land – will the public footpath that runs through the site be maintained and in particular will the treacherous steps that currently take the footpath over the structures in the site, be removed and replaced with a flat safe pathway?</p> <p>Two Water Road and Moor sites will affect the Bulbourne (see comments for HH01)</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8361
<b>Person ID</b>	211117
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Heylin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth Area HH01 North Hemel – 1550 houses on the Gade valley side ... will permeable hard standing areas be installed, will swales and suds be installed with an appropriate maintenance programme? Will low water use and grey water use fixtures be use das standard? Will there be silt traps for surface water drainage?</p> <p>The Civic Centre and Market square sites will also affect the River Gade (see comments for HH01 site.</p> <p>HH09 Nation Grid Land – will the public footpath that runs through the site be maintained and in particular will the treacherous steps that currently take the footpath over the structures in the site, be removed and replaced with a flat safe pathway?</p> <p>Two Water Road and Moor sites will affect the Bulbourne (see comments for HH01)</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8375
<b>Person ID</b>	1266205
<b>Full Name</b>	DI HAMMOND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth Area HH01 North Hemel – 1550 houses on the Gade valley side ... will permeable hard standing areas be installed, will swales and suds be installed with an appropriate maintenance programme? Will low water use and grey water use fixtures be use das standard? Will there be silt traps for surface water drainage?</p> <p>The Civic Centre and Market square sites will also affect the River Gade (see comments for HH01 site.</p> <p>HH09 Nation Grid Land – will the public footpath that runs through the site be maintained and in particular will the treacherous steps that currently take the footpath over the structures in the site, be removed and replaced with a flat safe pathway?</p> <p>Two Water Road and Moor sites will affect the Bulbourne (see comments for HH01)</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8402

<b>Person ID</b>	1266230
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE WHELAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I wouldn't normally get involved however I believe we now need to I work for Hemel Hempstead hospital I also live in Boxmoor unfortunately we also had to have new houses built at bottom of our garden taking away much of the light in winter nights however during COVID lockdown I have never seen so many families and a lot more elderly people all walks of life use the moor .My neighbours are mostly elderly sit in there gardens as the cannot walk far or in wheelchairs will now have to sit looking at monstrosity buildings going up everywhere as it won't stop there once planning is permitted in the summer we have the animals in there children come from everywhere the even play in the stream everyone comments on how beautiful Boxmoor is and now you want to ruin the whole area I don't understand why anyone in there right mind would agree to this Boxmoor is not a working area apart from small businesses there is plenty of buildings available on industrial estate build them up there leave us alone please
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8426
<b>Person ID</b>	1266241
<b>Full Name</b>	George Smyth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>"The timeless feel of Boxmoor depends on the leafiness of the area around the station. There are few stations in the home counties where you can walk through a field of cows to get to the local railway station. The Box Moor Trust area is an asset to the town and it should not be destroyed in the area around the station by having high rise buildings. So, buildings at the station should be no more that four storeys to avoid new developments over-powering the surroundings and irreversibly destroying the street scene of the area around the station." - Cllr William Allen</p> <p>Agreed !</p> <p>Please keep this area green and free from the urban sprawl of high rise buildings! It's one of the main things that attracted us to Hemel to start our family!</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8521
<b>Person ID</b>	1266461
<b>Full Name</b>	Laura Mickute
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I resently bought house in Hemel Hempstead. I got allotment in grovehill society next to grovehill playing fields. I just checked your new development plants.. I am loosing not only view of fields next to my house but allotment too. Can you consider do not effect our allotment plots? I am attached plan with map about which i worry (i marked it in orange).
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Screenshot.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8564
<b>Person ID</b>	1266565
<b>Full Name</b>	ANNE WERBICKI
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The DLP represents excessive overdevelopment to the serious detriment, in particular, of: Green environmentally important spaces eg the loss of Two Waters Moor in an area which is already a grey urban desert; Proposed high rise buildings around the station area- completely out of keeping with adjoining Boxmoor Trust areas - proposed intensive development will be environmentally inappropriate both as to its unsuitability to the existing streetscape and the environmental sustainability of the surrounding natural areas which will be impacted significantly by the intended high intensity station development. Green areas are crucial to the enjoyment of Hemel for future generations. Hemel is already suffering from suffocating concrete encroachment - this proposal exacerbates the problem for little gain.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8566
<b>Person ID</b>	1266566
<b>Full Name</b>	ARABELLA MOONEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am particularly concerned about the height of the proposed development at the station. Boxmoor and the Boxmoor trust land is a place of great beauty. Any developments should, in my opinion be of a maximum of 4 stories high.</p> <p>I feel great steps have been taken in the past few years to improve the beauty of Hemel Hempstead. The proposal feels like a rushed decision to meet government housing targets, rather than a considered approach to what would work well for the existing local community, protecting the precious green belt and providing high quality housing for both existing and new residents.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8602
<b>Person ID</b>	1207775
<b>Full Name</b>	Heather & John Ebdon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Two Waters Opportunity Area</b></p> <p>Policy SP 18 covers this area, which goes far beyond the normal bounds of the local definition of Two Waters. It seeks to “respect the character of the moors” with “development of an appropriate height” yet at site <b>HH08</b> blithely ignores the strong local consensus that a development over four storeys high would destroy the visual landscape links between the moors and the commons. The rationale appears to be that developers state that four storey developments are not financially viable, by which they mean they do not maximise profits. A rigorous adherence from the outset to a density level sympathetic to the need to retain the integration between moor and common would drive down the residual residential land values and work in the interests of the community and not simply developers.</p> <p><b>Site HH12</b> remains common land capable of providing an attractive amenity approach to the town of Hemel Hempstead and the Borough should cease their attempts to allow development on land that has been owned for grazing and leisure purposes by local inhabitants since 1581. It is so much more than the rather derogatory “locally registered park and garden” a phrase which suggests an almost wilful ignorance of the town’s heritage.</p> <p><b>Site HP16</b> appears to be adjacent to Further Roughdown, part of the exchange land vested in the Box Moor Trustees in respect of the A41 construction. If this agricultural land is to be released for other uses it appears that consideration should be given to extending the Trust lands rather than light industrial development. In any event, the requirement to “ensure the development is not visible from the countryside beyond the A41” is risible – more pertinently it would need shielding from Further Roughdown and there is frankly nothing that would make it not visible from the majority of Hemel Hempstead.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8608
<b>Person ID</b>	218981
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Sue Valentine
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I'd like to state my objections to the plan in relation to HH08 to HH12.</p> <p>The roads and infrastructure around London Road from Westbrook Hay through Boxmoor and Two Waters to Kings Langley is already over congested and significant improvements to the highways and services will be needed in order to accommodate the extra traffic.</p> <p>In particular I am really disappointed about HH12. How could anyone think building on common moor land would be acceptable? There's very little green space left in Dacorum and this is a step too far.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8635
<b>Person ID</b>	1266605
<b>Full Name</b>	HELEN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I write regarding the proposal of major development for the Hemel Garden Communities.</p> <p>I oppose the plan for a number of reasons:</p> <p>The vision is to deliver green spaces yet it will destroy 900 acres of green belt enjoyed by the communities. Much of the centre of Hemel Hempstead sits empty now, why not redevelop there instead of destroying the green belt land that can be enjoyed by so many. It has been lovely, particularly over the last year, to see so many people enjoying the walks across the land that you now want to destroy. The city centre is deserted and had been long before the pandemic. Rows and rows of empty buildings that could be redeveloped instead of destroying protected beautiful green spaces enjoyed by so many.</p> <p>The scale of the impact on the Green Belt and the Chilterns area of Outstanding Beauty is vast - it will have a significant and detrimental impact on the natural environment.</p> <p>The roads to the north of the development are single track roads and would be unable to cope with the vast increase in transport. There would also be an increase in noise and air pollution and an increase in risk to cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders.</p> <p>Green Belt and areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are protected for a reason and it seems ironic that planners want to destroy 900 acres of it to deliver 'green spaces'.</p> <p>This pandemic has highlighted how important areas such as this are for mental health and well being. Let the communities continue to enjoy the green spaces and if the additional houses are essential, then build them on the deserted town centre where the infrastructure is already in place.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8672
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8704

<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8707
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

Lead Local Flood Authority. The scale of growth to the north and east of Hemel Hempstead and the challenge of draining surface water due to the absence of watercourses, means that drainage strategies for the sites need to be considered at an early stage so that they can be integrated with corridors such as the provision of green As more than one developer is likely to be involved, it is essential that a strategic SUDS network is developed at the framework/master planning stage.

**Paragraph 23.71**

Transport. The county council welcomes the fact that sustainable travel such as walking, cycling and public transport will be given priority, as this aligns with the policies in HCC's adopted LTP4. HCC would like to see more emphasis placed on the importance of sustainable modes of transport within and between Hemel Garden Communities, including the important role that MMTI's will play in the uptake of sustainable modes of transport, and the text should be updated accordingly to reflect this.

It would also be helpful to mention that the East Hemel Hempstead growth area will deliver a high-quality walking and cycling bridge across the A414 (overcoming severance for pedestrians and cyclists) along with a major upgrade for the A414 / Green Lanes junction and other sustainable connections to and from key origins and destinations within and between the development. The text should be updated accordingly to reflect this.

This paragraph also needs to differentiate between the local plan and the East Hemel Hempstead growth area and recognise that the East Hemel Hempstead area will also deliver a high-quality pedestrian and cycle bridge across the A414 and a major upgrade of the A414 / Green Lanes (Breakspear) junction. It is not clear at this time whether the improvements to Junction 8 will be wholly funded by the development (and in any case this would include the East Hemel development within St Albans City & District).

**Paragraph 23.75**

Transport. There should also be recognition of the need to provide good sustainable transport links from the development to the town centre and station.

**Paragraph 23.77**

Transport. There is little difference between delivery for phase 1 and phase 2. Given that phase 2 is beyond the local plan period and the HGC transport work is at a relatively early stage, it is considered that it would be better to refer to the HGC work as being the means to identify the features required to support growth.

**Paragraph 23.80**

Transport. The work presented by ITP on infrastructure requirements does include the suggestion of MMTI's including one for the town centre. HCC's position on this is that opportunities need to be explored in relation to developing existing interchanges into an MMTI rather than creating a new one as this phrase appears to

Identified infrastructure requirements

Concern is raised regarding the growth areas at North Hemel Hempstead (phases 1 and 2) and West Hemel Hempstead, as any increase in housing will impact upon the existing availability of provision across these areas of Dacorum. Currently, there are sufficient places in the Dacorum area apart from Hemel Hempstead West area where a deficit is showing from Summer 2021.

The North and West Hemel Hempstead growth areas will need to consider establishing new childcare provision to cater for this new demand. A new 0-5 childcare provision for working families would suffice in each of those. In terms of the childcare facilities, it would require approximately 275 sqm (which includes both internal and outdoor space) for the childcare facilities, in each of the North and West Hemel Hempstead growth areas.

Whilst it would be expected that the developer would build and then lease the buildings to a childcare provider, for the relevant cost consultant to understand the overall “cost” of the development, the childcare facility and the approximate generated cost will need to be included and this would be £670,725 per childcare facility, based on a baseline of 7sqm per place.

With regard to families accessing childcare in Dacorum, there is a preference for childcare to be close to their home with unnecessary travelling 80% of families who access childcare in the borough do so within their family support service locality which is a significantly higher percentage than the county average.

Family Support Services will require access to community space to deliver their. The service is currently commissioned out by the county council to partners who deliver a range of support and information to families of children under 11 years old.

### **Paragraph 23.70**

Lead Local Flood Authority. The scale of growth to the north and east of Hemel Hempstead and the challenge of draining surface water due to the absence of watercourses, means that drainage strategies for the sites need to be considered at an early stage so that they can be integrated with corridors such as the provision of green. As more than one developer is likely to be involved, it is essential that a strategic SUDS network is developed at the framework/master planning stage.

### **Paragraph 23.71**

Transport. The county council welcomes the fact that sustainable travel such as walking, cycling and public transport will be given priority, as this aligns with the policies in HCC’s adopted LTP4. HCC would like to see more emphasis placed on the importance of sustainable modes of transport within and between Hemel Garden Communities, including the important role that MMTI’s will play in the uptake of sustainable modes of transport, and the text should be updated accordingly to reflect this.

It would also be helpful to mention that the East Hemel Hempstead growth area will deliver a high-quality walking and cycling bridge across the A414 (overcoming severance for pedestrians and cyclists) along with a major upgrade for the A414 / Green Lanes junction and other sustainable connections to and from key origins and destinations within and between the development. The text should be updated accordingly to reflect this.

This paragraph also needs to differentiate between the local plan and the East Hemel Hempstead growth area and recognise that the East Hemel Hempstead area will also deliver a high-quality pedestrian and cycle bridge across the

A414 and a major upgrade of the A414 / Green Lanes (Breakspear) junction. It is not clear at this time whether the improvements to Junction 8 will be wholly funded by the development (and in any case this would include the East Hemel development within St Albans City & District).

#### **Paragraph 23.75**

Transport. There should also be recognition of the need to provide good sustainable transport links from the development to the town centre and

#### **Paragraph 23.77**

Transport. There is little difference between delivery for phase 1 and phase 2. Given that phase 2 is beyond the local plan period and the HGC transport work is at a relatively early stage, it is considered that it would be better to refer to the HGC work as being the means to identify the features required to support

#### **Paragraph 23.80**

Transport. The work presented by ITP on infrastructure requirements does include the suggestion of MMTI's including one for the town centre. HCC's position on this is that opportunities need to be explored in relation to developing existing interchanges into an MMTI rather than creating a new one as this phrase appears to

### **Policy SP16: North and East of Hemel Hempstead Growth Areas**

Lead Local Flood Authority. The production of a masterplan for the north and east of Hemel Hempstead growth areas is This would be the appropriate mechanism to consider a strategic SuDS network.

Transport. The county council would like to see more emphasis placed on the importance of sustainable modes of transport within and between Hemel Garden Communities, including the important role that MMTI's will play in the uptake of sustainable modes of transport to achieve a 60% modal shift. The fourth bullet point within the policy needs to re-worded accordingly to reflect this.

### **Policy SP19: Maylands Business Park**

Transport. The county council would expect there to be support for passenger transport services to the town centre and station within this

#### **Paragraph 23.89**

Children's Services. In the light of the need to find a new primary school site within the Two Waters area, it is requested that the wording is amended as follows:

*"There are significant regeneration opportunities in the area, particularly the Station Gateway, former Gasworks Site and Two Waters North / Magic Roundabout. These developments will deliver significant residential development together with supporting services, a new primary school and infrastructure."*

### **The Rest of Hemel Hempstead (paragraph 23.96)**

Transport. There is no reference to what the developments listed within this paragraph will provide. The developments in the rest of Hemel Hempstead cumulatively add up to a significant number of new homes. A policy is required setting out what is needed from these developments e.g. provision of safe and direct sustainable transport access from the sites towards key destinations, along with a reference to the need for Transport Assessments and infrastructure which follows HCC's Highways design.

### **North Hemel Hempstead Allocations**

Children's Services. Development proposed within the North Hemel Hempstead allocations that form part of the wider 'Hemel Garden Communities' amounts to an increase of 5,550 dwellings (1,550 dwellings within the plan period in phase 1 and 4,000 dwellings beyond the plan period in phase 2). This amounts to a potential additional child yield of just under 14fe, when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil However, the supporting text for phase 1 states that the 1,550 dwellings figure includes provision for older people, although a percentage has not been stated.

In order to accommodate the additional child yield from this growth area and adjacent sites (including LA/1), sites for five new 2.92ha primary school sites are sought (amounting to 15fe). In addition, two new 13.2ha secondary school sites (amounting to 20fe) are sought in order to meet the pupil yield arising from this development and the cumulative impact of a proportion of other developments across Hemel Hempstead.

Transport. The county council as Highways Authority, has previously provided feedback to the LPA on these proposed sites. However, there are still some that are included which are likely to be problematic in terms of making them accessible by adequate bus services. Sites in Hemel Hempstead that are potentially problematic are as follows (see detailed comments under each of the following growth areas: HH03/HH04 Hospital site and Paradise/Wood Lane End, HH09 National Grid Land, HH16 Two Waters Rd/A41 Employment Site, HH20 Breakspear Way/Green Lane/Boundary Way, Maylands Gateway, HH24 Land at Turners Hill, HH25 Land to r/o St Margarets Way/Datchworth Turn, HH26 South of Green Lane.

### **Growth Area HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1)**

Adult Care Services. Housing provision for older people is welcomed at this site, although HCC would like confirmation of the type of accommodation for older people which will be provided and assurances that a proportion of accommodation will be available for people with fully funded care (affordable rented) as per the South West Herts LHNA. There is also no mention of provision of appropriate housing for people with disabilities. HCC are in support of the figures given at Part 1 Table 9 - 100% of socially rented housing to be accessible and 10% of all housing to be wheelchair user dwellings. As stated above, such provision for older people and people with disabilities should be close to public transport links, local amenities, shops and health care.

Children's Services. The proposed provision for a new primary and secondary school (totalling 92ha and 13.2ha respectively) within this allocation is welcomed. However, a further allocation of another new primary school (additional 2.92ha) is required to mitigate the impact of both this development (phase 1) and the nearby LA/1 development. Both new primary schools should give enough land for a 3fe primary school (2.92ha each). The proposed secondary school will serve both phase 1 of the North Hemel development and some additional developments within Hemel Hempstead itself. Whilst it is currently unclear whether all of the growth area will be removed from the Green Belt, in order to ensure

deliverability, the primary and secondary schools should be shown as an education allocation on the inset map (Map 1), along with the accompanying proposals map and where possible, the build zone removed from the Green Belt. This is in line with the county council's comments under the section titled: 'Education.'

Transport. The route through to the Link Road is only described as a secondary access and will need to be suitable for a bus operation. A bus route will need to be through Marchmont Farm as this site is unlikely to support bus service diversion on its own in the long term and having services run through North Hemel to Leighton Buzzard Road would mean this site would be a significant distance away from available services.

With regard to a new strategic corridor road through north and east Hemel Hempstead, HCC would wish to see consideration given first to opportunities to maximise sustainable modes of transport and then determine the residual impact of vehicular traffic to see if a new strategic corridor is required. The Stage 2 transport work for Hemel Garden Communities will determine this, and the third bullet point under: 'Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport' needs to be updated accordingly to reflect

Waste Management Unit. Provision for a new recycling centre, as stated within the list of requirements for this growth area is supported. A new 1ha recycling centre within North Hemel will replace the existing facility at Eastman Way, which as explained previously is not suitable for expansion.

The county council's 'Local Authority Collected Waste Spatial Strategy, Household Waste Recycling Centre Annex (Updated April 2019)' identifies three areas of search for new recycling centres in the county. The purpose of these areas of search is to find three new recycling centre super sites where further provision is required to meet future need. The first Area of Search (AoS1) surrounds Bishop's Stortford within East Herts District, the second Area of Search (AoS2) covers Welwyn Garden City, Hatfield and land southeast of St Albans and Area of Search 3 (AoS3) includes the area between east Hemel Hempstead and western St Albans. One new recycling centre is needed within AoS3.

Dacorum Borough falls partly within AoS3 and whilst the North Hemel Growth Area falls outside this particular area of search, the suggested location is within close proximity and therefore provision of a recycling centre within this growth area is The recent withdrawal of the draft St Albans Local Plan has curtailed a potential allocation for a similar recycling centre on land within a proposed employment area at East Hemel Hempstead.

In order to ensure deliverability, a new 1ha recycling centre should be shown as an allocation on the relevant inset map (Map 1), along with the accompanying proposals map and removed from the Green Belt. The county council will consider submitting a soundness objection to the forthcoming regulation 19 local plan, if the 1ha recycling centre is not shown as an allocation on the proposals map and relevant inset map and remains in the Green

### **Growth Area HH02: North Hemel (Phase 2)**

Children's Services. The proposed provision for two new primary schools and a secondary school (totalling 6ha and 13ha respectively) within this allocation is However, in the light of this allocation potentially generating up to 10fe of child yield, when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield, it is requested that a third 2.92ha, 3fe primary school is allocated within the site. The primary schools will serve pupils arising from the phase 2 allocation, along with the proposed secondary school that will have a wider catchment area.



The primary and secondary schools should be shown as education allocations on the inset map (Map 2), along with the accompanying proposals map and where possible, the build zones removed from the Green Belt, in line with the county council's comments under the section titled: 'Education.'

Transport. Similarly to the previous comment made under Growth Area HH01:North Hemel, the new strategic corridor road that will run through north and east Hemel Hempstead, will be determined through stage 2 transport work for Hemel Garden Communities, and the second bullet point under: 'Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport' needs to be updated accordingly to reflect this.

### **Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Allocations**

Children's Services. Development proposed within the town centre allocations, during the plan period amounts to an increase of 1,230 dwellings on five separate allocations. This amounts to an additional child yield of 1.23fe, when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

In order to accommodate the additional child yield from these sites, along with further developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, a 2.03ha site for a new 2fe primary school is therefore sought.

### **Growth Area HH03: Hospital Site (previously MU/2)**

Children's Services. Provision for a new primary school within the allocation is welcomed. The primary school will serve pupils arising from within this development and other town centre allocations. However, in order to ensure deliverability, the primary school should be shown as an education allocation on the inset map (Map 3), along with the accompanying proposals map.

Transport. This site along with Growth Area HH04: Paradise/Wood Lane End, is over the recommended accessibility criteria from existing bus stops as is part of If these sites came forward together would create greater critical mass to fund transport improvements, individually would not enable adequate improvements to be made. Policy should enable this.

### **Growth Area HH05: Market Square**

Transport. This growth area should maximise its very sustainable location within the town centre, as the town's bus station is within

### **Growth Area HH06: Civic Centre Site**

Transport. This is a sustainable site, with bus stops within walking distance and close to the town centre.

### **Growth Area HH07: NCP Car Park, Hillfield Road**

Transport. Development within this growth area should maximise the opportunity of its location to the Bus Station.

### **Two Waters Allocations**

Children's Services. Development proposed within the Two Waters area of Hemel Hempstead during the plan period amounts to an increase of 1,560 dwellings on eight separate This amounts to an additional child yield of 1.56fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

In order to accommodate the additional child yield from these sites, along with further developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, a 0.3ha site for a 2fe new primary school is sought, in order to meet the pupil yield arising from developments within the Two Waters area.

#### **Growth Areas HH08: Station Gateway**

Transport. The supporting text should be expanded to recognise and reflect the requirements of the station during the plan period in relation to the wider Hemel Garden Community project, i.e., number of cycle parking spaces, high quality transport information provision. The current proposals for this site require further work before the county council will support from a bus perspective.

It is essential that the site is developed in a manner that is future proof and able to function as a high-quality interchange with sufficient capacity for future services. HCC will require significant enhancement of London Road for the transport interchange, this should be included when discussing the multi-modal transport interchange.

The county council would wish to see more emphasis being placed on sustainable transport connections to and from the station, so that it will be easy for people to travel by sustainable modes rather than the car in accordance with the policies in LTP4. Proposals will need to include high-quality walking, cycling and public transport connections to key areas of Hemel Hempstead including the town centre and onwards towards key growth areas in north and east Hemel Hempstead, and this needs to be reflected in the supporting text for this site.

#### **Growth Areas HH08: Station Gateway and HH09: National Grid Land**

Children's Services. Provision for a new 2fe primary school (totalling 2.03ha) within one of these growth areas should be considered, as these are the largest allocations within the Two Waters area and are subject to masterplanning. Other allocations within Two Waters are not considered to be suitable to accommodate a new primary school. The county council will not be able to support the planned growth within this area, without the provision of an additional primary school.

#### **Growth Area HH09: National Grid Land**

Transport. A significant proportion of this site has an over recommended accessibility criteria from bus stops and the growth area is not large enough to facilitate adequate improvements to services. Direct access to bus services should be a feature of the sites design and there may be opportunities to enable links to Growth Area HH16 through this

It is suggested that the following wording under the heading: 'Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport' is amended:

*Enhance pedestrian and cycle links with Station Gateway, the town centre, and key employment sites ~~where possible~~.*

#### **Growth Area HH10: Symbio Place, Whiteleaf Road**

Transport. The growth area is within the recognised accessibility criteria of bus stops on Two Waters Rd with adequate services.

It is suggested that the following wording under the heading: 'Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport' is amended:

*Enhance pedestrian and cycle links with Station Gateway, the town centre, and key employment sites ~~where possible~~.*

### **Growth Area HH11: Two Waters North**

Transport. The growth area is well located in relation to access to bus services, being within 400m of several stops with a wide variety of services

It is suggested that the following wording under the heading: 'Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport' is amended: *Enhance pedestrian and cycle links with Station Gateway, and key employment sites where possible.*

### **Growth Area HH13: Frogmore Road**

Transport. The canal limits accessibility and bus stops may be over recognised accessibility criteria depending on available pedestrian Th county council welcomes the provision of a new pedestrian bridge as this will reduce the severance caused by the river and improve sustainable connections to and from the site. A new pedestrian bridge would need to connect to the surrounding walking and cycling network to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport, and this needs to be reflected in the text.

### **Growth Area HH14: 233 London Road**

Transport. This growth area has bus stops in close proximity that are served by regular inter-urban bus

### **Growth Area HH15: Ebbens Road**

Transport. A pedestrian link between Ebbens Road and Lawn Lane/ Belswains Lane roundabout would mean bus stops are within recognised accessibility criteria and services are adequate.

### **Growth Area HH16: Two Waters Road, A41 Junction Employment Site**

Transport. It is unclear how this growth area can deliver high quality walking, cycling or public transport Without further evidence and measures secured in policy, HCC would not support this site's inclusion within the plan and would submit a soundness objection at the Regulation 19 stage, should it be included within it. of its inclusion.

The site score poorly for recognised accessibility criteria from existing bus services and it is not clear how/if the site could facilitate improvements for public transport access. The county council will only support its inclusion where the following can be evidenced (and secured in policy)

- Pedestrian access route suitable for all users;
- Cycling access route reflective of the aspirations of Hemel Garden Communities;
- Access to public transport provision reflective of an employment sites

### **Maylands Allocations**

Children's Services. Development proposed within the Maylands area of Hemel Hempstead during the plan period amounts to an increase of 770 dwellings on three separate allocations. This amounts to an additional child yield of 0.76fe when using the county council's tiered approach to pupil yield.

### **Growth Area HH17: Cupid Green Depot**

Transport. There are bus stops outside the site with adequate services. HCC welcomes the provision of direct and convenient walking and cycling connections to link the site to the surrounding sustainable networks such as the Nickey

Line, as this will play an important role in connecting the site to key destinations in Hemel Hempstead via sustainable modes of transport, and this needs to be reflected in the text.

#### **Growth Area HH18: Kier Park**

Transport. Bus stops are within 200m, with commuter services and a regular inter-urban

#### **Growth Area HH19: Wood Lane End**

Transport. Bus stops are available within the recognised accessibility criteria with adequate

#### **Growth Area HH20: Breakspear Way/Green Lane/Boundary Way, Maylands Gateway**

Transport. Some of this growth area is over recognised accessibility criteria from existing bus stops, and services available are commuter services. Service improvement may be problematic short term, likely to be more possible with development of adjoining East Hemel Garden Communities land.

With regard to the Maylands Gateway, it would be helpful to mention that the East Hemel development will deliver a high-quality walking and cycling bridge across the A414 (overcoming severance for pedestrians and cyclists), along with a major upgrade for the A414/Green Lanes junction and other sustainable connections to and from key origins and destinations within and between the development.

#### **Rest of Hemel Hempstead Allocations**

Children's Services. Development proposed within the rest of Hemel Hempstead during the plan period amounts to an increase of 1,815 dwellings on six separate allocations. In addition, the balance of the approximate 3,600 dwellings from windfall and other commitments (outside of the locations identified above) will need to be accommodated.

In order to help accommodate additional child yield from these sites, along with further developments arising from windfall and existing commitments, a site of sufficient size for a 2fe school (2.03ha) is sought at land to the north of Astley Cooper

A further secondary site (of sufficient size for a 10fe school) is also sought to help mitigate the potential child yield from Hemel Hempstead, located to provide an appropriate spread of new provision when considering the location of other new secondary schools.

The above school requirements are in addition to the primary schools proposed at the LA/3 development (of 2fe size) and the Spencer's Park (Phase 2) development (of 2fe size). Furthermore, expansions of existing primary schools, subject to feasibility, will also be required to meet need arising from Hemel Hempstead developments.

#### **Growth Area HH21: West of Hemel Hempstead**

Transport. Discussions are currently ongoing regarding the Section 106 agreement associated with this site to secure bus service improvements that are mentioned within the supporting text.

#### **Growth Area HH22: Marchmont Farm**

Transport. An approved access strategy is required for a new point of access onto the A4147 (notably for LTP4, policy 5) and other connections for sustainable modes should be detailed within site specific policy. Integration and protection of existing rights of way will be required and should be commented on in the policy. A bus service diversion is being

planned for this site but it is considered unlikely to have longevity. It is really important that bus services from the North Hemel growth area are able to pass through this site in future, in order to ensure it is adequately served long term. The site should have a bus route passing through the site to enable this.

#### **Growth Area HH24: Land at Turners Hill**

Transport. An approved access strategy is required, due to the proximity and existing junction onto the A414 and clarification of key destinations and the impact of severance by the A414 (crossing may be required). The county council welcomes the retention of footpaths, if opportunities for cycle provision exist they should be explored. There are no bus stops within recognised accessibility criteria of this site and services on the A414 are currently limited. This site needs to come forward with adjacent development sites which would produce developer contributions large enough to enable bus service improvements.

#### **Growth Area HH25: Land r/o St Margarets Way/Datchworth Turn**

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission, due to the possible complexities of taking vehicle access from Green Lane and access/routes for sustainable modes. A wider permeability for walking/cycling into and out of the site should be sought. Nearest bus stops are over recognised accessibility and this site is not large enough to contribute to bus service improvements

#### **Growth Area HH26: South of Green Lane**

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission, due to the possible complexities of taking vehicle access from Green Lane and access/routes for sustainable modes. A wider permeability for walking/cycling into and out of the site should be sought. Closest bus stops are over recognised accessibility and this site is not large enough to contribute to bus service improvements.

#### **Growth Area HH27: Jarman Park-out of centre retail allocation**

Transport. The following text should be amended as follows:

- *A ~~traffic study~~ Transport Assessment may be required and road works should accommodate traffic generation.*

Wider consideration of the site and a garden town transport context should be considered and a relevant policy included. It should be noted that the existing shuttle bus from the town centre to the site only runs until lunchtime and on limited days and there are off-site bus stops within recognised accessibility criteria, although existing car parking on site likely to make car trips more attractive

#### **Growth Area HH28: Bunkers Park-crematorium allocation**

Clarity is required with regard to the walking/cycle links should be included, such as the wider connectivity context of the link. Bus stops are available on Bedmond Road within recognised accessibility criteria of front of the site with regular inter-urban This should be maximised to enable public transport access to the site.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8731
<b>Person ID</b>	1207811
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Hadfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>On a personal level, as a resident of the Boxmoor area of Hemel Hempstead, we love our area because of its beautiful green spaces, country feel and vibrant community. We have been particularly grateful for this in recent times. The proposed developments at Hemel train station and Chaulden fields will be seriously detrimental to our area, with increased traffic, pressure on already struggling infrastructure and resources (such as water supplies which have already been a problem for local developments) and serious environmental impact.</p> <p>Of particular personal concern is the plan for high rise housing around Hemel Hempstead station. Currently this is in one of our greenest areas, opposite the station is a beautiful moor with animal grazing, the feel of this will be totally destroyed by having high rise buildings looming over it. The area is already busy traffic wise and with this being a main route out of the town, along with the station, it really can't cope with extra pressure. I would also like to note that over the last few years there have been problems with the moors near the station flooding in the winter, the last thing that is needed is the huge foundations of high rise buildings pushing the water even higher.</p>

In conclusion, the numbers proposed appear to have been decided upon using out of date information and should be revisited with models based on the future not the past. The plan as it stands could well result in building vast numbers of houses to adhere to a mandatory number that is nowhere near reality, resulting in unsuitable and unneeded developments. Green space will therefore be lost and communities ruined for no reason.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8799

**Person ID** 1261814

**Full Name** Liz Uttley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I am pleased to see that the Two Waters area has been marked for redevelopment. This area is in need of regeneration. I hope that much needed improvements to the public realm can be included as part of these schemes. At present it is only possible to walk from Apsley to the town centre by walking alongside either Two Waters Way, or Lawn Lane. These roads have lots of traffic and the fumes, and along with the slim paths (Two Waters Way) which make pedestrians feel vulnerable, mean that it unpleasant to walk this relatively short distance, and people instead drive. For the same reason, London road also requires urgent improvement, and a traffic management plan for this area is essential.

I am also pleased that the train station is marked for redevelopment, however I would note that much care must be taken not to damage the setting of the Moor, which is a vital and well loved natural asset for Boxmoor and Hemel as a whole. On top of this, this development should be considered in the light of likely changes to commuting habits post COVID,

and must be sensitive not to present further competition to footfall in the town centre by providing a new shopping centre. Some shops will be acceptable for convenience, but it should not present as a 'mini Milton Keynes'.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8823
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Phase 1: HH01: 212.2ha. 1550 homes - Includes retail and community facilities, primary and secondary schools, Council depot and household recycling site and a country park of 'district-wide importance'. It will also have 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' (SANG) to 'offset adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods due to recreational pressure' which the developments would create.</p> <p>This is possibly the worst and most damaging to the Upper Gade Valley and to the CAONB, which, in the Council's own Landscape Assessment, requires the relatively unspoilt landscape to be conserved and strengthened'. Clearly this cannot be consistent with vast development covering an entire valley side.</p> <p>It brings development up to the edge of Piccotts End, a small historic hamlet designated a Conservation Area with many listed buildings. It will completely 'wrap around' the hamlet seriously affecting its setting and the quality of life of the</p>



existing residents. The proposed development will extend up to and abut the CAONB. The land is on the steep southern slope of the north side of the Gade Valley and therefore any development will physically and visually severely affect the valley and the CAONB. The periphery of Grove Hill can already be seen from long distances and this new development will bring urban development completely into the open countryside. Scant regard is paid to the effects on the setting and views to and from the CAONB nor to the vast increase in traffic, lighting, noise and disturbance to wildlife plus destruction of hedgerows, trees, historic field patterns. As a token, it proposes that an ancient woodland would be saved and possibly supplemented (with ancient trees?). The increased pressure on Ashridge, the Gade Valley Water Meadows and other parts of the AONB will be immense.

Part of the proposal involved a new link to Jn8 of the M1 as part of a new Mass Rapid Transit system to Harlow which is again very 'old fashioned', road orientated thinking which has major environmental implications. A spin off from this is that local traffic will be pushed onto already heavily trafficked rural roads and though villages and hamlets used as 'rat-runs', further affecting the environment and living conditions of existing residents and further limiting the encouragement to cycle or walk. No improvements are proposed for existing roads or existing rural communities.

The Gade Valley is recognised by the Council itself as 'a key biodiversity area with mosaic, wetland, grassland and woodland' which will be completely destroyed. There is no mention of how they intend to mitigate the disastrous and irreparable damage. A vague suggestion of 'landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors' is proposed which replaces existing natural open space with a man-made environment which is certainly no compensation. They state that they will 'enhance or restore hedgerows and field patterns and boundaries', but how can they do this if they are building over the entire area? Similarly, they state they will 'conserve and enhance historic sunken lanes and Public Rights of Way' which is somewhat perverse as in the Marchmont Farm development (included in the Plan as HH22), a new access road crosses over an historic path which will severely affect users of the path which leads from Piccotts End to an area of public open space within Grove Hill!

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8824

**Person ID** 1158356

**Full Name** Colin Blundel

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Phase 2: HH02: 160.9ha. 4000 homes - safeguarded for after 2038 - which is only 17 years away and should be considered now as part of the whole N/NE expansion of Hemel Hempstead. This lies to the north of HH01 around the existing development of Grove Hill and has been planned in conjunction with St Albans City and District Council. However, St Albans' Local Plan has been deemed to be unsound and therefore has been postponed which throws into question this Phase. up to the boundary with St Albans. Thus, the swathe of Green Belt around the northern part of Hemel will be totally lost. The same arguments apply as to Phase 1.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8825
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH03: 5.93ha, 450 homes – These are on the current hospital site, despite the plan to revamp the hospital facilities. Will there be space for that too?
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8826
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH21: 55.64ha, 1100 homes – This site is included in the existing Local Plan is known as LA3: West Hemel and an outline planning permission exists for 1100 dwellings, community facilities, travellers site and land for a primary school (reliant of funding from HCC - not the developers!). Considerable opposition was ignored. The wildlife corridor is a couple of metres wide abutting car parking laybys and little open space provision. At least it's within walking distance of the town and station! This development is on 55.64ha of Green Belt and is very visible on the southern slope of the northern side of the Bulbourne Valley.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8827
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH22: 19.15ha. 385 homes and a travellers site - Known in the existing Local Plan as Marchmont Farm, a planning application has just been submitted. This will join up with HH01 so a done deal already.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS8828
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH23: 2.71ha, 90 homes, Old Town - This currently provides a soft edge to the entrance and setting of Hemel Old Town. It is steeply sloping, and the proposal is for 90 dwellings, which could be up to 4 storeys in height to 'add interest'. The existing green slope does that!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8829
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH12: Two Waters Moor designated for 60 dwellings. We think this was part of Box Moor that the Trust wanted to have deregistered from Common Land and the DoE rejected. (known as Two Waters Moor East).
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	No specific sites, but a review should be undertaken in the urban areas to identify any buildings no longer in business use for conversion to residential use.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8840
<b>Person ID</b>	1207905
<b>Full Name</b>	Patricia Munn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Specific comments on Area HH08 Station Gateway. We are not fundamentally opposed to the redevelopment of the station area. However the proposal to include a tower block of up to eight storeys is wholly unacceptable in a low rise area. An eight storey building cannot 'respond positively to the adjacent moor' and the other local environmental features. Further a tower of more than four storeys would overlook and overshadow local dwellings and would have a significant negative on Boxmoor Trust lands repeating the mistake of The Kodak Tower.

This plan proposal appears to have been prepared without regard to the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic on working and commuting patterns. This proposed development will appeal predominantly to commuters and many organisations including Network Rail are now planning on considerably reduced commuter traffic. That calls into question the fundamental assumptions underlying HH08 in particular but also other proposed areas of development.

Dacorum Borough Council should revisit its core assumptions in light of these changes.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8843

**Person ID** 1266791

**Full Name** Robert Munn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

Specific comments on Area HH08 Station Gateway. We are not fundamentally opposed to the redevelopment of the station area. However the proposal to include a tower block of up to eight storeys is wholly unacceptable in a low rise area. An eight storey building cannot 'respond positively to the adjacent moor' and the other local environmental features. Further a tower of more than four storeys would overlook and overshadow local dwellings and would have a significant negative on Boxmoor Trust lands repeating the mistake of The Kodak Tower.

This plan proposal appears to have been prepared without regard to the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic on working and commuting patterns. This proposed development will appeal predominantly to commuters and many organisations

including Network Rail are now planning on considerably reduced commuter traffic. That calls into question the fundamental assumptions underlying HH08 in particular but also other proposed areas of development.  
Dacorum Borough Council should revisit its core assumptions in light of these changes.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS8891

**Person ID** 1266830

**Full Name** Rebecca Vieyra

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment** I oppose the plans for Hemel as there will be too many houses and it will ruin our town.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS8918
<b>Person ID</b>	1266852
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Buildings of at least 8 storeys high are proposed at Hemel station – this will ruin the view from the Moor and the view up to Felden. This is inappropriate on the edge of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The homes at the station will be aimed at commuters, and so will not be the affordable housing needed by the 7,000 people on the housing list. At the consultation a few years ago, residents felt that a maximum of 4 storeys high should be the maximum – why hasn't the council listened to these views? The plan proposes shops at the station – this would take business away from an already hard-hit town centre and the local shops in Boxmoor.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9004
<b>Person ID</b>	1266980
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Janine Smith

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Buildings of at least 8 storeys high proposed at Hemel station – this will ruin the view from the Moor and the view up to Felden. This is inappropriate on the edge of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The homes at the station will be aimed at commuters, and so will not be the affordable housing needed by the 7,000 people on the housing list. At the consultation a few years ago, residents felt that a maximum of 4 storeys high should be the maximum – why hasn't the council listened to these views? The plan proposes shops at the station – this would take business away from an already hard-hit town centre and the local shops in Boxmoor.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9163
<b>Person ID</b>	211352
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Sanderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>YES HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now and safeguarded for development post 2038. Given that the Council aspire to Garden City status, HH02 should be combined with HH01 now to provide a new vibrant, dynamic community of 5400 new homes and 21st century infrastructure which will boost the Garden City plan and meet all the Council's strategic objective. Such an extension to Hemel has the scale to help regenerate its New Town core but also provide significant benefits: Accessible location. Provide benefits of scale development- sustainable, minimise energy consumption, enable renewable energy technology, decentralise heating, support public transport initiatives and avoid harm to environmental assets. This could be a real opportunity for the Borough to develop a vibrant 21st century extension which will help regenerate its New Town core, but not by delaying and destroying Berkhamsted and Tring in the meantime.</p> <p>The Hospital site should not be re-developed until there is a strategy to provide adequate Healthcare in the Borough and the surrounding area.</p> <p>There are 2 ways of achieving this. Either by re-opening Hemel Hempstead Hospital to increase the number of beds per head of population or by building a brand new hospital in addition to Watford. At present DBC is failing its citizens by acquiescing in a situation where their health provision is below the national average.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9164
<b>Person ID</b>	211352
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Sanderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>YES HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now and safeguarded for development post 2038. Given that the Council aspire to Garden City status, HH02 should be combined with HH01 now to provide a new vibrant, dynamic community of 5400 new homes and 21st century infrastructure which will boost the Garden City plan and meet all the Council's strategic objective. Such an extension to Hemel has the scale to help regenerate its New Town core but also provide significant benefits: Accessible location. Provide benefits of scale development- sustainable, minimise energy consumption, enable renewable energy technology, decentralise heating, support public transport initiatives and avoid harm to environmental assets. This could be a real opportunity for the Borough to develop a vibrant 21st century extension which will help regenerate its New Town core, but not by delaying and destroying Berkhamsted and Tring in the meantime.</p> <p>The Hospital site should not be re-developed until there is a strategy to provide adequate Healthcare in the Borough and the surrounding area.</p> <p>There are 2 ways of achieving this. Either by re-opening Hemel Hempstead Hospital to increase the number of beds per head of population or by building a brand new hospital in addition to Watford. At present DBC is failing its citizens by acquiescing in a situation where their health provision is below the national average.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9210
<b>Person ID</b>	1267203
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eileen Martin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Question 5: Do you have specific comments about any of the Proposals and Sites?</p> <p>Yes ..... I am concerned about the Station Gateway development. A shopping centre there could take business away from the town centre.</p> <p>The Plan suggests flats there to a height of 8 storeys. I, along with other residents, indicated that a height of 4 storeys was the reasonable maximum. This is to ensure any building is in keeping with the adjacent Moor, a beautiful natural asset.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9211
<b>Person ID</b>	1267203
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eileen Martin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Question 5A: Are there any other sites that you think should be included in the Plan?</p> <p>Yes. I'd like to include creating Woodland areas alongside dwellings.</p> <p>I support a plan which envisages Hemel in particular as a Woodland Town. I would like you to include a plan pays attention to the benefits of healthy air quality and an environment that supports health and well being through maintaining and sustaining a natural habitat in the urban area so we continue to enjoy a good quality of life. Creation of appropriate thought out Woodland in carefully considered areas would have far reaching benefits into the future, would be a good legacy for Hemel and a model for other towns in line with Climate Change Agenda. We have to think of future generations as well.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9347
<b>Person ID</b>	1267365
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jont Cole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9541
<b>Person ID</b>	1267431
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Williams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Digging deeper and talking to councillors and residents, I'm shocked at the number of developments you are considering building, much more than before and too many in my opinion to cope with the infrastructure we have and you propose. I think you need to look again at how this will impact the towns, especially Hemel.</p> <p>Of serious concern to me are two areas: West of Chaulden: Despite everyone's concerns and complaints about this development and its impact on Chaulden and Boxmoor there seems to be even more homes being built here. I'm very disappointed you haven't listened.</p> <p>Likewise with Hemel Station and London Road. Again, this was consulted on previously but on closer inspection the plans have not been revised in the tiniest.</p>

It still states up to 8 storey buildings along London Road and a totally unnecessary shopping and flat development in front of the station.

There's an opportunity to make this part of the moor a really appealing area to live rather than the tired business premises that are there now, but you seem to insist on repeating the mistakes of the past and letting architects create ugly, larger out of character buildings in Boxmoor.

Stop pandering to developers and stand up and create a town people are proud to live in.

Berkhamsted would not build modern 8 storey buildings here if this part of the moor belonged to them, why does Hemel have to put up with it?

Build something that's in-keeping with Boxmoor's Edwardian and Victorian heritage instead of systematically destroying it as this council has in the past.

Let's create something that our children will be proud of and will make people want to come and live here rather than all the towns around us.

There's a Facebook group called Hemel Hempstead Remembered where people are sharing old photographs. The Marlowes looked amazing and would have been a huge asset today had we kept it. There are houses big and small that have been bulldozed in the name of progress, but would a huge attraction today, Gadebridge House, Chaulden House, Northridge House, St Nicholas House, Bury Mill, have a walk down St Johns Road in Boxmoor and look at the incongruous 60s and 70s houses that have been built, when all it would take is a little effort on the planning department's part to make this a much more beautiful town.

I don't feel like this council really cares what we think and this consultation process, using out-dated data, being forced through in a pandemic, without even waiting to see how this affects people and how the work shop and live, quite simply proves it to me.

I would be more than happy to be proved me wrong, but I feel you listen to developers more than your own people

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS9595
<b>Person ID</b>	1263214
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr R Pope
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are you seriously planning to build houses on the Hemel Hospital site? How is this environmentally sound when we will have to travel to Watford Hospital for routine appointments, blood tests, x-rays etc?</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9596
<b>Person ID</b>	1267455
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms C Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are you seriously planning to build houses on the Hemel Hospital site? How is this environmentally sound when we will have to travel to Watford Hospital for routine appointments, blood tests, x-rays etc?</li> </ul>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9682
<b>Person ID</b>	1267468
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Berry
<b>Organisation Details</b>	CPRE Hertfordshire
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Specific objection is raised to the North Hemel proposal as an unsustainable development which will cause immense damage to high grade agricultural land and the setting of the Gade valley.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there has been entirely inadequate consultation on the Hemel Garden Communities proposals despite their considerable impacts on the countryside.</p>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9804
<b>Person ID</b>	1259583
<b>Full Name</b>	Marc Best
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I would like to state that I strongly disagree with the Local Plan that has been set out by Dacorum Borough Council. I would like to see the number of new houses reduced and to ensure that our green space in Hemel Hempstead is not taken away by money grabbing property developers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over development of Green Belt land. The land was 'Green Belt' for a reason, it is there to protect it.</li> <li>- The chalk streams in Hertfordshire need to be protected. Increased water usage due to new houses will damage these. Look at the River Ver</li> <li>- There are too many houses in the proposed planned, this is from outdated figures, I specifically disagree to the following developments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Over development of London Road near Hemel Train station. Eight story buildings are way too tall for the area. It will overshadow the much beloved Boxmoor trust land and ruin it.</li> <li>- Ebberns Road - This road is already to congested with houses, building more dwellings here is ridiculous</li> <li>- West Hemel - This is a massive over development that will have ecological impacts. It will also affect the whole of Chaulden due to the sheer number of the proposed houses</li> <li>- There is little mention in the plans of how infrastructure will be improved to handle this many new residents.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS9965
<b>Person ID</b>	1267791
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL DAVIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	<p>I'm writing to you in response to the local plan consultation. I have tried to respond through your portal but to no avail.</p> <p>As a resident of Apsley, I have looked at the Hemel Hempstead proposal in the most detail but my general thoughts apply to all of your local plans.</p> <p>Quite simply, I don't think it's appropriate for ANY development to be happening on greenfield sites such as those proposed near the Redborun link road and Leighton Buzzard roads are; nor a crematorium at Bunker's Park - what an absurd proposal! I fully believe that NOTHING should happen on any Boxmoor land or adjacent to. We should be enhancing and celebrating our green spaces, and the history of our area. Hemel has a bad reputation but only because its history has been squashed by poorly thought out housing and land use. There's actually a lot to celebrate and learn about the history of this area - I am sure most people do not know anything because it is not celebrated or even recognised.</p>

This leads me onto the brownfield sites that have been proposed. For me, it is only acceptable to develop on these if they will:

- enhance the local area aesthetically.
- use sustainable materials
- greenery and wildlife will be incorporated into the building and surrounding land design
- ENOUGH PARKING IS PROVIDED

I spend a lot of time walking around Hemel and looking at landuse and I can see that development on some of these brownfield sites could be beneficial to the town if they are managed correctly.

I have also heard (on the grapevine) that Dacorum doesn't actually need as many houses as have been proposed but haven't reviewed this. In addtiion, I notice there is housing for those who have money and those who do not have any. What about the people that have some, but not lots and perhaps are renting or borrowing from the bank of mum and dad? There is NEVER housing for this demographic.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10065

**Person ID** 489014

**Full Name** Mrs Carole Lewis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I as a resident of Boxmoor am particularly worried about the station gateway development. There is a shopping centre proposed within it, which will take business further away from an already struggling town centre. On top of this, the local plan suggests a maximum height of 8 storeys, after a previous consultation indicated that 4 storeys was the absolute maximum height appropriate next to the moor, as any higher would ruin the beauty of this vital natural asset. Are these flats designed for local people, or for people moving out of London, and commuting back in every day?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10100
<b>Person ID</b>	1268043
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNE HAYDEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>OBJECTIONS</p> <p>HH13 Frogmore Road</p> <p>170 dwellings in yet another small space is ridiculous. It's all very well putting a pedestrian bridge in, but when it's vehicular access that is a major issue, it will exacerbate the problem by adding volumes of new vehicles.</p> <p>We already have three new monstrosities on the front end of the site - NO MORE. Build some houses so you still have homes but will be more in keeping with the area overall.</p>

HH15 Ebberns Road

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

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

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10135

**Person ID** 1249632

**Full Name** Mrs Lorna Bloomfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The proposals for housing development in Growth Areas HH01 and HH02 are excessive and wholly biased against the residents of both Grove Hill and Woodhall Farm as these two estates will become surrounded by new developments. No other area of Hemel Hempstead will be affected as badly as these two areas.</p> <p>On a personal note, as holders of an allotment at Gove Hill Allotment Site, we are dismayed to see that the allotments form part of the proposals for HH02 – this should not be the case and they should be retained for their existing purpose for the use of the local community permanently.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10139
<b>Person ID</b>	1264938
<b>Full Name</b>	David Bloomfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The proposals for housing development in Growth Areas HH01 and HH02 are excessive and wholly biased against the residents of both Grove Hill and Woodhall Farm as these two estates will become surrounded by new developments. No other area of Hemel Hempstead will be affected as badly as these two areas.</p>



On a personal note, as holders of an allotment at Gove Hill Allotment Site, we are dismayed to see that the allotments form part of the proposals for HH02 – this should not be the case and they should be retained for their existing purpose for the use of the local community permanently.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10141

**Person ID** 1268066

**Full Name** FIONNUALA WALRAVENS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

I am a resident of Great Gaddesden and am contacting you to comment on the planned major housing development and new road between Grove Hill and Briden's Camp.

I am very concerned about the significant and unnecessary environmental impacts the proposal will have. Whilst I recognise there is a need to provide more housing I do not feel the proposed development takes account of less environmentally damaging alternatives. There needs to be a review of the proposal which takes account the following concerns.

- 1 The proposal will result in the loss of 2,000 acres of open space, 900 of this is Green Belt

- 1 Over provision of housing. The current plan is based on 2014 government figures which have been withdrawn due to impact on Green Belt land. I believe the plan should be updated with 2018 ONS figures, which suggest a target of just 500. This would enable conservation of Green Belt land.
- 1 Significant impact of the Chiltern ANOB. The scale of this development and major new road will have a significant detrimental impact of the ANOB and may hinder proposals to upgrade it to a national
- 1 Under estimating brownfield I cannot see evidence that the available brownfield space around Hemel is being maximised. Also, the impacts of COVID-19 on the way we structure society must be accounted for. We are already seeing huge amounts of redundant office and retail space. There could be prime locations for affordable housing in the future and further reduce impacts on Green Belt land.
- 1 Unsustainable infrastructure The location of the planned development is far from a train station. We should be encouraging people to use public transport, instead of building houses miles away from stations! As a

result it seems likely that this development will result in thousands of extra cars on local roads.

- 1 Creation of a new link road. It is not clear how this link road will be used. How will traffic from Berkhamsted and Tring access it? Currently Water End has an old single lane bridge. A recent bypass in Dunstable has helped to reduce the burden of traffic on this choke point, however this link road would not only undo that but would make the situation much worse. It looks like the proposal is attempting to shift traffic problems into small local surround villages, this is totally unacceptable and detrimental to the air quality and local
- 1 Water stress: The River Gade is a chalk stream and is currently over-abstracted to supply water to local residents. In 2019 the river totally dried out, threatening the viability of the chalk stream and the wildlife it supports. We are facing a climate emergency, future extreme weather will add stress to these fragile eco Any responsible governing body would be looking at ways to reduce stress on these eco-systems. The UK is home to the majority of the world's chalk streams. We should be proud of our unique natural heritage and protect it. Adding thousands of homes to the local area in a plan that involves a significant time lag in the availability of new water supplies is reckless and risks adding further stress to an already incredibly fragile eco system.

I hope these comments will be taken into consideration. Please realise, this is not simply a case of people not wanting any development on their backyard. These are significant environmental concerns. We live in a rapidly evolving world

where respect for the environmental and thoughtful planning is becoming increasingly valued. And those who do not heed these important principles are increasingly held to account.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10154

**Person ID** 1145402

**Full Name** Mrs Margaret Stanier

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

There is no justification for the considerable loss of green belt land proposed. I refer particularly to the green belt land included in the proposals for North Hemel Hempstead. The recent pandemic restrictions have emphasised the importance of accessible green spaces, and considerable numbers of local people have been able to enjoy walking and cycling in this beautiful countryside, safeguarding both their physical and mental health.

Any development proposals must include sufficient green space: parks, playing fields and allotments. This plan does not do this.

Agricultural land is vital to safeguard our future food security. The developments proposed for North Hemel Hempstead would destroy many acres of fertile, productive land.

The current drainage in the Gade Valley in the North Hemel Hempstead area is currently frequently overwhelmed by run off from the surrounding fields after rainfall. Any development proposals must mitigate the increasing problems which would be caused by building on these fields.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10172
<b>Person ID</b>	1268078
<b>Full Name</b>	Corran & Mark Griffin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	1 The Local Plan omits any reference to a separate 400 house development already submitted under planning reference 21/00171/SCE. 21/00171/SCE seems to be trying to sneaked in under the radar separately, rather than being considered as part of an overall cohesive plan. With the 5,500 homes proposed in the Hemel Garden Communities under the Local Plan and the 400 under 21/00171/SCE, it is actually another 6000 new homes being proposed in the same small area north of Hemel Hempstead.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10373
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	DBC has a history of ignoring guidance as well as agreeing uplifts in numbers agreed the LA3 site (West Hemel Hempstead) was raised from 900 to 1100. This site effectively joins Bourne End to Hemel.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10428
<b>Person ID</b>	334456
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Cotton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>It is unfortunate that the development to the east of Hemel Hempstead falls within St Albans, and therefore, although it is plainly of more relevance to Dacorum, cannot be included in the numbers for their Plan. However, that is no excuse for the projected development to the north of Hemel Hempstead, which is a prime example of urban sprawl. Also, I note that, in the Key Diagram on P.29, both Phase 1 and Phase 2 are coloured as areas of Housing Growth. In 7.21, you specifically say that: “The latter <i>will be</i> identified as safeguarded land until released for housing” (my italics). Until it is so identified (which will include public examination by the Planning Inspectorate) it is, therefore, unequivocally still Green Belt Land, and the map, whether by accident or intent, is deceptive, and should be amended. The draft proposals map at the end of the document repeats this error. And once land is removed from the Green Belt, of course, the chances of its being reinstated are so close to zero as to be negligible.</p> <p>These two areas are also distant from the railway station and the M1, and there is no guarantee that, should development take place, new public transport links would be set up: these lie outside the purview and competence of both the developers and the Council. And it would seem to be at odds with Paragraph 138 in the government's National Planning Policy Framework document, which states, in part: “ Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed <i>and/or is well-served by public transport</i>” (my italics).</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10429
<b>Person ID</b>	334456
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Cotton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>It is unfortunate that the development to the east of Hemel Hempstead falls within St Albans, and therefore, although it is plainly of more relevance to Dacorum, cannot be included in the numbers for their Plan. However, that is no excuse for the projected development to the north of Hemel Hempstead, which is a prime example of urban sprawl. Also, I note that, in the Key Diagram on P.29, both Phase 1 and Phase 2 are coloured as areas of Housing Growth. In 7.21, you specifically say that: “The latter <i>will be</i> identified as safeguarded land until released for housing” (my italics). Until it is so identified (which will include public examination by the Planning Inspectorate) it is, therefore, unequivocally still Green Belt Land, and the map, whether by accident or intent, is deceptive, and should be amended. The draft proposals map at the end of the document repeats this error. And once land is removed from the Green Belt, of course, the chances of its being reinstated are so close to zero as to be negligible.</p> <p>These two areas are also distant from the railway station and the M1, and there is no guarantee that, should development take place, new public transport links would be set up: these lie outside the purview and competence of both the developers and the Council. And it would seem to be at odds with Paragraph 138 in the government's National Planning Policy Framework document, which states, in part: “ Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed <i>and/or is well-served by public transport</i>” (my italics).</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10433
<b>Person ID</b>	1268440
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Michele Larkin

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	In Hemel Hempstead town centre for instance.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10465
<b>Person ID</b>	1268450
<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPH STOPPS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	DACORUM GREEN PARTY
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The plan already proposes over-expansion of Dacorum.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10494
<b>Person ID</b>	869129
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Ann Hetherington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10552
<b>Person ID</b>	1268687
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Isabelle Robinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10598

<b>Person ID</b>	1268726
<b>Full Name</b>	DR ADRIENNE GARNER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I feel strongly that encroaching on Green Belt land for property development should not be considered.  As I said early I believe there is going to be a move away from living in the SE.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10621
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH01 and HH02</p> <p>HH02 is reserved for future possible development of the Garden Communities project, with priority given to HH01. This flies in the face of the Schedule of Site Appraisals of October 2017 whose recommendation was <b>"Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt."</b></p> <p>The view across The Gade Valley from North Gadebridge is one of the gems of Hemel Hempstead, the impact on the views by building on HH01 would be tragic</p> <p>Goodbye to all this?</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Dac Env Forum.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10623
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><i>“HH05 - Market Square Town Centre Retail and other town centre uses at ground floor level; and around 130 dwellings”</i></p> <p>The NLP seeks to enhance the Borough as a lively, vibrant and creative community. An iconic arts and entertainment venue befitting the residents of the whole Borough and drawing in visitors from further afield would significantly contribute to this aim. Market Square is about the only viable location for a vibrant arts centre worthy of the aspirations inherent in the thinking behind the NLP.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10624
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth area HH21 West Hemel Hempstead (aka LA3) has under <i>Delivery Strategies "Principally allocated for:"</i> <i>Extension of Shrubhill Common Nature Reserve.</i></p> <p>However, in the <i>Proposals and Sites</i> section, although under "<i>Urban Design Principles:</i>" there is "<i>Design the development to the highest sustainability standards possible.</i>", under "<i>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure</i>" there is no reference Shrubhill Common LNR or to a wildlife corridor in the development.</p> <p>Taken together, these are in contradiction to the planning application already approved in November 2019:</p>

The developers have not planned a wildlife corridor as indicated, or an extension to Shrubhill Common, and at meetings with DEF the developers refused to commit to the highest possible sustainability standards. None of these principles were included in the planning application that was approved.

We object that DCC seeks approval for the Local Plan which contains clauses that **DBC have already agreed to ignore**. We are very concerned that the admirable aspirations of the proposed Local Plan have been categorically ignored by DBC even before its adoption.

Furthermore, this issue was the subject of a complaint by DEF to DBC following the November 2019 council meeting on the grounds that the planning application was contrary to the Core Strategy. The new Local Plan should promote confidence by the public that the Climate and Biodiversity emergencies will be tackled, but unfortunately this precedent does not inspire confidence.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10650

**Person ID** 369415

**Full Name** Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum

**Organisation Details** Chair  
 Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

DEF is very concerned that DBC's advocacy for Hemel Garden Communities would remove Green Belt on a massive scale, over and above Government requirements and beyond the current planning period. We note that DBC topic paper Site Selection Appendix B shades the HGC on the NE slope of the Gade Valley as "constrained land", and we infer that this will not result in building in that area. DEF, though not in any way convinced of the need for the HGC, strongly recommends that all the land SE of Wood Farm is constrained, thus preserving the outstanding views across the Gade from Gadebridge, and the southern boundary of Gadebridge Park

DEF further maintains that the post Covid and Brexit 'New Normal' will result in an increased rate of conversion office blocks in London to residential and the consequent reduction in housing demand in Dacorum.

We dispute the presentation of the Hemel Garden Communities (HGC) concept as a prerequisite within the New Local Plan. It appears that this current consultation on the NLP is the first opportunity to comment on HGC's merits or otherwise. This was indicated to the DEF at its meeting in May 2019, when James Doe, DBC Assistant Director – Planning, Development and Regeneration - told the DEF that the only opportunities for public comment would be via the New Local Plan and any subsequent Master Plans. See:

<http://dacenvforum.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/090519-DEF-Minutes-9th-May-2019.pdf>. Indications of the way in which HGC has been promoted to date are given in Paras. 1.31, 1.33 and 23.6 of the Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth document. The identification (23.6) of the Crown Estate as a "significant stakeholder as a major landowner" highlights the influence of vested interests in forming a Local Plan which is shot through with advocacy on behalf of HGC.

An implied justification for virtually pre-empting the NLP by means of HGC occurs in Para. 1.31 by classifying HGC as a "cross boundary matter", since the proposal extends into St. Albans district. However this argument should be disregarded. Clearly the removal from Green Belt of Sites HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1) 1,550 homes and HH02: North Hemel (Phase 2) around 4,000 dwellings post 2038 is highly significant for Dacorum whether or not they form part of a larger scheme.

Reservation of, or "safeguarding" the Phase 2 land for HGC beyond 2038 is similarly unacceptable because it embeds the presumption for continuing a policy of Green Belt depredation beyond the current planning period, thereby pre-empting future planning rounds. This premature loss of Green Belt is explicitly and ominously described in Para. 1.37 of the Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth document as "*releasing additional land from the Green Belt around Hemel Hempstead (as part of the Hemel Garden Communities programme) to meet longer term development needs.*"

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

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10654
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The departure of the Plan from previous policies and judgements when it comes to the assessments of individual Sites is equally stark and unexplained. A large and flagrant example of this is North Hemel, where in the Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendix E.1 the Plan's assessment tick-list under "Landscape/Townscape", while admitting that . . .</p> <p><i>" The northern boundary of the site is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and development could affect the setting of the AONB. The site is within the High Gade Valley and Gaddesdon (sic) Row character areas. Development of the site would extend Hemel Hempstead into this prominent area of countryside and close the gap with Piccotts End" . . . gives it an amber cross meaning "The option is likely to have a negative effect which is not significant". It is the amber cross that seals its fate for Site Selection purposes.</i></p> <p>In contrast, the Schedule of Site Appraisals (for large greenfield sites) of October 2017 for the equivalent Site HH-h1b North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 and 2) had under the Technical Studies Assessment the categorical statement <b><i>"Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt."</i></b></p> <p>Even amongst the documents now under consultation there is contradiction:</p> <p>The Topic Paper - Site Selection - Appendix B has a map for North Hemel , Site 74, with hatching marking "constrained land". Under "Officer recommendation" it has <b><i>"Officers agree with the AECOM Site Assessment Study recommendation that the western part of the site is unsuitable for development due to heritage, landscape and visual and coalescence impacts on Piccotts End and the undeveloped Gade Valley."</i></b></p>



However, the Map in the main NLP document Part 3 calls it HH01 and does not make this distinction about the western part.

TRL, who were commissioned to produce this Sustainability Appraisal Report are similarly arbitrarily casual in giving the amber cross i.e. "not significant" to Biodiversity, another sustainability criterion despite their having found: *"The site also includes Varney's Wood wildlife site and is adjacent to Thrift Wood wildlife site, both of which contain ancient woodland, which could be affected by development. Large scale development could give rise to possible adverse effects on Chiltern Beechwood SAC."*

Alongside , for the same Site TRL award a Green Tick ("The option is likely to have a positive effect which is not significant") because: *"Development at this large site would provide the opportunity to include a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) area which could deliver local biodiversity enhancements . . ."* **DEF is most concerned that no such SANG** has actually been proposed, and is not guaranteed. In any case, the proposal of a SANG does not in any way guarantee complete mitigation of the loss.

In the mechanical totting up that basically drives the Site Selection process the

Green Tick is used in order to cancel out even the (understated) amber cross. However in any reasonable view one cannot offset the other. The two "coulds" are not of the same weight. A physical threat cannot be offset by the possibility of first aid.

Our doubts about "deliver local biodiversity enhancements" are based on our experience over the past two decades regarding the possibility of providing an adequate Wildlife Corridor as an extension for the Shrubhill Common LNR. During the latest phase of that process, culminating in the approval by DBC of the Master Plan for West Hemel (LA3), the number of homes increased from the 900 of the Core Strategy to 1100. That step increase could have been used instead to provide a substantial wildlife corridor, as called for by DEF and Friends of Shrubhill Common, together with advice from the Herts. Biological Records Centre

, and based on guidelines issued by English Nature. Instead, while there are so- called "Green Corridors" in the LA3 Master Plan, their principal purpose is recreational, not nature conservation.

Our own observations on the **unsuitability of North Hemel** for development complement those that have been raised by the Borough's consultants and then overridden in the interests of achieving housing targets:

The area is essential in providing a visual background for Hemel's Northern fringes, and in providing a visual buffer for the Upper Gade Valley AONB to its North. It is much enjoyed by users of its footpath and bridleway network. **During the Eighties and Nineties three new hedgerows on Wood Farm were planted by volunteers with the express purpose of enhancing the landscape in response to the Council's Urban Edge Study which called for suggestions for such enhancements. The farm manager co-operated in this project, and by designating a Permissive Path link made possible a circular walk from Dodds Lane, which takes in all three hedgerows.**

The visual impact would severely detract from the amenity value of the recently established **Halsey Field Wildlife Site just to the north of Warners End Wood, one of whose glories, much appreciated by its many local visitors, is the view across the valley.**

The shift towards downgrading the strategic and visual importance of Green Belt sites occurs in other sites now recommended for withdrawal from the Green Belt.

Reverting to the previous, more objective assessments in the Schedule of Site Appraisals of October 2017 and in consequence keeping these sites as Green Belt could be achieved by a reduction in the housing demand figure, as is called for in our response on Housing Numbers.

The supporting Green Belt Topic Paper summarises the justification for the Plan's huge inroads into Green Belt:

*"7.1. The Council has been considering all reasonable options for accommodation growth outside of the Green Belt from the outset of preparing the Plan and has tested these through the Sustainability Appraisal process."* Around this subject, the Green Belt Topic Paper also quotes repeatedly from the National Planning Policy Framework.

Besides questioning the quality and consistency of the Sustainability Appraisal process, as we have done above, we again point to the opportunities offered by central Government to reduce housing demand figures and thereby to spare Green Belt:

From the Housing Policy (Supply and Delivery) Topic Paper:

*(2.21) "The Government ... recognised that Local authorities **may not be able to meet their identified housing need in full, for example because of land constraints (such as Green Belt) in their area ... "***

The argument for reducing the housing demand figure is set out in the Housing Demand part of our response.

The Green Belt Topic Paper presents a case that in Dacorum there are the "exceptional circumstances" that the NPPF demands as a precondition for releasing Green Belt land. In essence this case consists of the series of prescribed steps that Dacorum has taken in order to satisfy, and in the case of North Hemel Phase 2 vastly to exceed, a housing target that is assumed without question to be fixed. **It does not address the question of why Dacorum, in the National context, should be regarded as "exceptional"**. The presentation also quotes from case law in support of "exceptional circumstances", but ignores some of the judicial comment accompanying decisions made elsewhere, such as in Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council:

*"...the planning judgements involved in the ascertainment of exceptional circumstances ... should ..... grapple with the following matters....."*

- 1 ***The nature and extent of harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would have been lost if the boundaries were reviewed); "***

**DEF submits that the loss of Green Belt is seriously deleterious to the intrinsic character of the Borough, is not justified by the needs of current residents, and very cogent reasons can be put forward under current Govt guidelines to plan for far fewer developments on the Green Belt.**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10691

**Person ID** 1161079

**Full Name** Melanie Llewellyn

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now and safeguarded for development post 2038. Given that the Council aspire to Garden City status, HH02 should be combined with HH01 now to provide a new vibrant, dynamic community of 5400 new homes and 21st century infrastructure which will boost the Garden City plan and meet all the Council's strategic objective. Such an extension to Hemel has the scale to help regenerate its New Town core but also provide significant benefits: Accessible location. Provide benefits of scale development- sustainable, minimise energy consumption, enable renewable energy technology, decentralise heating, support public transport initiatives and avoid harm to environmental assets. This could be a real opportunity for the Borough to develop a vibrant 21st century extension which will help regenerate its New Town core, but not by delaying and destroying Berkhamsted and Tring in the meantime.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10693
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The Hospital site should not be re-developed until there is a strategy to provide adequate Healthcare in the Borough and the surrounding area. There are 2 ways of achieving this. Either by re-opening Hemel Hempstead Hospital to increase the number of beds per head of population or by building a brand new hospital probably in addition to Watford. At present DCB is failing its citizens by acquiescing in a situation where their health provision is below the national average.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10874
<b>Person ID</b>	619474
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Brenda Mariner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The field between Cherry Bounce and Fletcher Way was previously referred to as LA2 but is now referenced as HH23. This field has long been regarded as part of Gadebridge Park and as such is in regular daily use, all year round. It forms a quieter space as the main Park has prioritized the childrens facilities. Development here would deprive local residents of such a valued facility. With an influx of new homes the existing park would be further in demand and become overcrowded and no longer the vital green space that it is now.</p> <p>Views across the town would be lost forever if this were to be developed. The stunning views from Fletcher Way have been seen in photographs and paintings over the years and show the beauty of the Historic Old Town.</p>

It is important that the nature of the Historic area is preserved and developing too close to the Historic High Street would lose much of the character of the area. The Conservation Area contains listed buildings and development here would adversely affect the historic environment.

Since the High Street was made into a One-Way system there is no facility for buses, although this was promised when the One-Way system was proposed. Therefore transport to the area would be a problem if it could not go through the High Street.

The area is close to Howe Wood Local nature reserve and development would impact this. There would be damage to some habitats. Red Kites are nesting nearby and it is thought that bats are also in the trees at the top of the field.

This is a steeply sloping field and this would pose problems with development. Adjacent areas suffer from Subsidence and have problems with access. Currently, the Refuse Collection vehicles cannot get to some areas, so neither would Fire engines or Ambulances and this is a really serious problem.

The Old Town shops consist mainly of Hairdressers and several empty shops and would not provide useful shopping for new homes.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS10875

**Person ID** 619474

**Full Name** Miss Brenda Mariner

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>The Debenhams building at the Plough Roundabout end of the Marlowes is now no longer in use as a department store. In the current financial climate, and foreseeable future, it is highly unlikely to be used as another department store. The building could be redeveloped into flats in the same way as the Kodak building. Perhaps allowing for shops on the ground floor.</p> <p>Plans for the retail area here would need to focus on high end but smaller shops. The Marlowes centre and Riverside areas have long had empty sites and these need to be filled to attract shoppers and enhance the area.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10881
<b>Person ID</b>	1149755
<b>Full Name</b>	MR CHRIS PICHON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	There needs to be a complete review of commercial and retail premises that become redundant due to the economic fallout from the Covid Pandemic. There should be no final decisions on any green belt sites until a complete review has been undertaken. The Debenham site for example could comfortably be converted to residential, and there are numerous sites around the Borough that could become available. Green belt land must not be sacrificed BEFORE a full review has been undertaken. If this means putting the Local Plan dates back, then so be it.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS10893
<b>Person ID</b>	1268687
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Isabelle Robinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11051
<b>Person ID</b>	1160525
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Hislam
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH08 – Station Portal</b></p> <p>The Council appear to have overlooked the needs of the communities on the south side of the station who wish to access the station. This includes residents of Felden and possibly Bovingdon. There is a pedestrian subway beneath the A41 linking Roughdown Avenue to Roughdown Villas Road and Sheethanger Lane. Access to the station can be via Roughdown Avenue but I do not know how often the gate is open or whether uses require a pass or key. The above roads need improvement, and a cycle store could useful be situated near the station at the end of Roughdown Avenue.</p> <p>There should also be a pedestrian / cycle access from Roughdown Avenue (north side of railway overbridge) to the station car park, hence allowing pedestrian access for the residents who live on the south side of the railway. This includes residents of Felden and possibly Bovingdon.</p> <p><b>Foot / Cycle route from Bovingdon to Hemel Hempstead Station</b></p> <p>Following on from the above is the possibility of a new passage to / from the station to ease road traffic. Several routes are possible. Most lead to the underpass beneath the A41 and hence to the station. There is approximately 60 metres (200 feet) height difference between the ends of the proposed routes. Whilst this, as an average, is not unreasonable, there are sections that are comparatively steep. The route taking in Stoney Lane and Box Lane via Bury Rise has merit in the simple fact that it provides the shortest ‘hill climb’ of all routes. All possible routes would require improvements.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11142
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1)</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>Yes, Varney’s Wood AWI site; and two Ecosites - ‘Small Wood west of Lovetts End Farm’; and part of ‘Garmer Spring and adjoining Hedgerow’.</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Adjacent to Thrift Wood (Ashridge) LWS; and remaining part of ‘Garmer Spring and adjoining Hedgerow’ Ecosite. Also adjacent to the following Ancient Woodland Inventory sites – Thrift Wood; Garmer Spring – both above mentioned LWSs. Across the road from Howe Grove LWS.</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Extensive area of largely undeveloped land. Agricultural fields with hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. Farmland birds.</p>

**Opportunities**

Retain LWS and trees / hedgerows. Buffer woodlands. Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low for arable / grassland as considered unlikely to have ecologically significant habitats. **High for woodland LWS.** Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

YES, if LWS affected.

Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11143

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Area HH02: North Hemel (Phase 2)</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, part of ‘Green Lane by Hay Wood / Heavens Wood’ Ecosite runs into the site. This lane is also Common Land.</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Adjacent to ‘Hay Wood (Holtmere)’ LWS and AWI site; and ‘High Wood (Hemel Hempstead)’ LWS. Part of ‘Jarvis Dell Manorial Waste &amp; Leverstock Green’ Common Land runs adjacent to the southern edge.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Largely undeveloped land with agricultural grasslands and hedgerows. Thick woodland belt at southern boundary.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. Farmland birds. Also Roman snails.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain trees and hedgerows. Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low for arable / grassland as considered unlikely to have ecologically significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b></p>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11144
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH03: Hospital Site (previously MU/2)</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Yes, adjacent to 'Paradise Fields Central' LWS at the south- east corner</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Previously developed land with buildings and some scattered trees.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Limited. Retain trees and buffer south and east sides to adjacent habitats / LWS. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Consider measures to achieve net gain</p>

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**

Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment

**Included files****Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS11145

**Person ID**

1207333

**Full Name**

Growth Team

**Organisation Details**

Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

**Growth Area HH04: Paradise / Wood Lane (previously MU/3)**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Yes, adjacent to 'Paradise Fields Central' LWS at the south- east corner

**Other features**

Previously developed land

**Protected species**

There may be potential for roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Limited. Buffer adjacent habitat / LWS to the east. Create / enhance green corridor on the eastern edge. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11146

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Growth Area HH05: Market Square</b> <b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No <b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No <b>Other features</b> Previously developed land – Largely hardstanding and bus station building. A few trees. <b>Protected species</b> Unlikely although there may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present. <b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Retain trees. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. <b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain <b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low <b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS11147
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH06: Civic Centre Site</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Adjacent to Ecosite known as 'Queensway to Coombe Street'</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Building, hardstanding, occasional trees.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats (including roosts) are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Bats (including roosts) are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11148
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	<b>Growth Area</b> HH07: NCP Car Park, Hillfield Road <b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No <b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No <b>Other features</b> Previously developed land – multi-storey car park. <b>Protected species</b> Unlikely.

**Opportunities**

Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**

Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11149

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Area HH08: Station Gateway</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Yes, within 25m of Boxmoor Common LWS (and Common Land) - separated by the A41 carriageway; and Moorend Farm Meadows RIGS / LGS (a meadow showing rare pingo structures).</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Previously developed land with Units, hardstanding and some trees</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Limited. Retain trees. Create / enhance green corridors to nearby habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Consider measures to achieve net gain</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p> <p>Low – medium if trees affected. Avoid light spill on trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p> <p>None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b></p> <p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS11150</p>

<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH09: National Grid Land</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Adjacent to an Ecosite known as 'Disused Railway Line South London Road Two Waters. Across the road from Boxmoor Common LWS / Common Land.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land, building and hardstanding</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats are known to be in the area and have been recorded roosting within the site.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low – <b>high if bat roost affected</b>. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None. Preliminary Roost Assessment likely to be required</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11151
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area</b> HH10: Symbio Place, Whiteleaf Road</p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land, building and hardstanding</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely although there may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p>

Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment likely to be required

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11152

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment** **Growth Area HH11: Two Waters North**  
**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Across the road(s) from remaining parts of Boxmoor Common LWS (and Common Land).

**Other features**

Previously developed land, largely Units and hardstanding. Adjacent to canal on southern side.

**Protected species**

Unlikely although there may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present

**Opportunities**

Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent canal habitat

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**

Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11153

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH13: Frogmore Road</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Yes, adjacent to 'Grand Union Canal, Two Waters to Nash Mills Lane' LWS.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Canal and river border site to the NE and SW respectively.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Buffer river habitat with green corridor. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11154
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH14: 233 London Road</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Unit on hardstanding</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely, although there may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain</p>

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**Included files****Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS11155

**Person ID**

1207333

**Full Name**

Growth Team

**Organisation Details**Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council**Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment****Growth Area HH15: Ebbens Road****Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Yes, 'Grand Union Canal, Two Waters to Nash Mills Lane' LWS runs close to the rear boundary of the site

**Other features**

Previously developed land. Units on hardstanding.

**Protected species**

There may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Limited. Buffer south-west boundary near canal with green corridor. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11156

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH16: Two Water Road / A41 Junction Employment Site</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Western edge is 10m from Roughdown Common SSSI (which is also Common Land). Also adjacent to part of Boxmoor Common Common Land</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land, two agricultural fields divided by a hedgerow. Boundary hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain trees and hedgerows. Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats / SSSI. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low as considered unlikely to have any ecologically significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11157
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH17: Cupid Green Depot</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Yes, adjacent to part of 'Disused Railway Line, Hemel Hempstead' LWS on the southern boundary.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Units on hardstanding. Some scattered trees. Part of 'Jarvis Dell Manorial Waste &amp; Leverstock Green' Common Land runs along the northern boundary of the site.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p>

Limited. Buffer adjacent LWS. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11158

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites** Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment  
Growth Area HH18: Kier Park  
Recognised ecology sites within Site

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

No

**Other features**

Undeveloped plots with rough grass and colonising vegetation; some hardstanding. Mature woodland strip beyond the western boundary.

**Protected species**

Unlikely

**Opportunities**

Consider enhancement measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11159

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team



**Agent ID****Agent Full Name****Agent Organisation****Yes / No**\* **Yes**\* **No****Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment****Growth Area HH19: Wood Lane End****Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

No

**Other features**

Previously developed land

**Protected species**

Unlikely. There may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Unlikely. There may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None

**Yes / No**\* **Yes**\* **No****Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11160
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH20: Breakspear Way / Green Lane / Boundary Way, Maylands Gateway</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, Part of 'Buncefield Lane Field behind Cemetery' Ecosite.</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land. Grassland or cleared? Hedgerows and some scattered trees</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Badgers records from the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Create / enhance green corridor to adjacent habitats. Consider enhancement measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. Also fruit/nut tree planting.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p>

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low as considered unlikely the grassland will be of ecological significance.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11161

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
 Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Growth Area HH21: West Hemel Hempstead**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

Yes, three Ecosites: 'Paddock north-west of Shrub Hill Common'; 'Hedgerow W. of Shrub Hill Common'; 'Hedgerow east of Pouchen End Lane'.

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Yes, within 20m of Shrubhill Common LNR, but separated by a road called either Warners End Road or Long Caulden (depending where the name changes). Also adjacent to two Ecosites: 'Grassland between Winkwell and Pouchen End'; 'Green Lane NW of Shrub Hill Common'

**Other features**

Undeveloped land. Grassland field with boundary hedgerows.

**Protected species**

Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Retain trees and hedgerows. Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats, especially Shrubhill Common to the east.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low as considered unlikely to have habitats of ecological significance. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11162

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH22: Marchmont Farm</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>Yes, contains a small strip of habitat from the western boundary of 'Picotts End Lane' Ecosite</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Yes, within 25m of Howe Grove Wood Local LNR, but separated by the A4147.</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Undeveloped land. Grassland fields with hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p> <p>Low as considered unlikely to have habitats of ecological significance. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p> <p>None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11163
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH23: Old Town</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Across the road from 'Gadebridge Park' Ecosite</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land. Grassland with scattered trees.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p>

Create / enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low – medium depending on quality of grassland habitat. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11164

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Area HH24: Land at Turners Hill</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, Ecosite 'Paradise Field Borders'.</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Yes, adjacent to 'Paradise Fields Central' LWS.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land. Grassland field with boundary hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats (including roosting bats) and badgers known to be in the area.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain hedgerows and green corridors to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low – medium depending on quality of grassland habitat. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No</p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS11165</p>



<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH25: Land to R/O St Margarets Way / Datchworth Turn</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, part of Ecosite: 'Breakspear Way Open Space'.</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Across the road from 'Leverstock Green School' Ecosite. Part of 'Jarvis Dell Manorial Waste &amp; Leverstock Green' Common Land runs along the southern boundary of the site.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land. Grassland with scattered trees.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Maintain and enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Plant a native-species hedgerow on the western boundary. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p>

Low – medium if trees affected. Grassland unlikely to be a significant habitat. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11166

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

**Growth Area HH26: South of Green Lane**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

Yes, part of site is an Ecosite known as 'Leverstock Green School'

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Yes, adjacent to (remainder of) Ecosite 'Leverstock Green School'

**Other features**

Undeveloped land, grassland field with hedgerows on two sides.

**Protected species**

Bats (including roosts) are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Maintain and enhance green corridors to adjacent habitats. Plant a native-species hedgerow on the western boundary. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low as considered unlikely the habitats will be of ecological significance. Avoid light spill on adjacent habitats to the east.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11167

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area HH27: Jarman Park – Out of centre retail allocation</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land with rough grassland and scrub, scattered and clustered trees.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b>  Retain trees. Create / enhance green corridor on eastern side. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b>  Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low as considered unlikely the habitats will be of ecological significance. Avoid light spill on adjacent habitats to the east.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p>

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11168

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment** **Growth Area HH28: Bunkers Park – crematorium allocation**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No.

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

No.

**Other features**

Undeveloped land.

Agricultural grassland, cut. Mature hedgerow on eastern edge

**Protected species**

Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees

**Opportunities**

Retain and enhance hedgerows. Create / enhance green corridor to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11172

**Person ID** 1262170

**Full Name** Julie Banks

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>The Town Centre</b> key development needs to demonstrate some respect for our heritage, open up a vibrant flagship for Dacorum residents in our town centre not just one and two bed flats. I cannot see how the changing and challenging face of the high street is being supported in these plans</p> <p><b>Hemel Garden Communities</b>, like other identifies opportunities I worry about the early release of green belt – in fact the release of green belt for example if there is a ‘plan’ to see 200+ homes in Henry Wells Square in Grovehill how can the council not be pursuing this use of brown field ahead of the loss of green belt in the LA1 scheme? How will the utility companies provide for such a development? How will the roads cope with the increase in traffic etc.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11176
<b>Person ID</b>	1268977
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Young
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I have just noted that an area marked for development past 2038 appears to involve destroying Grovehill allotments. I had previously believed that this was protected land that could not be repurposed (and am yet to see otherwise). But, just in case you are still taking feedback on the proposals I would like to make it known that these allotments are a joy to work, a huge boost to peoples mental health as well as enabling people to grow their own fruit and vegetables. I think that we should be allocating more space for allotments and not destroying those that we already have.</p> <p>Could you please clarify, for me, whether it is intended that this land be repurposed for something other than an allotment? I do not believe that there is another allotment anywhere near this location and so you would be depriving people of a lot without sufficient reason, IMHO. This would negatively affect the mental and physical health of a range of people and families (my family included affecting ages 12, 15, 32 and 40).</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11206
<b>Person ID</b>	1153900
<b>Full Name</b>	Jackie Burwell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Growth Area HH28: Bunkers Park. This is a much-loved public open space, which has been highly valued during this past year. It has recently been restored and cultivated by local volunteers. Many people drive to the park and use the car park there. The proposal suggests 'minimising private vehicle access through the site,' which implies that access



from Bedmond Road to the small car park will be affected. It is vital that this access and car park are retained. Also, the proposal encroaches on the current Bunkers Park open space, which is not acceptable.

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

Yes

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

I am heartened to see that earlier proposals for developing various other sites in Kings Langley (Shendish, Wayside Farm and Hill Farm) have currently been abandoned. The proposals for developing the land at Shendish was always unsustainable due to lack of access, both through Shendish (a private estate with narrow access) and Rucklers Lane (a small, narrow lane, which is already very congested). In addition, Shendish Golf Course and the open land beyond is a highly-valued public amenity; it has certainly been an important and popular open space this past year, benefiting many in the local area. Shendish is also home to diverse wildlife, including deer, badgers, pheasants and numerous species of birds. These factors underline why it is important to minimise the need for developing on Green Belt land such as this, to protect biodiversity and preserve the health and wellbeing of local people by protecting their access to large open spaces.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11209

**Person ID** 1149643

**Full Name** Mr Philip Burwell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

Growth Area HH11: Two Waters North - would this retain the existing B&Q store in some manner, which is a vital retail resource since other stores such as Homebase in Apsley have closed.  
Growth Area HH12: Two Waters/London Road - developments over four storeys would be out of keeping with this area.  
Growth Area HH13: Frogmore Road and Growth Area HH15: Ebbens Road - The local plan seeks to increase employment, so how will the current industrial units be re-located?

Growth Area HH28: Bunkers Park - this has become a much-valued local open space which has recently been lovingly restored and cultivated by local volunteers. The proposal suggests 'minimising private vehicle access through the site', but this includes access from Bedmond Road to the small car park for Bunkers Park. This access and car park must be retained. The proposal also encroaches on the current Bunkers Park open space which is not acceptable.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

I am pleased to see that proposals for developing land between Shendish and Rucklers Lane seem to have been abandoned. This was always unsustainable because of lack of access both through Shendish (a private estate) and Rucklers Lane (too narrow and leading into the Red Lion junction which is already very congested).  
 Shendish Golf Course - during 2020 this has become a valued recreational space for local people to take exercise. It is also a haven for wildlife and birds and must be retained in its present scale.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11314

**Person ID** 1269000

**Full Name** Mrs Tracey Franklin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

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

Yes

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	The first point of call is for Brownfield sites to be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all of these spaces, should Green Belt EVEN be considered. Developers are consistently only looking for the greatest financial return and do not even take into consideration the impact their greedy view, has on the environment and the actual residents themselves. The council SHOULD be defending these natural resources at all costs for their residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11414
<b>Person ID</b>	1269023
<b>Full Name</b>	DOUG DUNN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11541

<b>Person ID</b>	1269120
<b>Full Name</b>	JANE VELLACOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Hemel Hempstead town centre need rationalising
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11588
<b>Person ID</b>	1269146
<b>Full Name</b>	MAXWELL CLIFTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11617
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH01: North Hemel Phase 1</b> - 212.2ha 1550 homes plus retail and community facilities, primary and secondary schools, Council depot and household recycling site and a country park of 'district-wide importance'. It will also have 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' (SANG) to 'offset adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods due to recreational pressure' which this development will exacerbate! But it does say that they will save an ancient woodland and possibly supplement it but the damage will have been done.

**HH22: known in the existing Local Plan as Marchmont Farm** - 19.15ha 385 homes and a travellers' site. A planning application has recently been submitted. This will join up with HH01.

Some 392ha of Green Belt will be lost on the north/north east side of the Upper Gade Valley for the development of these 3 blocks of land. No replacement Green Belt land is proposed. This is possibly the worst and most damaging proposal totally ruining the Upper Gade Valley which the Council recognises as a key biodiversity area with a mosaic of fields, wetland, grassland and woodland. It states, in its own Landscape Assessment, that it *'requires the relatively unspoilt landscape to be conserved and strengthened'*. So how can the Council now justify the scale of development proposed which will cover an entire side of the valley? The Revel End Plateau where Phase 2 is proposed was acknowledged to be *'improved and conserved'* - hardly under this scale of development.

In the Schedule of Sites Appraisals, October 2017, North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 & 2), under Technical Studies A, Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal conclusions, it states *'Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt'*. Suddenly, following receiving a substantial grant for consultants, it has become 'Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Spatial Vision'. This snappy title with visions of well designed, tree lined, low density developments of Ebenezer Howard, belies the reality as suggested by Transport for New Homes document (June 2020) headlines: *'Green Promises broken: garden villages will be dominated by the car'*.

The land is on the steep southern slope of the north side of the Gade Valley and therefore any development will physically and visually severely affect the valley and the CAONB. One can already see the edge of Hemel (Grove Hill) from long distances and this new development will bring urban development into the open countryside. It will be a disaster. Scant regard is paid to the effects on the setting and views to and from the CAONB nor to the vast increase in traffic, lighting, noise and disturbance to wildlife plus destruction of hedgerows, trees, historic field patterns. As a token, it proposes that an ancient woodland would be saved and possibly supplemented (with ancient trees?).

It is certainly not an acceptable setting for the CAONB nor for a possible National Park. Any attempt to provide a buffer will introduce a man-made barrier - normally just a couple of rows of trees which take decades to mature. This will not lessen the effect on long distance views. Country Parks are manufactured landscapes with bland open spaces including facilities for play and refreshments and of course car parking. This in no way compensates for the loss of the natural environment. It will use *'landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors'* but at present the whole area is green! not measly corridors of new planting. The increased pressure on Ashridge, the Gade Valley Water Meadows and other parts of the AONB will be immense.

Even the Council acknowledges the *'substantial loss of Green Belt land'* and that it will bring development towards Redbourn contrary to one of the functions of the Green Belt.

Development will be up to and abutting the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Following the Glover Report, this area is possibly a future National Park. Currently, the CAONB is surrounded by open Green Belt countryside, a mosaic of historic field patterns, ancient hedgerows and woodlands, including a designated Ancient woodland, ie. an appropriate setting. Such large-scale urban development, despite the suggestion of a buffer zone, will cause irreparable damage to the area. The Council seems to want development at any cost - even with the kudos of having a National Park in the Borough, they seem to prefer the developers' money to that of increased tourism and benefit to the existing residents. They consider that a man-made country park of 'district-wide importance' will be in some way compensating for the loss of the natural environment and the 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is said to 'offset adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods due to recreational pressure' which they are creating! This is NOT Milton Keynes which was planned from conception but virtually a 'New Town' bolted on to the original New Town destroying its original setting. Hemel New Town was well planned to take account of the environment it sits in. This development does no such thing - totally ignoring the natural landscape. The Council are grabbing development at any cost.

The development will abut the edge of Piccotts End, a small historic hamlet designated a Conservation Area with many listed buildings. It will completely 'wrap around' the hamlet and subsume it into the new development, seriously affecting its setting, historic relevance and the quality of life of the existing residents.

Part of the proposal involved a new link to Jn8 of the M1 as part of a new Mass Rapid Transit system to Harlow which is again very 'old fashioned', road orientated thinking which has major environmental implications. A spin off from this is that local traffic will be pushed onto already heavily trafficked rural roads and though villages and hamlets used as 'rat-runs', further affecting the environment and living conditions of existing residents and further limiting the encouragement to cycle or walk. No improvements are proposed for existing roads or existing rural communities.

The Gade Valley is recognised by the Council itself as '*a key biodiversity area with mosaic, wetland, grassland and woodland*' which will be completely destroyed. There is no mention of how they intend to mitigate the disastrous and irreparable damage. A vague suggestion of '*landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors*' is proposed which replaces existing natural open space with a man-made environment which is certainly no compensation. They state that they will '*enhance or restore hedgerows and field patterns and boundaries*', but how can they do this if they are building over the entire area? Similarly, they state they will '*conserve and enhance historic sunken lanes and Public Rights of Way*' which is somewhat perverse as in the Marchmont Arms development (included in the Plan as HH22), a new access road crosses over an historic path which will severely affect uses (walkers, cyclists, horse riders) of the path which leads from Piccotts End to an area of public open space within Grove Hill! The Council makes claims that it will encourage such users but then puts them in danger by proposing a new road!

Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment	
Included files	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11619
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH02: North Hemel Phase 2</b> - 160.9ha 4000 homes plus retail and community facilities, primary and secondary schools, Council depot and household recycling site - safeguarded for after 2038 - which is only 17 years away and should be considered now as part of the whole N/NE expansion of Hemel Hempstead. This lies to the north of HH01 around the existing development of Grove Hill and has been planned in conjunction with St Albans City and District Council. Thus, the swathe of Green Belt around the northern part of Hemel will be totally lost.</p> <p>However, St Albans' Local Plan has been postponed as it was deemed to be unsound by the Inspector which throws into question the whole Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Project. This is a clear indication that the Dacorum Plan is premature and based on outdated and incorrect data and assumptions. As this is the most disastrous proposal for Hemel Hempstead and the area as a whole, this must be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Some 392ha of Green Belt will be lost on the north/north east side of the Upper Gade Valley for the development of these 3 blocks of land. No replacement Green Belt land is proposed. This is possibly the worst and most damaging proposal totally ruining the Upper Gade Valley which the Council recognises as a key biodiversity area with a mosaic of</p>



fields, wetland, grassland and woodland. It states, in its own Landscape Assessment, that it *'requires the relatively unspoilt landscape to be conserved and strengthened'*. So how can the Council now justify the scale of development proposed which will cover an entire side of the valley? The Revel End Plateau where Phase 2 is proposed was acknowledged to be *'improved and conserved'* - hardly under this scale of development.

In the Schedule of Sites Appraisals, October 2017, North Hemel Hempstead (Phases 1 & 2), under Technical Studies A, Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal conclusions, it states *'Exclude from further assessment and retain as Green Belt'*. Suddenly, following receiving a substantial grant for consultants, it has become 'Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Spatial Vision'. This snappy title with visions of well designed, tree lined, low density developments of Ebenezer Howard, belies the reality as suggested by Transport for New Homes document (June 2020) headlines: *'Green Promises broken: garden villages will be dominated by the car'*.

The land is on the steep southern slope of the north side of the Gade Valley and therefore any development will physically and visually severely affect the valley and the CAONB. One can already see the edge of Hemel (Grove Hill) from long distances and this new development will bring urban development into the open countryside. It will be a disaster. Scant regard is paid to the effects on the setting and views to and from the CAONB nor to the vast increase in traffic, lighting, noise and disturbance to wildlife plus destruction of hedgerows, trees, historic field patterns. As a token, it proposes that an ancient woodland would be saved and possibly supplemented (with ancient trees?).

It is certainly not an acceptable setting for the CAONB nor for a possible National Park. Any attempt to provide a buffer will introduce a man-made barrier - normally just a couple of rows of trees which take decades to mature. This will not lessen the effect on long distance views. Country Parks are manufactured landscapes with bland open spaces including facilities for play and refreshments and of course car parking. This in no way compensates for the loss of the natural environment. It will use *'landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors'* but at present the whole area is green! not measly corridors of new planting. The increased pressure on Ashridge, the Gade Valley Water Meadows and other parts of the AONB will be immense.

Even the Council acknowledges the *'substantial loss of Green Belt land'* and that it will bring development towards Redbourn contrary to one of the functions of the Green Belt.

Development will be up to and abutting the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Following the Glover Report, this area is possibly a future National Park. Currently, the CAONB is surrounded by open Green Belt countryside, a mosaic of historic field patterns, ancient hedgerows and woodlands, including a designated Ancient woodland, ie. an appropriate setting. Such large-scale urban development, despite the suggestion of a buffer zone, will cause irreparable damage to the area. The Council seems to want development at any cost - even with the kudos of

having a National Park in the Borough, they seem to prefer the developers' money to that of increased tourism and benefit to the existing residents. They consider that a man-made country park of 'district-wide importance' will be in some way compensating for the loss of the natural environment and the 'Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace' (SANG) is said to 'offset adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods due to recreational pressure' which they are creating! This is NOT Milton Keynes which was planned from conception but virtually a 'New Town' bolted on to the original New Town destroying its original setting. Hemel New Town was well planned to take account of the environment it sits in. This development does no such thing - totally ignoring the natural landscape. The Council are grabbing development at any cost.

The development will abut the edge of Piccotts End, a small historic hamlet designated a Conservation Area with many listed buildings. It will completely 'wrap around' the hamlet and subsume it into the new development, seriously affecting its setting, historic relevance and the quality of life of the existing residents.

Part of the proposal involved a new link to Jn8 of the M1 as part of a new Mass Rapid Transit system to Harlow which is again very 'old fashioned', road orientated thinking which has major environmental implications. A spin off from this is that local traffic will be pushed onto already heavily trafficked rural roads and though villages and hamlets used as 'rat-runs', further affecting the environment and living conditions of existing residents and further limiting the encouragement to cycle or walk. No improvements are proposed for existing roads or existing rural communities.

The Gade Valley is recognised by the Council itself as '*a key biodiversity area with mosaic, wetland, grassland and woodland*' which will be completely destroyed. There is no mention of how they intend to mitigate the disastrous and irreparable damage. A vague suggestion of '*landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors*' is proposed which replaces existing natural open space with a man-made environment which is certainly no compensation. They state that they will '*enhance or restore hedgerows and field patterns and boundaries*', but how can they do this if they are building over the entire area? Similarly, they state they will '*conserve and enhance historic sunken lanes and Public Rights of Way*' which is somewhat perverse as in the Marchmont Arms development (included in the Plan as HH22), a new access road crosses over an historic path which will severely affect uses (walkers, cyclists, horse riders) of the path which leads from Piccotts End to an area of public open space within Grove Hill! The Council makes claims that it will encourage such users but then puts them in danger by proposing a new road!

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11621
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH22: known in the existing Local Plan as Marchmont Farm</b> - 19.15ha 385 homes and a travellers' site. A planning application has recently been submitted. This will join up with HH01.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11622
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH03: Hemel Hospital</b> – 5.93ha, 450 homes, hospital hub, primary school. Priority must be given to providing vastly extended health services given the amount of additional dwellings proposed for the Borough. Health services are already stretched and it is an absolute disgrace that the Health Trust has deliberately neglected the existing hospital. The amount of health service retained is questionable given that 3ha is for a school, leaving only 2.9ha for dwellings, health and of course public open space!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11624
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH21: known in the current Local Plan as LA3 West Hemel – 5.5.6ha, 1100 homes.</b> An outline planning permission exists for 1100 dwellings (increased from the originally proposed 900 dwellings), community facilities, travellers site and land for a primary school (reliant of funding from HCC - not the developers!). The wildlife corridor is a couple of metres wide, the existing Chiltern Way (a Nationally important footpath is encroached by car parking laybys and a token open space provision. At least it's within walking distance of the town and station! The loss of Green Belt has not been replaced and despite considerable opposition and a devastating effect on the southern slope of the northern side of the Bulbourne Valley this was granted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11626
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH23: Old Town 2.71ha, 90 homes -</b> This currently provides a soft edge to the entrance and setting of the historic Hemel Old Town. It is steeply sloping and the proposal is for 90 dwellings, which could be up to 4 storeys in height to 'add interest'. The existing green slope does that! It is very visible from the Gadebridge Park which is of Borough importance, regrettably bring development up to its historic boundary wall. Gadebridge Park is very prone to flooding and building this close will exacerbate this.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11627
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Whilst both of these sites are brownfield sites and there is no objection in principle to their development, it is the overall scale that will be severely detrimental to the Boxmoor Common. The proposals suggest heights of between 4 and 8 storeys which will over shadow and totally dominate this very important and historic open space. Much lower developments should be proposed bearing in mind the residential properties in the area are predominantly 2 storeys.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS11629
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH08: Station Gateway</b>, 360 homes – plus regeneration of rail station, retail, offices, hotel</p> <p><b>HH09: National Grid land</b>,400 homes</p> <p>Whilst both of these sites are brownfield sites and there is no objection in principle to their development, it is the overall scale that will be severely detrimental to the Boxmoor Common. The proposals suggest heights of between 4 and 8 storeys which will over shadow and totally dominate this very important and historic open space. Much lower developments should be proposed bearing in mind the residential properties in the area are predominantly 2 storeys.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11631
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH11: Two Waters North:</b> 2.8ha, 350 homes, employment, offices, hospitality, open space to the canal. Whilst this is a brownfield sites and there is no objection in principle to its development, again it is the overall scale that will be severely detrimental to Box Moor Common. Much more emphasis should be paid to enhancing the canal and a more appropriate form of development such as the Canal Basin in Apsley which will enhance the important canal.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11632
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH12: Two Waters/London Road:</b> 0.62ha, 60 homes – this land is liable to flood and it also is part of Box Moor. A recent application to deregister it as Common land was refused by the Secretary of State. Therefore, it is not available for development.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11634
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH17: Cupid Green Depot</b> 2.9ha 360 homes It seems bizarre that this depot within the urban area is to be replaced by one North Hemel Phase 1 located in the Green Belt! No sure how it will enhance the setting of the Listed Corner Hall Farmhouse as there is a supermarket between the site and the Farmhouse!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11638
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	In light of the effects of the pandemic, an urgent review should be undertaken in the urban areas to identify any buildings no longer in retail or business use which could be suitable for rebuilding or conversion to residential use.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11744
<b>Person ID</b>	1269230
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLES GABRIEL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes (comment removed).</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p> <p>For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11782
<b>Person ID</b>	1269235
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Eleanor Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11791

<b>Person ID</b>	1264468
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes (comment removed).</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p>

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS11894

**Person ID** 1269277

**Full Name** DEFINE PLANNING AND DESIGN LTD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

BHL supports the allocation of Growth Area HH01 for 1,500 dwellings, and commends the recognition by DBC of the opportunity that is present north of Hemel Hempstead.

Indeed, the commitment made towards the Hemel Garden Community reflects the significant quantum of housing development that is needed in the Borough over the upcoming plan period, and reflects the NPPF's position that "*the supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements or significant extensions to existing villages and towns*" (paragraph 72). Indeed, the Government's award of "Garden Town" status following a successful 'Transformational Garden Communities' bid marked an acceptance that strategic-level growth would be particularly suitable within Hemel Hempstead.

Notwithstanding that BHL supports the broad scope of the allocation of Growth Area HH01, BHL has some comments on the following aspects of the allocation policy as an interested party given their land interests north of Hemel Hempstead:

Bullet point 2 requires a “*new country park of district-wide importance.*” Whilst the provision of this feature is supported, the policy provides little information regarding its size, form or location. Given that the plan requires proposals to be consistent with the Hemel Garden Communities Charter, it is envisaged that the area of the country park will be similar to the area denoted as ‘SANGs’ on Figure 4 of that document, which totals some 90 hectares.

Bullet point 4 requires “*a range of new retail and community facilities [...] involving a new district or local centre with a medium or large supermarket and also smaller scale local or neighbourhood centres.*” Again, guidance is required in relation to the scale of those required facilities given the implications on the residential net developable area and the capacity of Growth Area HH01; and should form part of the allocation requirement. That point also stands for the requirement at bullet point 8 for “*safeguarded land for a council depot and household waste recycling centre.*”

Bullet points 5 and 6 require a new 3ha primary school and a new 13ha secondary school. HH02’s development requirements require 2no. 3ha primary schools and a 13ha secondary school, which appears to be *in addition* to the requirements for HH01 (i.e. 9ha of primary and 26ha of secondary school provision in total), but that matter is not made sufficiently clear in the ESFG nor the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Therefore, the overall requirements for education provision need to be clearly set out for the development as a whole (HH01 and HH02 combined), with specific requirements for each phase. In any event, the merits of planning for a comprehensive development in relation to education and other masterplanning / design considerations is outlined below.

Whilst there is uncertainty surrounding the size of the country park and community / retail uses, those requirements will clearly take up a considerable proportion of the Phase 1 site. That, in addition to the site’s difficult topography at the west, the need to respond to adjacent heritage assets (listed buildings, the Piccotts End Conservation Area, and a Scheduled Monument) and the AONB, and the requirement for land to be safeguarded for the strategic link road, may limit the residential developable area. Indeed, once those factors have been considered, built development may be limited to the area immediately adjacent to the existing built form, south of Dodds Lane.

Whether that will be sufficient to total 1,550 dwellings, given the lower densities associated with Garden Communities, is unclear. Thus, DBC should allocate Growth Area HH02 in the upcoming plan period to ensure that DBC can deliver sufficient housing in this location and the Borough as a whole.

### **Phasing of development**

#### Delivering the strategic transport corridor:

Growth Area HH01’s allocation policy states that both Phase 1 and 2 “*should be planned together, as a minimum through closely aligned masterplans taking an integrated approach to the joint site area*”, and indeed both Growth Area HH01 and HH02 require the “*delivery of a strategic corridor route between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road*”.

However, neither policies HH01 and HH02 or the IDP specify the timing of the strategic corridor’s delivery, nor what phasing arrangements are envisaged. Indeed, two scenarios may realistically arise; either the entirety of the road would be required during HH01’s development, or only the stretch of the road that lies within the boundary of HH01 would be

required as part of HH01's development, with the remainder delivered during HH02's construction. That matter must be clarified in the plan and IDP.

In any event, should the entire link road be required during Phase 1, that would be a considerable commitment and development cost for developers. Indeed, for infrastructure of that scale to be viable, developers in the Phase 2 area would require a significant degree of certainty that the entire Hemel Garden Community would come forward, with some 5,500 dwellings to be delivered.

The ESFG fails to provide that certainty. Whilst it references a desire for a comprehensive approach to development, it only refers to the "*opportunity*" for delivery in HH02 post-2038 "*subject to a future Local Plan Review*". DBC will be aware of the dynamic nature of the planning system and housing needs and supply in particular, and thus will understand that leaving the further consideration of this site, regardless of DBC's clear acceptance of its suitability, until the next local plan review (which could be some way down the line) does not offer any certainty of its development.

Alternatively, should the road's phasing be consistent with the phasing of residential land parcels (i.e. Phase 1 delivers only the extent of the road within its boundary), that would limit connectivity between Phase 1 and the strategic road network to the east until the remainder of the road is delivered. In that event, for traffic to travel from Phase 1 to the M1, it would be required to head south and travel along the Link Road/Redbourn Road/ Hemel Hempstead Road corridor. The traffic implications of this would be considerable, and would not promote good connectivity or transport principles within Phase 1.

To remedy this, and given the requirement for DBC to identify further residential land to meet its increased housing need plus a buffer for flexibility (see BHL's response to Question 2 above), both Phases 1 and 2 should be allocated for development within the upcoming plan period. Indeed, that would allow for developers to commit to the development of the strategic route in its entirety, with the certainty that their development parcel would come forward to make that investment viable.

Furthermore, given the long-term aspirations for development east of Hemel Hempstead (within St Albans City and District Council land), the pursuit of a comprehensive approach to the wider North Hemel Hempstead Growth Area would also provide more certainty to facilitate the potentially speculative delivery of infrastructure and housing east of Hemel Hempstead. As such, this comprehensive approach would be critical in realising the wider aspirations of the Hemel Garden Communities scheme outside of Dacorum Borough alone.

Thus, this approach to comprehensively planning the wider development would ensure that good transport and urban design principles can be promoted from the outset across the entire Garden Community area, and developers, the Council and the Hemel Garden Communities group can develop a strategic transport framework to promote such principles.

#### Infrastructure provision and Masterplanning:

Similarly, taking a strategic-level approach to other infrastructure would result in a comprehensive development that makes better use of the available land north of Hemel Hempstead.



Indeed, the allocation requirements for both HH01 and HH02 require provision of new district and local centres including medium / large supermarkets, smaller scale local and neighbourhood centres, the provision of primary and secondary schools and (specifically for HH01) the provision of a country park and land for a council depot and household waste recycling centre.

Clearly, infrastructure provision will drive the wider site's layout and, by evolving a strategic-scale site-wide infrastructure framework, developers can ensure that residents are well connected to important community and retail facilities. For example, by considering provision on a strategic-scale, it may be more beneficial for the whole scheme to deliver one central local centre with an excellent range of services and facilities, supported by a network of well connected, smaller local centres to support this. Such an approach would promote an efficient use of land and good urban design principles.

That may not be achieved, however, by separately planning for Phase 1 in the first instance, and then Phase 2 following that (should a Local Plan Review necessitate the site's development). Indeed, should HH02 fail to come forward, HH01 may be left as an isolated neighbourhood that is poorly connected in transport terms, and has limited / poorly located key infrastructure provision.

Those points are also relevant to other considerations. For example, the ability to produce a site-wide framework for drainage, landscape, biodiversity and green infrastructure would result in an efficient scheme that promotes good urban design principles, and has a positive lasting legacy. Indeed, ESFG itself reflects that, stating that both phases "*should be planned together [...] taking an integrated approach to the joint site area.*"

Proposed approach to HH01 and HH02:

In light of the above considerations, and given the need to identify more housing land to allow for a buffer above DBC's increased minimum housing need (see Policy SP2), Growth Area HH02 should be allocated for development in the plan period alongside HH01. Indeed, the site's safeguarded status is testament to the site's suitability for development and, given the clear need to deliver more sites in the Borough, it would be a sensible approach to allocate this site.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11895
<b>Person ID</b>	1269277

<b>Full Name</b>	DEFINE PLANNING AND DESIGN LTD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>BHL supports DBC’s recognition that Growth Area HH02 is a suitable location for development, as reflected through the safeguarding of the site for development; albeit BHL is of the view that the site should be allocated for development in the coming plan period for the reasons set out below. In addition, BHL has the following comments on the allocation policy itself:</p> <p><b>Allocation Requirements:</b></p> <p>Bullet point 3 requires “a range of new retail and community facilities [...] involving a new district or local centre with a medium or large supermarket and also smaller scale local or neighbourhood centres.” However, guidance is required specifying the scale of the required retail and community facilities, and should form part of the allocation requirement.</p> <p>Bullet points 4 and 5 require 2no. 3ha primary and 1no. 13ha secondary school. HH01’s development requirements require a 3ha primary and a 13ha secondary school, which appears to be <i>in addition</i> to the requirements for HH02 (i.e. 9ha of primary and 26ha of secondary school provision in total), but that matter is not made sufficiently clear in the ESFG nor the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Therefore, the overall requirements for education provision need to be <u>clearly</u> set out for the development as a whole (HH01 and HH02 combined), with specific requirements for each phase. In any event, the merits of planning for a comprehensive development in relation to education and other masterplanning / design considerations is outlined below.</p> <p>The ‘site-specific requirements’ also state that the scale and form of the required SANG (Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace) should be agreed with Natural England prior to the submission of a planning application. This requirement is not practical, as the SANG’s scope and form would be informed by a Habitat Regulations Assessment undertaken as part of the outline planning application. Thus, it would be more reasonable to request <i>pre-application consultation</i> with Natural England, with the planning application itself subsequently agreeing the details of the scale and form of the SANG.</p> <p>The site-specific requirements also requires developers to investigate the effect on five listed buildings to “ensure that their setting is conserved and/or enhanced” and also to “ensure that the setting of the scheduled monument <i>The Aubreys Camp [...] is conserved.</i>” This requirement is contrary to NPPF paragraph 196 that states that applications will be approved even where proposals “will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset” where the public benefits outweigh that harm. Thus, these requirements should be removed.</p>

Furthermore, developments are required to “achieve a 60% share of sustainable transport modes by 2050.” That requirement is ambiguous. For this requirement to be consistent with NPPF paragraph 16d, further information is required to allow for easy interpretation of planning applications; namely, what the Council’s ‘modal aspiration’ is, whether the 60% refers to a 60% increase or 60% total, how the 60% modal share is measured (i.e. is it 60% of all journeys, 60% of passengers, etc?), and what is considered to be a sufficient contribution to the modal share aspiration?

Delivering the strategic transport corridor:

Growth Area HH01’s allocation policy states that both Phase 1 and 2 “should be planned together, as a minimum through closely aligned masterplans taking an integrated approach to the joint site area”, and indeed both Growth Area HH01 and HH02 require the “delivery of a strategic corridor route between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road”.

However, neither policies HH01 and HH02 nor the IDP specify the timing of the strategic corridor’s delivery, nor what phasing arrangements are envisaged. Indeed, two scenarios may realistically arise; either the entirety of the road would be required during HH01’s development, or only the stretch of the road that lies within the boundary of HH01 would be required as part of HH01’s development, with the remainder delivered during HH02’s construction. That matter must be clarified in the plan and IDP.

In any event, should the entire link road be required during Phase 1, that would be a considerable commitment and development cost for developers. Indeed, for infrastructure of that scale to be viable, developers in the Phase 2 area would require a significant degree of certainty that the entire Hemel Garden Community would come forward, with some 5,500 dwellings to be delivered.

The ESFG fails to provide that certainty. Whilst it references a desire for a comprehensive approach to development, it only refers to the “opportunity” for delivery in HH02 post-2038 “subject to a future Local Plan Review”. DBC will be aware of the dynamic nature of the planning system and housing needs and supply in particular, and thus will understand that leaving the further consideration of this site, regardless of DBC’s clear acceptance of its suitability, until the next local plan review (which could be some way down the line) does not offer any certainty of its development.

Alternatively, should the road’s phasing be consistent with the phasing of residential land parcels (i.e. Phase 1 delivers only the extent of the road within its boundary), that would limit connectivity between Phase 1 and the strategic road network to the east until the remainder of the road is delivered. In that event, for traffic to travel along the Link Road/Redbourn Road/Hemel Hempstead Road corridor. The traffic implications of this would be considerable, and would not promote good connectivity or transport principles within Phase 1.

To remedy this, and given the requirement for DBC to identify further residential land to meet its increased housing need plus a buffer for flexibility (see BHL’s response to Question 2 above), both Phases 1 and 2 should be allocated for development within the upcoming plan period. Indeed, that would allow for developers to commit to the development of the strategic route in its entirety, with the certainty that their development parcel would come forward to make that investment viable.

Furthermore, given the long-term aspirations for development east of Hemel Hempstead (within St Albans City and District Council land), the pursuit of a comprehensive approach to the wider North Hemel Hempstead Growth Area would also provide more certainty to facilitate the potentially speculative delivery of infrastructure and housing east of Hemel

Hempstead. As such, this comprehensive approach would be critical in realising the wider aspirations of the Hemel Garden Communities scheme outside of Dacorum Borough alone.

Thus, this approach to comprehensively planning the wider development would ensure that good transport and urban design principles can be promoted from the outset across the entire Garden Community area, and developers, the Council and the Hemel Garden Communities group can develop a strategic transport framework to promote such principles.

Infrastructure provision and Masterplanning:

Similarly, taking a strategic-level approach to other infrastructure would result in a comprehensive development that makes better use of the available land north of Hemel Hempstead.

Indeed, the allocation requirements for both HH01 and HH02 require provision of new district and local centres including medium / large supermarkets, smaller scale local and neighbourhood centres, the provision of primary and secondary schools and (specifically for HH01) the provision of a country park and land for a council depot and household waste recycling centre.

Clearly, infrastructure provision will drive the wider site's layout and, by evolving a strategic-scale site-wide infrastructure framework, developers can ensure that residents are well connected to important community and retail facilities. For example, by considering provision on a strategic-scale, it may be more beneficial for the whole scheme to deliver one central local centre with an excellent range of services and facilities, supported by a network of well connected, smaller local centres to support this. Such an approach would promote an efficient use of land and good urban design principles.

That may not be achieved, however, by separately planning for Phase 1 in the first instance, and then Phase 2 following that (should a Local Plan Review necessitate the site's development). Indeed, should HH02 fail to come forward, HH01 may be left as an isolated neighbourhood that is poorly connected in transport terms, and has limited / poorly located key infrastructure provision.

Those points are also relevant to other considerations. For example, the ability to produce a site-wide framework for drainage, landscape, biodiversity and green infrastructure would result in an efficient scheme that promotes good urban design principles, and has a positive lasting legacy. Indeed, ESFG itself reflects that, stating that both phases "*should be planned together [...] taking an integrated approach to the joint site area.*"

Proposed approach to HH01 and HH02:

In light of the above considerations, and given the need to identify more housing land to allow for a buffer above DBC's increased minimum housing need (see Policy SP2), Growth Area HH02 should be allocated for development in the plan period alongside HH01. Indeed, the site's safeguarded status is testament to the site's suitability for development and, given the clear need to deliver more sites in the Borough, it would be a sensible approach to allocate this site.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11916
<b>Person ID</b>	1268937
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lynette Hyde
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Q 5</b></p> <p><b>Specific comment on any of proposed sites</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>The proposed numbers of houses is too high throughout the proposal</p> <p>The Hemel Garden site on the Green Belt land between Piccots End and Grove Hill is vastly over developed.</p> <p>This proposal includes a new road from the M1 at J 8 to the Leighton Buzzard Road (B440) close to Water End.</p> <p>This road has been de-trunked and has severe weight restrictions and HGV bans – it could not sustain significant additional traffic as a rat run from the M1 via Potten End to Berkhamsted and beyond.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS11973
<b>Person ID</b>	1264526
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter King
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Water End & Upper Gade Valley Conservation Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	See our comments on the Delivery Strategy above
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12037
<b>Person ID</b>	1269358
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Tim Duggleby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director Redevelopment Programme West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269359

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Tom Rudd
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	BDP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The Trust supports allocation of the existing Hemel Hempstead Hospital site under Growth Area HH03, but considers that amendments are required to the policy wording to clarify that redevelopment of the site will be driven by the Trust's clinical requirements and associated timescales.</p> <p>Growth Area HH03 allocates the existing Hemel Hempstead Hospital site for the delivery of around 450 dwellings (subject to masterplanning), a new 3ha primary school, public open space and a new/revised hospital hub. It is understood that, upon adoption of the new Local Plan, this is intended to replace existing site allocation MU/2 contained within the Site Allocations Written Statement (2017) which covers both the hospital site and neighbouring Paradise Fields, and similarly identifies the site as suitable for a replacement hospital, new two-form entry primary school and 400 homes, with development to be guided by DBC's Town Centre Masterplan (2013).</p> <p>With regard to the provision of a new/revised hospital hub, in 2019 West Hertfordshire Hospitals NHS Trust (WHHT) published its Strategic Outline Case (SOC) for the redevelopment of hospital services across West Hertfordshire. Within the SOC the preferred way forward identified the Hemel Hempstead Hospital site as the location for a specialist centre delivering a range of planned medical services, with parallel work undertaken by Herts Valley CCG confirming the site's suitability as the location for an Urgent Treatment Centre.</p> <p>Inclusion of the WHHT redevelopment plans within the first phase of the Government's Health Infrastructure Plan (2019) provided the Trust with the funding required to develop the SOC into an Outline Business Case (OBC), thereby confirming the preferred option for delivering future acute hospital services across West Hertfordshire. Included within this process is the development of 1:200 plans and, where required, the submission of outline planning application.</p> <p>The Trust plans to complete the OBC in Autumn 2021 and will be engaging with Dacorum Borough Council and other key stakeholders to ensure the plans for the Hemel Hempstead Hospital site meet both the needs for future healthcare provision, the aspirations of Dacorum Borough Council's Emerging Strategy for Growth, and the demands this growth will place on both healthcare services and the council's housing plan.</p> <p>The Trust supports the intention to allocate the site for a combination of healthcare, residential and support services, and the recognition that this will be achieved through the consolidation and development of healthcare services into the most viable footprint, thereby releasing surplus land for wider redevelopment. It recognises the need to progress at pace, but must also ensure the adopted solution delivers value for money, is affordable and can be delivered within the specified timeline. The Plan must deliver the Trust's Clinical Model and ensure that services are maintained throughout the redevelopment programme.</p>

In this regard, it is noted that the 2013 Town Centre Masterplan, which is provided policy support by existing site allocation MU/2, states that the delivery strategy for the 'Hospital Zone' should be driven by the Trust's operational and timing requirements (paragraph 6.5.2.1). The Trust would therefore like to request that a similar provision is made by new Growth Area HH03, in order to clarify that the quantum and nature of development to be delivered at the site will ultimately be driven by the Trust's clinical requirements as a healthcare provider, and associated funding timescales.

The Trust currently plans to complete its OBC in Autumn 2021, and if approved by its regulators, to be in a position to undertake the healthcare component of the redevelopment at Hemel Hempstead Hospital between 2022 and 2025. During this period the Trust will work with Dacorum Borough Council to agree the development plan for the surplus NHS estate, thereby reducing any delay in commencing construction. As stated in response to question 4 above, the Trust is likely to be in a position to confirm the size and location of land available following approval of the OBC in late 2021, and this will be reflected in any further representations made on Site Allocation HH03 as the draft Local Plan progresses to anticipated adoption in late 2022.

The Trust's plans are dependent on securing the funding necessary to complete the redevelopment on all 3 of its sites.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12043

**Person ID** 1269361

**Full Name** Dr Freya Rumball

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats. Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12179
<b>Person ID</b>	1269448
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Mardell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Any where but Hemel Hempstead!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12207
<b>Person ID</b>	1269456
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms R & C R & Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are you seriously planning to build houses on the Hemel Hospital site? How is this environmentally sound when we will have to travel to Watford Hospital for routine appointments, blood tests, x-rays etc?</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12225
<b>Person ID</b>	1269476
<b>Full Name</b>	EMILY DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes even badgers.</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p> <p>For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12269
<b>Person ID</b>	1264925
<b>Full Name</b>	sharon warner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>When we moved into our house on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we loved that from our house you just walked a little while and you access to countryside with beautiful countryside views and loads of wildlife.</p> <p>Walking our dogs during the daylight hours you can hear and see lots of different species of birds and on our night time 'walkies'strolls its not unusual to see hedgehogs and foxes</p> <p>It is such a shame these beautiful areas will be built on and will shall lose all the wildlife in that area to build to meet government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of spending our latter years in the area we raised our family and made lots of friends.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the local fields create large rivers and a lake along which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Proposing to build homes on areas</p>

that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is, this is a known fact. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12472

**Person ID** 629143

**Full Name** Mr Chris Briggs

**Organisation Details** Spatial Planning Manager  
St Albans City & District Council

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>7. Hemel Garden Communities (HGC)</b></p> <p>Overall, SADC is generally supportive of the Hemel Garden Communities Local Plan policies. SADC do consider overall that the policies and Key Diagram could be streamlined for greater clarity. Potentially policies SP14 and SP15 could be one policy.</p> <p>Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph SP3 are:</p> <p><i><del>“The town will also expand on its eastern side into St Albans City and District Council area.”</del></i></p> <p>Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph 7.21 are:</p> <p><i>“The scheme also forms part of a large and comprehensive development that extends east of the town into St Albans City and District, which is <del>expected within</del> <b>being considered as part of their forthcoming Local Plan</b>”</i></p> <p>Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph 23.9 are:</p> <p><i>“At the same time an additional 4,300 homes and land for 8,000 jobs are being <del>proposed</del> <b>considered</b> to the East of Hemel Hempstead (in St Albans district), also supported by the HGC Programme <b>and St Albans District Local Plan work.</b>”</i></p> <p>Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to the additional text in the same paragraph, as set out below, would benefit from being set in the context of the South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan and any evidence base work related to the statement:</p> <p><i>“Beyond 2038 there is an opportunity for at a further 5,500 homes to be delivered around Hemel Hempstead in both St. Albans and Dacorum administrative areas (subject to a future Local Plan review). This takes the long-term development potential in and around Hemel Hempstead to over 20,000 additional homes by 2050.”</i></p> <p>Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph 23.18 are:</p> <p><i>“Herts IQ includes a significant expansion of Maylands Business Park, with <b>a potential</b> 55 hectares of employment land east of Hemel Hempstead <b>being considered</b> in St Albans district <b>as part of its Local Plan development.</b>”</i></p>

Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to the diagrams ‘*Key Developments in the whole of Hemel Hempstead*’, ‘*Key Development in North Hemel Hempstead*’ and ‘*Key Developments in Marylands*’ are:

Areas outside of DBC’s administrative boundary should be more clearly set out and represented in a different colour. This relates to anything past the light blue line called ‘*Dacorum boundary*’. Furthermore, please remove ‘new housing’ and ‘new employment’ and ‘potential school’ symbols within the SADC boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, SADC’s now withdrawn Local Plan did not contain any housing east of the M1. Also for the avoidance of doubt, SADC’s now withdrawn Local Plan did not contain schools in the same locations as those set out in these diagrams.

Finally, in ‘*Key Developments in Maylands*’ the diagram could be misconstrued as allocating land for employment in SADC.

Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph 23.23 are:

~~“At the time of writing a further Circa 4,3000 4,000 dwellings is to be being considered for released forming a Growth Area to the east of Hemel Hempstead in St Albans district to meet their needs (up to 2038) with a possible further 1,500 in a Growth area to the north east to meet longer term needs.”~~

Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to paragraph 23.27 bullet point three are:

~~“Supporting the expansion of Maylands Business Park by continuing to engage with St Albans in relation to the potential East of Hemel Hempstead site in St Albans district and including integrating it integration with the existing business park.”~~

Potential changes (subject to the SADC Local Plan process and ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions) to Policy SP15 are:

~~“Growth will also occur East of Hemel Hempstead which is within St Albans district.”~~

SADC supports the approach to provision of an improved new Household Waste and Recycling Centre for Hemel at 23.56.

SADC would support additional references to potential new sustainable transport access improvements towards Apsley station (e.g. a new segregated cycle path).

Potential changes to Policy SP16 to further strengthen the policy:

#### *Strategic Principles*

*Development across the areas will deliver the following:*

- 1 **Development in accordance with Masterplans, Design Guidance and Design Codes.** Masterplans and design codes will be expected to be prepared by landowners in collaboration with the Local Planning Authorities and with engagement of key stakeholders and communities. **These masterplans and design codes will be required to be endorsed by all Local Planning Authorities ahead of any formal submission of a planning application.**

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12522
<b>Person ID</b>	1207806
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Graebe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH02 - North Hemel  This site is to be "safeguarded" for a decade or two, rather than used for housing now. Why? It seems that this site would be better used now - even in stages - to reduce the huge impact of the Government's imposed housing requirements, rather than victimising the small market towns by allowing damaging small developments such as the two listed above.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12550
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Growth Area HH02</b> Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now. Should be included for development 2021-2038 rather than safeguarded.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12551
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH03 Hospital site. Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear sustainable NHS strategy for this part of Hertfordshire (incl. Watford and St Albans) is confirmed and initiated.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12552
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH06</b> Civic Centre Site. Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12561
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We note the several comments throughout the Draft Plan that underpin the decision to distribute the housing allocations in the manner set out. This will result in very substantial additions to both the major settlements of Berkhamsted and Tring with extensive new releases of Green Belt to be designated as 'Growth Areas'. Although cogently set out in the Plan, neither towns' growth will be organic nor 'sustainable' – as local employment opportunities at the scale to match resident numbers does not exist and will lead to additional out-commuting.</p> <p>Far better to locate new dwellings at scale closer to centres of industry and hence employment. For Dacorum, industry is concentrated in Maylands and the surrounding area.</p> <p>We note the proposals for Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities – the land released for Growth Area HH01 (Phase 1) to be undertaken 2021 -2038 and the Growth Area HH02 – North Hemel (Phase 2) recorded as being released from</p>

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

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12569

**Person ID** 1261562

**Full Name** Sally Symington

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12570
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	HH11: offices should not be restricted to ground floor
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12571
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12583
<b>Person ID</b>	1269559
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jessica Giolda
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.  Keep away from Green Belt
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12632
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 56346 HH01 & HH02 North Hemel (Phase 1 & 2)  The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to both the wastewater network and sewage treatment infrastructure. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the

earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on the network and treatment infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development>.

Planning, either by email [Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk) tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12633

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
 Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 42629 HH03: Hospital Site (previously MU/2)  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12634
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>42631</p> <p>HH04:</p> <p>Paradise/Wood Lane (previously MU/3)</p> <p>On the information available to date we would like additional information about the number of the proposed offices. Considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposed development and the proposal for the addition of a public open space within the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.</p>

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12635

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**  
67937  
HH05: Market Square

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12636

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 67939 HH06: Civic Centre Site  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ  il accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.  Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network  There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.  <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</a> .
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12637
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>67941</p> <p>HH07: NCP</p> <p>Car Park, Hillfield Road</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p>

in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12638

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment** **Site ID**  
**Site Name**

**Water Comments****Waste Comments****Additional Comments**

63213

HH08: Station Gateway

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

**Yes / No**\* **Yes**\* **No****Proposals and Sites****Hemel Hempstead Garden****Communities Other sites****comment****Included files****Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS12639

**Person ID**

1207604



<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>42604</p> <p>HH09: National Grid Land</p> <p>The level of information contained in this document does not allow Thames Water to make a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require more specific details regarding the connection points(s).</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p>

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12640

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**

67946

HH10: Symbio Place, Whiteleaf Road

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email [Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk) tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12641

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>67947</p> <p>HH11:Two</p> <p>Waters North</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p>

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12642

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**

67952

HH12:Two

Waters/London Road

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the site as a part of a development cluster in this location the wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. For this reason, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development.

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby and the proposal of a public space in the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12643
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>65971</p> <p>HH14: 233</p> <p>London Road</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12644
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 65949 HH15: Ebberns Road  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ



Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12645
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 67959 HH16:Two Waters Road / A41 Junction Employment Site

The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on network infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development>.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12646

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>65974</p> <p>HH17: Cupid Green Depot</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12647

<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>67960</p> <p>HH18: Kier Park</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the site as a part of a development cluster in this location the wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. For this reason, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development.</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposal of a public space in the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is located upstream (i.e. before) one of our critical assets, Maylands Balancing Pond which has overtop the last years and it is important to secure that no additional pressure will impose on that. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p>

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12648

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 56228 HH19:Wood Lane End  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12649
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 67961 HH20: Breakspear Way / Green Lane / Boundary Way, Maylands  The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to both the wastewater network and sewage treatment infrastructure. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on the network and treatment infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development</a> . Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12650
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>32838</p> <p>HH21:West Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on network infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development</a>.</p>



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12651
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 39825 HH22: Marchmont Farm

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the site as a part of a development cluster in this location the wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. For this reason, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development.

In accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

There are public sewers crossing your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12652
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>42623</p> <p>HH23: Old Town</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p> <p>In accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12653
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 42607 HH24: Land at Turners Hill  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing.

Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12654

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**  
42611  
HH25: Land to R/O St Margarets Way

/ Datchworth Turn

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email [Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk) tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12655

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

**Site ID**

**Site Name**

**Water Comments**

**Waste Comments****Additional Comments**

67962

HH26: South of Green Lane

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the site as a part of a development cluster in this location the wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support the demand anticipated from this development. For this reason, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development.

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a watercourse nearby and the proposal of a public space in the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

**Yes / No**\* **Yes**\* **No****Proposals and Sites****Hemel Hempstead Garden****Communities Other sites****comment****Included files****Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS12656

**Person ID**

1207604

**Full Name**

Thames Water Planning Policy

<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>57426</p> <p>HH27: Jarman Park - Out of centre retail allocation</p> <p>The level of information contained in this document does not allow Thames Water to make a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require an indication of the scale of development regarding the maximum capacity of the proposed hotel and the rest of the proposed developments.</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the existence of a balancing pond nearby. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12687
<b>Person ID</b>	1269591
<b>Full Name</b>	Ross Campbell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Client Director Aberdeen Standard Investments
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269593
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Jessica Wilson
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p><b>Development Opportunity</b></p> <p>As has been highlighted in Section 2, there is opportunity for development at the Site to assist DBC in achieving the objectives set out in their Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan continues the allocation of the Site in a General Employment Area, the policy around which needs to ensure sufficient flexibility given the Covid-19 pandemic, updates to relevant planning legislation and the Government's and NPPF (2019)'s requirements to make the best use of sustainably located and previously developed This issue is further emphasised by the fact that the Site has been actively marketed since February 2020 with no suitable occupier having been secured.</p>

The Site is located in an area of change whereby a number of recent developments for residential-led mixed use developments are coming forward, including those adjacent along London Road. It is therefore considered that the Site as existing is not contributing positively nor making the best use of its sustainable location, as is required by the NPPF (2019).

In addition, the Site is also largely (although not exclusively) under one ownership and there exists a clear opportunity for intensification to help meet the needs set out in the Draft Local Plan, particularly residential needs. It is also noted that there are no buildings of merit within the site.

ASI are reviewing options for development at the Site, partly due to the lack of interest received during the recent marketing exercise and are keen to work with DBC as part of this given that the Site is considered to have potential for a mix of uses (not just employment), including residential.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12725

**Person ID** 1269605

**Full Name** Ms Hailey Woldt

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

Building blocks higher than 4 stories at Hemel Station will permanently spoil the 'street scene' of Boxmoor. Having nicer buildings there would be nice - even mixed use like restaurants and retail as well as homes - as the old run down buildings currently there add nothing. But having a huge tower next to the beautiful fields of Boxmoor Trust would be too much. Please keep it to 4 stories at most.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12744
<b>Person ID</b>	1250257
<b>Full Name</b>	Kate Harwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Gardens Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Development of Hemel Hempstead</b></p> <p>Although the Draft Plan states in its Mission Statement (23.11) that Garden City Principles will be followed in development plans, the expansion of Hemel Hempstead as proposed is against both Garden City Principles and against the New Town Principles laid out by Jellicoe and others. These require communities to be within easy reach of green open space for health and recreation. In the New Towns including Hemel, this was achieved by having discrete neighbourhoods separated from each other by green open space.</p> <p>HH01, HH02, HH05, HH22 destroy those principles by building on the open land at present available to residents of the communities adjacent to the proposed development areas.</p> <p>The heritage of the 20th century is increasingly being recognised, including addition of 20th century parks and gardens to the HE Register. Dacorum's 20th century heritage as one of the first New Towns should be conserved and enhanced in line with NPPF Chapter 16.</p> <p>The proposed employment development area west of the M1 should have policies to control buildings' height and lighting. The Registered Park and Listed mansion of Gorhambury lies to the east of the M1 and the setting could be harmed by ill-considered proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12751
<b>Person ID</b>	1250256
<b>Full Name</b>	Herts Gardens Trust
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Herts Gardens Trust
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Development of Hemel Hempstead</b></p> <p>Although the Draft Plan states in its Mission Statement (23.11) that Garden City Principles will be followed in development plans, the expansion of Hemel Hempstead as proposed is against both Garden City Principles and against the New Town Principles laid out by Jellicoe and others. These require communities to be within easy reach of green open space for health and recreation. In the New Towns including Hemel, this was achieved by having discrete neighbourhoods separated from each other by green open space.</p> <p>HH01, HH02, HH05, HH22 destroy those principles by building on the open land at present available to residents of the communities adjacent to the proposed development areas.</p> <p>The heritage of the 20th century is increasingly being recognised, including addition of 20th century parks and gardens to the HE Register. Dacorum's 20th century heritage as one of the first New Towns should be conserved and enhanced in line with NPPF Chapter 16.</p> <p>The proposed employment development area west of the M1 should have policies to control buildings' height and lighting. The Registered Park and Listed mansion of Gorhambury lies to the east of the M1 and the setting could be harmed by ill-considered proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12767
<b>Person ID</b>	1269624
<b>Full Name</b>	David Burne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Redington Capital
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269623
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mark Harris
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Associate Bidwells LLP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>This representation is made on behalf Redington Capital who have an interest in land off London Road, Apsley, currently identified in the Development Plan as part of a General Employment Area (GEA). As is discussed below, the site, which contains a vacant 70,0000 sq ft office building, has been subject to a request for pre-application advice in relation to the potential redevelopment for a residential-led, mixed use scheme.</p> <p>Whilst Redington Capital are considering their next steps with regards a planning application, they are also keen to inform the development of the Local Plan to ensure it is fit for purpose moving forward, supports the delivery of much needed</p>

housing in the area and provides sufficient flexibility to allow the appropriate redevelopment of land that is no longer required for its existing use.

This representation is broken down into two key areas; Housing Need and Supply and Employment Land Provision.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12771

**Person ID** 1269624

**Full Name** David Burne

**Organisation Details** Redington Capital

**Agent ID** 1269623

**Agent Full Name** Mark  
Harris

**Agent Organisation** Associate  
Bidwells LLP

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel  
Hempstead Garden  
Communities comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

The Employment Topic Paper goes on to recognise a number of points which align with our position that the approach to restricting the loss of office floorspace is inappropriate. In particular, the input of the Councils' own Economic Development and Infrastructure Team (paragraph 4.26) which confirms (amongst other points) that:

- Demand for large office buildings/space is falling as the nature of business changes
- There is a major shortage of smaller units to facilitate business growth
- A criteria based policy could be considered to protect better quality units

The first of these two points are particularly pertinent to Redington Capital's interests at Network House at Apsley which comprises a dated, vacant 70,000 sqft office building which, despite marketing, has remained unoccupied for over a year.

The building, despite theoretically being a good location for office use due to the proximity to the railway station, is highly likely to remain vacant for the foreseeable future, not making a contribution to the employment needs of the area. This is due to the unsuitability of the current building, and the fact that it is financial unviable to bring the office up to the standard that may (again theoretically) make it attractive to occupiers.

A mixed-use development of the site, incorporating some small office units to meet the identified need, alongside other uses, could be viable – but would not be allowed under the draft Policy SP2 due to a net loss in floorspace.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12791

**Person ID** 1269630

**Full Name** Christopher Lyne

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment** I believe that the plans for Station Gateway pose a question of prioritisation. Do we want to retain the views onto the moor, enjoyed by residents and visitors alike, as they have been for centuries, or do we want to provide high rise housing for incoming commuters (who may prove a diminishing number) and draw people away from the town centre with new retail outlets in the station area. The question really is a no-brainer, which the Two Waters consultation could be said to have already answered. Please think again.

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

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12798
<b>Person ID</b>	1269632
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Katrina Lovett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Phase 2 north Hemel Hempstead</p> <p>I am unsure if the allotment site in <u>Grovehill</u> is included to be built on. The allotment is on a slope and the land at the bottom is often flooded with the amount of rain we have had in the last few years. The area outside the fenced bit of the allotment has been turned into a wild flower area to attract insects and bees.</p> <p>There are now long waiting lists for allotments in Hemel Hempstead and it is an area that has helped many of us who have a allotment at that site cope with our mental health during COVID.</p> <p>As it is an allotment it should now stay as one so it can service the local people in <u>Grovehill</u> as there are no other allotments in <u>Grovehill</u> area.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS12839
<b>Person ID</b>	1260255
<b>Full Name</b>	KTB Commercial
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260252
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Peter Biggs
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>I act for KTB Commercial Ltd who have an interest on a piece of land to the south east of 92 Piccotts End Road. The parcel of land is outlined in red on the attached plan. The land is currently used for grazing horses and has a substantial timber boarded and brickwork building located at the northern end used for horses and storage of equipment. Access to the building is from a track from Piccotts End Lane to the south of the site.</p> <p>The landowner of this site also owns the paddock to the south of this piece of land.</p> <p>Although the smaller site was not put forward through the Council's Call for Sites process, KTB Commercial Ltd have retained the services of PJB Planning to consider the opportunity to redevelop the site for residential development. The attached document prepared by Douglas &amp; King Architect provides an initial review of the site and considers the development potential, comprising a small limited development of 3 residential properties. The main emphasis of this proposal is to significantly improve the appearance of the site within the Conservation Area and result in an enhancement to the views of the site, particularly from Piccotts End Road to the south west.</p> <p>In terms of the Local Plan consultation, this response focuses on the particular issue of the settlement hierarchy and identification of villages for development. The primary thrust of this submission being that this site should be included within the settlement boundary of the Piccotts End, and that Piccotts End should be classed as a village which allows, subject to other considerations and policy requirements, limited infilling within the village as defined by paragraph 145 e) of the NPPF 2019.</p>

I have attached a drawing showing how the draft Proposals Map should be amended to include this site within the settlement boundary of Piccotts End.

With this change to the settlement boundary, it is considered this site would constitute an infill site between an established row of dwellings and the settlement boundary, and in principle the proposed development for 3 dwellings would fall within the allowed Green Belt exception paragraph 145 e) of the NPPF 2019.

Paragraphs 19.13 to 19.21 and Policy DM39 provide further detail of how the Council defines “Selected Small Villages” in the Green Belt.

Paragraph 19.16 identifies Chipperfield, Flamstead, Potten End and Wigginton within the Green Belt as selected smaller villages. Paragraph 19.17 goes on to state that other settlements and hamlets in the Borough are not considered to constitute villages.

It is worth noting that whilst the Council make this statement in Paragraph 19.17, elsewhere within the Plan “Other small villages” are referred to, for example, within Table 1: Settlement Hierarchy.

The Council therefore appear to contradict themselves within the Plan as to what is and what is not a village.

Paragraph 19.17 seeks to provide a further guidance as to how the Council has classed a settlement as a village and sets out 4 criteria:

- they do not have the necessary cohesiveness to justify a boundary;
- they do not contain enough key services and infrastructure to warrant settlement status;
- they simply form the ribbon development of adjoining larger settlements; or
- in order to protect their intrinsic character from development

In the case of Piccotts End, the Council’s Proposal Map provides a settlement boundary around what is considered by the Council to be the settlement edge. As such, this complies with the first criteria in that a sense of cohesiveness within the settlement.

Piccotts End has a public house, a number of businesses, antique, bus stops along Piccotts End Road, and the historic Piccotts End Paintings. These businesses, services and tourist attractions distinguish the settlement at Piccotts End from others. It is also located in close proximity to both Hemel Hempstead and the planned Growth Area of Hemel North. As such, it complies with the second criteria set out in Paragraph 19.17.

Piccott End itself cannot be classed as a form of ribbon development. It has a historic street forming a back bone to the village, with more recent development at either end. Although it is in close proximity to Hemel Hempstead, it does not adjoin the larger settlement, and has its own village identity. The third criteria therefore does not apply to Piccotts End.

The fourth criteria should not be used to define what is considered to be a village or not. Other policies within the Local Plan will seek to protect heritage assets and Conservation Area, and it should not be the role of policy DM39 to prevent development within these areas as a matter of principle. It is therefore considered that the fourth criteria is not relevant to considering what is and what is not classed as a village.

It is noted that this criterion for defining a village is taken from the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Study Main Report October 2017. It was at this stage the Council took the view not to consider settlements, such as Piccotts End, as a village for planning purposes.

However, Piccotts End clearly has attributes of a village, in that it has a number of businesses providing employment opportunities, including the Marchmont Farm workshops, a metal fabrication firm, antique shop, and a fencing and landscaping company based within the village. All of these would have been classed as a higher-order service within the 2017 report, if Piccotts End had been included in the review. The village also has The Marchmount Arms public house at its southern end, which would have been scored as a key service within the 2017 report.

The 2017 Hierarchy report also consider accessibility. Piccotts End has number of bus stops through the village along Piccotts End Road; there is a bus service that provides a direct route into Hemel Hempstead; the bus service runs Monday to Friday and after 9am; and there are fewer than 10 trains/buses per day. The 2017 Hierarchy report would have scored this level of bus service provision as limited, but as the village is within 5 km of Hemel Hempstead it would have been scored overall a Low Accessibility rating.

Based on this scoring and assessment of the settlement structure, at the very least Piccotts End should have been classed as a village. This assessment also does not take into account the proximity of the new service and facilities that will be provided at North Hemel Garden Community.

As such, Policy DM39 should be amended to recognise the opportunity that villages such as Piccotts End can provide in terms of delivering sympathetic high quality limited infill development in compliance with paragraph 145 of the NPPF 2019.

It is also proposed that the settlement boundary of Piccotts End should be amended to include the parcel of land to the south east of 92 Piccotts End, which is identified on the attached plan.

The attached document prepared by Douglas & King Architects, demonstrates how this piece of land is part of the village and that a small scale limited development of 3 properties on this land between 92 Piccotts End and the proposed village boundary, would significantly enhance the appearance of the site and views of the Piccotts End Conservation Area.

### **In conclusion**

This letter has set out a response to the policies proposed in the new draft Local Plan, and particularly highlights that to be consistent with national planning guidance within the Green Belt, Piccotts End should be defined as a village within which limited infill development is allowed in principle. This letter also makes a case for extending the settlement boundary at Piccotts End to include the parcel of land and stables to the south east of 92 Piccotts End.

Finally, that attached document prepared by Douglas & King Architects reviews the context of the site and development potential to fall within the new Policy DM39 and other relevant policies in the new Local Plan and paragraph 145 e) of the NPPF 2019.

### **Included files**

[PCTe\\_SK\\_020\\_A Village Boundary.pdf](#)  
[PCTe\\_EX\\_100\\_A Extg Site Layout.pdf](#)  
[PCTe\\_Feasibility Doc\\_Jan 2021.pdf \(1\)](#)

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12858
<b>Person ID</b>	1269653
<b>Full Name</b>	Tony Dowle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Rathbawn Properties Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269652
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Miss Lucy Morris
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>NORTH HEMEL URBAN EXTENSION</b></p> <p>Through Policy SP14 (Delivering Hemel Garden Communities) and Policy SP15 (Delivering Growth in Hemel Hempstead), the Council is proposing an urban extension to North Hemel comprising 5,500 homes, 1,500 of which will be delivered in the Plan Period. Part of this extension falls within the boundary of St Albans City and District Council (SADC).</p> <p>The Plan mentions at paragraph 23.14, that the Council will work closely with SADC to deliver the allocation, including developing a masterplan. However, there is no recognition of SADC having voted to formally withdraw its Local Plan in November 2020 and the implications this may have on the deliverability of the site. SADC is now starting work on a new Local Plan.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Inspector's letter to SADC concluded that the council had failed in its Duty to Cooperate, particularly in relation to discussions (including with DBC) around the ability to meet housing need. This is something which DBC needs to consider carefully, in order to avoid failing in the same regard when its own Plan is being examined.</p> <p>At a SADC Planning Policy Committee meeting on 2 February 2021, SADC's draft response to DBC's Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation was discussed. Draft minutes for this meeting have not yet been published. Whilst the draft response shows that SADC planning officers are generally supportive of DBC's Plan, some concerns were raised over the characterisation of the Hemel Garden Communities and how DBC has portrayed the status of SADC's Local Plan.</p> <p>The response makes it clear that SADC would like it to be noted that it is at the very early stages in its Local Plan production and no decisions have been made on the content of the Local Plan or its spatial strategy. It has requested amendments to policy wording to reflect that development of the Hemel Garden Communities to the east, within SADC,</p>

is being *considered* rather than is *expected*. This adds a layer of additional uncertainty over the ability of the Hemel Garden Communities to deliver the level of proposed housing within the Plan Period.

SADC's planning officers have raised concerns about a proposed secondary school shown in DBC's Local Plan which is located within SADC's administrative boundaries and have questioned the lack of evidence to support this school.

Whilst officers are supportive of the overall approach to the Hemel Garden Communities, they have asked for DBC to remove references to new housing, new employment and potential schools within the SADC boundary, and have concerns about how development at Maylands Business Park may be seen as allocating land for employment within the SADC boundary. SADC has reminded DBC that councils can only allocate land for development within their own boundaries.

SADC further notes that its withdrawn Local Plan did not contain any housing east of the M1 which is included on DBC's key diagrams or schools in the locations indicated by DBC. It is therefore unclear what evidence DBC has used to draw up these diagrams.

SADC has also asked for clarification that the 1,500 homes which are proposed to come forward at this location in the Plan Period, are to be located with DBC's own administrative boundaries. We consider that this should be explicitly referred to within Table 32, as set out in Policy SP15.

Therefore, there are questions as to how the allocations at Hemel Garden Communities can come forward, with the need to work closely with SADC to deliver them and whether the early status of SADC preparing a Local Plan will affect this delivery. DBC needs to fully consider the implications of delays in securing delivery at this location and what effect it could have on meeting its housing requirement.

It is recommended that DBC looks at other potential sources of delivery in order to ensure it can meet its housing requirement in full over the Plan period and address its critical housing supply issues.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS12892

**Person ID** 1269665

**Full Name** Mr Martin Hicks

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Growth Area HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1) This will isolate a LNR and is therefore unsustainable</p> <p>Growth Area HH02: North Hemel (Phase 2) This will isolate ancient semi-natural woodland, and is therefore unsustainable.</p> <p>Growth Area HH12:Two Waters/London Road This will destroy part of a Local Wildlife Site, part of Boxmoor Common and isolate and fragment a section of the river valley of the Bulbourne / Gade. It is therefore unsustainable.</p> <p>Growth Area HH16: Two Waters Road / A41 Junction Employment Site This will further isolate Roughdown Common SSSI and is therefore unsustainable.</p> <p>Growth Area HH21: West Hemel Hempstead This will essentially isolate Shrub Hill Common LNR and as such is unsustainable.</p> <p>Growth Area HH22: Marchmont Farm This will isolate Howe Grove LNR and as such is unsustainable.</p> <p>Growth Area HH24: Land at Turners Hill This will reduce the ecologically valuable series of ancient meadows in Hemel Hempstead. As such, it is unsustainable.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12916
<b>Person ID</b>	1269666
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Oliver

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Building tower blocks of over 4 storeys round Hemel Hempstead station will detract from the land managed by the Box Moor Trust, which attracts most people to that area in the first place. The last year has proven that commuting to a workplace central London is no longer necessary. Working practices have changed, and being able to reach the capital quickly is neither desirable or sensible.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12937
<b>Person ID</b>	1269678
<b>Full Name</b>	GARY TRENT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	No Green Belt land should be sacrificed for development.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS12999
<b>Person ID</b>	1059698
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Lyne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	I believe that the plans for Station Gateway pose a question of prioritisation. Do we want to retain the views onto the moor, enjoyed by residents and visitors alike, as they have been for centuries, or do we want to provide high rise housing for incoming commuters (who may prove a diminishing number) and draw people away from the town centre with new retail outlets in the station area. The question really is a no-brainer, which the Two Waters consultation could be said to have already answered. Please think again.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	



<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13241
<b>Person ID</b>	1270143
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Thomas Parsons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes even badgers.</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p>

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS13276

**Person ID** 1270156

**Full Name** Ms Pauline Taylor

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	With regards to the building over the road opposite the adventure park chaulden , the historic woodland lane is this to be left untouched?
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13303
<b>Person ID</b>	1270186
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie English
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I would like to add my comments to the local plan consultation please</p> <p>I have 2 areas of development that I would like to comment on please.</p> <p>1) HH08 Station Gateway development in Hemel Hempstead. Whilst I believe this area is overdue for development and would welcome retail and residential opportunities, I do think that 8 stories would be too high and out of character for this area. The impact on properties on Roughdown Avenue would be unfair and it would dominate the area. Also I would ask that plans consider access from the rear of the station to the newly developed area so that residents from Felden can use the new facilities more readily.</p> <p>2) HH21 West Hemel Hempstead. This is such a huge development of up to 1150 houses. It will obliterate the views of green fields from my home and neighbourhood. This green space is precious and a large part of the appeal of the area.</p>

A new primary school will not go far enough to address the issues with school places in the area. Traffic is already an issue - any issues on the a41 and surrounding roads increase traffic on London road and jams form as people take shortcuts at Winkwell. This area is already narrow and cannot accommodate such an increase in traffic.

I hope you add my views to the consultation.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS13316

**Person ID** 1270198

**Full Name** Mr Hilary Curtis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

If building in Dacorum is absolutely necessary, look to the town centres, particularly the Marlowes - Debenhams will make good flats.

Keep away from Green Belt

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

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13343
<b>Person ID</b>	1270207
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Helena Thorpe Foulsham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife some 10+ years ago.</p> <p>Our current environment means that we can look out of our window and gaze upon the multitude of flora and fauna that we have become accustomed to in the many years of living here.</p> <p>We have seen baby foxes grow into adults reproducing their own families. Listening to the wildlife throughout the day and night when the world sleeps and they go about their business.</p> <p>We watch the trees turn their leaves from a rich green to a golden red and fall before winter and start to bud and grow again when the sun warms the Earth from the spring.</p> <p>We watch the birds build their nests in the strong trees that have stood for centuries. Providing shelter for those inside the trunks and under their umbrella leaves.</p> <p>The brambles that hide the rabbits which scoot across the fields in the early mornings and at dusk. How can we allow urbanization to continue when it destroys not only the aesthetics of the</p>

Countryside, but the removal of habitats of so many critical animals and flora which are of the utmost importance to everyone.

the land in which the planning is being considered, is a flood plain. When there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers which flow and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds Lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days and over the years have become increasingly bigger and stay longer. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents.

Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. How are the Council going to implement this and ensure the new homes will act upon this? The specified location is rural, there is nothing there, so walking to a nearby shop would be at least 20 mins - a Mother with children in tow with bags of shopping? The same family having to travel to the nearby school on cycles. Sadly the encouraging the residents to use active travel instead of vehicles would be a negative response.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport within the existing areas of Hemel has been promised for years and never delivered, therefore it can not be deemed a trusted or usable and reliable service.

M1 links whilst convenient to the planned area would involve additional car use, so again the active travel implication would be non effective here.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS13425

**Person ID** 1270261

<b>Full Name</b>	MRS SAFFRON MURRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p> <p>For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13562
<b>Person ID</b>	1207724

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Gill Broadbent
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>My comments are respect of HH08:</p> <p>* buildings of up to 8 storeys (and possibly more) would be very much out of character with the neighbouring area. This site is right next to moorland/common land which runs alongside the river/canal - this gives the area a very rural and countryside feel, which is enjoyed by many residents who take recreation and exercise on the moor - and wildlife/animals use the moor. The moorland forms part of Boxmoor village, and buildings that reflect the villagey feel would be more appropriate. The current station buildings are low-level and cannot be seen well from the moor, and do not impact on the enjoyment of the moor.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13572
<b>Person ID</b>	1227768
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Denise Young
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes even badgers.</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p> <p>For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13703
<b>Person ID</b>	1270361
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jon Whysall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Yes, the Boxmoor and Two Waters sites will add ridiculous amounts of traffic and congestion to the already very busy roads. The last time my partner was involved in a consultation about this development (she took part in the 2017 resident consultation) your answer was to encourage cycling by 'offering free bike racks'.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13737

<b>Person ID</b>	1270365
<b>Full Name</b>	Trustees of Gaddesden Estate
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Trustees of Gaddesden Estate (GaddesdenTrust)
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270367
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr David Fletcher
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director – National Development & Planning Strutt and Parker
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH01 and HH02 are located on the northern side of Hemel Hempstead where there are no major corridor or road links and the land is adjacent to the AONB. As a result, these allocations will result in significant upfront cost/investment in infrastructure in terms of highways (roads, roundabouts, pedestrian/cycle paths, signage/gantries/lighting ) and the installation of services/utilities (electricity/gas, water/drainage, and media). The allocations would also result in a significant loss of prime agricultural land.</p> <p>Not only does this raise considerable concerns regarding the impact on the Chiltern AONB (which is elaborated on in further detail in section 3), as well as the pro-longed construction time over many years, it is also likely to result in deliverability and completion issues due to ongoing costs of infrastructure.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is difficult to see how these allocations will be financially viable such that they could sustainably maintain a consistent delivery rate and supply of housing over the plan period. This is particularly important as the ESG contains some very ambitious housing completion targets during the middle of the plan period. The housing trajectory scales up from 753 new dwelling in 2024/2025 to nearly double that by 2027/2028 to 1,347 new dwellings. Furthermore, the small collection of large allocations is not only under significant pressure to deliver housing, but also under pressure to deliver them without compromising the quality. Consideration will need to be given to the government's direction of travel of the 'building beautiful' agenda and forthcoming National Design Density of housing development to create successful places, will play an important role and there are concerns that large allocations once divided into phased parcels would struggle to implement the quantum of development.</p> <p>Viability and delivery issues that are often experienced by large, phased allocations that can easily stall the construction process and subsequently delay delivery. Further evidence needs to be provided to demonstrate that HH01 and HH02 are deliverable in that regard.</p> <p>Therefore, there is significant uncertainty with the levels of infrastructure investment required, ambitious delivery rate/supply, and quality of development of the Council's. It is therefore advised that the Council reassess its ESG by relieving the</p>

pressure on large allocations on towns by distributing housing across the borough. This strategy would have the benefit of not only achieving proportionate and more sustainable growth, but also help to maintain and grow smaller settlement, particularly local businesses and facilities. It would also increase the amount of choice people would have to live and work. The increase in distribution of housing to all parts of the borough would also to avoid creating property hot spots where house prices are too expensive. With the average house price in Dacorum being £453,950 (national average £269,000 – according to ONS) this is a fundamental concern which the EGS should be seeking to address/help balance. More housing in more locations creates more choice and better more inclusive and sustainable communities.

Of the three strategic sites proposed for allocation (as referenced in paragraph 2.12), particular concern is raised in relation to North Hemel, given that it is firstly the largest allocation within the Borough and secondly, it is the only strategic location to immediately adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

One of the main constraints to delivering growth in Dacorum is the Green Belt and The Green Belt covers most of the borough including the main towns such as Hemel Hempstead. The AONB which overlaps in places with the Green Belt, extends only to the north of the borough. The south of the Borough, which includes settlements such as Kings Langley, Abbots Langley, Bovingdon, Chipperfield along with the south side of Hemel Hempstead all benefit from being located some distance from the AONB.

Paragraph 71 of the NPPF, specifically states that in identifying land for new homes, new housing should not be allocated on land which would compromise the protection given to areas or assets of particular importance in this framework, such as AONB's. In addition, paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and AONB's., which have the highest protection in relation to these issues.

Historically, concerns regarding the adverse impact on the character of the AONB has prevented any significant development north of Grove Hill, with only minimal 'ribbon' development along Leighton Buzzard Road.

Therefore, the proposed approach within the Local Plan and in particular the proposed allocation of the largest housing and employment site in the Borough immediately adjacent to the AONB is not considered to accord with paragraphs 71 and 172 of the There are a number of locations elsewhere in the Borough where growth could be directed that does not impact upon the AONB, including land to the south of Hemel Hempstead. As explained above, South Hemel Hempstead, also benefits from significantly better road connectivity, with ease of access to the A41, M1 and M25. Therefore, it is unclear why, North Hemel has been chosen as a location for development, given that it is clearly not the most appropriate strategy for growth when considered against the alternatives.

Furthermore, it is considered that emerging Policies HH01 and HH01, are in direct conflict with Policy DM27 of the emerging Local Policy DM27 of the draft local plan describes the role that development in the Chiltern AONB plays in helping to "conserve, restore or enhance the prevailing quality, character and condition of the area". The policy continues, outlining the only few exceptional circumstances in which development will be permitted; the AONB must not be adversely impacted in any way, unless satisfactorily mitigated. In summary, Policy DM27 states that "permission for major developments in the Chilterns AONB's will be refused unless exceptional circumstances prevail as defined by national planning policy".

A development of up to 5,550 on land that immediately abuts the AONB, is considered to be at odds with both national policy and policy DM27, which seeks to protect the character of the AONB. To the north of HH01 and HH02, the land rises steeply into the AONB and the proposed development will be clearly visible and visually intrusive into the This will have an adverse impact upon both visitors and residents within the AONB.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS13739

**Person ID** 1270365

**Full Name** Trustees of Gaddesden Estate

**Organisation Details** Trustees of Gaddesden Estate (GaddesdenTrust)

**Agent ID** 1270367

**Agent Full Name** Mr  
David  
Fletcher

**Agent Organisation** Director – National Development & Planning  
Strutt and Parker

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

One of the principle of objectives of the EGS is about mitigating and adapting to climate change by reducing the causes and promoting the use of renewable resources, reducing carbon emissions and waste and protecting natural Another key principle which is linked to this is conserving and protecting the natural environment by minimising the effects of pollution, reducing the impact of new development on air quality, providing biodiversity net gain and conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of the countryside and the Chiltern AONB.

The Council declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019 to respond to the challenges of reducing the impact of climate. Therefore, it is important that the EGS firstly reflects the challenges and promotes a growth strategy that positively contributes towards achieving the goals of reducing climate change through sustainable. Unfortunately, the EGS is seeking to retrofit the mitigation around the growth strategy rather than it being the starting point to inform the strategy. There is significant evidence from other similar growth strategies in nearby authorities that informs the EGS of large allocations is not sustainable.

This has often been a factor contributing to Planning Inspectors to find draft local plans unsound due to an over reliance on large sites for housing delivery, rather than a more holistic approach, comprising a range of site Paragraph 68 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises the important contribution that small and medium sized sites can make to meeting the housing requirement of an area as they can be built out relatively quickly. It specifically requires local planning authorities to identify at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare.

Two adjacent sites comprising a total of 5,550 dwellings with associated services and infrastructure are certain to have lengthy build out rates; the emerging plan describes site HH02 as a 'long term' development, and does not plan for delivery to commence until 2038.

Considering the above, it is reasonable to assume that the land comprising the two allocations will be undergoing varying levels of construction, from above ground works to development completion, for at least 10 years; once phase 1 has been completed, work will begin on phase 2. Therefore, any surrounding land, including land owned by the Trustees of Gaddesden Estate and nearby small villages and hamlets must deal with all adverse impacts and significant inconveniences associated with large scale development for several years.

It is likely that a significant impact of the development at North Hemel Hempstead will severely impact congestion on the Leighton Buzzard Road, the main road connecting Hemel Hempstead to the villages to the north, and the proposed housing allocations. As one of the few primary roads providing access between Hemel Hempstead and the area to the north, congestion is already a cause for concern. Once construction traffic becomes dependent on this road, it is likely the road will not have sufficient capacity to cope with the increased amount of frequency of traffic.

It is unclear if the EGS has carried out a carbon calculation to demonstrate the amount of carbon emissions that each of the large allocations would create and what impact the mitigation measures would have in off-setting the. Clearly, from a purely observational perspective, the amount of carbon produced from the infrastructure that would be required just to provide a developable site, would be significant in itself. Therefore, the allocations would be starting from a significantly negative carbon starting point.

In order to be both compliant with national policy and acceptable from our client's perspective, both allocations must be revised, at present they are impractical and An allocation of such a large size in a rural area surrounded by small villages and agricultural development will undoubtedly result in long term adverse impacts, not able to be sufficiently mitigated against. If some level of development must occur, it must be of a far smaller scale in order to be practical and deliverable

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13740
<b>Person ID</b>	1270365
<b>Full Name</b>	Trustees of Gaddesden Estate
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Trustees of Gaddesden Estate (GaddesdenTrust)
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270367
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr David Fletcher
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director – National Development & Planning Strutt and Parker
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As set out within section 2 of this representation, the proposed allocation of land to the North of Hemel Hempstead within policies HH01 and HH02 is considered to be unsound having regard to national Both policies should be deleted from the emerging Local Plan and alternative strategy should be considered. Notwithstanding this, in the event that the two allocations are not removed from the plan, it is imperative that the policy wording is amended in order to safeguard to an extent the amenity of the AONB and neighbouring residential receptors.</p> <p>In order to protect the integrity of the Chiltern AONB, extensive screening and buffering through tree planting, shrub planting and hedgerows along the allocations northern boundary is Screening of this nature is still not capable of completely protecting the character of the AONB, but is critical to prevent the extent of adverse impacts which are unavoidable with an allocation of this nature. Furthermore, clarification is required regarding the location of the proposed new bypass within the allocation; this is something that is another huge factor impacting the Chiltern AONB, its potential impact cannot be sufficiently evaluated without additional detail and clarification. It is imperative that this new bypass is not situated to the north of the allocation, given the likely adverse impact a road to the north would have in terms of noise and air quality upon the AONB.</p>

It is also important that heritage assets are fully protected as a result of the The listed buildings in proximity to the allocations include:

- Grade II South Bridge at Water End Over The River Gade, UID 1101225;
- Grade II The Red Lion Public House and Attached Coachhouse, 1348058;
- Grade II Grist House Farm, UID 1101227;
- Grade II\* The Golden Parsonage And Garden Walls Attached on North East, UID 1101260; and
- Grade II Barn at Grist House Farm 25 Metres to South East of House, UID 1348059.
- Grade II Gaddesden Lodge, UID 1172970
- Grade II Gaddesden Place Stables and Attached Walls, UID 1101254
- Grade II\* Gaddesden Place, UID 1101253
- Grade II Corner Farm, UID 1348036
- Grade II Barn and Stables at Little Lovetts End Farm, UID 1173064

These local heritage assets must be protected not just from the allocations, but from any adverse impacts associated with the construction Of particular significance is the Golden Parsonage, a Grade II\* listed building.

It is recommended that the following amendments are made to the policy wording of policies HH01 and HH02 as highlighted in red follows:

The site's masterplan should be developed in accordance with The Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Spatial Vision and other supporting guidance. Design codes will be developed alongside the Plan to support the Masterplan. The north of the site shall be safeguarded solely for use as recreational area/green buffer to the The northern parcels within the development shall be of a low density and have a maximum storey height of 2 storeys.

The site will be brought forward with a masterplan showing a comprehensive phasing programme for development to be prepared in consort with the local planning authority.

The allocations *North Hemel (Phase 1)* and *North Hemel (Phase 2)* should be planned together, as a minimum through closely aligned masterplans taking an integrated approach to the joint site

#### **Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport:**

Development of the site should seek to achieve a 60% share of sustainable transport modes by 2050. Primary access to be provided via Leighton Buzzard Road/B440 with secondary access to be provided via Link Road (GA-HH22 – Marchmont Farm).

Safeguard sufficient land to provide for a new strategic corridor route (40mph) which will connect the Leighton Buzzard Road to North Hemel (Phase 2) and the allocations to the east (St Albans City and District Council Local Plan). The preferred route will be situated towards the south of the development with suitable measures to ensure safeguarding of the AONB from increased traffic.

Create a new district/local/neighbourhood centre, masterplanned in a way which connects to existing and future The centre should include new retail and community facilities to serve the day-to-day needs of new and existing residents, and a medium or large supermarket if it is decided not to build this facility on site HH02.



Provide 3 ha of land for and deliver a new primary school, to be located at the district/local/neighbourhood centre.

Provide 13 ha of land for and deliver a new secondary school on site.

Consideration should be given to Controlled Waters as a receptor to potential ground contamination.

Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities:

- The topography of the site with particular attention to those areas which are highly inter-visible;
- Areas which share characteristics with or create the setting for the Chilterns AONB;
- The setting of the historic settlement and conservation area of Piccotts End;
- The variation in landscape sensitivity within the parcel;
- Conserving enhancing or restoring the hedgerows and field patterns and boundaries;
- Conserving and enhancing the historic sunken lanes and PRow;
- The vernacular, use of materials and setting of the existing farmsteads;
- The characteristic ridgelines and tree-lined skylines of the area; and
- **No development shall be situated within 350 metres of the AONB**

Undertake a project level Habitats Regulations Assessment to ensure that no significant adverse effects take place on designated/European sites where pathways exist

Deliver Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on-site to offset potential adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC arising from recreational The scale and form of this SANG will need to be agreed with Natural England in advance of the submission of an outline planning application.

Use the new landscape structure to develop a series of new green and blue infrastructure corridors through the site and connect with existing green networks in the area

Retain and where possible enhance Ancient Woodland both within (Varney's wood) and on the edge of the site.

#### **Historic environment and Cultural Heritage:**

Ensure the heritage assets at Piccotts End (including the Conservation Area, Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments) are conserved through appropriate landscape mitigation measures on land to be retained in the Green Belt.

#### **Allocation Scope of Allocated Land**

The scope of the land allocated also appears to be solely on the basis of landownership. As shown in appendix A, our clients own land adjacent to Leighton Buzzard The land allocated within HH01, adjoins this parcel of land to both the east and south boundaries. It appears that the only reason that this land has been excluded from the area allocated as part of HH01 is on the basis of landownership rather, than any sound planning reason for excluding it. It is important that at this stage, that technical work is undertaken to inform the proposed route of the new bypass, to provide certainty that this field (or part of it) will be required to provide highway infrastructure works.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13789
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes even badgers.</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p>

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS13816

**Person ID** 1270385

**Full Name** Ms Katy Regan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Moving Household Waste to HH01 with no route to the north for >7.5 tonne vehicles and overlooked by AoNB not in line with policy.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13824
<b>Person ID</b>	1207914
<b>Full Name</b>	Maria Oliver
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Four storey buildings near Hemel Hempstead station will spoil the 'feel' of Boxmoor. Boxmoor residents are attracted to the area because of the views beyond the station towards Roughdown common and the woods. High storey buildings will detract from the area.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13837
<b>Person ID</b>	777073
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Lyne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Station Gateway: The previous (Two Waters) consultation on the plans for the Station Gateway – showed very clearly that development of more than 4 storeys is totally inappropriate for the location and unacceptable to residents. This is a very complex project involving the railway and other stakeholders. It seems that DBC is being driven by the developers in this, as it is in their interests (and their interests alone) to promote high rise apartments with view over the Moor.</li> </ul> <p>However, such development would be utterly detrimental to the Moor itself and unacceptable to existing residents. Moreover, such a development is not intended for local people, but for commuters to London, for people moving out of London. The Covid pandemic and Brexit have probably changed the nation's living, working and shopping patterns irrevocably in ways it is too soon to predict but it is likely to render the intentions behind this development null and void, being designed for large-scale commuting. There is likely to be less commuting. Those who previously commuted to London are likely to only travel 2 or 3 times a week in the future. The intended retail units in this development risk taking away business from the town centre which already needs as much stimulus as it can get if it is not to die. The plan for the Station Gateway may well be out-dated before it even starts.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden</b>	

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13838
<b>Person ID</b>	777073
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Lyne
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hemel Garden Communities: This project is just too big, takes up unnecessary amounts of precious Green Belt land and will create unbalance on the north-east side of Hemel.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13916
<b>Person ID</b>	1207810
<b>Full Name</b>	Louisa Groves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Hemel Hempstead hospital - with 16,600 new homes being proposed, DBC are still proposing that we all go to a run down hospital in Watford that is already struggling to cope with demand?  Station Gateway - residents have already informed you that they did not want more than 4 storeys at this sight and this has been ignored. The Moor in Boxmoor is very important to residents you are not listening to them.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13937
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Growth Area HH02</b> Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now. Should be included for development in the period of this Local Plan period rather than safeguarded for potential future use.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13938
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH03</b> Hospital site. Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear and sustainable NHS strategy for West Hertfordshire is confirmed and initiated.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13939
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH06</b> Civic Centre Site. Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13958
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Growth Area HH02</b> Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now. Should be included for development in the period of this Local Plan period rather than safeguarded for potential future use.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13959
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH03</b> Hospital site. Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear and sustainable NHS strategy for West Hertfordshire is confirmed and initiated.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13960
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH06</b> Civic Centre Site. Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS13976
<b>Person ID</b>	1270411
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jacqui Parr

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Yes, the Boxmoor and Two Waters sites will add ridiculous amounts of traffic and congestion to the already very busy roads. The last time I was involved in a consultation about this development (I took part in the 2017 resident consultation) your answer was to encourage cycling by 'offering free bike racks'.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14028
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The development to the north of Hemel Hempstead seems to be based principally on a large Green Belt site. However, access in and around Link Road would seem to be inadequate.</p> <p>The solution is flawed in that a 'new' road from Junction 8/M1 to the now B440 will simply undo the benefits of the recent detrunking of that road. While HGV vehicles would still be banned, a substantial increase in traffic can be anticipated over and above that generated by the development (s). This will have a deleterious effect on the area, including surrounding villages.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14033
<b>Person ID</b>	1270428
<b>Full Name</b>	KIERAN HOLLAND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	As homeowners on the Avenue throughfare of the Fields End Phase 1 /North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its quiet cul de sac, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.

Knowing that we will soon live on a main busy through road we are concerned regarding the local infrastructure surrounding us.

Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes over 1/2 an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be up to an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home (through flooded roads). As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1/M25 - as such, this will also be encouraging necessary car use.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14096

**Person ID** 1270485

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Colin Poole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1261397
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Chloe French
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Planning Associate Bidwells LLP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Our client owns land on the edge of Piccotts End adjoining the Marchmont Farm allocation. A site location plan has been included within this submission for ease of reference. The site has been subject to a pre-application submission for circa 9 self-build properties (reduced to 7 properties) and it is our intention to submit an outline planning application once the pre-application process has been completed. A copy of the latest proposed layout is also attached for ease of reference. The site was identified as site 73 in the Site Selection Topic Paper (November 2020).</p> <p>We have significant concerns with the emerging Local Plan in terms of the housing need and supply of development and parts of the development strategy. This representation will however focus on the self and custom build (SCB) element of the Plan, where we feel we can contribute to ensuring the success of this aspiration of both the Dacorum Local Plan as well as the national legislation and guidance.</p> <p><b>Housing Need and Supply</b></p> <p>The Council expect this plan to deliver 16,900 homes over the plan period. This is however significantly below what the plan should be delivering. Although we sympathise that this plan has been prepared in a turbulent time in terms of the pandemic and the changes to Standard Methodology, the most recent Government consultation published in relation to Standard Methodology sets the Dacorum housing numbers at a minimum of 1,023 new homes per year between 2020 and 2038. This equates to a <u>minimum</u> of 18,414 dwellings. The affordability ration would also need to be considered when it is due to be published in March 2021.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this fundamental under provision, Paragraph 60 of the NPPF requires Councils to consider the unmet need of any neighbouring areas. Although it is acknowledged that Dacorum are working with their neighbours in South West Hertfordshire, the unmet need of other authorities must also be considered.</p> <p>Furthermore, given Dacorum's proximity to London, and the significant unmet need that they are facing, it would be reasonable for the neighbouring Hertfordshire authorities to work with the London authorities to accommodate some of the unmet London need. It has been well documented that the pandemic has changed commuting patterns with those working in London wanting to move out of the city given the provision of more flexible working practices. This will undoubtedly impact on housing demand within Dacorum and should therefore be planned for within this Plan.</p>

Not only is there an insufficient quantum of development planned for, there is also a failure to include an appropriate buffer, which will further exasperate the under provision. The deficit in housing numbers should be rectified now, prior to the pre-submission version of the Local Plan so that proper consultation can be undertaken as well as ensuring a robust and durable Local Plan covering the appropriate plan period. Currently, the Local Plan includes a 2% buffer in land supply (303 homes – paragraph 7.128 of the draft Local Plan). This level of contingency is wholly insufficient, both in percentage terms and as an absolute number.

We believe that a buffer of 20% should be included within the Plan. This is justified based on the historic delivery of housing (an average of around 544 dwellings per annum for the past three years); as well as the percentage of larger, more complex sites; and potential fluctuations in demand resulting from the duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities. A 20% buffer would mean that the Local Plan should be planning for 22,097 homes in the plan period, but even at 10% the number of homes would be 20,255. These figures suggest a deficit in planned housing development of between 3,355 and 5,197 homes.

This is a significant shortfall which can only be rectified by the additional sites being identified across the Borough for allocation. This will obviously impact on the 5-year housing land supply, so it will be vital that smaller, deliverable sites are able to come forward within the next 5 years to meet the current level of demand and ensure that the supply is not backloaded.

### **Delivery of Self and Custom Builds (SCB)**

The key requirements of the national legislation governing self and custom builds (SCB) are set out in the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Acts introduced three duties for local authorities to meet demand for custom and self build housing (collectively known as “the Right to Build”), requiring them to:

- Prepare, publicise and maintain a register of individuals and associations of individuals “who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land”;
- Have regard to the register “when carrying out their planning, housing, land disposal and regeneration functions”; and,
- Give suitable development permission for enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for custom and self-build housing in their area on a rolling, three-year, basis.

The Governments’ White Paper ‘Fixing our Broken Housing Market’ also gives support for SCB. This led to the Right to Build Task Force, which recognise the latent market for housing delivery within the SCB market, but also identifies that high quality, sustainable dwellings can be delivered through allowing and supporting SCBs.

On the 8 February 2021, the Planning Practice Guidance was amended to state that LPAs need to consider self build registers when they are preparing planning policies (Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 57-027-201760728). Furthermore, it now states:

*“Assessment of local housing need as a whole should be conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Within this context, the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups should be assessed including people wishing to self-build or custom-build their own homes.*”



*Local planning authorities should use the demand data from the registers in their area, supported as necessary by additional data from secondary sources (as outlined in the housing and economic development needs guidance), to understand and consider future need for this type of housing in their area. Secondary sources can include data from building plot search websites, enquiries for building plots recorded by local estate agents and surveys of local residents. Demand assessment tools can also be utilised.”* Planning Practice Guidance (011 Reference ID: 57-011-20210208)

The Custom and Self Build, Demand Assessment Framework (January 2020), prepared by Three Dragons provides a simple comparison between demand for CSB (as measured by the register) and supply which is measured by single dwelling completions. A demand from the register for 29 plots a year has been identified and there is a current supply of 30 units per annum. This form of measurement is inaccurate and fails to fully recognise the demand for self and custom build plots. We therefore welcome the modelling undertaken by Three Dragons [FOOTNOTE 1: Evidence Base – Dacorum Borough Council, Custom and Self Build, Demand Assessment Framework, January 2020. Prepared by Three Dragons.] which demonstrates that the demand for CSB plots will rise from 68 units per year in years 1 -5 to 78 units per year in years 11 – 17. The Local Plan should be planning for the full, quantifiable demand, and appropriate sites should be identified and brought forward through the Local Plan to meet this housing need, particularly in the later years of the Plan where it has been shown that the level of demand will increase.

We very much welcome the inclusion of Policy DM8 ‘Custom and Self Build Housing’ however strongly disagree that CSB plots should only be provided within larger development sites. Smaller sites are ideally placed to deliver CSB plots and help develop communities of like-minded individuals while ensuring Government targets are met in a sustainable and well thought out manner. This is confirmed by the Three Dragons research which indicates that most of the demand is being met through small site developments. Specific, smaller scale plots should therefore be identified to address this requirement.

It is also important to note that Local Authorities have a rolling 3-year period in which to meet the needs of the register. The PPG states: *“At the end of each base period, relevant authorities have 3 years in which to permission an equivalent number of plots of land, which are suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding, as there are entries for that base period.”* (Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 57-024- 201760728). Although there are currently 29 people on the register, the actual amount, as confirmed by Three Dragons, is more likely to be between 68 – 78 dpa. The current policy seeks to address SCB plot requirements through larger sites only. Once adopted, larger sites will then be required to plan in the SCB plots, this will inevitably take time to come to fruition and in the meantime, the rolling three-year target will not be met.

Our client’s land would be a perfect allocation for SCB plots and therefore should be included within the Local Plan. This will not only help increase the much-needed housing provision within the Borough, but it will also add diversity to the housing market and provide the types of plots that people are looking for on the self build register.

### **Site Selection**

The Council’s consultants AECOM have undertaken an assessment of 144 sites provided by the Council. The assessment narrows this down to 46 sites which were considered to be potentially suitable for development, albeit with some constraints.

Our Clients' land ('Site Reference 73' in the site selection paper) was identified as *“considered suitable for further consideration but not carried forward for detailed testing”*. This is a fundamental error and the site should have been considered further, particularly given that it was identified as suitable for further consideration.

Table 7 of the main report states that *“Development of sites would erode an important open gap separating Hemel Hempstead with Piccotts End [...]. Due to the scale and nature of these sites, there is limited potential to adequately mitigate this.”*

We strongly disagree with this assessment and have demonstrated how the site can be developed within the area of previously developed land ensuring that a high-quality separation between Piccotts End and Hemel Hempstead can be achieved.

The site is largely previously developed land and represents an achievable, suitable and deliverable site for residential allocation in the Local Plan. This will help address the significant shortfall in housing land supply and help meet the identified need, particularly of SCBs.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

This Local Plan fails to sufficiently plan for the housing demand for Dacorum. The proposed supply is considered to be between 3,355 and 5,197 homes short of the actual housing demand. The deficit has been largely caused by a failure to account for the revised standard methodology as well as an insufficient buffer.

Small development sites have a key role in ensuring much needed housing delivery in the short term and should therefore be balanced against the larger more strategic sites which often take years to come to fruition. Smaller sites will be easier to bring forward in the short term and help provide much needed housing now.

We welcome the inclusion of Policy DM8; however, believe that changes are required to the policy to ensure that it delivers SCB plots. Specific land should be identified within the Local Plan to deliver SCB plots. This will add to the diversity of the housing market and meet the requirements of the Right to Build. As currently worded, the inclusion of plots on larger sites only will fail to meet the rolling three-year requirement, particularly in the early years of the plan.

Our clients' land at Marchmont Farm is an achievable, suitable and deliverable site for self and custom builders. It would therefore help achieve self build plots in the Borough through the provision of sustainable development on previously developed land.

It is therefore concluded that in its current form, the Local Plan has not been positively prepared and current housing shortages will be exasperated without the inclusion of more sites to accommodate the identified need.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Appendix 1 - Site Location Plan 2315-51B.pdf</a> <a href="#">Appendix 2 - Proposed Development 2377 01C.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14102
<b>Person ID</b>	1207309
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Andrea Gilmour
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Property Planning Manager Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Land at Chaulden Lane, Hemel Hempstead</b> Hertfordshire County Council are the landowner of a small parcel of land located in the south east corner of the site allocated as Growth Area HH21: West of Hemel Hempstead in the Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038). This is land shown on the attached plan reference EM9775. The County Council as landowner supports the inclusion of this land within Growth Area HH21: West of Hemel Hempstead.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">EM 9775.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS14152
<b>Person ID</b>	1163439
<b>Full Name</b>	Lindy Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Growth Area HH02 Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now. Should be included for development 2021-2038 rather than safeguarded. HH03 Hospital site. Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear sustainable NHS strategy for this part of Hertfordshire (incl. Watford and St Albans) is confirmed and initiated. HH06 Civic Centre Site. Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14211
<b>Person ID</b>	1270570
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard James
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Apsley Developments Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270569

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr James Delafield
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	JB Planning Associates
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>JB Planning Associates have been instructed by our client Apsley Developments Ltd (ADL) to submit representations which support the allocation of land at Shendish Manor, which is being promoted by the site owners (W Lamb Ltd) as an urban extension to Hemel Hempstead of approximately 500 units. This site does not feature as one of the proposed allocations in the document and we understand from the information available on the site selection process that this was due largely to concerns regarding how safe site access can be provided as well as the potential impact that development of this site may have on the local and strategic road This led Dacorum Borough Council to conclude in the Site Selection Topic Paper (November 2020) that, on balance, there are more suitable sites in the area which can better deliver the strategy of the Local Plan.</p> <p>We have considered the content of the Regulation 18 Emerging Strategy for Growth and the supporting evidence and wish to submit representations to the consultation which respond to question 5A by explaining how ADL can facilitate the delivery of this site by providing an additional access point which will address the concerns identified through the site selection process.</p> <p><b>Background and Context</b></p> <p>In 2010 ADL secured planning permission for 325 dwellings (ref: 4/02419/04/FUL) on its land immediately to the north of land at Shendish Manor. It subsequently sold the land to Bovis, now part of Vistry Group PLC, who have built out the development. Under the terms of the sale and transfer, ADL retained land between the Vistry development and the land at Shendish Manor, along with the rights to cross the area of public open space between this land and the new spine road on the Vistry development (Shearwater Road).</p> <p><b>Question 5A: Are there any other sites that you think should be included in the Plan?</b></p> <p>Our Client, Apsley Developments Ltd (ADL), considers that land at Shendish Manor should be included in the Local Plan as an allocation.</p>

The site is in the Green Belt and comprises part golf course that is in active use, and part open land historically associated with Shendish Manor. It is bounded to the north by the Vistry development, the east by a railway line, the south by residential development on Rucklers Lane (located in the parish of Kings Langley), and to the west by the grounds of Shendish Manor, including the remaining part of the golf. Beyond the railway line to the east is Apsley's neighbourhood centre, whilst the town centre of Hemel Hempstead is approximately 1.5km to the north.

This site has been the subject of detailed testing by the Council (site reference 82) as an urban extension to Hemel Hempstead with the potential to deliver approximately 500 dwellings, a new local centre and primary school. This detailed testing, which is presented in Appendix B of the Site Selection Topic Paper (November 2020), reveals that Officers considered that the site performs well on a number of identified criteria, with the majority of identified constraints likely to be sufficiently mitigated alongside development, and the site's close proximity to Apsley Railway Station seen as a significant positive.

However, Officers were concerned about how safe site access can be provided over the railway line to the east or onto the Rucklers Lane adjoining the southern. They add that whilst a technical solution may be achievable for this, the impact that development of this site may have on the local and strategic road network could be significant. The delivery of new on-site infrastructure such as a school could exacerbate these concerns. They conclude that, on balance, there are more suitable sites in the area which can better deliver the strategy of the Local Plan.

Noting the decision not to move forward with the site as an allocation was made because of access issues, our Client has instructed WSP to undertake a review of whether the provision of an additional access on its retained land to the north via Shearwater Road/Featherbed Lane would address the concerns raised over the impact of the development on the local and strategic road network. A Technical Note setting out the findings of this review is included at Appendix 1 to these representations and is summarised in the following paragraphs.

At Figure 1.1 of the Technical Note, WSP identify the extent of ADL's retained land between the Vistry development and the land at Shendish Manor, and at Figure 1.2 an illustrative access junction to serve the proposed site allocation from Shearwater Road is shown.

The Technical Note explains that the review established the predicted multi-modal trip generation of the Land at Shendish Manor site (for the provision of up to 500 dwellings) and, to assess the impact of the completed development, distributes and assigns vehicular trips onto the surrounding highway network via three potential access points. These are illustrated at Figure 2.1 and include the two identified by the site promoters and assessed by the Council as part of its site selection process (i.e. Rucklers Lane and the A4251 / Shendish Manor access) and a third access from the north, facilitated by ADL's retained land. Notably, the latter was not considered when the site was assessed by the Council.

The Trip Rate Information Computer System (TRICS) database has been used to assess the potential number of trips that may be generated by the Land at the Shendish Manor Site, based upon surveys of similar sites. The multi-modal trip generation estimates that, of the total number of trips generated daily from the site (4,095), 2,874 (70%) will be made by private vehicle (car). Trips made by sustainable modes (walking, cycling, train or bus) will amount to 1,020 trips, of which 543 (53%) will be made by train. This high proportion of trips by train can be attributed to the site being adjacent

to Apsley Railway Station, a calling point on the West Coast Main Line, which provides direct connectivity to London and the West Midlands.

Vehicular trips have been distributed using journey to work origin-destination data (2011 Census) and assigned onto the local highway network for the time periods assessed (AM peak and PM peak) using Google Maps route planner. Three access option scenarios have been undertaken:

- **“Option 1”** (two access points – Rucklers Lane and A4251 / Shendish Manor): it has been assumed for the purposes of this appraisal that 60% of trips would utilise the A4251 / Shendish Manor access with the remaining 40% utilising a Rucklers Lane access;
- **“Option 2”** (three access points – Rucklers Lane, A4251 / Shendish Manor and northern access/Featherbed Lane): it has been assumed that 40% of trips would still utilise the A4251 / Shendish Manor access with the remaining 60% of trips utilising a Rucklers Lane access and Featherbed Lane access equally; and
- **“Option 3”** (two access points – A4251 / Shendish Manor and northern access/Featherbed Lane): it has been assumed that 60% of trips would utilise the A4251 / Shendish Manor access with the remaining 40% utilising a Featherbed Lane access

The trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed site allocation have been added onto the 2038 future year (calculated by applying growth factors to validated 2021 base flows) traffic flows to generate “2038 Baseline + Development” scenarios for the three access options.

The junction capacity assessments demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity at all junctions in the 2038 future year, except for the A4251 / Nash Mills Lane / Rucklers Lane signalised junction which is predicted to operate over capacity in the 2038 base scenario in both peaks. As this is a key junction for southbound traffic, it is inevitable under all three options that a significant proportion of traffic will travel through the junction; therefore, the junction still operates over capacity and slightly worsens compared with the baseline. However, Option 3 removes the assumed site access(es) onto Rucklers Lane, resulting in a significant drop in traffic flows on this arm, reducing the capacity to circa pre-development levels

Notably, Featherbed Lane and its approaches have enough link flow capacity to support additional development, that would be related with the provision of a northern access to the proposed site allocation.

WSP conclude that the inclusion of a northern access and exclusion of the Rucklers Lane access largely remedies the increased congestion issues at the A4521 / Nash Mills / Rucklers Lane signalised junction caused by the proposed site allocation. It therefore follows that a northern access point to the site, via the ADL retained land, would facilitate the delivery of the Land at Shendish Manor site.

On the basis of this evidence, we consider that the concerns raised by the Council in the Site Selection Topic Paper over the potential impact of the Land at Shendish Manor development on the highway network can be addressed through the provision of the northern access point identified in these representations.

As such, there are no significant highway grounds not to progress the Land at Shendish Manor site, and we respectfully request that the Council reconsider its decision not to include it as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan. As the Council correctly note in the site assessment, it is in a highly sustainable location close to Aspley Railway Station and

we agree that this should be seen as a significant As WSP note in their assessment, there is an expectation that a high proportion of trips associated with the development could be made by train given the proximity of the site to Apsley Railway Station, a calling point on the West Coast Main Line, which provides direct connectivity to London and the West Midlands.

Having regard to the site's location, we consider it also relevant to note that it adjoins (beyond the railway line) the Two Waters Opportunity Area, which is identified in the emerging Local Plan as a focus for growth and regeneration in Hemel Hempstead.

As para 23.84 of the draft Local Plan explains "The area represents the most sustainable location within the town given its proximity to public transport, retail and other facilities all of which are within easy walking distance. The area is located close to both rail and bus services delivering excellent connectivity allowing for easy movement without reliance on the private car."

Land at Shendish Manor therefore represents an ideal opportunity to deliver more growth in the most sustainable location in the Borough's principal and only strategic sized settlement. In this respect, we are of the view that the allocation of the site would accord with paragraph 138 of the NPPF which states that **"when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account... Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public "**

To ignore the sustainability credentials of the site risks the Local Plan being found unsound during the Examination process as it would not be consistent with national Furthermore, for the Council to do so on the basis of a concern over highway impact would also be unjustified on the basis of the technical evidence submitted with this representation.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

In this representation, we have explained why the Council should reconsider its decision not to include land at Shendish Manor (site reference 82) as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan. We understand, whilst it is considered by the Council to be in a highly sustainable location, the decision not to include it was due largely to concerns regarding how safe site access can be provided as well as the potential impact that development of this site may have on the local and strategic road network.

We have demonstrated in these representations how our Client, ADL, can address this concern by providing an additional access point on the northern boundary of the proposed site allocation. The accompanying Technical Note prepared by WSP demonstrates how the inclusion of this additional access will remedy congestion issues that would have been exacerbated by the development of the site if it relied on an access from Rucklers Lane to the south.

On the basis of this evidence, we consider that there are no significant highway grounds to discount the Land at Shendish Manor site. To ensure that sustainable patterns of development are promoted when releasing land from the Green Belt, we respectfully request that the Council reconsider its decision not to include it as an allocation in the emerging Local Plan.

**Included files**

[ORG Apsley Developments - Agent James Delafield - JB Planning Assoc.pdf](#)



<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14269
<b>Person ID</b>	1270624
<b>Full Name</b>	ROD MACGILLIVRAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Local Plan, under the heading of <b>Vision and Strategic Objectives</b>, states the following in section 2.2:   <i>“Dacorum’s Full Council passed a motion declaring a Climate Emergency in July 2019 and has since prepared a Climate Change Strategy. The Local Plan will play a central role in delivering a number of the aims set out in both. <b>A central thread of the Local Plan is to plan for a low-carbon future in which carbon emissions and other greenhouse gasses are reduced as we adapt to the new climatic norms. The growth offers a real opportunities to deliver significant and meaningful measures to combat the effects of the climate change emergency.</b>”</i> (My emphasis)</li> </ul> <p>The content of the Local Plan unfortunately then shows that Dacorum is only paying lip service to these objectives. The Plan cannot credibly claim to support these as strategic objectives when it then proposes the largest sites for development in locations which will do exactly the opposite. The so-called Hemel Garden Community site would result in increased carbon emissions because it is nowhere near existing public transport nodes. It will increase private motor vehicle usage. It is simply one of the least sustainable locations that could be chosen for development in Hemel Hempstead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is recognised that the draft Local Plan has identified that a proportion of the projected housing need could be accommodated on brownfield land close to the city centre of Hemel Hempstead and/or close to existing transport hubs serving Hemel Hempstead. If the projected housing need is reviewed and rationalised as suggested in section 3 of this document, this may well satisfy the need for housing growth in Hemel Hempstead in</li> </ul>

- However the draft Local Plan suggests that beyond the houses that could be provided on these brownfield and town centre sites, many further homes are required to meet the projected need in Hemel But instead of focussing on undeveloped land which is close to existing town and transport infrastructure, the Plan suggests that this growth should primarily be accommodated on the green belt to the north of Hemel Hempstead.
- From discussion with officers it is evident that the significant development proposed on the green belt to the north of Hemel Hempstead (the so-called Hemel Garden Communities) is driven by the unsubstantiated projected growth in housing need. It is argued in the draft Local Plan that this need cannot be met without a significant incursion into the Green Belt in this
- Apart from the questions raised above as to the veracity of this need, in debating where such large growth number could be accommodated, it became evident that the proposed location of the so-called Hemel Garden Communities has been driven more by where the required land can be most easily brought forward for development, rather than by objective assessment of where development is best and most sustainably The following points further illustrate this.
- I have previously referred to the October 2017 Settlement Hierarchy Study in assessing this draft Local Plan. That study refers to the national and regional planning policy (NPPF) in section 2.1.1 and states

In section 2.1.3 the study refers to relevant NPPF objectives, including:

*The Core Principle that planning should actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus development in locations which are or can be made sustainable;*

- ***Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant transport movement are located where the need to travel will be minimized and the use of sustainable transport modes can be ”*** (My emphasis)

The draft Local Plan fails to meet these objectives and is therefore in contravention of national policy. The largest proposed development sites (the so-called Hemel Garden Community sites north of Hemel Hempstead) are as far as one can get from existing public transport nodes, and are not suitable for walking nor cycling to existing rail stations. The over 5,000 new houses proposed in this location will generate significant additional transport movement but are not located where the need to travel will be minimized, nor where the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximized.

This proposed development therefore contravenes national policy.

- It is likely that many of the new households formed would be commuter households, needing to travel out of this area into neighbouring towns and into London to get to

work. There is no existing public transport infrastructure in north Hemel Hempstead to support this growth in commuters.

- The Dacorum Local Plan Strategic Transport Modelling Report compiled by Aecom and dated May 2020, lists in Appendix II a Full List of Public Transport Schemes in Hertfordshire that have been modelled. It is alarming that this list included NO new public transport schemes modelled to serve the new developments proposed north of Hemel In other words, the lip service paid to sustainability in the Local Plan is not underpinned by any detailed proposed new public transport.
- There are no existing regular bus routes from the north of Hemel that are suitable for There is no plan beyond a wish to show how the new developments would be supported by public transport.
- The proposed location of the so-called Hemel Garden Communities is as far as it is possible to get from Hemel Hempstead station and from Berkhamsted station and still be considered to be part of The Plan expresses the desire to encourage walking and cycling as preferred means of transport. As a resident of Water End, which is reasonably close to the proposed development sites and about the same distance from existing transport hubs, I can state categorically that this is wishful thinking. Firstly the hilly nature of the terrain discourages cycling at the beginning and end of a working day, given that it would be a sweaty commute to the stations. Secondly the sheer distance from the nearest stations (4.1 and 6 miles respectively) means that walking is not an option. Thirdly, the roads to Berkhamsted are narrow and therefore dangerous for cyclists, particularly considering the speed of the traffic. The roads to Hemel Hempstead station are already extremely busy at peak times, making these roads equally dangerous for cyclists. Fourthly, our weather is frequently and predictably wet, meaning that cycling and walking as a means of commuting to work is just not going to happen at any scale.
- Residents of the proposed Hemel Garden Communities would therefore be condemned to driving, in private vehicles, either to work or to the railway stations. The Plan makes no provision for the increased pressure on parking at the stations. It is worth noting that parking at these stations is already over-subscribed (excepting for the impact of the coronavirus pandemic). Furthermore the parking area at Hemel station is proposed for re-development. Unless that redevelopment caters for a substantial increase in the availability of parking, the problem simply will be

- Even if there were sustainable transport to get commuters from north Hemel to the rail stations, the COMET study assumes infinite capacity on rail and busses in its Anybody that has experience of Pre-COVID commuting from Hemel to London will tell you that simply getting onto trains at the station was sometimes challenging because of the trains already being over-capacity, and frequently even once on a train, getting a seat was difficult.

It is clear that this commuter experience will be substantially worse if the proposed development north of Hemel is allowed to proceed.

- While the Local Plan talks of improving public transport services, the Strategic Transport modelling Report acknowledges that bus routes change on a commercial

basis and it is therefore not possible to make forecasts about bus routes over the next 10-20 years. In other words the Local Plan is proposing substantial new housing development in an area currently not serviced by public transport, with no supporting plan to show how improved public transport could be delivered. The only therefore certainty is that residents will have to rely on private transport for their commutes.

- It is therefore self-evident that the proposed Hemel Garden Communities location is the least sustainable location for development in Hemel. It will lead to increases in polluting vehicles, deterioration of air quality, increase in illnesses and hospitalisation, and increased pressure on the NHS and Care services. This proposed development location represents a shocking dereliction of our responsibility to future generations to start showing real commitment to creating a sustainable environment.
- As indicated above, the Local Plan provides no detail, beyond a wish list, as to how the substantial increase in the population of north Hemel Hempstead would be supported by the development of sufficient social and physical infrastructure.
- There are no proposed new hospital
- Fresh water supply is extracted from the chalk aquifers, which are already over- The Plan has no answer to how this will be corrected in the face of substantial new housing development.

- The environmentally sensitive chalk streams in this part of Hertfordshire are already depleted resulting in damage to the sensitive fauna and flora along these river valleys. My property backs onto the River Gade and this damage and depletion is self-evident. This river has deteriorated so that there are no longer any fish in it.
- There have been studies carried out by Aecom to model the anticipated traffic impacts from the Local Plan development These include the **2036 COMET Dacorum Local Plan Scenario** dated Aril 13, 2018; and subsequently the **Dacorum Local Plan Strategic Transport Modelling Report** dated May 2020. I will not present here a detailed commentary on these technical documents, but the following points extracted from these documents are relevant in demonstrating that the infrastructure planning accompanying the Local Plan is inadequate, and further illustrating that the proposed Hemel Garden Community development site is illogical.
- A new Link Road is being considered to route traffic between Tring, Berkhamsted and Junction 8 on the M1. It appears that this new route follows existing routes through central Berkhamsted, and on the Leighton Buzzard Road through part of Water End. The intention is to relieve traffic through central Hemel Hempstead and on the A414. Without any detail being available the only possible reaction to this plan is that it is ill- conceived: Traffic through Berkhamsted and Potten End travels on congested country roads with only single lane crossing points available over the railway line through Berkhamsted; the Leighton Buzzard Road through Water End is already congested, and the pinch point of the single Lane bridge over the River Gade creates a bottle-neck that already results in traffic backing up on this
- The COMET study identifies that the development locations proposed in Berkhamsted and Tring are close to existing stations and consequently little additional road traffic is generated – these sites are close enough to the stations that the additional traffic will largely travel on foot to the stations. Alas, the same is not true for Hemel. As shown above, the ‘Hemel Garden Community’ site location is so badly located that it generates additional traffic, resulting in additional pressure on the Leighton Buzzard Road, and on roads in Hemel. The relative unsustainability of the Hemel Garden Community site is further underlined by the COMET

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14322
<b>Person ID</b>	1270637
<b>Full Name</b>	TOM GROVES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Too many houses proposed.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14339
<b>Person ID</b>	1270639
<b>Full Name</b>	HELEN PRICE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p>I'm writing in regards to the development plans for Hemel Hempstead .</p> <p>In particular the areas of Dodds lane adjacent to Picotts end and also the proposals for the houses from Cupid green lane.</p> <p>It saddens me and all of our friends and family to see a town that we selected to live in because of the good balance between town and country life being done so well. I live on Woodhall farm and love the fact we can walk five minutes and be in the beautiful surrounding countryside . We live here for this reason we chose to have our life here based on this so in your plight to house people from OTHER TOWNS such as Watford and St. Albans you're going to ruin the lives of the people that are in YOUR town who chose to reside here because of how it is in the here and now.</p> <p>You state that the town NEEDS to provide these properties yet think the towns people are un aware of the fact that so many of the flats you've built recently stand empty still.</p> <p>The people of this town are a close knit community and we aren't stupid enough to not realise the financial benefits to the council and the fact the the plans for this have only been released at late stages so sadly protesting doesn't seem to make a difference to you as really you don't care about the towns people you just care about money and our protests are in vein as you are out for money making and not the care of the lives of residence of Dacorum .</p> <p>You don't care that so many people are now considering moving from the town they have been born and raised in because you are destroying it and taking away all of our beautiful green land one step at a time . There will be no nice green land left just vile man made parks with football pitches over crowded and ending up looking like another Watford which frankly resembles a doss hole. God forbid St Albans would use their own land to build for their towns folk as well nope send them all here . Cram them all in . Make this town overpopulated and hell on earth.</p> <p>Thanks for turning so many peoples worlds upside down and ruining their daily way of life to financially benefit yourselves. Amazing effort at making it look like it's all for the people though maybe some people will be idiotic enough to believe it. Sadly for you no one I know does though. Enjoy ruining peoples loved one building project at a time. We built a home we love and now are likely to be driven out of it thanks you the councils plans.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b></p>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14356
<b>Person ID</b>	1270641
<b>Full Name</b>	WILLIAM ALLEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Similarly, the most westerly block of Hemel Garden Communities needs to be pulled back from the Leighton Buzzard Road and a wider green corridor is needed around Piccotts End to avoid the village being coalesced into Hemel Hempstead. Under current plans Piccotts End simply becomes a suburb of Hemel Hempstead and, as a village, loses its relationship with the countryside around it.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS14357
<b>Person ID</b>	1270641
<b>Full Name</b>	WILLIAM ALLEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The timeless feel of Boxmoor depends on the leafiness of the area around the station. There are few stations in the home counties where you can walk through a field of cows to get to the local railway station. The Box Moor Trust area is an asset to the town and it should not be destroyed in the area around the station by having high rise buildings. So, buildings at the station should be no more than four storeys to avoid new developments over-powering the surroundings and irreversibly destroying the street scene of the area around the station.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14377
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now and safeguarded for development post 2038. Given that the Council aspire to Garden City status, HH02 should be combined with HH01 now to provide a new vibrant, dynamic community of 5400 new homes and 21st century infrastructure which will boost the Garden City plan and meet all the Council's strategic objective. Such an extension to Hemel has the scale to help regenerate its New Town core but also provide significant benefits: Accessible location. Provide benefits of scale development- sustainable, minimise energy consumption, enable renewable energy technology, decentralise heating, support public transport initiatives and avoid harm to environmental assets. This could be a real opportunity for the Borough to develop a vibrant 21st century extension which will help regenerate its New Town core, but not by delaying and destroying Berkhamsted and Tring in the meantime.</p> <p>The Hospital site should not be re-developed until there is a strategy to provide adequate Healthcare in the Borough and the surrounding area. There are 2 ways of achieving this. Either by re-opening Hemel Hempstead Hospital to increase the number of beds per head of population or by building a brand new hospital probably in addition to Watford. At present DCB is failing its citizens by acquiescing in a situation where their <b>health provision is below the national average.</b></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14422
<b>Person ID</b>	1270662
<b>Full Name</b>	MAX GOODE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>LCR and NR support the draft allocation HH08: Station Gateway and the role that the Site can play in delivering the a multi modal transport interchange and high density residential development. Taking each section in turn, we provide the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Red Line Boundary (Map 8):</b> LCR and NR confirm that the red line boundary identified as part of the draft allocation is accurate and reflects the current proposals. LCR are in discussions to acquire all land outside of their control and remain in dialogue with the Council on this</li> <li>• <b>Size (Hectares):</b> LCR and NR confirm that the Site area is correct and have no further comment to</li> <li>• <b>Allocated for (key development and land use requirements):</b> LCR and NR support the draft allocation and the prospective land uses, however, we consider the wording should be amended to read (we have written this to emphasise where changes have been made to the wording): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>“Regeneration of the existing train station and inefficient car park through consolidation of the existing facilities and provision of a multistorey car park;</i></li> <li>• <i>Other uses that support the multi-modal transport interchange and surrounding residential development; <del>are ancillary to the main use of the site as a strategic hub, including, but not limited to retail, food and drink establishments, offices and a hotel;</del></i></li> <li>• <i>Multi-modal transport interchange promoting sustainable methods of transport and public transport;</i></li> <li>• <i>Around 360 530 dwellings, subject to masterplanning;</i></li> <li>• <i>A landmark building up to 14 storeys in height; and</i></li> <li>• <i>New public ”</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Through pre-application discussions with Dacorum Borough Council, it is currently proposed to deliver approximately 530 residential units as part of the wider Site development, alongside an improved train station, multi modal transport interchange, multi-storey car park and a mix of uses to support the wider development aspirations of the Site. Included within the current proposals is a mixed use landmark building which is currently proposed to be up to 14 storeys in height. These proposals have been presented to the Council and the Community Review Panel and we are in the process of reviewing the formal advice received and how this influences the design moving forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Site Specific Requirements – Urban Design Principles:</b> LCR and NR generally support urban design principles set out within the draft allocation, however, propose an explicit reference to a landmark building on the Site in this section, and confirmation that this could be up to 14 storeys in This is consistent with the current proposals for the Site.</li> </ul>

- **Site Specific Requirements – Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport:** LCR and NR support this element of the draft allocation, particularly the references to linked cycle and pedestrian routes which is something that is promoted within the current proposals for the
- **Site Specific Requirements – Social and Community:** LCR and NR support this element of the draft allocation and agree that the provision of ground floor active uses to support the multi-modal transport interchange should be a priority for the Site. This is something which is promoted within the current proposals for the
- **Site Specific Requirements – Environmental Health:** LCR and NR do not have any comment on this element of the draft
- **Site Specific Requirements – Landscape Considerations:** LCR and NR do not have any comment on this element of the draft
- **Site Specific Requirements – Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:** LCR and NR do not have any comment on this element of the draft
- **Site Specific Requirements – Historic, Environment and Cultural Heritage:** LCR and NR do not have any comment on this element of the draft

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Proposals and Sites  
 Hemel Hempstead Garden  
 Communities Other sites  
 comment

Included files

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14428

**Person ID** 1270664

**Full Name** ASHLEY COLLINS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>developing an initial masterplan for the proposed development and results in a scheme which responds well sympathetic to the surrounding area.</p> <p>The masterplan comprises various housing blocks of 3-6 storeys in height, although a majority are 4 storeys. This particular masterplan will provide 401 dwellings with a mix of 1, 2, 3 and 4 bed units and 293 parking spaces. However, taking the Two Waters Opportunity Area growth aspirations into account and allowance for high density developments, it may be able to accommodate more with additional height.</p> <p>In light of the above, the Site is considered a sustainable alternative to some of the greenfield sites which have been put forward as allocations within the “Proposals and Sites” section of the Emerging Strategy for Growth. However, and in light of the comments earlier in these representations in relation to Housing Need within the Housing Strategy, it may be that this site is included as an additional allocation rather than alternative, to help meet the Dacorum’s unmet housing need.</p> <p>In terms of site details for a potential allocation and in line with the other emerging allocations within Chapter 24 of the Strategy for Growth, Royal London Asset Management proposes the following initial allocation requirements within the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities / Two Waters Allocations section:</p> <p><b>Growth Area: Apsley Mills</b></p> <p><b>Size (Hectares)</b></p> <p>2.6ha</p> <p><b>Allocated for (key development and land use requirements)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Minimum of 400 dwellings, subject to masterplanning; and</li> <li>· High quality public realm adjacent to Grand Union Canal.</li> </ul> <p><b>Site-specific requirements</b></p> <p><b>Urban Design Principles:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Development should normally be between four and six storeys. Proposals for taller buildings in excess of this may be considered in accordance with Policy DM41 - Heights of Buildings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport:</b></p>

- Enhance pedestrian and cycle links with the town centre;
  - Enhanced pedestrian links with Apsley Train Station.
- Flood Risk and Drainage:**
- No built development should take place within Flood Zones 2 and 3 on the northern edge of the Site; and
  - Full investigation of potential existing culverts to be undertaken.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14439

**Person ID** 1270665

**Full Name** Cllr Stephen Claughton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

Yes

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

New dwellings should be located closer to centres of industry and employment. For Dacorum, industry is concentrated in Maylands and the surrounding area.

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14469

<b>Person ID</b>	1270671
<b>Full Name</b>	Spencer Jefferies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Town Planner National Grid
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270670
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Matt Verlander
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director Avison Young
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>National Grid has appointed Avison Young to review and respond to local planning authority Development Plan Document consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regard to the current consultation on the above document.</p> <p>About National Grid National Grid Electricity Transmission plc (NGET) owns and maintains the electricity transmission system in England and Wales. The energy is then distributed to the electricity distribution network operators, so it can reach homes and businesses.</p> <p>National Grid Gas plc (NGG) owns and operates the high-pressure gas transmission system across the UK. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the UK's four gas distribution networks where pressure is reduced for public use.</p> <p>National Grid Ventures (NGV) is separate from National Grid's core regulated businesses. NGV develop, operate and invest in energy projects, technologies, and partnerships to help accelerate the development of a clean energy future for consumers across the UK, Europe and the United States.</p> <p>Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets.</p> <p>Details of the sites affecting National Grid assets are provided below.</p> <p>Electricity Transmission</p> <p>Development Plan Document Site Reference Asset Description HH02 North Hemel Hempstead (Phase 2) ZA ROUTE TWR (419 - 522): 400Kv Overhead Transmission Line route: ELSTREE - SUNDON 1</p>

A plan showing details of the site locations and details of National Grid's assets is attached to this letter. Please note that this plan is illustrative only.

Please also see attached information outlining further guidance on development close to National Grid assets.

National Grid is happy to provide advice and guidance to the Council concerning their networks. If we can be of any assistance to you in providing informal comments in confidence during your policy development, please do not hesitate to contact us.

To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect their assets. Please remember to consult National Grid on any Development Plan Document (DPD) or site-specific proposals that could affect National Grid's assets.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">26.02.21 - Dacorum BC - Local Plan Reg 18 - Asset Map.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14584
<b>Person ID</b>	1270702
<b>Full Name</b>	TESCO PENSION INVESTMENT FUND MANAG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>Introduction</b>



We write on behalf of our client, Tesco Pension Investment Fund Management ('**TPIFM**') in respect of its interests in land at Jarman Square in Hemel Hempstead.

This letter is submitted to provide representations to the consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth which was published in November 2020.

TPIFM has a long leasehold interest in the development referred to as 'Jarman Square' which is located off Jarman Way to the south of the St Albans Road (A414) in Hemel Hempstead (the '**Site**').

The Site comprises an existing leisure scheme but is not allocated for any specific uses within the emerging Local Plan.

In summary, TPIFM supports the overarching aspirations for investment and growth within Dacorum as detailed within the Emerging Strategy for Growth. To help realise these aspirations, TPIFM would advocate that the Council captures greater potential for the redevelopment and / or intensification of existing 'brownfield sites'. In particular, Jarman Square provides an opportunity for intensification of quantum and diversification of uses to include residential (which may support the existing commercial operations at the wider site and Jarman Park as a whole). We request Jarman Square be reallocated as a 'Growth Area'. Such an allocation would accord with the strategic objectives to optimise previously developed land in sustainable locations to help meet the housing requirements of the existing and new population over the plan period.

The justification for the proposed amendment to the emerging plan is provided below.

As set out above, TPIFM's land interest relates to the Jarman Square development which comprises of a range of commercial leisure uses which include a cinema, gym and a range of major food and beverage operators.

The Site forms part of the wider Jarman Park development and is located to the south of the A414, St Albans Hills, which links Hemel Hempstead town centre with the M1 (Junction 4).

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East.

Savills (UK) Limited. Chartered Surveyors. Regulated by RICS. A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2605138. Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD

\\fpdsavills.co.uk\network\Office\ManchesterData\Planning\Planning (Archive 1)\TPIFM\Jarman Park, Hemel\LP Reps\L210226 SAV TPIFM Reps FINAL.docx

Access to Jarman Square is via a three arm roundabout on St Albans Road (A414) which is a dual carriageway linking the town centre to Junction 8 on the M1.

The surrounding area comprises a mixture of commercial and residential uses. Jarman Square forms part of a wider retail / leisure destination which also includes a Tesco superstore, McDonald's 'drive thru' and The XC Extreme Sports Centre.

Land to the south and east of the Site is characterised by traditional, two storey residential units around St Albans Hill Road and Bennetts End Road. To the north, on the opposite side of the A414 several applications have been approved or are pending for new residential development. This includes the approval of 7 storey block at Eastwick Row and a pending application for three residential blocks which range from 4 to 5 storeys at 'Paradise Fields'.

The Site is located approximately 1km east of Hemel Hempstead town centre and approximately 2km from junction 4 of the M1.

The National Planning Policy Framework ('**NPPF**') requires all Local Plans to be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.

Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

They should be consistent with the principles and policies of the NPPF, and should be aspirational but realistic to address spatial implication of economic, social and environmental dimensions.

Planning policies should amongst other things be '*flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan...to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances*'<sup>3</sup>. Paragraph 118 states that planning policies should encourage multiple benefits from urban land.

At the heart of the above is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which for plan-making means positively seeking opportunities to meet development needs of an area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change.

As the new Local Plan emerges, it is important that it adheres to the requirements of the NPPF in positively promoting new development in sustainable locations across the Borough.

TPIFM supports the overarching vision and strategic objectives for Dacorum as outlined within the Local Plan consultation document.

The Local Plan should seek to facilitate the optimisation of previously developed land and this will include an increase in heights and densities. Mixed use development (residential and commercial uses) should be supported on sustainable sites and intensification promoted having regard to appropriate local context.

TPIFM also strongly supports the delivery of new housing through the redevelopment of previously developed land, vacant or underused sites within the urban areas of the Boroughs as proposed by draft Policy SP4 of the Sustainable Development Strategy.

Jarman Square forms part of a wider 'Out of Centre Retail Location' as defined by draft Policy DM21 of the Emerging Strategy for Growth Local Plan.

TPIFM notes and supports the principle of this designation which seeks to recognise that the Site and wider Jarman Square area performs a role within the retail and leisure hierarchy. That is that it complements the offering found within designated retail centres and ensures that Dacorum has a comprehensive offer to meet the requirements of its immediate and wider catcher area population.

Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the retail and leisure sector has experienced a material change in recent years which has been further accelerated by the current pandemic. A number of further changes to the overall function of these sectors is projected in the short and longer term given the different market forces and change in consumer trends. It is anticipated that demand for retail and leisure floorspace within the Borough, including at Jarman Square, will change (either in terms of overall demand, type of premises or size of requirements).

TPIFM advocates that the policy framework in the emerging Local Plan recognises the potential for the repurposing of existing commercial sites as opportunities for intensification and diversification. The introduction of a mix of uses, including residential, could support redevelopment as well as helping to support retained commercial floorspace. New residential communities will drive footfall and demand for retail, leisure and other commercial and community uses.

Jarman Square represents a previously developed site in a sustainable location and as such it has potential to accommodate a successful mix of land uses including residential. This could be in the form of re-use of existing floorspace, redevelopment of existing floorspace or simply as standalone development (building above the existing structure or building on underused parts of the Site).

The re-positioning of the existing scheme would enable the Site to contribute positively towards strategic objectives of the Plan in terms of residential land supply. Optimising the use of brownfield land will help to reduce pressure on Greenbelt and other non-developed sites within the Borough.

There is a parcel of land at Jarman Park (c2 hectares) allocated as an 'out of centre retail site' under reference Growth Area HH27. This comprises of a vacant brownfield site located immediately to the north of Jarman Square which benefits from an allocation within the current adopted Local Plan for retail and leisure uses (Reference: Proposal S/1).

TPIFM requests that the Growth Area HH27 be extended to include Jarman Square or alternatively the latter be allocated under a separate, new Growth Area. A new designation should identify the potential of Jarman Square in terms of its ability to accommodate additional floorspace (development of up to six storeys is considered appropriate) and a greater range of land uses, including residential.

As set out above, Jarman Square is within the established 'built up' area of the settlement boundary for Hemel Hempstead and is a sustainable location. It is situated on an arterial road leading into Hemel Hempstead town centre and benefits from direct access via public and sustainable modes of transport. Optimisation of land in this location accords with the

overarching objective of the NPPF to deliver sustainable forms of development and would ensure that the Site can make an important contribution towards the delivery of new homes. The recognition of the Site as forming part of a wider growth area will also help to ensure that it can be delivered in an integrated and coordinated way with the other sites within the Borough which are identified formally within the emerging Local Plan.

TPFIM requests that the Site is allocated as a Growth Area as part of the Delivery Strategy for Hemel Hempstead for a 'mixed use' including: **leisure, complementary retail and residential**. The Site should be afforded a site reference and should be identified on the Proposals Map. A red line boundary map which illustrates the Site is enclosed as part of these representations.

This consultation response from TPIFM relates specifically to the spatial strategy for growth and in particular the strategic objectives around identifying appropriate sites for development. Whilst the overarching strategy is considered to be sound and legally compliant, the amendments proposed by TPIFM would provide greater certainty that the various policy objectives can be delivered.

TPIFM reiterates that Jarman Square should be recognised formally for its ability to accommodate a greater quantum of floorspace and uses as part of the long term plan for the Borough. The function of the Site is anticipated to change and it provides an opportunity to help meet the demand for housing as part of a mixed use development in the future.

Jarman Square should be identified as Growth Area in the Local Plan in order to ensure the most effective and optimum use of 'previously developed land' within the Borough.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

**Included files**

[ORG Tesco Pension Investment Fund Management - Agent Chris Moore Savills - Jarman Square Site Plan.pdf](#)

**Title**

Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID**

EGS14585

<b>Person ID</b>	1270702
<b>Full Name</b>	TESCO PENSION INVESTMENT FUND MANAG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>We write on behalf of our client, Tesco Pension Investment Fund Management ('<b>TPIFM</b>') in respect of its interests in land at Jarman Square in Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>This letter is submitted to provide representations to the consultation on the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth which was published in November 2020.</p> <p>TPIFM has a long leasehold interest in the development referred to as 'Jarman Square' which is located off Jarman Way to the south of the St Albans Road (A414) in Hemel Hempstead (the '<b>Site</b>').</p> <p>The Site comprises an existing leisure scheme but is not allocated for any specific uses within the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>In summary, TPIFM supports the overarching aspirations for investment and growth within Dacorum as detailed within the Emerging Strategy for Growth. To help realise these aspirations, TPIFM would advocate that the Council captures greater potential for the redevelopment and / or intensification of existing 'brownfield sites'. In particular, Jarman Square provides an opportunity for intensification of quantum and diversification of uses to include residential (which may support the existing commercial operations at the wider site and Jarman Park as a whole). We request Jarman Square be reallocated as a 'Growth Area'. Such an allocation would accord with the strategic objectives to optimise previously developed land in sustainable locations to help meet the housing requirements of the existing and new population over the plan period.</p> <p>The justification for the proposed amendment to the emerging plan is provided below.</p>

As set out above, TPIFM's land interest relates to the Jarman Square development which comprises of a range of commercial leisure uses which include a cinema, gym and a range of major food and beverage operators.

The Site forms part of the wider Jarman Park development and is located to the south of the A414, St Albans Hills, which links Hemel Hempstead town centre with the M1 (Junction 4).

Offices and associates throughout the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific, Africa and the Middle East.

Savills (UK) Limited. Chartered Surveyors. Regulated by RICS. A subsidiary of Savills plc. Registered in England No. 2605138. Registered office: 33 Margaret Street, London, W1G 0JD

\\fpdsavills.co.uk\network\Office\ManchesterData\Planning\Planning (Archive 1)\TPIFM\Jarman Park, Hemel\LP Reps\L210226 SAV TPIFM Reps FINAL.docx

Access to Jarman Square is via a three arm roundabout on St Albans Road (A414) which is a dual carriageway linking the town centre to Junction 8 on the M1.

The surrounding area comprises a mixture of commercial and residential uses. Jarman Square forms part of a wider retail / leisure destination which also includes a Tesco superstore, McDonald's 'drive thru' and The XC Extreme Sports Centre.

Land to the south and east of the Site is characterised by traditional, two storey residential units around St Albans Hill Road and Bennetts End Road. To the north, on the opposite side of the A414 several applications have been approved or are pending for new residential development. This includes the approval of 7 storey block at Eastwick Row and a pending application for three residential blocks which range from 4 to 5 storeys at 'Paradise Fields'.

The Site is located approximately 1km east of Hemel Hempstead town centre and approximately 2km from junction 4 of the M1.

The National Planning Policy Framework ('**NPPF**') requires all Local Plans to be based upon and reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, with clear policies that will guide how the presumption should be applied locally.

Local planning authorities should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change.

They should be consistent with the principles and policies of the NPPF, and should be aspirational but realistic to address spatial implication of economic, social and environmental dimensions.

Planning policies should amongst other things be '*flexible enough to accommodate needs not anticipated in the plan...to enable a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances*'<sup>3</sup>. Paragraph 118 states that planning policies should encourage multiple benefits from urban land.

At the heart of the above is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which for plan-making means positively seeking opportunities to meet development needs of an area, and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change.

As the new Local Plan emerges, it is important that it adheres to the requirements of the NPPF in positively promoting new development in sustainable locations across the Borough.

TPIFM supports the overarching vision and strategic objectives for Dacorum as outlined within the Local Plan consultation document.

The Local Plan should seek to facilitate the optimisation of previously developed land and this will include an increase in heights and densities. Mixed use development (residential and commercial uses) should be supported on sustainable sites and intensification promoted having regard to appropriate local context.

TPIFM also strongly supports the delivery of new housing through the redevelopment of previously developed land, vacant or underused sites within the urban areas of the Boroughs as proposed by draft Policy SP4 of the Sustainable Development Strategy.



Jarman Square forms part of a wider 'Out of Centre Retail Location' as defined by draft Policy DM21 of the Emerging Strategy for Growth Local Plan.

TPIFM notes and supports the principle of this designation which seeks to recognise that the Site and wider Jarman Square area performs a role within the retail and leisure hierarchy. That is that it complements the offering found within designated retail centres and ensures that Dacorum has a comprehensive offer to meet the requirements of its immediate and wider catcher area population.

Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the retail and leisure sector has experienced a material change in recent years which has been further accelerated by the current pandemic. A number of further changes to the overall function of these sectors is projected in the short and longer term given the different market forces and change in consumer trends. It is anticipated that demand for retail and leisure floorspace within the Borough, including at Jarman Square, will change (either in terms of overall demand, type of premises or size of requirements).

TPIFM advocates that the policy framework in the emerging Local Plan recognises the potential for the repurposing of existing commercial sites as opportunities for intensification and diversification. The introduction of a mix of uses, including residential, could support redevelopment as well as helping to support retained commercial floorspace. New residential communities will drive footfall and demand for retail, leisure and other commercial and community uses.

Jarman Square represents a previously developed site in a sustainable location and as such it has potential to accommodate a successful mix of land uses including residential. This could be in the form of re-use of existing floorspace, redevelopment of existing floorspace or simply as standalone development (building above the existing structure or building on underused parts of the Site).

The re-positioning of the existing scheme would enable the Site to contribute positively towards strategic objectives of the Plan in terms of residential land supply. Optimising the use of brownfield land will help to reduce pressure on Greenbelt and other non-developed sites within the Borough.

There is a parcel of land at Jarman Park (c2 hectares) allocated as an 'out of centre retail site' under reference Growth Area HH27. This comprises of a vacant brownfield site located immediately to the north of Jarman Square which benefits from an allocation within the current adopted Local Plan for retail and leisure uses (Reference: Proposal S/1).

TPIFM requests that the Growth Area HH27 be extended to include Jarman Square or alternatively the latter be allocated under a separate, new Growth Area. A new designation should identify the potential of Jarman Square in terms of its ability to accommodate additional floorspace (development of up to six storeys is considered appropriate) and a greater range of land uses, including residential.

As set out above, Jarman Square is within the established 'built up' area of the settlement boundary for Hemel Hempstead and is a sustainable location. It is situated on an arterial road leading into Hemel Hempstead town centre and benefits from direct access via public and sustainable modes of transport. Optimisation of land in this location accords with the overarching objective of the NPPF to deliver sustainable forms of development and would ensure that the Site can make an important contribution towards the delivery of new homes. The recognition of the Site as forming part of a wider growth area will also help to ensure that it can be delivered in an integrated and coordinated way with the other sites within the Borough which are identified formally within the emerging Local Plan.

TPFIM requests that the Site is allocated as a Growth Area as part of the Delivery Strategy for Hemel Hempstead for a 'mixed use' including: **leisure, complementary retail and residential**. The Site should be afforded a site reference and should be identified on the Proposals Map. A red line boundary map which illustrates the Site is enclosed as part of these representations.

This consultation response from TPIFM relates specifically to the spatial strategy for growth and in particular the strategic objectives around identifying appropriate sites for development. Whilst the overarching strategy is considered to be sound and legally compliant, the amendments proposed by TPIFM would provide greater certainty that the various policy objectives can be delivered.

TPIFM reiterates that Jarman Square should be recognised formally for its ability to accommodate a greater quantum of floorspace and uses as part of the long term plan for the Borough. The function of the Site is anticipated to change and it provides an opportunity to help meet the demand for housing as part of a mixed use development in the future.

Jarman Square should be identified as Growth Area in the Local Plan in order to ensure the most effective and optimum use of 'previously developed land' within the Borough.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files** [ORG Tesco Pension Investment Fund Management - Agent Chris Moore Savills - Jarman Square Site Plan.pdf](#)

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14588

**Person ID** 1270707

**Full Name** Ms Debbie Wilson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.

From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and sometimes even badgers.

Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets is heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.

Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14600

**Person ID** 1270709

**Full Name** Mr Rodney Tucker

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and (comment removed).</p> <p>Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p>

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14607

**Person ID** 1270714

**Full Name** Mr Kevin Kelly

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

As homeowners on the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, we bought our home specifically for its exceptional views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.

From our windows we can currently look out over foxes, muntjac and a wide diversity of birds and on our night time strolls we can encounter bats, hedgehogs, and (comment removed).

Knowing that this will all be bulldozed and built upon for false government targets its heart-breaking and will provoke us into wanting to leave the town that we grew up in, instead of wanting to be a part of it.

Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various neighbours have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.

The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. The walk to the train station from our current location takes around an hour and for the newly built homes, this would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.

This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.

For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14845

**Person ID** 325470

**Full Name** Gardener Family Trust

**Organisation Details** Gardener Family Trust

<b>Agent ID</b>	1270807
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Alistair Brodie
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Henry H Bletsoe & Son LLP
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We note the ambitious plans to work with St Albans City &amp; District Council, in the delivery of over 10,000 new homes, as part of a new Garden Town. Whilst this is commendable, the scale of development is very large and in part reliant upon the provision of major new infrastructure and a close working relationship between two neighbouring, planning authorities. From my early career working at Telford Development Corporation I am well aware of the long lead in times associated with development on this scale. It is a complicated and time consuming process frequently involving differences of opinion between two local government bodies. In Telford there was a constant tension between Telford Development Corporation, as the delivery vehicle and Wrekin District Council, as the planning authority.</p> <p>I have also been involved recently, in development to the north of Houghton Regis where substantial housing development is now beginning to take shape, largely designed to meet the housing needs of Luton Borough Council, but on land which falls within the control of Central Bedfordshire Council.</p> <p>The whole process has been hugely delayed as a result of differences of opinion between the two authorities, which eventually ended up being contested in the courts.</p> <p>Therefore, with the best will in the world, and whilst I commend the ambitions set out in the housing delivery strategies, I must express concern over the ability of two independent planning authorities, to embrace the Hemel Garden Communities principle and positively work through a Memorandum of Understanding in order to coordinate the policies required between the two bodies.</p> <p>Given the long lead in time required to bring forward the scheme at HH21 for 1150 dwellings (which still does not currently have planning consent, after years of going through the local plan process and the planning application process) I am concerned that this large and complex scheme will not deliver the required housing numbers, within the anticipated timeframe. Smaller, more manageable schemes are easier and quicker to bring forward.</p> <p>In addition, the number of houses proposed on sites in Hemel Hempstead, is partly dependent upon the redevelopment of brown field sites. Again experience suggests considerable uncertainty must exist over when such sites will come forward for development and, in some instances, there must be a possibility that some sites will fail to come forward for redevelopment.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes



<b>* No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>We attach two plans showing an area of land off Fields End Lane, identified during earlier stages of the Emerging Local Plan as a potential site for residential development. The site has a gross area of approximately 7.8 hectares, with tree planting in the north western corner and a shelter belt against existing development along the eastern and southern boundaries, leaving an area available for development of approximately 6.6 hectares.</p> <p>The land is enclosed on its eastern and southern boundaries, by existing residential development. Access could be achieved either through improvements to Fields End Lane itself, or by driving a new road to the north, across land belonging to other members of our clients' family, emerging onto a new junction on Berkhamsted Road. This might involve some additional development on the land to the north of Fields End Lane. A plan of our clients' land is attached to this representation.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Gardener Trust Image 2.jpg</a> <a href="#">Gardener Trust Image 1.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14872
<b>Person ID</b>	1270824
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Prologis
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270823
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Nick Green
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director Savills
<b>Yes / No</b> <b>* Yes</b> <b>* No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>As part of the strategy for a significant increase in employment floorspace in the Borough, the extension of Maylands Business Park is a logical and sound approach, building upon the existing character and function of this area, as well as existing infrastructure to deliver high quality employment floorspace at site HH20 (Breakspear Way / Green Lane / Boundary Way, Maylands Gateway). This site would form a natural extension and rounding off of the Maylands Business Park in this gateway location, and the quantum and scale of development set out in the proposed site allocation is considered to be appropriate. The site would not contribute towards any extension of built development into protected open land or countryside. Furthermore, the development of this site would reduce pressure on the release of Green Belt land elsewhere in the borough to meet the employment needs set out in the emerging Local Plan.</p>

The Emerging Growth Strategy makes reference to the updated South West Hertfordshire Economic Study Update (2019) which sets out a number of key economic messages. This identifies that the supply of employment space is at a critically low level, including a shortage of industrial space and space for small firms in Dacorum.

The Economic Study Update (2019) found that there is a shortfall of 211,000 sqm of industrial land supply in South West Hertfordshire, including an under supply of 120,000 sqm of such floorspace in Dacorum. The Study went on to identify a need to provide additional employment space in Dacorum between 2018 and 2036 of:

- Offices: 45,100 sqm
- Industrial: 196,500 sqm

As above, the employment strategy set out in the Emerging Growth Strategy seeks to accommodate Dacorum's indicative floorspace growth figures for office and industrial space as far as possible, with a key aim to enhance Maylands Business Park as Dacorum's premier business park. However, the draft Plan considers there is no significant urban industrial land supply in Borough, except at Maylands Gateway fronting the St Albans Road/Breakspear Way (proposed site allocation HH20). The Council are therefore reliant on other South West Hertfordshire authorities to take their unmet need, including significant provision of office and industrial floorspace at the East Hemel Hempstead site in St Albans City and District. This highlights the importance of the proposed site allocations coming forward in the Local Plan, as it will provide the most significant contribution to future industrial land supply in the Borough. The land proposed at Maylands Business Park will also help to support economic growth and job creation, in line with planned growth of East Hemel to the east of the site and within St Albans boundary, with a significant number of new homes planned.

Overall, we believe the proposed employment allocations set out in the draft Plan, and the planned expansion of Maylands Business Park, will make an important contribution to the Borough's employment need, in an accessible and well serviced location within close proximity of Hemel Hempstead Town Centre and well connected to the wider area with access to the M1.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**

<b>Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14874
<b>Person ID</b>	1270825
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Hardy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Managing Director Lansdown
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>Land South of Chaulden Lane, Hemel Hempstead HP1 2BT, a 5.6ha site which is immediately available and demonstrably able to deliver 100 dwellings within the first 5-years of the plan period.</p> <p>The site is very sustainably located and comprises a Green Belt anomaly, the development of which will have limited impact on the Green Belt and form a strong long-lasting Green Belt boundary in line with the NPPF.</p> <p>Please see supporting statement and additional supporting evidence.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">ORG Lansdown_Land - Richard Hardy- Local Plan Consultation Response - Chaulden Lane.pdf</a>

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14908
<b>Person ID</b>	1270828
<b>Full Name</b>	Owen Ellander
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Property Development Greene King Brewing and Retailing Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270829
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mrs Helen Binns
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Walsingham Planning
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Green Belt boundary and Growth Area / housing allocations - see letter of representation from Walsingham Planning.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p>We are instructed by Greene King Brewing and Retailing Limited to make representations on their behalf to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038): Emerging Strategy for Growth. Specifically, we write with reference to land to the north of the Red Lion Public House on London Road, Hemel Hempstead. These representations request (1) the land is removed from the Green Belt and (2) the land is allocated a Growth Area for housing in the emerging Local Plan. A plan identifying the land in question is contained with this letter.</p> <p><b><u>Site</u></b></p> <p>The site comprises an irregular shaped parcel of land that extends to an area of circa 1 hectare. It is located to the east of A4251 London Road, to the north of Nash Mills Lane and the Red Lion Public House, to the west of the River Bulbourne / Grand Union Canal and a recent residential development and to the south of an employment area. The site is generally flat and is considered suitable for development.</p> <p>Although the site appears within the Green Belt, it does not serve any of the five purposes for including land within the Green Belt. It is also entirely disconnected from the open countryside. Indeed, the site is most accurately described as an edge of urban area undeveloped greenfield infill site. There is in our view therefore no planning basis for the site</p>

being within the Green Belt and not being available for development, particularly given the current pressure and demand for land to meet future development needs within the main urban areas and particularly Hemel Hempstead. The site directly abuts employment development to the north and residential development to the east and a public house to the south. The wider area around the site is mixed in nature comprising a mix of residential, employment and commercial and retail uses. The site is in a highly sustainable location and accessible by a range of non-car modes of transport. It is also accessible to a range of local services and facilities and employment opportunities.

The site is entirely in the ownership of Greene King Brewing and Retailing Ltd and is not subject to any existing leases. It is not in an existing active use and thus is available for immediate development subject to the necessary the planning permission being achieved. Having regard to the location of the site on the edge of main urban area of Hemel Hempstead, it is considered a suitable and appropriate site for accommodating future development needs. Whilst the site is subject to a number of constraints, they are not considered insurmountable or barriers to the development of the site. The land thus represents a viable and entirely deliverable development opportunity.

### **Development Potential**

Notwithstanding the site's apparent current Green Belt designation, we consider the site to be an available, suitable, and viable future development opportunity. We have enclosed with these representations a separate 'Site Assessment' document which demonstrates this. This considers the site's constraints in more detail. By way of a summary, the site is considered to be subject to the following constraints:

- Green Belt;
- Red Lion Public House Grade II statutorily listed building;
- Part of the site is in Flood Risk Zone 2 and susceptible to surface water flooding.
- Area of mature planting/ trees along the eastern boundary.

Neither the site's flood risk category nor the statutorily listed status of the adjacent Red Lion Public House constitute an insurmountable constraint that would prevent or render the site unsuitable for development. They are not therefore reasons to conclude that the site cannot accommodate future development needs. Rather it would be for an application for planning permission to demonstrate that the type, scale, siting, and design of development is acceptable having regard to these constraints.

Regarding the Green Belt designation, it is entirely unclear from the draft Proposals Map whether the land is actual meant to be shown as within the Green Belt or whether it is a drafting error. Notwithstanding this fact, in the event that it is within the Green Belt. it is our view that it should be removed from the Green Belt as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan, with the land incorporated into the defined settlement of Hemel Hempstead. This is because the designation of the land as Green Belt, cannot in our view be justified, by reference to the five reasons for including land in the Green Belt. The reasons for this are set out in detail below.

It is also worth noting at this point, that the site was submitted and promoted as a future development site in the Council's 2017 'Call for Sites' consultation. The Council's assessment of the site is contained within the Site Assessment Study January 2020 under Ref. 66 Land adj. Red Lion, Hemel Hempstead. The Council's overall conclusion was as follows:

*“Site considered suitable for residential or employment use. Whilst its existing contribution to Green Belt purpose is strong, it performs sufficiently well on other criteria to enable it to be considered potentially suitable for allocation with major constraints”.*

Having considered the site in some detail, aside from its Green Belt designation, we do not consider the land to be subject to insurmountable constraints and indeed, this is confirmed by the Council’s site assessment. With regard to the Green Belt, whilst the wider parcel of Green Belt land which the site forms part of for assessment purposes (Ref. HH-A12 in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal (January 2016)) is considered to perform strongly in terms of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt, the contribution that this individual parcel of land makes has not been assessed and when it is, it is clear that it contributes little if anything to the five purposes for including land in the Green Belt. By virtue of this fact, the land should in our professional view be removed from the Green Belt.

### **Proposals and Sites: Hemel Hempstead**

Having regard to the sustainable location of site and its position on the A4152 London Road and edge of the ‘Two Waters Opportunity Area’, we of the view that the land should be allocated as a Growth Area and specifically for new housing within the emerging Plan.

The enclosed ‘Site Assessment’ document provides important information regarding the availability, suitability and viability of the site for housing.

#### Suitability

The land is considered suitable for residential development being located in close proximity of other housing and directly adjacent to the built-up area of Hemel Hempstead. The site is also located in a highly sustainable location within walking and cycling distance of local services and community infrastructure as well as employment opportunities and public transport. The site’s canal side location would also make it an attractive location for new housing. The development of the site for housing would be entirely compatible with adjacent land uses and would be in keeping with the character of the area.

Discussions have previously been undertaken with the Highway Authority and a means of vehicular access to the site agreed in principle.

#### Availability

The site is entirely in the ownership of Greene King Brewing and Retailing Ltd. The site is currently unused and is not subject to any outstanding leases. No third-party land is required to develop the site. The land is not subject to any restrictive covenants that would prevent or delay the site being brought forward for development.

In terms of timescales, subject to the land being removed from the Green Belt and planning permission being secured, it is considered that it is not unrealistic to anticipate development being brought forward on the site in the next 3- 5 years.

#### Viability

No detailed viability work has yet been undertaken. However, our client is confident that development of the site is viable, particularly given the site is greenfield. Further more detailed work can be undertaken in due course in discussion with the Council.

The above information, together with that contained in the 'Site Assessment' document demonstrates that the site is available and suitable for development for housing and that it can be viably developed for this purpose. Whilst the site is subject to some constraints, they are not considered insurmountable. A layout for the site has not yet been developed, however we are of the view that it has the potential to accommodate up to 150 dwellings with means of access taken from Nash Mills Lane.

Conclusion

To conclude, our client considers that land to the north of the Red Lion, London Road, Hemel Hempstead should be removed from the Green Belt and the land brought within the defined settlement boundary of Hemel Hempstead. Our client also considers that the land should be brought within the "Two Waters Opportunity Area" and allocated as a Growth Area for housing in the new emerging Local Plan.

**Included files**

[Site Location Plan.pdf](#)  
[26-02-2021 Site Assessment Document .pdf](#)

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14912

**Person ID** 1270830

**Full Name** Sara Sweeney

**Organisation Details** Kitewood Estates Ltd

**Agent ID** 1270831

**Agent Full Name** Simon  
Chadwick

**Agent Organisation** Managing Director  
CarneySweeney Ltd

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

**Summary**  
 These representations to the Dacorum Emerging Growth Strategy (DEGS) Draft Local Plan have been prepared on behalf of Kitewood Estates. Kitewood controls land at Holtsmere End Farm which is included in the area identified in

Policy HH02 as being part of the Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities (HGC) site which is prima facie a major project which the Councils (both Dacorum and St Albans) wish to prioritise to deliver housing in the area.

Whilst Kitewood is strongly supportive of the principle of the HGC vision, it does have concerns over the delivery of it as outlined in the DEGS. The HGC project has received Government funding and Kitewood is aware of work that is being carried out in relation to it, including the instruction of consultants to prepare a framework masterplan. Whilst Kitewood is contributing to the cost of the framework masterplan, it reserves the right to comment on its conclusions and also note that the intended first phase of the HGC project as a whole is in general to be achieved through the development of land controlled by the Crown Estate within St Albans – ‘East Hemel’ with the first phase of HGC in Dacorum being that subject to Policy HH01 – land again controlled in the Crown Estate.

Kitewood’s position is set out in more detail in the representations below; however, in summary:

- 1 Support for the HGC proposal as a concept and a means of delivering significant amounts of housing in conjunction with the Government new settlement principles.
- 2 Support for the logic of the land in St Albans (mainly) coming forward as part 1 of the development on land which is controlled by the Crown Estate.
- 3 Support for the logic of the bringing forward of land in the north-western quadrant of the HGC allocation in Dacorum (Policy HH01) as an early phase of development within the district – subject to greater indication of it facilitating the delivery of the project as a whole (particularly the land within Policy HH02) rather than being regarded as an objective in its own right.
- 4 Support for the principle of co-ordination between landowners (and the Councils) to arrive at a framework masterplan for HGC as a whole that ensures early delivery of infrastructure to allow the HGC project to be delivered as soon as possible with phases of development coming forward simultaneously.

In this regard, Kitewood has a number of concerns about the current situation with regard to the HGC project as set out in the relevant policies of the draft Local Plan as follows:

- The housing requirements for the district as a whole in Policy SP2 are under-estimated. Using the Government’s ‘approved’ standard methodology calculation, at least 100 additional dwellings a year should be provided in Dacorum – ie 1,023 dwellings per annum compared to the current required rate being used in the DEGS of 922. This would mean a further 1,800 dwellings or so be provided for in the plan period.
- Concern that such a small proportion of the HGC garden community site in Dacorum (only 1,500 dwellings out of a total required provision of housing in the district as a whole 16,600) is planned to take place – ie only 9% of the projected housing provision on the Council’s figures are intended to come forward on the HGC site. If the housing requirement was increased in accordance with the correct standard methodology figures, that percentage falls to 8%.
- Notwithstanding Government commitment and the high priority placed on delivery of garden communities, Kitewood considers insufficient emphasis is being placed on securing the delivery of more of the HGC project within the Plan period in Dacorum. The Council (and the Crown Estate) seem content to achieve the HH01 part of the allocation in the Plan period without prioritising a delivery mechanism for the site as a whole including HH02.



- The emphasis on delivery of more of the HGC site in the Plan period should be reflected in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which should set out a coherent and viable strategy for providing inter alia the east-west link road between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road on a phased basis within the Plan period – hence allowing additional dwellings to come forward quicker on HH02.
- Kitewood’s concerns on the lack of progress made in relation to demonstrating delivery of infrastructure (particularly highways and transportation) to support the early delivery of the HGC project were confirmed by the content of the stakeholder workshop relating to the transport plan for HGC held on 24 February 2021.
- The lack of complete commitment to HGC is demonstrated by the fact the land required for ‘phase 2’ of HGC beyond is only proposed to be excluded from the Green Belt in this Plan All land required for the comprehensive development of the new settlement (ie HH01 and HH02) and should be allocated for housing and related uses to enable phases to be delivered simultaneously.

Given the issues related to viability and deliverability have not been demonstrated as being addressed in the DEGS – and the onus is as much on the Council as it is on landowners and developers in this regard – there is a danger the Plan will not survive scrutiny on viability and delivery issues – as has recently been the case with new settlement proposals in North Essex.

It is accepted that further work needs to be done in relation to these matters and that the Council has appointed appropriate personnel to The focus should be on resolving them with the overall aim to bring forward more of HGC as a whole within the Plan period rather than simply relying on phase 1 to provide a small proportion of housing requirements and to delay decision making on key issues relating to infrastructure provision on the latter phases. Kitewood would maintain an objection to this aspect of the HGC proposals and considers that whilst strong support can be given to the principle of the HGC, the direction of travel of the intentions for the policies related to it does not place sufficient priority on delivery of dwellings within the Plan period that match the Hemel Garden Communities Charter.

The following pages explain in more detail the reasons for Kitewood’s position. Kitewood remains committed to discussing matters with other landowners; the Council and other relevant organisations to bring forward a co-ordinated, deliverable and viable strategy for HGC that allows it to make more of a contribution to housing delivery within the Plan period than is currently the case. The key to that happening is a strategy for delivery of the east-west link road between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road referred to above.

### **Kitewood’s views on key issues within the DEGS**

There are a number of key issues that Kitewood would wish to comment on that have led to the conclusions reached in the summary on page Kitewood has suggested which policies would require amendment as a result of these conclusions although it is considered more helpful to comment wholly on the key issues.

#### 1 Housing requirements in the DEGS 2020 to 2038 and the achievement of them

The requirement which the DEGS seeks to achieve in terms of housing provision in Dacorum arises, inter alia, from the South West Hertfordshire Needs Assessment is some 16,596 dwellings in the Plan period. This figure is included within Policy SP2 – Spatial Strategy for Growth and is based on the use of an annual dwelling requirement of 922 However, the latest Government advise on which version of the standard methodology requirements should be used should result

in the figures generated by the 2018 standard methodology being used (which itself was based on the 2014 household projections). This would mean an annual dwelling requirement for Dacorum (as a starting point) of 1,023 dwellings per annum, ie 100 per annum more than the Council is currently using for the determination of the housing requirements in the DEGS. On this basis the overall housing requirement of 16,600 dwellings in Policy SP2 should be increased to a minimum of 18,400 dwellings.

To be fair to the Council, paragraph 5 of the emerging growth strategy accepts that there are uncertainties over using the 16,600 figure “particularly as there may be a further refinement to the process of calculating housing need and other matters that may need to be factored in”.

The Council accepts it will need to review the position and it is therefore considered that the Council could not really be criticised for the use of the 922 figure as a starting point emanating from the work that was done prior to the more recent decisions being made by the Government on the standard methodology. However, using the same basis (ie Government approved standard methodology figures) as the Council used to arrive at a starting point figure of an annual housing requirement of 922 dwellings per annum in the DEGS would not result in the figure being 1,023 dwellings per annum.

How the Council seeks to achieve the 18,400 requirement figure (or 16,600 as was calculated) is set out in the settlement strategy of the The potential to achieve a high level of growth whilst maintaining the character of some of the smaller settlements and market towns is doubted. In this regard, the proportionate increase in the size of the settlement of both Berkhamsted and Tring is already reasonably high – there would be little scope to expand these settlements further to meet increased housing requirements.

Whilst the Council says it wishes to concentrate more development within the Hemel Hempstead urban area it sees the achievement of this as relying on increasing densities and potentially finding sites for tall buildings in which to accommodate (presumably) apartment style developments close to the town centre. It also, however, seeks to maintain its existing amount of office floorspace within the main urban areas. The main sources of housing land within urban areas (which it identifies in paragraph 7.6) are in relation to exploring opportunities on former employment land; reviewing the opportunities to increase to the unallocated sites; allowing for 200 dwellings per annum on windfall sites and identifying contributions from neighbourhood plans. These do not really provide any new sources of supply (apart from on allocated sites) that have not been available for the housing market to provide over the current Local Plan period. Although there is some potential for conversion of existing office space to residential under new Permitted Development Rights (notwithstanding the Council’s aim to reduce office space supply), the potential for tall buildings within urban areas (particularly where there are very few existing tall buildings) is likely to prove controversial in terms of delivery and acceptability.

Therefore, in terms of achieving both the existing housing requirement proposed or a new higher one, the key is identifying and delivering new Plan allocations. Having identified the HGC as a key priority – as underlined by Government commitment – in Kitewood’s view it makes sense to use the new settlement as the main means of meeting increased housing requirements rather than find new allocations.

Therefore, the Council should re-consider its priorities in terms of how it may achieve a higher housing requirement than is currently set out in the Local Plan and seek to deliver the HGC quicker – as a minimum to accommodate an additional 1,800 or so dwellings in the Plan This would sensibly be on land currently included within Policy HH02.

Notwithstanding the above, even if the housing requirement was to remain as currently proposed, HGC offers the opportunity to deliver sustainable development adjacent to the Borough's principal settlement and its accelerated delivery offer potential to take off the pressure for the lower tier settlements to release Green Belt to deliver development in this Plan period.

#### 1 The role of HGC new settlement

The background to the HGC project will clearly be known to the Council. However, in Kitewood's view the role of the proposed new garden settlement is very similar to others which were confirmed by the Government (and to which they provided funding) in 2019. The overall objective was, and still is, to deliver a step change in housing land supply- reflecting that the provision of new settlements has the ability to deliver housing at an increased rate because the capacity of many of the urban areas (particularly in the south east) was not bringing forward housing land quickly enough. This also relied on the fact that the Green Belt constrained the growth of most major towns and cities within the south-east – therefore the concept of new settlements in the Green Belt – providing housing in a co-ordinated way with a high priority on design – had to be progressed through the Local Plan process rather than a planning application in the short term.

The key though has always been that the Government was seeking to assist local authorities in promoting new garden settlements to deliver housing or high quality environment as quickly as possible. In this case, Kitewood's concern is that in the background where more housing land is going to be required through the Local Plan than the Council currently allow for, there is insufficient priority being placed on facilitating the viable delivery of the HGC project.

In this regard, Kitewood notes that the general intention for the HGC project is for phase 1 of the development (East Hemel) to be broadly on land in St Albans. Kitewood accepts it makes sense for the first phase of the HGC project to take place on that land but maintains the position that phases can be brought forward simultaneously with the delivery of the infrastructure. It is somewhat concerning that the East Hemel part of the allocation proposed within the St Albans Local Plan appears to have encountered delays in delivery because of the difficulties which the St Albans Local Plan is having in progressing through the Examination. Therefore, the original programme for the delivery of the HGC project as a whole may itself be delayed because of the issue in the St Albans part of it. Hence it is even more critical that there is no impediment imposed by the Council to delivering the HGC falling within Dacorum's Borough boundary.

The intention for the delivery of the Dacorum element of the HGC – as currently referred to in the relevant draft policies in the DEGS – proposes that the western part of the development (Policy HH01) comes forward in the Plan period with the eastern part (Policy HH02) being removed from the Green Belt for development beyond the Plan Period. Whilst the HH01 land is in the control of the Crown Estate and it makes sense to consider this as the first phase of development of HGC in Dacorum, insufficient attention has been given so far to how a comprehensive plan for HH01 and HH02 land can be delivered in a viable way with particular regard to how the early phases of development would facilitate infrastructure – notably the east- west link road between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road that would allow earlier release of the phase 2 land within the Plan period. The impression which is given in the DEGS is that the phase 1 land will meet Plan requirements within the Plan period and therefore decisions about bringing forward later stages beyond the Plan period need not be prioritised. In view of Hemel Hempstead's position in the settlement hierarchy, the opportunity to deliver comprehensive and sustainable growth in the form of HGC along with the additional housing requirements and

the need for a comprehensive and co-ordinated approach to deliverability and viability this, in Kitewood's view, is the wrong approach.

Given the small proportion of development which the HGC is intended to provide within the Dacorum Local Plan period – 1,500 dwellings out of the likely housing requirement of at least 18,400 in the Plan period to 2038 – this clearly does not represent an appropriate prioritisation of such a key project which has received Government It would be appropriate, in Kitewood's view to aim, to provide all of the additional 1,800 dwellings which will be required because of the change in Government approach to calculation of housing requirements in Dacorum in the Plan period in the new settlement. Kitewood's view is that the other 'priorities' which the Council have, should not over-ride that of delivery of more of the new settlement in the Plan period.

What is therefore required is an acceleration of the delivery of the HGC project with particular regard to the costs and provision of the highways infrastructure (particularly the Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road link) which will facilitate HH02 and the earlier delivery of This could include – for example – the potential for all phases of the development to contribute towards the cost of such a link road on a proportionate basis with a proactive approach to funding and delivery that will then lead to a quicker development of the HGC project as a whole. Kitewood controls land within the HGC area currently covered in Policy HH02 within Dacorum. It is committed to a co-operative approach with other landowners and the Council to take such a proactive view. Kitewood's concern having considered the current position is that whilst East Hemel and site HH01 are being prioritised by landowners and the authorities, there is insufficient priority on how the delivery of those sites HH01 and HH02 would fit into an overall strategy for the HGC project as a whole – including a co-ordinated approach to contributions to infrastructure required to serve the HGC as a whole. It is hoped that further discussion and solutions to these issues will come out of the framework masterplan project which Kitewood is assisting in the funding of. However, Kitewood wants to reserve its position on that matter and comment further. Kitewood would wish to see a strategy for highway infrastructure delivery that would allow sites HH01 and HH02 (in part) to come forward viably within the Plan period with development taking place for the east and west of the overall site within Dacorum.

It is indicative of the lack of priority which the Council is placing on the delivery of the entire HGC project within the Plan period up to 2038 that not all of the land which has been identified as suitable for delivery of HGC is allocated for its development. Site HH02 is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. Kitewood objects to this allocation strategy and would strongly argue that given the commitment which the Council wants landowners to make to co-operation, an allocation of land for development (which may go beyond the Plan period) is not unreasonable.

There are two further factors which the Council should take into account in actually allocating land for development of HGC rather than simply removing it from the Green Belt.

a. The need to establish a viable and deliverable HGC project as a whole for the Local Plan to be found 'sound'

The Council may be aware that in other parts of the country – including North Essex – the Inspectors considering Local Plan proposals for new garden settlements have expressed concern over the evidence base which the Council has assembled as not providing sufficient certainty on the deliverability and viability of a new settlement proposal.

The provision of certainty and deliverability/viability of the project as a whole is not currently met by the DEGS, given, inter alia, the proposed policies do not allocate all land required specifically for that purpose – merely to remove it from the Green Belt. This does not show intent as to how the new settlement would be delivered on land allocated for that purpose. Whilst it is accepted that the proposals for East Hemel (on land controlled by Crown Estate) is more advanced than land in Dacorum, this does not obviate the need to consider how both HH01 and HH02 land comes forward and contributes towards the achievement of the longer term infrastructure requirements of the rest of the A proportionate and comprehensive approach needs to be taken. Kitewood is strongly of the view that planning and delivery of the new settlement should not take place on the basis of achieving East Hemel and some of phase 1 in Dacorum and then consider at a later stage what might happen next.

#### b. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan as is currently drafted does not contain sufficient evidence to inform how the major infrastructure requirements for HGC – notably highways – will come. It simply outlines the likely costs and programme needs to be defined for delivery. In Kitewood's view the assumption in the DEGS that the HH01 site may not come forward until the latter years of the Plan period could be significantly improved upon with further initiatives taken on the delivery issue – particularly on how a link road from Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road serving HH01 and HH02 can be delivered and funded.

Kitewood is concerned that as it currently stands doubt will be expressed by an Inspector considering the Local Plan in terms of viability, delivery issues and lack of certainty (indicated in part by the lack of specific allocation) to demonstrate the soundness of the HGC. This is particularly the case as more housing land will be required in the Plan period and the HGC should perform a much greater role in meeting that requirement than is currently intended to be the case.

In this regard, the HGC Charter dated November 2018 set out a number of objectives including Principle 8 – “Innovative approaches to delivery”. This states for example that the local authorities would “directly invest in the funding and delivery process including through the use of compulsory purchase orders”. It also stated that early phases of development would include a new link road to the north of Hemel Hempstead, improved junction on the M1, and improvements of Breakspear roundabout. This vision suggests a holistic approach of the land north of Dacorum served by an appropriate link road which currently the DEGS strategy has no detail of – and nor does the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The concerns about the lack of progress on a robust delivery plan – particularly relating to highways and transportation to serve the scale of housing development proposed – were emphasised at the recent stakeholder workshop (24 February 2021) on the HGC transport plan. Whilst Kitewood welcome the opportunity to participate, it was evident from the workshop (which disappointingly was not attended by anyone from either Dacorum Borough Council or St Albans City Council) that no decisions appear to have been made as to what the transportation links are going to comprise; no appreciation of how to deliver key infrastructure to ensure housing delivery and it would appear no joined up thinking between the emerging transport plan; the framework masterplan; the HGC vision document and the policies within the DEGS. The key question of how much infrastructure is required; when and its cost to ensure the provision of HGC as a whole and then the appropriate phases within the Local Plan to secure earlier delivery of the housing phases has not been properly addressed yet.

Without a sufficiently robust strategy for HGC there is a danger that the Plan will be put in jeopardy and in order to achieve the increased housing requirements the Council will be under pressure to grant planning permission on land which it otherwise may not wish to see come forward within the Plan period.

The problems which St Albans DC is having with the Local Plan being found sound (albeit for different reasons) would want to be avoided in Dacorum.

#### 1 The HGC growth area proposals HH01 and HH02

Kitewood notes the content of the objectives for the North Hemel Hempstead allocations and the proposals in HH01 and HH02. It agreed with the general intention to develop a masterplan for the site in accordance with the Garden Communities Spatial Vision. It considers that the proposals in relation to both HH01 and HH02 should be reviewed in the context of bringing forward the infrastructure (particularly for phase 2) much earlier than is currently intended. Kitewood, as stated above, does not agree with the intention to simply remove the phase 2 land from the Green Belt and safeguard it for development after 2038 'subject to masterplanning'. It considers insufficient priority is currently placed in the document on ensuring delivery of the appropriate infrastructure for both phases 1 and 2 in Dacorum. In essence, particularly should the housing requirement be revised upwards, the Council should seek to achieve the delivery of at least 1,800 or so dwellings proposed in phase 2 within the Plan period and should ensure through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and framework strategy the provision of the link road and key infrastructure to allow that delivery to take place.

Whilst the detail of how such a link road would come forward should be assessed in the HGC transport plan and the framework masterplan report (and Kitewood has specifically requested that takes place), the initial views of Kitewood's transport consultants have on such a link are as follows.

The consideration of the appropriateness of allocating land for specific development even though some of it goes beyond the Plan period is relevant following the publication of the Government's proposed changes to the This suggests that for larger development proposals the policies relating to them could look at a timeframe beyond 15 years and indeed up to 30 years. Therefore, there is a view emerging from Government that the provision of new settlements like HGC should be the subject of policy commitments beyond a 15 year period. Therefore, if the Council was of the view that (wrongly) the phase 2 land should only come forward for development after the end of the Plan period the allocation of it for specific development now would likely be supported by the changes to the NPPF.

HH01 is proposed to deliver approximately 1,550 dwellings and if access is to be achieved to HH01 from a new link road (either from the A41 to the M1 or from Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road), the key location of the site access would be on Leighton Buzzard Road. There would appear to be opportunities for emergency/secondary access to Grovehill and Woodhall Farm, but these are unlikely to be suitable for primary access or have the capacity to accommodate traffic associated with anything but a limited number of units.

Leighton Buzzard Road is a wide single carriageway road with a 50mph speed limit. It is considered acceptable that an appropriate means of access from Leighton Buzzard Road could be provided to HH01, but if only a single point of access to serve up to 1,550 dwellings is proposed until the east-west link is completed to either the M1 or Redbourn Road, this single access is unlikely to accommodate the level of traffic flow that will inevitably have to pass through Hemel Hempstead town centre to access the As such, the link road is expected to be required for HH01 on its own.

With the addition of up to 4,000 dwellings on HH02 (equating to approximately 5,500 dwellings and the rest of the other uses when combined with HH01), the east-west link from Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road and to the north-south spine road that has been identified as accommodating the East Hemel development, will be essential.

When HH01 and HH02 are considered comprehensively, there is likely to be a further link to the M1 required. This might be in the form of either a new junction on the M1 (Junction 8a), or improvements to Junction 9. It appears that the improved connection to Junction 8 via the Green Lane/Boundary Way roundabout is the preferred option for unlocking capacity for the East Hemel scheme, but this is not considered to accommodate or be an appropriate means of delivering a suitable means of access to the M1 for the HH01 and HH02 development at North Hemel.

Changes to emerging policies required

The main purpose of this document is for Kitewood to express its views on key issues that have led to the formulation and wording of the policies in the DEGS document. It is important for these issues to be addressed and then the appropriate changes to the relevant policies can be However, in general terms it is Kitewood’s view that the overall strategy Policy SP2 would need to be changed and updated to reflect the need to provide additional housing as a first step.

As far as the specific policies relating to the HGC itself are concerned, whilst the list of anticipated provision of development in Policies HH01 and HH02 would probably be a fair summary of the types of development that will come forward, there is no overarching policy for HGC related to the strategic provision of development, its phasing and likely delivery of housing and It is requested the Council gives serious consideration to re-casting how the policies in the DEGS document would provide such an overarching policy linked to a masterplan that can then be considered as part of the Local Plan process. Similarly, this policy should include a defined strategy for delivery of infrastructure including the key link road between Leighton Buzzard Road and Redbourn Road – whether part of a wider sustainable transportation corridor or otherwise.

Kitewood is, as stated in these representations, willing to co-operate and give their views to the relevant parties in the evolution of the policy process.

<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS14956</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1207224</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>Please note that a Sequential test and a level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will need to be carried out for any site allocations that have flood risk <b>before we would consider the local plan sound</b>.</p> <p>Our detailed comments are provided below, following the general order of the topics presented in the draft local plan document. Where we wish to see policies strengthened we have outlined the additional content we would like included. <b>While waste water capacity has been mentioned, it will need to be embedded within plan policies for us to find the plan sound.</b> Major development should be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity for local water supply. The subject of water resources and supply needs to be embedded as much as possible within any development plan.</p> <p>Wherever green infrastructure is mentioned we would like to see this changed to 'green and blue infrastructure' to recognise the importance of the interconnectivity of the green and blue network.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14981
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224



<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The site policy mentions 'modelling of small watercourses will need to be completed to determine extent of flood risk across the site'. While not classified main rivers this future modelling should include climate change allowances. This area does have a significant surface water flow path. There is potential for Natural Flood Management to be incorporated into the landscape vision.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14982
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The site policy mentions 'modelling of small watercourses will need to be completed to determine extent of flood risk across the site'. While not classified main rivers this future modelling should include climate change allowances. This area does have a significant surface water flow path. There is potential for Natural Flood Management to be incorporated into the landscape vision.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14983
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Please be aware that due to sensitive receptors (groundwater and the River Gade) we would have serious concerns if a petrol station was proposed as part of the suggested supermarket and we would object due to its unsuitability to the location.  Tall buildings should not impact on overshadowing of the River Gade. An assessment of shadowing levels should be undertaken to ensure no negative impacts.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14984
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We understand that this site already has planning permission so influencing policy may be restricted for this site.</p> <p>We are pleased to see the inclusion of the retention of the buffer zone and the policy that no development will be in the flood zones.</p> <p>Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Controlled waters are extremely sensitive in this location. The site is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Located within a Source Protection Zone 1 and within a 100m radius of an abstraction for potable</li> <li>1 Additionally, the site overlies the Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, a Principal</li> <li>1 River Gade is located along the western site boundary</li> </ul>

The site allocation highlights that *'building heights should be maximised in this location'* however, increased heights may necessitate the use of piled foundations (and cause overshadowing issues for the river). The use of piled foundations would pose concerns and we would object to any proposals involving piled foundations until these are supported by a robust risk assessment to demonstrate that they are appropriate in this location (within an SPZ1 and in close proximity to an abstraction).

We would also advise that you consult Affinity Water.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14985

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

The site has a complex and extensive history of former industrial uses including gasworks and depot. Intrusive investigations undertaken to date has reported the presence of gasworks related contaminants. Further comprehensive intrusive investigations to establish risks to controlled waters will be required as part of any development scheme. The site is located within a Source Catchment Area and overlies the Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, a Principal Aquifer. Additionally, River Bulbourne is located approximately 30m from the northern site boundary.

Subject to the results of the intrusive investigation works the adoption of infiltration SUDs may not be suitable as they could potentially mobilise contamination in the ground. The use of piled foundations would pose concerns and we would object to any proposals involving piled foundations until these are supported by a robust risk assessment to demonstrate that they are appropriate in this location. During consultations we would recommend contaminated land conditions to manage risks to controlled waters.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14986

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

A large portion of the site is within Flood Zone 2. Current models show that during a flood event with climate change allowances, water leaves the river banks. As much redevelopment should be outside the flood zone as possible, and in any event a smaller footprint than current. Redevelopment of flood zones should return the land to flood plain as much as possible. The Flood risk and drainage section does not make mention to the 10 metre buffer being maintained and we request that this is included not only for biodiversity but flood risk reasons. Flood zone 3 is also on site and so access/egress requirements will need to be considered.

Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.

It appears that there is a WFD action at this site that should be addressed in any planning application:

WFD Action ID 33,577. Fish easement to bypass stepped weir and mill downstream. Restore chalk stream characteristics. Increase sinuosity and morphological diversity. Enhance in-channel, marginal aquatic and bank habitats. Establish and manage riparian buffer zones.

Tall buildings should not impact on overshadowing of the River Gade. An assessment of shadowing levels should be undertaken to ensure no negative impacts.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14987

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

Our records show that this site is part of a local wildlife site (Boxmoor common). The appropriate body should be consulted to ensure this site is suitable for development. You will need to include appropriate acknowledgement of the site and that it will be protected/enhanced throughout development.

There is a need to protect water quality entering the 'drain' marked on site as this flows to the River Bulbourne. The drain should be renaturalised to create wetlands to filter run off, this could form part of the biodiversity net gain on site.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14988

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

There has been historic flooding on site so we are pleased to see that no development should take place within Flood zones 2 and 3. The Flood risk and drainage section does not make mention to the 10 metre buffer being maintained and we request that this is included not only for biodiversity but flood risk reasons. Flood zone 3 is also on site and so access/egress requirements will need to be considered.

Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.

It appears that there is a WFD action at this site that should be addressed in any planning application:

WFD Action ID 33622 Apsley Frogmore End 150m to Apsley Lock remove hard bed/banks, establish buffer zone. Remove hard bed/banks. Replace with soft engineering solution if necessary. Increase sinuosity and morphological diversity. Enhance in-channel, marginal aquatic and bank habitats. Establish and manage riparian buffer zones to enhance river corridor habitat

A minimum of 10m buffer zone between the River Gade and any built environment which could form part of the biodiversity net gain requirement. There should be no lightspill above 2 lux. The development should protect and enhance the chalk stream priority habitat. A WFD assessment will be required to be submitted as part of any application.

Our records show that this site is part of a local wildlife site. The appropriate body should be consulted to ensure this site is suitable for development. You will need to include appropriate acknowledgement of site and that it will be protected/enhanced throughout development.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS14989

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14990
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The site is located within a Source Catchment Area and overlies Lewes Nodular Chalk Formation, a Principal Aquifer. <b>Part of the site is over an Historic Landfill.</b></p> <p>The proposed scheme is for a retail led development. Due to the potential for gross contamination infiltration SUDs is unlikely to be suitable for the proposed scheme and we would object to any proposals for deep foundations (e.g. requiring piling) unless the developer can demonstrate how they will manage risks to controlled waters. We would recommend contaminated land conditions to deal with risks to controlled waters.</p> <p>Development on the Historic landfill part of the site may require a permit. The applicant would need to make enquiries regarding potential requirements under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS14991
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	Please refer to Section L Cemetery Developments of The Environment Agency's Approach to Groundwater Protection <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/groundwater-protection-position-statements</a> . And <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/cemeteries-and-burials-prevent-groundwater-pollution">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/cemeteries-and-burials-prevent-groundwater-pollution</a> .
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS15042
<b>Person ID</b>	1250021
<b>Full Name</b>	Hallam Land Management Ltd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Hallam Land Management Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1265070
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Stacey Rawlings
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	We strongly contend that a decision now to allocate a first phase of HGC is not HLM recommend that the allocation of HGC phase 1 should be deleted from the DBLP and delivered as a strategic allocation through the emerging JSP. This will enable the assessment of transformational long-term cross-boundary growth options to be properly considered and examined in the round. The whole of the area earmarked to deliver HGC Phase 1 and 2 land can form part of a specific policy for 'Safeguarded Land in the Green Belt' to facilitate conformity with the JSP.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	Land at Berkhamsted Road, Hemel Hempstead (SLAA Site 78: Polehanger Lane) has been assessed as suitable and available and can contribute towards meeting the housing needs of the borough within the plan period to 2038 in accordance with the preferred spatial It can plug the gap whilst HGC is progressed through the strategic plan. It has been reviewed through the Councils site assessment process and performed well against the assessment criteria, including GB considerations. It should be included as an allocation to provide flexibility and certainty for the plan to deliver the required housing requirement.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15047
<b>Person ID</b>	1250021
<b>Full Name</b>	Hallam Land Management Ltd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Hallam Land Management Ltd

<b>Agent ID</b>	1265070
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Stacey Rawlings
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>The proposed allocations in this section of the draft plan require full justification. At the present time, there is insufficient evidence available in the public domain to enable a full response to be made to proposed Sites HH01 (and HH02) at Hemel Hempstead. At this stage, HLM observe that the two land parcels – at 212 hectares for 1,550 homes and 160 hectares for 4,000 homes and similar associated transport, social and community infrastructure are out of kilter.</p> <p>Regarding Hemel Hempstead sites in general, please refer to the summary table HLM1 at Appendix 1 of this representation. Generally, there is an underlying theme within the accompanying Urban Capacity Study and Site Assessment proformas that many of the urban sites may not be fully viable when assessed against all policies in the plan.</p> <p>HLM considers that the sites selected to deliver the proposed strategy may not be effective. Particularly the deliverability of urban sites and how realistic is the approach given that the majority are in active use. As the plan-making process advances, this potential yield may evolve and be refined (i.e. reduce).</p> <p>The lead-in period for Site HH01 at HGC (phase1) is reliant upon a wider strategy and new strategic infrastructure. Timescales for delivery are not yet available for scrutiny, or the relevant evidence base to establish whether 1,500 units are achievable by 2038.</p> <p>Further, in light of the proposed site selection, it is not clear that the development strategy will deliver 35-40% affordable housing across its site allocations.</p> <p>The portfolio of sites at Tring and Berkhamstead appear relatively less constrained in delivery terms in comparison to the Hemel Hempstead portfolio of sites. The overall strategy, when taken as a whole, is at risk of delivering growth in the market towns and less sustainable settlements given the uncertainties surrounding delivery of the Hemel Hempstead sites particularly in the early year of the plan. This will not achieve the stated objectives of focusing new development at the most sustainable location of Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>HLM does not consider there is sufficient headroom within the plan to ensure the Plan remains robust in the event there is slippage from the allocated sites, such as those requiring significant pieces of new infrastructure i.e. at HGC or cessation/relocation of existing uses to release the land for development. The more sustainable locations for accommodating any shortfall are significantly constrained by GB designations. There is a high risk of any top-up ‘windfall’ sites being in less sustainable locations beyond the GB that might prejudice the overall spatial strategy.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

\* No

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

HLM considers additional land should be allocated to ensure a plan-led approach to development. It is acknowledged that further Green Belt release will be necessary to accommodate additional/alternative housing sites. To accord with, and bolster the spatial strategy vision and objectives, additional growth should be directed to Hemel Hempstead.

The proposals for the smaller settlements of Berkhamstead and Tring to support a polycentric development strategy are noted, however the extent of growth to those towns already appears disproportionate in scale. It is not appropriate to increase development further in these smaller towns.

**Site opportunity: Site 78: Polehanger Lane**

HLM's Land at Berkhamstead Road (SLAA Site 78: Polehangar Lane) has been promoted as part of the Local Plan. It has been assessed in the evidence base and was summarised that the site performs well in general, but that there were other site allocations that would be more suitable to assist with delivery of the strategy of the new Local Plan, including the potential to maximise sustainable transport modes.

A vision document is appended to these representations setting out how the site can contribute to the spatial strategy (Appendix 1).

It is important that the Green Belt boundaries that feature in the new plan are strategically defensible and can endure for the life of the plan. The extension of the Green Belt proposed for Land at Berkhamstead Road, Hemel Hempstead can provide a reliable and defensible boundary, following the physical line of the established woodland and the field boundaries. This aligns with the advice set out in para 139 of the NPPF on defining Green Belt boundaries.

In terms of transport related assessments, the site testing concluded that:

[please see image 2]

Whilst the Sustainable Transport Strategy is awaited, the evidence base that is available suggests that the other draft site allocations, principally North Hemel Hempstead, will be reliant on improved pedestrian and cycle links and dedicated bus routes between the site and the town centre/station.

References are also made to embracing electric cycling technologies and the implementation of a Travel Plan. Such strategies to focus on active travel are also the principle upon which the Tring and Berkhamsted Sustainable Transport Strategies are built, with consideration of traffic capacity having been rejected on the basis of the COMET modelling outputs.

Such strategies are supported and indeed would also be adopted as part of the transport strategy for SLAA Site 78.

Representations have been previously submitted highlighting this, with suggested interventions that would include:

- Improved pedestrian/cycling routes, crossing locations and prioritisation, including improvements to the existing route that runs through Gadebridge to the south, linking the site with the wide ranging established infrastructure that already exists in the area, such as local schools and retail properties, as well as linking the site toward the town centre.

- Relocating an existing bus turnaround facility into the site from Boxted Road, extending existing services into the site and potentially improvements to peak hour frequencies that would provide a direct route south toward the town centre and the station, from which residents could access the Multi-Modal Transport Interchange intended for the station;
- Internalisation of trips through the provision of a dedicated primary school and implementing measures such as a Walking Bus to the school;
- Providing electric vehicle/cycle charging infrastructure for each property and investigating the potential for mini electric scooter hire stations within the site, dependant on the legal position of this mode of travel at the time of development;
- Ensuring high speed broadband to allow working from home; and
- Encouraging car clubs and car sharing.

These interventions would benefit both the SLAA Site 78 and established residential communities to the south, and are further indicated below. A larger copy reproduced at **Appendix 3: Figure HLM1**.

[please see image 3]

Furthermore, the development proposal is geographically located in a way that could complement the strategies within the Local Plan. Located on the western side of Hemel Hempstead, any latent traffic not addressed by the sustainable travel strategy that needs to access either the town centre or station, can do so without being wholly reliant on travelling by car via the A414 through Hemel Hempstead. Via the proposed public transport strategy, residents would be able to access the Multi-Modal Transport Interchange at the station, and from here access the proposed Mass Rapid Transit towards Maylands via the A414.

Whilst the development may have an impact on the local highway network, localised junction improvements can be implemented, with this detailed testing undertaken at planning application stage.

Furthermore, whilst the Hemel Hempstead Draft Sustainable Strategy has not been released to inform this consultation, Local Plan Chapter 21 notes that it has identified 4 key strategic movement corridors through Hemel Hempstead. Policy DM51 – *Supporting and Protecting Land for Transport Interventions* then infers this encompasses Galley Hill, with Link Road also being an important East-West link. Site 78's location, on the northern edge of Hemel Hempstead, means that such interventions would support and complement development in this location, with the development in turn providing contributions to support this aspiration. Residents would, therefore, be able to use a network of active transport infrastructure to travel east/west through the northern edge of the settlement to access trip attractors such as Maylands, without being wholly reliant on travel via the A414.

In summary, SLAA Site 78 relies on a transport strategy that reflects all of the other major draft allocations, with identified improvements to pedestrian and cycle networks and improved public transport services. Furthermore, any localised highway capacity impacts will be site specific and can be addressed in a traditional way, directly via a specific developer either through S278 agreements or S106 contributions. Other draft allocations are instead potentially reliant on more costly interventions and therefore other sources of funding that may not be available. An allocation of SLAA Site 78 would, therefore, support the transport related planning policies within the emerging Local Plan.

In summary, SLAA Site 78 provides a clear opportunity to allocate alternative or additional land in the plan period to give more certainty to the housing strategy which will need to deliver sufficient homes to meet the identified need. It fits with the spatial strategy of accommodating growth at Hemel Hempstead as a priority and is available and deliverable. It is in a single ownership, under the control of HLM and there are no barriers to its early delivery, unlike the majority of the identified preferred allocations for Hemel which are reliant upon the relocation or cessation of existing uses and the wider complexities of bringing forward Phase 1 of HGC.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">IMAGE 2.jpg (1)</a> <a href="#">image 3.jpg (2)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15052
<b>Person ID</b>	1270849
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jessica Lindfield
<b>Organisation Details</b>	St William Homes LLP
<b>Agent ID</b>	210999
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Friend
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director Vincent & Gorbng
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>St William is a joint venture between the Berkeley Group and National Grid Property ('National Grid'), which was formed in The partnership combines National Grid's extensive portfolio of surplus brownfield sites across London and the South East with the Berkeley Group's design expertise and proven track record of delivery to create high-quality residential and mixed use developments.</p> <p>St William regenerates and transforms derelict former gasworks sites and as part of the Berkeley Group, their driving purpose is to create high quality homes, strengthen communities and improve people's lives through fantastic The pandemic restrictions have further highlighted the importance on the quality of homes and their surrounding spaces, ensuring that they are sustainable, inclusive to all and accessible to local amenities and key social infrastructure.</p>

Bringing forward these former gasworks sites for the delivery of homes is very challenging as they are technically very complex; it involves significant (often upfront) levels of investment and comes with high developer risk; very few developers have the capacity, expertise or risk appetite to regenerate such sites.

Since the formation of the JV, St William has been granted planning approval for 13 former gasworks sites which include; Rickmansworth Gasworks (48 homes) Borehamwood Gasworks (78 homes), Watford Gasworks (92 homes) and more recently Hertford Gasworks (375 homes).

During the early part of the plan period, St William intend to develop the former Hemel Hempstead Gas Works site on London Road, Hemel Hempstead identified within the draft plan as “Growth Area HH09: National Grid Land.” The allocation is presently described as being for “around 400 dwellings, subject to master-planning; and public open space.”

From previous discussion with the Council as well as the current Site Allocation policy, it has been acknowledged that the site provides a key opportunity to bring forward housing and would contribute to the regeneration of the area. It has also been acknowledged that, being a former gasholder site, viability will be challenging and a consideration for any scheme going forward. St William look forward to continuing to work in partnership with the Council to achieve the regeneration of this site.

The site is presently allocated within the adopted Site Allocations DPD (2017) but it is important that the emerging plan, both generally and in relation to this site, reflects changes in planning policy context, housing need, design aspirations and environmental Key to the success of the plan as a whole will be ensuring that the general policies and this particular allocation fully recognise the need to positively support the delivery of new homes, with full consideration given to how policy requirements impact on both the ability to optimise capacity and the viability of development.

St William is committed to delivering high quality, design-led placemaking and the regeneration of redundant gasworks sites, with a particular focus on landscape; St William believe that the space between buildings is where a community can be established and somewhere that is sociable, sustainable and safe. This approach provides for a practical way to open up and reconnect places that have been closed to the public for decades – the land at the former Hemel Hempstead Gas Works site being a classic example. It will enable the development to result in a welcoming, sociable, beautiful place within Hemel Hempstead at the same time as building the additional housing that people urgently need.

St William welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Council as it undertakes a review of its Local Plan alongside discussions regarding a planning application for the site that will demonstrate early deliverability. Having reviewed the emerging plan in its entirety, St William support the general approach of the plan, its growth aspirations, its focus on design-led placemaking and its recognition of the need to positively address the climate change agenda. St William will positively engage with the plan-making process as this continues. The following comments are made on the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (referred to as “DESG” in this document) within this context.

We comment first on the site specific allocation (section 2) and then on the general policies of the plan (section 3).

It should be noted that these representations are made solely on behalf of St William, notwithstanding any representations made by other divisions of the Berkeley Group or National Grid.

### **Growth Area HH09 – National Grid Land**



As the developer that will deliver this site, St William strongly support the residential allocation in principle, given its allocation is already established by virtue of the existing Site Allocations DPD. St William are in the process of bringing forward a planning application for development of the site. The site is available and deliverable, and it is expected that first completions will take place in December 2023. The new homes on the site will therefore be completed within the first five years of the plan; the development will therefore make a significant contribution to the 5-year housing land supply position.

### **Description of the allocation**

The allocation is described as being for “around 400 dwellings, with public open space.”

The reference to “public open space” within the policy is unclear and unnecessary. It could be read as though the site will accommodate public open space as a use in its own right as opposed to the ancillary open space that needs to be provided on-site to serve the development. St William assume the intention of the policy is the latter but this needs to be clarified by the It would not be possible to accommodate, for example, playing pitches on the site whilst maintaining the viability and deliverability of the scheme; it is important that this point is clarified. The need to provide open space on site, or contributions to off-site enhancement, is covered by policy DM63. For clarity, therefore, the allocation should omit reference to “public open space.” If the Council cannot agree to this amendment the allocation description should be amended from ‘Public Open Space’ to “Open space to serve the development.”

### **Housing yield**

In the context of the growth ambitions of the plan, it is essential that the yield from brownfield and sustainable sites is maximised to meet the 5 year housing land requirement, reducing both the loss of Green Belt and reliance on larger urban St William consider that Policy HH09 should be more ambitious in the number of homes that can be delivered on the National Grid site.

The allocation presently indicates that the site can accommodate “around 400 ” At this stage, St William consider this to be vague and unhelpful. Appeal decisions interpreting such policy wording have considered that “around” might be considered as +/- 10%.

Current feasibility work demonstrates that the site could accommodate circa 475 To ensure a positive policy context to optimising delivery from the site, St William proposed that the allocation should be expressed as a minimum of 440 homes. The reference to a minimum is consistent with the approach to both exceeding the housing requirement across the plan period and development in Two Waters being described in the plan as being “a minimum of 1,500 dwellings”. Indeed, throughout the DESG is the theme of maximising the potential of sustainable previously developed land. The policy should therefore be framed positively in this context to achieve and potentially exceed 440 homes. If the Council will not agree to this, and the word ‘around’ is maintained, St William suggest that this be amended to “around 460 dwellings.”

### **Affordable housing**

We make comments on the general affordable housing policies later in these representations.

In terms of the National Grid site, former gasworks sites are unique in both use and character; they are challenging and abnormally expensive to regenerate compared to delivery of development on other brownfield sites; they can also have ongoing operational requirements requiring physical infrastructure and easements which can considerably reduce the developable site area. The further challenge for any developer on these typically complex sites is the quantum of upfront costs required to make the sites adequate for residential delivery. The specific viability challenges to bring former utility sites forward needs to be carefully balanced to ensure these redundant brownfield sites fulfil their potential and contribute to an areas housing need.

The allocation should therefore specifically recognise the costs incurred by National Grid and St William as a result of bringing the site forward for development, associated with decommissioning, decontamination and bringing the site into residential use in considering the amount of affordable housing that can be provided on the site. Policy HH09 should indicate as follows:-

- *“A viability analysis should be prepared, taking account of the costs incurred since the cessation and decommissioning of the former use in order to clearly demonstrate the level of affordable housing that can be provided whilst ensuring that development can proceed.”*
- 

### **Urban Design Principles**

St William consider that it will be important for the Borough to make the most efficient use of the limited land available to achieve the levels of growth expected. This should be done with a focus on optimising densities in accessible locations whilst utilising a design led approach to achieve excellent place This will be particularly important for a Borough like Dacorum, whereby Green Belt development is needed to meet numbers.

The recent publication of the draft NPPF makes clear that the Government has given centre stage to its proposals to raise the standards of design and quality of new The NPPF’s policy for encouraging good design is strengthened, with significant weight to be given to development that adopts outstanding or innovative designs. A design led approach to the National Grid site will be adopted that will ensure the most efficient use is made of a brownfield site, optimising the delivery of homes whilst delivering high quality placemaking in accordance with this emerging and adopted NPPF policy.

We comment further on the general policy towards tall buildings (DM41) later in these In respect of the site allocation policy (HH09), this should be more positive in supporting taller and tall buildings (as defined in the plan as up to and exceeding six storeys respectively) on the National Grid site in accordance with the overall approach of Policy DM41 and the need to maximise the potential of the site. On this basis, St William consider that a design-led approach, with appropriate levels of open space and car parking, with a variety of building heights, can be accommodated on the site whilst respecting the site’s immediate and broader context. Indeed, a flexible approach to building heights will be essential to deliverability as the viability of the scheme will be driven by the ability to optimise the site; this will clearly necessitate tall buildings. The site allocation policy should not therefore place constraints on the design process, particularly with regard to building heights. A full landscape and townscape assessment will be prepared to support a future planning application in order that the impact of development on the character and appearance of the local area can be fully understood.

It is therefore considered that policy HH09 should be reworded to allow for flexibility in this regard, as follows :-  
*“A design-led masterplan to be agreed through development management that will allow for development of taller buildings (up to six storeys) and tall buildings (in excess of six storeys) in accordance with the principles set out in Policy DM41 – Heights of Buildings.”*

**Landscape Considerations**

The bullet point under this heading is somewhat vague as the meaning of ‘positively respond to the adjacent moors’ is unclear. It is suggested that this is replaced with the following  
*“Development should take into account the landscape setting and views of the site, in particular, from the adjacent moors, a locally designated park and garden”*

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15121

**Person ID** 1222814

**Full Name** Alex MacGregor

**Organisation Details** Senior Planner  
 Quod Ltd (ON BEHALF OF PIGEON INV MAN LTD)

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p>Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd welcomes and fully supports the identification of allocation sites HH01 and HH02 for residential-led development as part of the HGC. It is considered that development within the North Hemel Growth Area has the potential to provide a high-quality sustainable scheme based on garden community principles as part of the wider HGC proposals.</p> <p>However, whilst we fully support the allocation of site HH02, For the same reasons as set out in the response to Question 2, Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd does not support the safeguarding of land at North Hemel Growth Area (Phase 2) to deliver 4,000 post 2038, as set out in Policy HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2).</p> <p>In bringing these sites forward it will be important that they are fully integrated with development within the East Hemel Growth Area within SADC. An important aspect of this will be transport infrastructure provision and connectivity. In this context it is noted that both Policy HH01 North Hemel (Phase 1) and Policy HH02 North Hemel (Phase 2) state that sufficient land should be safeguarded to provide for a new transport corridor which will connect the Leighton Buzzard road to the allocations to the east (within SADC). This is an important infrastructure intervention to unlock the development potential across the whole HGC, both within DBC and SADC. This approach is therefore welcomed. As owners of the land north of Redbourn Road, Pigeon Hemel Hempstead Ltd confirm their commitment to help deliver this key piece of infrastructure to ensure that this connection can ultimately be delivered.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the nature and role of this link road and the appropriate mechanisms and timescales for its delivery remain uncertain and are subject to further consideration as part of the HGC Transport Strategy and Framework Plan. The prevention of development of the North Hemel Phase 2 land (HH02) before 2038 could potentially prevent the timely delivery of this link road which could unduly constrain wider transport and accessibility objectives.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No</p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS15226</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1271006</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Zoe Wiggins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>We were planning to buy our first home near the boundary of the middle of the Phase 2 North Hemel area, particularly for the views, access to countryside and enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>After finding out it will be bulldozed and built upon, we changed our minds.</p> <p>Each time there is heavy rain, the fields create large rivers and a lake which can spread from close to Redbourn all the way down Dodds lane towards Piccotts End. These rivers last for several days. Various friends have drone footage to show the extent of this problem, which is available on request. Planning to build homes on areas that frequently are known to flood would be catastrophic for the newly built homes and residents. Concreting of these areas would make this issue even worse than it already is. This would affect both North Hemel Phase 1 and 2.</p> <p>The plan mentions sustainable transport and encouraging residents to use active travel instead of relying on cars. For these newly built homes, the walk to the train station would be over an hour. Even if cycling lanes were installed on all roads from the new Garden Community to the train station, this would still take over half an hour at least, and be uphill on the way home. As such, it is expected that the majority of these residents would not use this travel method. The result of this would be an influx of cars travelling across town to the train station on roads which are already heavily congested.</p> <p>This also applies to accessing the town centre. Reliable public transport has been promised for years and never delivered, it is not trusted or expected that this will be a usable and reliable service.</p> <p>For those who do not access the train station, if they are not working locally, or from home, they are likely to be attracted to buying a home that is close to links to the M1 - as such, this will also be encouraging additional car use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15278
<b>Person ID</b>	1271103
<b>Full Name</b>	GRAHAM RITCHIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	FAIRFAX STRATEGIC LAND (HEMEL) LTD
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	<p><b>Representations Submitted on behalf of Fairfax Strategic Land (Hemel) Ltd</b></p> <p>We refer to the above consultation exercise and respond on behalf of our client, Fairfax Strategic Land (Hemel) Ltd, setting out a number of representations upon the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 – 2038)</p>

Consultation (the Emerging Strategy), including in relation to the **omission of land located west of Piccotts End, Hemel Hempstead (LPA Site Assessment Ref HH69) as a housing allocation for up to 400 dwellings** in helping to meet identified housing needs during the plan period.

The following plans and documents are submitted in support of our representations:

- Site Location Plan 1920-PL01 Rev A
- Indicative Site Layout 2037-PL04 Rev.G
- Landscape Assessment (Hyland Edgar Driver) (Feb 2021)
- Green Belt Assessment (CSA Environmental) (Feb 2021); and
- Highways and Accessibility Technical Note: Suitability of Land west of Leighton Buzzard Road, Hemel Hempstead and Analysis of Draft Housing Allocations (SK Transport) (Feb 2021).

The content of the supporting plans and particulars is set out below where relevant to the particular issue/discipline being addressed.

**Land located to the west of Piccotts End, Hemel Hempstead** is controlled by Fairfax Strategic Land (Hemel) Ltd extends to approximately 26ha (Site Assessment Ref HH69) and could provide for up to 400 dwellings.

The land comprises an available, suitable and deliverable opportunity to accommodate housing needs (both market and affordable), in a sustainable location, within the industry standard recommended walking and cycling distances from local services and facilities, including the significant retail, employment, community facility and leisure offer available in the town centre.

In addition, the ability to extend existing bus services into the site further serves to underpin the site's excellent sustainability credentials.

Development of the site for housing provides the opportunity to create a new planned expansion to Hemel Hempstead, and will include a CIL payment and/or commuted sum to be secured through a site-specific planning obligation to enhance the overall offer at Rossgate local centre; thus benefiting the wider community with an enhanced social offer.

The site's proximity to existing local centre, other local facilities as well as Hemel Hempstead town centre demonstrates the sustainability merits of the site for housing when set against the Council's on-going housing need.

A bus stop and turning loop has also been incorporated into the Indicative Site Layout, the provision of which has support from an established local bus provider having and they have confirmed they are willing to use the loop should permission be granted.

Notwithstanding the location of the site within the Green Belt, the character of the site is heavily influenced by the suburbs of Gadebridge, Piccotts End and other surrounding development including the electricity sub-station and garden centre beyond to the north.

The site offers the opportunity to provide a material contribution to the Borough's pressing and on-going housing need and do so in an appropriate manner without impacting upon the wider countryside surrounding Hemel Hempstead. As explained later in these representations, the site is ideally located to be brought forward for development in the early stages of the plan period, and/or in helping to meet a shortfall in the five year supply of deliverable land.

The land has inherent sustainability merits which make it suitable for residential development, and in our view represents a development opportunity providing a logical rounding off to the north of Hemel Hempstead with limit impact upon both the landscape and Green Belt purposes.

For the reasons set out in our submissions there are a number of fundamental shortcomings with the approach to site selection in the Emerging Local Plan Strategy that result in the need for amendments if it is to satisfy the tests of soundness at paragraph 35 of the NPPF.



Based on our assessment of the evidence base that has been used by the Council to underpin the approach to site selection, the Emerging Strategy cannot be said to be justified in so far as it fails to represent an appropriate strategy and nor does it adequately take account of the reasonable alternatives.

This is particularly the case for the approach to site selection at Hemel Hempstead.

We have undertaken a comparative analysis of the draft allocations proposed by the Council, including the 3 no. draft site allocations at Hemel Hempstead, comprising HH-h1b – North of Hemel Hempstead (phase 1), HH-h1b – North of Hemel Hempstead (phases 1 and 2) and HH-h2 – North of Gadebridge (Land at Piccotts End) and conclude that on a proper consideration of the evidence base the Emerging Strategy should have identified our client's land at Piccotts End as a housing allocation(s).

Our representations focus on specific parts of the Emerging Strategy as follows:

- **Policy SP4: Delivering the Housing Strategy**

The consultation draft Local Plan sets out a need to plan for a significant level of growth, including in the form of urban extensions and Green Belt releases. This includes a significant amount of planned growth at Hemel Hempstead. The spatial strategy has purportedly been informed by a number of evidence base documents. They include, but are not limited to:

- Housing Topic Paper
- Site Selection Topic Paper
- Site Assessment
- Sustainability Appraisal
- Green Belt Study
- Highway Studies

Our detailed representations are set out below and include submissions in response to the content of these evidence base documents, including, inter alia, the Site Assessment (prepared by AECOM alongside the Topic Paper) and the Sustainability Appraisal ("SA").

The NPPF sets out the principal components to be included in local plans. Paragraph 35 requires that in order to be “sound” a Development Plan Document (‘DPD’) should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

In order to be justified the DPD must be founded upon a robust and credible evidence base and represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

For the reasons set out below, we are of the view that the evidence base fails to provide a reasoned approach to site selection. This includes for the reasons set out in the accompanying plans and particulars (at (i) to (v) above). In this regard, we place particular emphasis upon the comparative analyses undertaken by Hyland Edgar Driver (landscape impact) and SK Transport Planning (highways) in relation to the Council’s approach to site selection.

The findings of the CSA Green Belt Assessment are also important in so far as they identify the Council’s Green Belt appraisal failed to undertake a finer grain analysis of the site as an individual land parcel. Rather, the Council’s analysis assessed the site as part of a much wider area of land. Had the Council undertaken this finer grain analysis they would have concluded in relation to the suitability of the site as a Green Belt release and carried it forward for further assessment as a housing allocation.

As such, it is our view that **the Emerging Strategy cannot be said to be justified and nor can it be said to be effective**. We expand upon our submissions in the detailed considerations as set out below.

As indicated at paragraph 2.3 of the Emerging Strategy, a key challenge for the Borough is the step change in housing growth to address the objectives of the Government to significantly boost housing supply.

Although paragraph 7.5 of the Emerging Strategy refers to the application of the Government’s draft approach to establishing the Borough’s housing requirements as outlined in its proposed changes to the Standard Method, the final approach has since been confirmed by the MHCLG; the updates to the PPG issued on 16th December 2020 refer (ID ref 2a-004-202001216).

Pursuant to the above, and although paragraph 7.5 refers to a minimum annual need of 922 dwellings (equating to at least 16,596 dwellings over the plan period 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2038), resulting from the revised PPG, the scale

of growth now required is for at least 1,023 dwellings each year (through application of the approach set out in the steps of the PPG).

This results in a need to find additional allocations for at least circa 1,818 dwellings. However, and in reality, the Local Plan needs to allocate significantly in excess of this just to meet the SM requirement. Moreover, there is also the need to satisfy the duty to cooperate. Moreover, there are significant issues with certain of the draft site allocations that cannot be said to be justified when assessed against the NPPF tests of soundness. These matters are expanded upon below.

Policies SP2 and SP4 indicate that the Council's objective is to deliver a minimum of 16,596 dwellings from 2020 until 2038, equivalent to 922dpa as outlined at paragraph 7.5.

We object to the Council's suggested approach both in terms of the number of homes being planned and in relation to the plan period.

In terms of both the planned levels of growth and the Plan period to which it relates, the NPPF is clear that the minimum annual housing requirement for the Borough must be set through application of the Standard Method within the assessment of Local Housing Need.

According to the Council's Local Development Scheme (agreed July 2020), the Local Plan is due for submission in October 2021 following consultation on a proposed submission document pursuant to Regulation 19 in June 2021. Adoption of the Plan is then envisaged for November 2022.

The Planning Practice Guidance (ID ref 2a-004-20201216) is clear that any assessment of need should be derived from considering household projections over the subsequent 10 years (with the current one as the start of the period for the appraisal). Whilst the Emerging Strategy is based upon the ten year period from 2020 until 2030, unlike that detailed in paragraph 7.5 of the document, this would be based upon the household projections from the 2014 base rather than the alternative approach in the Government's consultation.

In order to ensure consistency of housing need with supply, it is essential that the assessment of the requirement also considers the adequacy of supply at the same point in time.

With submission of the Local Plan not due until October 2021, it would be feasible and appropriate to rely upon the Council's annual assessment of the deliverability and developability of sites when reviewed at the 31st March 2021. Since this is not currently available, the assessment below considers the minimum requirement when assessed in 2020 and 2021 using the current approach outlined in Guidance.

The comparison of household projections for the 10 years after both 2020 and 2021 from the 2014 base as currently required in the PPG is outlined in Table 1 below.

*Table 1: Household Projections*

Base date for appraisal

Household projections in 2014 based data

2020

2021

2030

2031

Total change

Annual average

2020

66,908

74,213

7,305

730.5

2021

67,664

74,953

7,289

728.9

The Local Housing Need must then be adjusted to take account of the latest affordability ratios as outlined in the PPG (Step 2) (ID ref 2a-004-20201216).

The most recently published affordability ratios are those from 2019 published on 19th March 2020 which indicate that the median workplace based affordability ratio for the Borough is 12.21. The affordability adjustment ratio (using the formula below) relying upon this figure results in a 51.3125% uplift on the base household projections.

This results in the minimum annual need for 2020 being 1,105 ( $730.5 \times 1.513125$ ); and 2021 being 1,103 ( $728.9 \times 1.513125$ ).

Since the Core Strategy for Dacorum Borough was adopted on 25th September 2013, the five year period that the 40% cap pursuant to step 3 of the Local Housing Need calculation only applied until 24th September 2018.

The existing Plan's annual housing requirement from 2006 to 2031 is 430dpa (Policy CS17) and as the annual averages from the household projections above are above the 430dpa in the current Plan, pursuant to Step 3 of the Standard Method a 40% cap is applied to the household projections. This results in minimum housing requirements of 1,023dpa for 20201 and 1,020dpa for 20212.

The 2020 housing affordability information for England is anticipated to be published in March 2021. Consequently, if this is available prior to the consultation on the draft Submission Plan, the Borough's housing requirement should be adjusted to ensure it addresses the minimum outputs of the Local Housing Need calculation in the PPG (ID ref 2a-004-20201216).

As detailed above, the Council's latest Local Development Scheme (July 2020) indicates that adoption of the Plan is anticipated in November 2022, 13 months after it is due to be submitted in October 2021, this is not considered realistic.

A review of the time taken for the examination of Local Plan consulted upon and submitted for examination since the original NPPF was published in March 2012 indicates that on average the period from submission though to the document's

adoption was 572 days (i.e. 1 year 7 months) (for the more than 200 Strategic documents found sound until 1st January 2021)<sup>3</sup>.

With respect of the period from consultation on draft Submission through to adoption, this took on average 749 days (just over 2 years).

For neighbouring Welwyn Hatfield, which Authority also reviewed its Green Belt boundaries as part of the Local Plan process, that Plan was submitted in May 2017 and almost four years later that Plan is still at examination.

Based on the timelines contained in the current LDS, which indicates consultation in June 2021 and submission in October 2021, a more realistic adoption date would be June 2023 (2 years from consultation) or May 2023 (13 months from submission).

Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that the expected Plan end date of 2038 would provide the minimum 15 years post adoption obligated by paragraph 22 of the NPPF assuming adoption occurred in November 2022, as indicated above, this is not realistic. A more realistic adoption date would be summer 2023 which necessitates an extended plan period until at least 2039.

Although policies SP2 and SP4 indicate that a minimum of 16,596 dwellings are required over the 18 year period (2020-2038), this should be increased to at least 19,437 dwellings<sup>4</sup> over the 19 year period (2020-2039) as explained above. Alternatively, over the 18 years from 2021 until 2039, it would currently be a minimum of 18,360 dwellings<sup>5</sup>. These minimum requirements are therefore an increase of at least 1,764 dwellings on the targets currently outlined in the Plan.

1 730.5 x 1.4

2 728.9 x 1.4

3 Data from Local Plans: the examination process - GOV.UK ([www.gov.uk](http://www.gov.uk))

4 1,023 x 19

5 1,020 x 20

However, the PPG is also clear (ID ref 2a-007-20190220) that:

This reinforces the view that the 1,023dpa output from the Standard Method when appraised using a 2020 start date is clearly the minimum requirement and the Council should consider the scope for increasing this.

The application of the SM at the 2020 base-date results in a 18,414 requirement to be met during the plan period:

*1,023dpa x 18yrs (2020 to 2038) = 18,414 dwellings (to be expressed as a minimum).*

In addition to the minimum requirement derived from the application of the SM, there is a need to consider unmet needs within the context of the duty to cooperate. This is a central pillar of the plan-led system. Moreover, and in so far as this is a legal requirement, any failure cannot be rectified through the examination process. As such, this is a critical component of the plan making exercise that must be addressed by the Council at the outset.

In this regard paragraph 60 of the NPPF, is clear in requiring that any needs that cannot be met in neighbouring authorities should also be considered in determining the Borough's housing requirement.

Although it is recognised that the Council, along with a number of its neighbours, is preparing a South West Hertfordshire Joint Strategic Plan, as noted in paragraph

1.40 of the consultation draft Local Plan, this is designed to set the context of the period to 2050 and therefore post dates that of the emerging Growth Strategy. Accordingly, it is essential that the Council considers the extent of unmet needs from neighbouring authorities, consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.

As the principal and most sustainable settlement within the Borough, Hemel Hempstead will continue to be focus for housing growth, with Policy SP2 stating as follows:

*“Hemel Hempstead will grow by over 10,600 new homes and will deliver the majority of new employment space. A key feature of the strategy will be the intensification of sites within Hemel Hempstead through increased heights and densities.*

*Key areas for redevelopment include sites across the Town Centre and Two Waters Areas. Smaller scale development within the existing urban area will also be provided to ensure previously developed land is optimised.*

*The town will grow to the north by providing a minimum of 1,500 homes with further land to deliver an additional 4,000 homes released from the Green Belt but safeguarded to meet longer term needs<sup>6</sup>.*

*New urban extensions to the north of the settlement will be planned and developed drawing on Garden City principles, with development within and around Hemel Hempstead supporting the transformation of the town. These sites will provide or support delivery of identified strategic infrastructure requirements, and sustainable transport enhancements and improve connectivity across the town.”*

Policy SP3 sets out a settlement hierarchy, which reiterates the role to be played by the town of Hemel Hempstead in helping to meet development needs during the plan period:

*“The most sustainable location in the Borough and the focus for the majority of development and strategic and town-wide infrastructure. Hemel Hempstead acts as the primary service centre for the Borough. The town will also expand on its eastern side into St Albans City and District Council area.”*

Whilst we support the continued reliance upon the settlement of Hemel Hempstead as the principal focus for growth during the plan period, we object to the draft site allocations on the basis that they do not represent the most appropriate locations for growth when assessed against the reasonable alternatives, which include the opportunity afforded by the allocation of land west of Leighton Buzzard Road to the west of Piccotts End to the north of Hemel Hempstead.

Section 23 of the consultation draft Local Plan sets out the sites proposed to be allocated for housing and employment growth at Hemel Hempstead.

We have undertaken a critical review of the draft allocations at the larger settlements of Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted (where the majority of the planned growth is proposed). We have then carried out a comparative analysis of certain of the draft allocations against the credentials of the subject site.



It is clear from the landscape analysis undertaken by Hyland Edgar Driver (“HED”) and the highways/sustainability analysis undertaken by SK Transport Planning that the subject site, which is not currently proposed as a housing allocation, performs better than that draft allocations in relation to these disciplines.

In addition to the above, the findings of the Green Belt appraisal undertaken by CSA Environmental (Feb 2021), demonstrates the suitability of providing for development on the site having regard to the assessment to be undertaken pursuant to the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out at paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

Furthermore, the additional technical work undertaken to date, including in relation to archaeology, heritage and flooding/drainage, all demonstrate there are no technical constraints to developing the site for approximately 400 dwellings.

6 This includes allocations HH01 (1,500 dwellings) and HH22 (385 dwellings) located to the east of Piccotts End

The Council’s housing trajectory is set out at Figure 2 of the consultation draft Local Plan, which position should be assessed against the background of the current position where the Council is only currently able to demonstrate a 2.5 year supply of deliverable housing land, which shortfall is substantial<sup>7</sup>.

Whilst the overall sources of supply expected within the Council is provided, there is no information indicating how the level of annual completions within the trajectory is derived.

Although the Housing Topic Paper purports to be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land in 2022, this is subject to the both the realism of the Council’s expected sources together with the requirement below the minimum detailed by the NPPF.

Applying a requirement derived from the Standard Method together with the Council’s expectations of delivery (which assumptions we dispute), illustrates that there will be insufficient land delivered to maintain a rolling 5 year supply until at least April 2025 through inclusion of only a 5% buffer and the Sedgefield approach to addressing cumulative under-delivery against a 1,023dpa minimum figure.

Based upon the Council's delivery assumptions, which figures we dispute, the five year supply positions from 2020 onwards is shown in Table 1 below.

*Table 1 – The Council's 5yr Supply Positions from 2020*

**Year**  
**Supply in Figure 2**  
**5 year period starting**

**Apr 20**

**Apr**

**21**

**Apr**

**22**

**Apr**

**23**

**Apr**

**24**

**Apr**

**25**

**Apr**

**26**

**Apr**

**27**

**Apr**

**28**

2020/21

654

4,858

2021/22

1,036

5,074

2022/23

759

5,662

2023/24

1,128

5,674

2024/25

753

6,129

2025/26

1,182

6,112

2026/27

1,252

5,705

2027/28

1,347

5,323

2028/29

1,140

5,098

2029/30

1,208

2030/31  
1,165

2031/32  
845

2032/33  
965

Figure 2 below shows by applying the above supply figures (which we dispute as being too optimistic and not achievable based upon the components if supply relied upon by the Council) to the respective annualised requirement the Council would be in deficit compared to the cumulative requirement until at least 31st March 2028.

7 See paragraph 48 of the appeal decision for The Old Orchard, Shootersway, Berkhamsted (PINS Ref: 3243939) (Dec 2020)

*Table 2 – Dwelling completions envisaged in Dacorum Borough compared to minimum Local Housing Need of 1,023dpa*

<b>Year</b>
<b>Expected Completions from Figure 2</b>
<b>Housing Need at 1,023dpa</b>
<b>Cumulative Difference</b>
<b>Annual</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>
<b>Annual</b>
<b>Cumulative</b>
2020/21
654
654
1,023
1,023
-369
2021/22
1,036

1,690  
1,023  
2,046  
-356  
2022/23  
759  
2,449  
1,023  
3,069  
-620  
2023/24  
1,128  
3,577  
1,023  
4,092  
-515  
2024/25  
753  
4,330  
1,023  
5,115  
-785  
2025/26  
1,182  
5,512  
1,023  
6,138  
-626  
2026/27



1,252  
6,764  
1,023  
7,161  
-397  
2027/28  
1,347  
8,111  
1,023  
8,184  
-73  
2028/29  
1140  
9,251  
1,023  
9,207  
44  
2029/30  
1208  
10,459  
1,023  
10,230  
229  
2030/31  
1165  
11,624  
1,023  
11,253  
371

2031/32

845

12,469

1,023

12,276

193

Although Table 2 indicates the shortfall could be resolved March 2028, this same does not apply with respect of the adequacy of a 5 year supply. This is shown in table 3 below.

Table 3 indicates that by applying the Sedgefield approach to resolving previous shortfalls, the application of a 5% buffer and a 1,023dpa requirement, the Council might only be able to demonstrate a 5 year supply in the five year period April 2025 until March 2030. For all other years a deficit would arise, even on the Council's assumptions of delivery.

Table 3 - Calculating 5 year requirements and the availability an adequate supply

**Step            in**  
**process**  
**5 year period**  
**2020-**  
**25**  
**2021-**  
**26**  
**2022-**  
**27**  
**2023-**  
**28**  
**2024-**  
**29**  
**2025-**  
**30**

2026-

31

2027-

32

2028-

33

Minimum base requirement (5  
x 1,023)

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

5,115

Plus shortfall

from Table 2

369

356

620

515

785

626

397

73

0

Minimum to be addressed (exc buffer)

5,484

5,471

5,735

5,630

5,900

5,741

5,512

5,188

5,115

With 5% buffer

274

274

287

282

295

287

276

259

256

Minimum to show 5 year  
supply

5,758

5,745

6,022

5,912

6,195

6,028

5,788

5,447

5,371

Forecasted for delivery (from

Table 1)

4,858

5,074

5,662

5,674

6,129

6,112

5,705

5,323

5,098

No. of year supply

4.22

4.42

4.70

4.80

4.95

5.07

4.93

4.89

4.75

Extent of surplus/ deficit

-900

-671

-360

-238

-66

84

-83

-124

-273

To ensure sufficient land is available to robustly demonstrate a 5 year supply, it is therefore essential that further deliverable land is identified. This should include land controlled by our client's to the west of Leighton Buzzard Road, north of Hemel Hempstead (Site Ref HH69).

In our view, the land at Piccotts End, Hemel Hempstead affords a more sustainable location in helping to meet housing needs than can be said to be the case with certain of the draft allocations proposed around the town.

The allocation of the omission site at Piccotts End would contribute to a sustainable pattern of development, locating housing closer to employment opportunities and the provision of services and facilities, including education, retail and bus services; than is the case with certain of the draft allocations as currently proposed.

The following changes are necessary in order to satisfy the duty to cooperate and the tests of soundness at paragraph 35 of the NPPF:

- **Address unmet housing needs from the neighbouring authorities**, which requirement should be added to the internalised requirement for Dacorum identified through the application of the Standard

- The Local Plan should **provide for at least 1,203 dwellings per annum**, based upon the local housing need derived from the Standard Method. This results in a need to plan for **at least 18,414 dwellings during the plan period 2020 to 2038**.
- However, the Local Plan should **cover a 15 year period from its anticipated date of adoption**, and should cover the period to
- Allocate additional sites to meet the increased housing requirement, whilst allocating more appropriate sites in favour of certain of the draft allocations, that cannot be said to be justified when considered against the reasonable
- Allocate land to the west of Leighton Buzzard Road, north of Hemel Hempstead for up to 400

This section of our representations considers the merits of the omission site (HH69) as a housing allocation for up to 400 dwellings in preference to certain of the draft allocations.

As set out above, there is a need to plan for additional allocations in meeting the housing need whilst certain of the draft allocations cannot be said to be justified when considered against the reasonable alternatives.

Section 2.7 of the Council's Site Assessment Study provides a schedule of all of the sites assessed around Hemel Hempstead and the reasons why 3 of them were advanced as draft housing allocations to be removed from the Green Belt (land north of Hemel Hempstead (2 sites) and land at Marchmont Farm).

As summarised in Table 4 below, a total of 5 no. sites at Hemel Hempstead are allocated for a total of 7,175 dwellings.

*Table 4: Draft Site Allocations at Hemel Hempstead*

**2020**

**Emerging**



**Strategy Ref**

**Site Assessment Ref**

**Site Location**

**Emerging    Strategy Indicative    Dwelling**

**Capacity**

**HH01**

**North Hemel (phase 1)**

1,550

**HH02**

74

**North Hemel (phase 2) (post**

**2038)**

4,000

**HH21**

**West Hemel Hempstead**

1,150

**HH22**

73

**Marchmont Farm**

385

**HH23**

**Old Town**

90

**Total**

7,175

However, and for the reasons set out in the supporting analyses<sup>8</sup>, the omission site at Piccotts End is preferable in landscape and highway/accessibility terms than HH01, HH02, HH21 and HH22.

Sites HH01, HH02, HH21 and HH22 are expected to deliver approximately 3,085 dwellings in the Plan period. We object to the allocation of these sites on the basis that they are not justified when considered against the superior attributes of the omission site at Piccotts End.

### General Approach

In order to consider whether the Emerging Strategy allocates the most appropriate sites for housing at Hemel Hempstead, we undertook a review of the evidence base, including the Site Assessments, Green Belt Review, Transport Assessments and Landscape evidence<sup>9</sup>.

Based upon the Council's assessment of a total of 8 no. sites at Hemel Hempstead as listed on page A6 of the Appendix to the Site Selection Background Paper as being identified for further testing. This followed the appraisal by AECOM that the 8 sites were considered either in whole or part as suitable for further consideration with major constraints.

<sup>8</sup> See the highways assessment prepared by SK Transport and the Landscape Assessment prepared by Hyland Edgar Driver)

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/planning-development/planning-strategic-planning/new-single-local-plan/technical-work-for-the-early-partial-review>.

The overall conclusions summarised were:

**Site****Site Reference****Justification**

North and North-East Hemel

74

AECOM considers that part of this site is suitable for further consideration with major constraints.

Land South of Link Road/ West of  
Fletcher Way

72

Pouchen End Lane

80

Fields End Farm

62

AECOM considers that these sites are suitable for further consideration with major constraints.

Fields End Lane

63

Polehanger Lane

78

Red Lion Lane

81

Shendish Manor and Fairfields

82

Through the AECOM appraisal, our client's site at Piccotts End (Ref HH69) was also evaluated, although its suitability was unjustifiably rejected in their Phase 2 Assessment as:

Our comparative assessment is attached as **Annex 1**, the content of which clearly established, beyond doubt, that the AECOM Site Assessment Report unjustly discount the Piccotts End site, as it performs better than other options assessed, including the land north of Hemel Hempstead proposed as an allocation in the document.

Notwithstanding its better performance compared to the north of Hemel Hempstead draft allocation, the earlier assessment indicates that there is a need to identify sites for at least 1,764 dwellings to meet the minimum local housing need for the authority. This is irrespective of any further uplift to contribute towards both the uncapped housing requirement together with any unmet needs arising in neighbouring authorities.

Since the AECOM Site Assessment discounted the suitability of the land north of Piccotts End, the subsequent review by the Council as summarised in the Topic Paper unjustifiably failed to appraise it and thus favoured it as an allocation.

A summary of the AECOM site Assessment and the Council's subsequent appraisal as it relates to the omission site is set out below, whilst a comparative analysis of the omission sites against the alternative site options is set out in the **accompanying Site Assessment Review: Hemel Hempstead Sites (Wolf Bond Planning)**. This demonstrates the Council's ranking/assessment of the sites is flawed. On a proper assessment site HH69 perform better than the draft allocations.

A critique of the draft allocations is also set out in the accompanying assessment undertaken by SK Transport (highways) and Hyland Edgar Driver (landscape).

#### Landscape Considerations

Table 1 of the Hyland Edgar Driver Landscape Appraisal sets out the findings of a comparative landscape assessment of each of the proposed Housing Sites, and compares them with the Piccotts End site, which assessment has been informed by Hyland Edgar Driver field evaluation.

The table provides a summary for each of the sites, describing the potential developable area and any landscape mitigation measures that may be appropriate, including strategic planting, and the retention of areas as undeveloped land for landscape, biodiversity and amenity enhancement purposes. The findings of the assessment are illustrated on the Sites Analysis Plan at the rear of their report.

That assessment confirms that the Piccotts End site has less of a landscape impact than the allocations at HH22, HH23 and HH01.

### Highways and Accessibility Considerations

SK Transport Planning have carried out a similar comparative analysis in relation to highway and accessibility considerations. Their report looks at the accessibility credentials of the sites in the form of a comparative review in relation to the ability to access the sites by walk, cycle, public transport and car.

SK Transport Planning's analysis demonstrates that the Piccotts End site is generally closer to amenities than the other locations assessed; and are not affected by any severance.

Section 5 of the Highways Technical Note concludes as follows:

- The HH69 'Land at Piccotts End' site is sustainably located, and meets the requirements as set out in the NPPF and DBC's development strategy. With the Council confirming that the most sustainable settlement location is Hemel Hempstead it is entirely logical and sensible to direct development to that location.
- The report also confirms that the site meets HCC's recommendations, with development directed towards the towns, such as Hemel Hempstead. In line with HCC's guidance, positioning development towards Hemel Hempstead will minimise the need to travel by private car, and will support walkable communities and integrated neighbourhoods. Delivering development at Piccotts End will also enhance walking, cycling and public transport improvements for all living in this geographic area, not just the end occupiers of the
- The review of the sustainable credentials for each of the strategic residential sites (those providing 100 units or more) identified by DBC, with the HH69 'Land at Piccotts End' site also included in the assessment, confirms that this site performs as well as four of the preferred sites and outperforms the remaining 14 sites across Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted, Tring, Bovingdon and
- The assessment confirms that in terms of sustainable development the HH69 'Land at Piccotts End' site performs materially better than 78% of the sites identified by DBC, and is directly comparable to the other 22% of sites that have been identified. The site also complies with the recognised walk distances to primary and secondary school

provision, bus stops and local facilities and Hemel Hempstead town centre. Based on these findings it is confirmed that the HH69 'Land at Piccotts End' site is either directly comparable or outperforms other

DBC preferred sites, and also has been shown to meet the sustainable development requirements of the NPPF, the 'golden thread' that runs through this document.

### Summary

On the basis of the Council's assessment, the decision to exclude Piccotts End from further consideration on account of its purported landscape and highway impact is not justified. This is particularly so when one considers the analyses undertaken by Hyland Edgar Driver and SK Transport Planning which sets out the acceptability of the development of the land for housing.

Informed by the technical work undertaken in support of the Piccotts End site, the accompanying Site Assessment Review: Hemel Hempstead Sites, concludes that the site should be allocated for housing development.

On the basis of a proper, robust assessment, the scoring matrix/assessment of the Piccotts End site (Ref HH69) as set out in the Site Assessment should be adjusted to accurately reflect its credentials. On undertaking this assessment, this would lead the Council to the only logical conclusion that land at Piccotts End should be allocated for housing in preference to the draft SAP Emerging Strategy allocation at north Hemel Hempstead.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is demonstrably the case that land at Piccotts End should be allocated in preference to a number of the draft allocations currently proposed for development in the Plan.

Further justification for the allocation of Site HH69 is set out below, the content of which has been informed by a range of site-specific technical studies.

These changes are necessary in order to satisfy the tests of soundness at paragraph 35 of the NPPF.

On the basis of the above, and informed by the technical work submitted in respect of landscaping, highways and sustainability matters, we consider that the land at Piccotts End is suitable for identification as a housing site.

Indicative Site Layout Plan No. 2037/PL.04G indicates the likely development parcels within the site as well as the intended location of the proposed vehicular access point, indicative route for a primary road through the site, together with the broad location of the green infrastructure (including formal and informal amenity and play spaces and balancing pond).

The site extends to approximately 26ha. This comprises a developable site area of circa 12ha for the residential element which will deliver up to 400 residential dwellings (at a net density of circa 33dph) with the remainder (extending to circa 14ha) being set aside for informal public open space and landscaping.

As shown on the Plan, the key existing landscaping features are to be retained and enhanced, with the scheme design informed by a well-conceived landscape strategy. Accordingly, the masterplan approach is very much landscape-led.

The access arrangements have been discussed (and to a greater extent agreed) with the County Council in order to agree the acceptability of the access arrangements in technical terms. Dealing with the vehicular access first the principle of a roundabout junction, designed in line with DMRB standards and with the appropriate forward visibility has been presented as part of the site assessment. This junction can accommodate the predicted development traffic and the bus service accessing the site.

The roundabout junction also incorporates a Toucan crossing to allow end occupiers of the development to provide a continuous link with the existing Public Footpath connections to Piccotts End village. Through upgrades to these links to the village the development will also have direct links to the existing signed cycle route southwards to the town centre via Piccotts End Road and High Street.

In addition to these links to the east the site also benefits from the Public Footpath network routing westwards through the site linking with Gadebridge. Along this route there are direct links into the residential streets in Gadebridge, and there are opportunities to upgrade this Public Footpath through improved surfacing along this corridor.

The site also benefits from a continuous pedestrian link along the western side of Leighton Buzzard Road which routes south from the site to the Galley Hill roundabout. At this point pedestrians can join the existing routes westwards to

Gadebridge or continue southwards along the combined pedestrian/cycle route through Gadebridge Park to link to the town centre. The scheme can deliver an upgraded 3m wide combined pedestrian/cycle route along the site frontage to connect into this existing infrastructure.

Land at the northern part of the site is proposed as a new public biodiversity and ecological enhancement area, which will include a number of circular walking routes.

The development parcels would allow for a mix of housing sizes, types and tenures, to meet the local needs identified in the most recent evidence base. This will include a mixture of family housing, smaller starter homes and flatted development. Each development parcel will have a comprehensive landscaping scheme designed as an integral part of the overall design process, to ensure that the final scheme is appropriate to its setting and character.

The development will provide a sustainable urban extension to Gadebridge and Hemel Hempstead, and will provide a strong defensible settlement edge defined by the open space and landscaping.

A number of technical studies have been undertaken to inform the masterplan approach to developing the site.

The content of the various technical assessments (which will be submitted as part of the application) is summarised below.

SK Transport Planning have prepared a draft Transport Assessment (“TA”) which summarises a range of background information, including the Transport Scoping Study undertaken with Hertfordshire County Council and the two traffic surveys undertaken in 2016 and 2017 (with the results of further surveys to be presented to County and included in the final TA: to include the outputs from County’s COMET transport model).

Pre-application discussions with County Highways are ongoing; and further surveys, discussions and exchanges of correspondence will take place.



In terms of the locational merits of the site, the TA refers to the guidance from the Department for Transport for both walking and cycling, confirming future residents would be within an acceptable walking and cyclic distance of a wide range of local services and facilities including the town centre.

In terms of highway safety, the TA confirms, on the basis of the data collected to date, that the history of traffic incidents in the area is slight and that such a proposed development would not materially increase this risk.

With regard to vehicular movements, the TA demonstrates the quantum of proposed development would not significantly change the operation of the local highway network, and certainly nothing that could be considered 'severe' as set out in paragraph 109 the NPPF.

Details of the highway and sustainability matters currently being discussed with County Highways, and which matters may feature in the final scheme design (and secured through CIL payments, s278 and/or s106 contributions) could include as follows:

- Following discussions with HCC Transport Development Control Officers, opportunities to enhance and upgrade the existing Public Footpath that runs east-west through the site and linking Piccotts End with Gadebridge have been
- A new controlled Toucan crossing on Leighton Buzzard Road is proposed as part of the vehicular access arrangements, which crossing will allow future users to safely cross the Leighton Buzzard Road and then connect into the existing PROW links on the eastern side of the
- The sustainable access strategy confirms that the existing pedestrian routes on the western side of Leighton Buzzard Road will be upgraded to 3m wide shared pedestrian/cycle routes to connect with Gadebridge. Enhancements to existing crossing points at the Galley Hill roundabout will also be made, to enhance connectivity to/from the town centre, which is a circa 2km walk/cycle from the
- Turning to the vehicular access to the site, a roundabout junction is proposed which is DMRB
- In line with discussions with HCC Transport Development Control Officers an emergency access to the development has also been shown on the illustrative This is provided by widening the existing pedestrian and vehicular access to the pumping station on Leighton Buzzard Road.

- It is also proposed to route existing bus services into the site, with the proposed bus loop providing appropriate boarding/alighting for an extended bus service to the site, as well as enclosed, wifi-enabled waiting facilities. The 'hub' will also provide secure cycle storage/parking facilities, mail-order delivery collection points and Real-Time Passenger
- Oxford Buses/Carousel have confirmed that they will provide an enhanced service, linking with their existing 105 service, which routes to/from Chesham to Hemel
- Once this service arrives in the town it will then be extended to route via Maylands Industrial Estate to the east of the town, before routing back to the proposed development site, through the town centre and also linking with the town's rail station.
- Operating a clockwise/counter-clockwise service in the town will deliver a bus service to the site every 30 minutes, between circa 0700 and 1900 hours Monday to Saturday. This service will enter the site via the roundabout junction and access the "sustainable hub", which has been located centrally within the site to ensure all residential units are located within appropriate walk distances of this facility.

As can be seen from this summary, a significant amount of technical work has been undertaken to enhance the sustainability credentials of the site. The review has also confirmed that the site is bounded by DBC land to the west/south-west, potentially allowing additional pedestrian/cycle links between the site and Gadebridge, on top of those already available via the PROW network and existing links along Leighton Buzzard Road/Galley Hill.

Overall, the TA concludes that the site affords a sustainable location in helping to meet identified housing needs, within walking and cycling distance from a significant range of employment, retail, education and recreation facilities; and there are no transport and highway reasons that would warrant a refusal of the development for approximately 400 dwellings.

The Flood Risk Assessment ("FRA") prepared by Hilson Moran details the drainage and flood risk matters including the baseline conditions, the overall flood risk posed and the scope for mitigation.

In addition to detailing the topography, geology and soils the FRA confirms that the entire site is within Flood Zone 1, areas at least risk of flooding.

However, and due to the potential for localised surface water flooding the FRA sets out the necessary drainage mitigation measures including water butts, swales and balancing ponds.

A connection to the local adopted foul sewerage is proposed at the south of the site, where the sewers are already present on site. It is recommended that surface water runoff is routed through permeable pavements, swales and an infiltration basin where the water can infiltrate into the subsurface. When flows exceed the design capacity of the infiltration basin it is planned that additional volumes would then overflow naturally to the River Gade to the east of the site, as is the current situation.

The FRA concludes that the principle of the proposed development is entirely acceptable with regard to flood risk grounds and the scheme can make a positive contribution towards sustainable surface water management.

The ecology report prepared by The Ecology Co-op provides both a Phase 1 Habitat Assessment and a suite of Phase 2 Protected Species Assessment.

The Phase 1 report refers to the Phase 1 habitat survey that found the site to comprise a range of habitat types including improved grassland, broadleaf and mixed woodland, scrub and hedgerows with the potential for some protected species to be present. On the whole the Phase 1 finds the habitat value of the site to be moderate- poor with further surveys required for badgers, reptiles, breeding birds, bats, dormice and roman snails.

A high level of badger activity was found both in terms of setts, badger runs, snuffle holes and latrines. The report concludes further badger surveys would be required.

In terms of bats, the fields themselves are of little value for bats, however the woodland, hedgerows and buildings all have the potential to support a variety of foraging bats species and as such further bat surveys would be required. These areas of woodland would be retained and incorporated into the landscaped led approach to the proposal.

In terms of other species, of particular note were potential signs of barn owls within one of the agricultural buildings which would require further monitoring. Further surveys would also be required for reptiles, dormice and roman snails as the site has the potential to have populations of these. No further surveys were required for great crested newts as the only ponds within 500m are active fishery ponds and unlikely to support breeding newts.

The Phase 2 report confirms that following further surveys some outline mitigation measures are required for badgers, bats, breeding birds and roman snails, whilst the likely absence of dormice and common reptiles was confirmed. Both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports conclude that subject to the mitigation measures, the proposal is entirely appropriate in terms of ecology and biodiversity.

The scheme represents an opportunity to achieve a net gain in biodiversity through the development and a detailed Habitat Creation and Management Plan has been produced to demonstrate how the retained woodland, hedgerows, improved and semi-improved grassland habitats will be managed or modified to lead to greater biodiversity value. New habitats are also proposed, including the creation of a pond, wildflower meadow habitat, tree and hedge planting. Many of these enhancements have been tailored to specifically enhance the value of the site for some of the species of conservation concern that are present, namely roman snails, bats and a variety of nesting birds.

As the development proposal is anticipated to have a limited impact upon protected species and the majority of habitats lost to the footprint of the scheme are primarily of low ecological value, the overall ecological impact of the scheme in the absence of mitigation and compensation is relatively low and opportunities for long-term enhancements to biodiversity and a variety of species of conservation concern are possible.

The Arboricultural & Planning Integration Report (prepared by Arbortrack Systems Ltd) states that there are a total of 156 surveyed trees or groups of trees within the site. Of these 8 are 'A' high quality trees; 81 are 'B' moderate quality trees; 65 are 'C' low quality; 1 is 'C/U' and 1 is 'U' unsuitable.

The report then sets out the number that would need to be lost together and that as a result of the scale of development this is a very low level of removal. Those retained the report states, all have a low post development pressure.

The report highlights one tree, tree no. 115, as requiring minimum areas of hardstanding and 'no dig' methods of construction should be used. Subject to such mitigation measures the proposal is in arboricultural terms, acceptable and all those trees retained can be safeguarded in a sustainable manner.

As such, trees are not considered to represent a material constraint to development of the site in the manner proposed.

In addition, the masterplan has been informed by a detailed landscape strategy that will serve to enhance and increase the overall tree cover within and along the boundaries to the site.

The accompanying Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (“LVIA”) undertaken by Hyland Edgar Driver sets out the landscape areas of relevance to the proposal.

The LVIA assessed the potential impacts (at construction and occupation phases) with an outline proposal at the site for approximately 400 dwellings. The LVIA states that the proposed development has been designed to fit in well with the nearby built form and to promote local distinctiveness.

The LVIA concludes in relation to the acceptability of the scheme in landscape terms as follows:

- The site is located within an existing strong landscape structure of existing trees and hedgerows around and dividing the area of pasture land, consisting of six fields and a central larger woodland. All significant boundary vegetation on the site will be retained and enhanced as much as possible with new planting to provide a positive improvement to the locality. The large central wood copse will also be retained to respect the character of the site.
- Care has been taken to preserve the valley character of the site allowing the existing landscape to dictate the form, siting and scale of the development. Implementation of a 20m no-build offset from the existing vegetation reinforces this principal. The landscape of the site will be enhanced by the addition of a significant amount of woodland, tree and hedgerow vegetation that is
- The proposal will preserve as much as possible, the landscape character of the area with large amounts of open space and woodland; the conserving of the existing landscape through careful design and an improvement through the use of native trees and shrubs; and that such a residential development would not be significantly visible in medium or long distance ”
- The report demonstrates that the proposed development on the site would:
  - 1 Preserve as much as possible the landscape character of the area by provision of large amounts of open space with area of dense woodland and tree and hedgerow planting around each development parcel to act a green buffer and visually screen the

- 1 Conserve and enhance the existing physical landscape through the careful design of the dwellings and through the addition of native trees and shrubs to enhance the
- 1 Improve the site through the use of native trees and shrubs which will conserve and enhance the character of the local

Not be significantly visible in medium or long distance views.

On the basis of the foregoing the scheme will result in a logical and sustainable urban extension within a landscaped setting.

The scheme design has been informed by detailed heritage appraisals.

The first prepared by Archaeology South-East advised on heritage as well as archaeological matters.

A second, more detailed analysis with regard to the built heritage context of the site has since been undertaken by Turley Heritage.

The appraisals confirm there are no listed buildings on the site nor is the site within a Conservation Area. However, there is a Conservation Area approximately 140m east of the site.

Both the Archaeology South-East and Turley Heritage reports confirm there are a total of 20 listed buildings within the wider study area and that direct to the south of the site is the Gadebridge Roman Villa Scheduled Ancient Monument.

The ASE Assessment concludes, in the context of archaeology that the site does have the potential for such archaeological findings; and that a series of nonintrusive geophysical surveys would ascertain the extent of such remains and the damage caused to them by farming and agriculture over time.

The Built Heritage Appraisal undertaken by Turley Heritage assesses the potential impacts on a range of heritage assets within the surrounding area including the Piccotts End Conservation Area, a number of listed buildings and groups, Scheduled Ancient Monument (Gadebridge Roman Villa) and other non-designated heritage assets.

The report concludes that the proposal would likely result in a degree of harm principally from the urbanising effects of the use and built development of new housing and associated infrastructure on the site which occupies higher ground which overlooks the riverside village, and the identified heritage assets. The report goes on to conclude that the cumulative impact would be 'less than substantial' for the purposes of the NPPF (paragraph 196 refers).

The report proposes a number of design principles and mitigation measures, which proposals have informed the masterplan design.

Pre-application discussions have been undertaken to date with the key heritage stakeholders, including the Local Planning Authority and Historic England. Accordingly, the masterplan design has been further revised during this process and in looking to respond to advice from these stakeholders. It has been established and agreed at this stage that it is the position of both the Local Planning Authority and Historic England that the impact of these proposals on heritage significance would be 'less than substantial' for the purposes of the NPPF.

With regard to archaeology, further advice has provided by Hertfordshire County Council (in addition to Historic England) in relation to the potential effects of the proposal as part of constructive pre-application discussions with to date with the key stakeholders.

The results of the archaeological fieldwork investigation that has been undertaken have been shared with the Council and County Council and confirm there would be no adverse impact upon archaeological remains from developing the site in the manner proposed.

On the basis of the foregoing, it is demonstrably the case that the evolution of the scheme design has been informed by a thorough consideration of heritage matters.

The Green Belt Assessment undertaken by CSA Environmental (Feb 2021) has considered the evidence-base to the consultation Local Plan and has assessed the capacity of the site to accommodate change having regard to the five purposes of the Green Belt at paragraph 134 of the NPPF.

The Green Belt Assessment concludes as follows:

- Overall, the Site is assessed as making a 'moderate' contribution to Green Belt purposes 1, preventing sprawl from Hemel. The Site is located alongside the urban area of Gadebridge, however separated by the woodland at Warnersend and Home Wood.
- Development at the Site would extend housing east of this woodland, however the Site is closely associated with the built extents of Hemel Hempstead, with the proposed built envelope broadly in line with the northern edge of the town. The new development would be contained to the east by the route of Leighton Buzzard Road; and to the north by a combination of woodland and topography, and there would be little perception of built development extending beyond the defined northern extent of the
- The Site is located at the urban fringe of Hemel Hempstead and makes a moderate contribution to preventing encroachment (purpose 3), however this would be the case with most greenfield sites on the edges of
- In respect of Green Belt purpose 2, development will not diminish the separation between the towns of Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamstead. There will be a reduction in the separation between Hemel Hempstead and Piccotts. However, the role of the Green Belt in maintaining separation between the main urban area and this lower tier settlement should be attributed limited weight. Similarly, the proposals will not impact on the setting of an historic town (Purpose 4).
  
- The proposed development is located in a sustainable location and in close proximity to facilities in the built up area of Hemel Hempstead. Any moderate harm to the Green Belt will need to be considered against the need to provide new housing in the most sustainable locations within the Borough.

The findings of the CSA Green Belt Assessment are also important in so far as they identify the Council's Green Belt appraisal failed to undertake a finer grain analysis of the site as an individual land parcel. Rather, the Council's analysis assessed the site as part of a much wider area of land. Had the Council undertaken this finer grain analysis they would have concluded in relation to the suitability of the site as a Green Belt release and carried it forward for further assessment as a housing allocation.

Our representations have undertaken the balancing exercise, and it is clear from the evidence base that the site affords a significant range of benefits as a housing allocation and should be allocated in helping to meet identified housing needs.



For the reasons set out above, the emerging Growth Strategy fails the tests of soundness at paragraph 35 of the NPPF for the following reasons:

- **Not positively prepared** – the emerging Growth Strategy does not seek to address the minimum housing needs for the authority, when assessed correctly in accordance with the Standard
- **Unjustified** – The emerging Growth Strategy does not represent an appropriate strategy in so far as it relates to the approach to site selection/housing allocations at Hemel

On a proper analysis, the land at Piccotts End, west of Leighton Buzzard Road, north of Hemel Hempstead (Site Ref: HH69) should be allocated for housing development as it is a superior location to the certain of the draft allocations on the edge of Hemel as well as certain of those proposed at Berkhamsted, Bovington, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring<sup>10</sup>.

- **Not effective** as will not be deliverable over the plan
- **Inconsistent with the National Policy** – The emerging Growth Strategy fails to identify sufficient housing sites in the most sustainable locations. Furthermore, it fails to provide for sufficient homes to both maintain a rolling 5 year supply together with addressing the minimum requirements when assessed in accordance with the NPPF.

This is irrespective of any further uplift to overcome the imposition of the 40% cap together with homes to contribute towards unmet needs of neighbouring authorities. The Plan will also fail to provide for a minimum 15 years post adoption as a result of the unrealistic timetable leading to a delay to the Plan's adoption.

We welcome the opportunity to continue dialogue with the Council in relation to the merits of the omission site HH69 as a housing allocation in order to meet the identified housing requirement during the plan period.

<sup>10</sup> See page 6 of the SK Transport Highways Assessment (Feb 2021)

Please do not hesitate to contact the writer should you wish to discuss any matter(s) arising.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">FAIRFAX HHALT ATTACH.pdf</a> <a href="#">ORG Fairfax Strategic Land Hemel Ltd - Agent Steven Brown Woolf Bond Planning 1220 Piccotts End Reps Report FINAL 210226.pdf</a> <a href="#">ORG Fairfax Strategic Land Hemel Ltd - Agent Steven Brown Woolf Bond Planning Annex 1 - WBP Site Assessment Review - LP reps for Fairfax - Feb 2021.pdf</a> <a href="#">ORG Fairfax Strategic Land Hemel Ltd - Agent Steven Brown Woolf Bond Planning 2037-PL04 Rev G INDICATIVE SITE LAYOUT.pdf</a> <a href="#">ORG Fairfax Strategic Land Hemel Ltd - Agent Steven Brown Woolf Bond Planning 4962_01F_Green Belt Assessment.pdf</a> <a href="#">ORG Fairfax Strategic Land Hemel Ltd - Agent Steven Brown Woolf Bond Planning SK21611 TN DBC Site Review For Issue (optimized).pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15279
<b>Person ID</b>	1269407
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Pratt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of our client, Mr. Martin Pratt, regarding the progress made so far in the development of the new Dacorum Local Plan and the potential inclusion of our client's land at Three Fields, Felden, Hemel Hempstead as a housing allocation site. We hope that by engaging with the Council at this early stage we can assist in the development of a strategy to sustainably meet the present and future housing needs of the community.</p> <p>The site is approximately 3.5 hectares and is located south of the A41 in Felden. The land is bordered on the east and west by residential development and to the north by the A41. The site has previously had an active use as agricultural</p>

land, however, there is currently no agricultural activity occurring on the fields. The site boundaries to the west and north are largely vegetated which obscures views onto the land from neighbouring residences and buffers noises and visual impacts of the A41. Access is gained from Sheethanger Lane to the west via a tree lined avenue and from Featherbed Lane to the south via a country lane.

The **white dashed line** in the image above shows the existing footpath that connects Felden Lane to Roughdown Avenue. The path cuts through an area known as Roughdown Common on the southern side of the A41. A pedestrian bridge links the path to the land north of the A41 and continues on to join up with Roughdown Avenue.

The **orange dashed line** is a proposed 115m long footpath to connect our client's land with the existing footpath. This path will boost the sustainability credentials of the site as it will make walking a viable choice for future and existing residents of Felden. The amount of walking time saved is outlined in the table below.

**Time taken to walk**

**from site without Orange Path**

**Time taken to walk**

**from site with Orange Path**

**Time saved as a percentage (%)**

**Transport**

Hemel Hempstead Railway Station

27 mins

13.5 mins

**50 %**

Bus and Coach Interchange

26 mins

13.5 mins

**48 %**

**Restaurants / Pubs / Cafes**

The Mallard

27 mins

13.5 mins

**50 %**

Puccino's

28 mins

15.5 mins

**45 %**

Station Cafe

27 mins

14.5 mins

**46 %**

Three Black Birds

35 mins

16.5 mins

**53 %**

The Steam Coach

36 mins

17.5 mins

**51 %**

**Convenience Stores**

SPAR

29 mins

11.5 mins

**60 %**

ALDI

36 mins

17.5 mins

**51 %**

Boxmoor Post Office

34 mins

16.5 mins

**51 %**

### **Healthcare**

Boxmoor House Dentist

28 mins

9.5 mins

**66 %**

### **Community Centre**

St. Mary & St. Joseph Parish Centre

36 mins

16.5 mins

**54 %**

St. John's the Evangelist Church

34 mins

15.5 mins

**54 %**

The **yellow dashed line** in the image above is a possible footpath that could be created to link the northern portion of the site to Sheethanger Lane. This 4-5m pedestrian link to Sheethanger Lane could be useful at encouraging interactions between existing residents and future residents and would offer a safe means of access for people traveling on foot to Sheethanger Lane.

The plans below are two proposals for development of the land to provide 40-46 dwellings along with a pharmacy, local convenience shop and community meeting room for the benefit of both future and existing residents of Felden.

**Plan No.1** envisions a typical market / affordable housing approach which would provide 19 affordable dwellings and 27 dwellings for the open market.

**Plan No.2** has been developed to respond to the demand for self-build housing plots within local authority and the southern portion of the development site has been reconfigured in this plan to show the demarcated self-build housing plots. Development along these lines will provide 17 affordable homes and 23 homes for the open housing market.

Both plans incorporate new pedestrian links to the existing footpaths in Felden as it is recognised that a substantial amount of time can be saved by making the best use out of the existing pedestrian infrastructure. The 45-66% time saving to local amenities that is possible for pedestrians through the creation of a pathway through Roughdown Common significantly boosts the sustainability credentials of the development site so that walking becomes a viable alternative to motorised vehicle use. The most dramatic time saving is between Boxmoor House Dentist with the projected walking time dropping from 28 minutes to just 9.5 minutes.

### **Plan No.2**

### **Plan No.1**

The sustainability analysis also highlights the lack of services within Felden itself as all the basic services required by existing residents are located on the opposite side of the A41 and are aligned more towards the Boxmoor neighbourhood of Hemel Hempstead. It was also noted that there is a lack of healthcare services in both Boxmoor and Felden as the only provider is the previously mentioned dentist. Therefore, these two development plans incorporate a pharmacy, local convenience shop and community meeting room to address this under provision so that the entire community of Felden can access basic services on their doorstep. The location of this unit will be close to both the footpath and road from Sheethanger Lane to ensure it is convenient for existing residents to get to. As shown on the plans above, the unit will be linked directly to the new Roughdown Common path to ensure accessibility for the existing residents of Felden.

The buffer zone between the proposed residential development and the A41 is an important asset in terms of noise attenuation and biodiversity value. The vegetation in this area softens the noise impact from the highway and forms a valuable extension of Roughdown Common. It is for these reasons that this area has been reserved in the plans for biodiversity enhancement. An assortment of native plant species will be introduced into this area to ensure that there is a net biodiversity gain as a result of development and that this area becomes an extension of the wildlife corridor along the A41. This zone will also have a dual purpose as it will incorporate a balancing pond to aid surface water drainage measures on the site, which in itself will attract and support new wildlife into the area.

Preliminary work has been carried out to establish the technical viability of the site as outlined below.

### **Trees**

A detailed tree survey has been carried out of both sites and the access lane and the relevant Root Protection Areas have been plotted. These have then been incorporated into the site constraints and the site layouts shown have been based around them.

### **Noise**

A Noise Assessment has also been commissioned to assess if the site can be developed suitably for housing. Noise monitoring took place from 20th September to 1st October 2020. The main noise source identified is traffic noise from the A41 to the north east of the site. A detailed noise model has been developed for the layout proposed. The necessary internal noise levels can be achieved by the use of enhanced double glazing in the construction of the new dwellings. The World Health Organisation's targets for external amenity areas can be achieved in the vast majority of the plots. There are a few where noise mitigation is required but this can be achieved by installing a 1.8m high close boarded fence along their rear or side boundaries – this is a normal type of boundary treatment which will not appear out of place.

What we hope the Council take from this correspondence is our client’s willingness to engage in the development of the new Local Plan in terms of future housing provision. The key message is the site offers strong foundations to build on, being in the right location, with the potential to benefit from and enhance connectivity into Hemel Hempstead for the benefit of existing and future residents. The north and south fields can be developed as one integrated whole but the southern field could be developed as a separate self-build project if required.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15296

**Person ID** 1161497

**Full Name** Mr Robert Sellwood

**Organisation Details** The Crown Estate

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

- **Growth Area HH01 : North Hemel Hempstead Phase 1** : The Crown Estate, as majority landowner in Phase 1, welcomes the principle of this proposal which is both viable and deliverable. Particular points to note are :
  - **(first bullet)** It should say “*a minimum of 1,550 dwellings*” to be consistent with Policy SP2 and other references
  - **(third bullet)** HH01 cannot deliver the whole strategic corridor. The text should be amended to refer to safeguarding the land for a multi-modal transport corridor which will be developed in phases (unless supported by external funding).

- **(sixth bullet)** No evidence has been provided to justify a new Secondary School to serve Phase 1 (1,550 homes)
- **(eighth bullet)** TCE has not seen any evidence to justify the proposal to locate a new Household Waste Re-cycling Centre in HH01
- The plan on page 265 should clarify the significance of the areas shown in If not relevant to the proposal, they should be removed.

The Proposals Map

The Crown Estate support the provisions of the draft Proposals Map in relation to the North Hemel Growth Area.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15297

**Person ID** 1161497

**Full Name** Mr Robert Sellwood

**Organisation Details** The Crown Estate

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

- **Growth Area HH02 : North Hemel Hempstead Phase 2** : This raises similar points to HH01 in terms of not being able to deliver the whole strategic link from Leighton Buzzard Road to Redbourn Road and the justification for a second Secondary School to serve Phase



The Proposals Map

The Crown Estate support the provisions of the draft Proposals Map in relation to the North Hemel Growth Area.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15298

**Person ID** 1161497

**Full Name** Mr Robert Sellwood

**Organisation Details** The Crown Estate

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

- **Growth Area HH20**: It is considered that it is important that this site facilitates pedestrian and cycle linkages consistent with the Project Breakspear infrastructure proposals immediately adjacent to it. Suggested potential wording is: *“Facilitate pedestrian and cyclist links to adjacent growth areas consistent with transport infrastructure proposals being developed to upgrade the Breakspear junction and improve access to the Maylands area.”*

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15303
<b>Person ID</b>	1161497
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Sellwood
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Crown Estate
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b><u>TCE Response to DBC Reg 18 Local Plan : Site HH26</u></b></p> <p>These representations are submitted on behalf of The Crown Estate (TCE) which is the freeholder of the whole of Proposal Site HH26.</p> <p>TCE strongly supports the allocation of the site for housing. The site is located on the western side of Westwick Row and already functions as part of the built-up area of Hemel Hempstead. It is also within easy walking and cycling distance of the existing facilities in Leverstock Green, including its thriving local centre. For longer distance trips, bus services can be accessed from the local centre. As a consequence, it is a highly sustainable location. It is also the case that land to the east of Westwick Row forms part of the proposed Hemel Garden Community (HGC) which is supported by central Government. In total, HGC is planned to provide around 11,000 homes and up to 10,000 jobs, plus supporting social and physical infrastructure. Once site HH26 is completed, it will form a logical part of the expanded urban area at Hemel Hempstead being delivered through Hemel Garden Communities. In addition, it will complement the very attractive adjacent housing schemes off Westwick Row and Pancake Lane which were facilitated by The Crown Estate.</p>

The Crown Estate can confirm that this land is available for development now and has no known constraints to its` early delivery. As currently described in the text of HH26, there is also no reason to believe that the site is not viable for development. TCE would, therefore, suggest that it is allocated for development in the first five years of the plan period.

As you will be aware, TCE has a long history of working in partnership with your Council to bring sites forward and looks forward to continuing this relationship in bringing forward the early development of site HH26.

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

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15311

**Person ID** 1250151

**Full Name** Andrew Marsh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

**HH20: Breakspear Way / Green Lane / Boundary Way, Maylands**

The site is within the wider setting of the Grade II listed Breakspears, and although some distance away development here has the potential to affect its significance through a change in its setting. We recommend that Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is undertaken to confirm the suitability of the site and to inform any development criteria that may be required to mitigate harm resulting from development here.

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15312
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH01: North Hemel (Phase 1)</b></p> <p><b>HH02: North Hemel (Phase 2)</b></p> <p>HH01 is adjacent to the Picotts End Conservation Area which includes one Grade I listed building, one Grade II* listed building, and five Grade II listed buildings. The other side of the A4146 is the Gadebridge Roman Villa Scheduled Monument, although given its distance and location is unlikely to be affected. Finally to the north-east of HH01 and HH02 is Aubreys Camp Scheduled Monument, which given its elevated position could be affected via a change in its setting. While development of both HH01 and HH02 appears feasible, given the scale of growth proposed a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required to confirm their suitability, extent and capacity, and to inform any development criteria that may be required to mitigate harm resulting from development.</p> <p>Finally, given the scale and relative complexity of development proposed, we strongly advise that a masterplanning exercise / Concept Framework is carried out prior to a planning application being submitted and determined. This work should be informed by and reflect the findings of the detailed HIA, and this should be stipulated in policy.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15313
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH21: West Hemel Hempstead</b></p> <p>The site is adjacent to the Winkwell Conservation Area which includes three Grade II listed buildings, and appears to include the Grade II listed Pouchen End. As with other sites in this Plan we recommend that Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is undertaken to confirm the suitability of the site and to inform any development criteria that may be required to mitigate harm resulting from development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15314
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH05: Market Square</b></p> <p>We object to the allocation of this site which is immediately adjacent to the Grade II Registered Water Gardens (designed by Jellicoe) to the west, and the Grade II listed Rowland Emmet Mosaic, which was installed in 1960 on side of Marlowes tiered car park, to the east, and recommend that it is deleted.</p> <p>In addition to designing the Water Gardens Jellicoe was also responsible for the original masterplan for Hemel Hempstead, and was brought back later to design the water gardens. While the original 1947 plan has the Square (market place) in a different location and presents a very different configuration for what became the water gardens, there was a strong intent for the town centre and the water gardens to relate to one another, with a consideration of the physical and visual interplay between them.</p> <p>Specifically there are a number of views across the gardens to the other side of the valley - Bank Square, Bridge Street and the market/old bus station area to link the old and new towns. For the Bank Court and old market sites Jellicoe's vision was for the low rise buildings to be set. He wanted the whole of Waterhouse Street to be set back to some degree and low rise ( like the 3-storey blocks at the corner of Bridge Road). His reasoning was that this would avoid a 'canyon' effect which would not only crowd the gardens but make them look smaller.</p> <p>When looking at the implemented townscape and gardens towards the south of the water gardens, there is a clear designed vista from Bridge Street/Marlowes west between the buildings across Bank Court over the River Gade and Flower Garden to fields and the school on the hill beyond. There is the road crossing at Bridge Street. The water gardens include viewing platforms looking east towards the town centre, and there is a 'viewing' mound in the north of the scheme</p>

(around which Jellicoe's serpent wrapped its tail). No bridges, platforms, etc. present any formal, axial arrangement with the town square, but there would certainly have been views from the Lovers Walk along the west side of the River Gade across the Square towards Hillfield Road.

We note that the Council's Hemel Town Centre Masteprlan 2011-2021  
[http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/hemel-hempstead-town-centre-masterplan-adopted-jan-13-\(small\).pdf](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/hemel-hempstead-town-centre-masterplan-adopted-jan-13-(small).pdf)  
 (adopted 2013) recognises the interplay between the water gardens and the town centre's civic spaces. It identifies the Town Square (Market Square) as an important civic space - part of the New Town's heritage but underutilised and ripe for improvement. While this document promoted the redevelopment of the square, the intent was as an enhanced public realm enlivened by active frontages and supporting greater public use. Such an approach seems appropriate, so it is concerning that the new Local Plan is proposing the Square as a development site to be filled-in with new buildings with a criteria requiring that building heights should be maximised.

The Market Square forms an important part of the setting of the water gardens, representing the correlation and juxtaposition of hard and soft public open spaces at the very heart of the New Town. The Market Square is also an important part of the New Town's urban design. It is on this basis that we object in principle to the allocation of this site, and we strongly advise the Council delete this allocation.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15315

**Person ID** 1250151

**Full Name** Andrew Marsh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>HH07: NCP Car Park, Hillfield Road</b></p> <p>This site contains the Grade II listed Rowland Emmet Mosaic, which was installed in 1960 on side of Marlowes tiered car park, to the east, and is immediately adjacent to the Grade II Registered Water Gardens (designed by Jellicoe) to the west.</p> <p>In relation the Rowland Emmet Mosaic, redevelopment of this site will necessitate the removal and relocation of the mosaic, and this will require listed building consent in consultation with Historic England. These requirements should be reflected in the site specific policy requirements for HH07.</p> <p>We note that as with HH05 Policy HH07 requires that building heights should be maximised. While we understand the Council's desire to maximise the capacity of this site, nonetheless this needs to be balanced against the New Town's urban design, and specifically Jellicoe's vision for low rise buildings (like the 3-storey blocks at the corner of Bridge Road) in this location. Indeed while taller buildings may be appropriate in some areas, there is an on-going question of scale. It is important that densification, including tall buildings, respects and does not harm the historic environment. We strongly recommend that the Council consider undertaking a tall buildings study (if it hasn't already done so) to inform Policy DM41 - Heights in Buildings. Ideally this should also consider the question of massing. The study should investigate the important key views of the New Town, the skyline as a whole and the contribution that makes to the Water Gardens and the wider historic environment and should establish if there is scope for tall(er) buildings and if so where and where not.</p> <p>We refer you to our publication, 'Increasing residential density in historic environments' which can be found <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/increasing-residential-density-in-historic-environments/">here</a>. This study explores the factors that can contribute to successfully delivering developments which increase residential density in historic environments. It uses a combination of literature review and case studies to provide a series of recommendations to support decision making.</p> <p>We also draw your attention to our advice note 4 in relation to tall buildings which provides further guidance in this respect (<a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/tall-buildings-advice-note-4/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/tall-buildings-advice-note-4/</a>). Please note that a revision of our advice note is currently out for public consultation and can be found here <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/news/tall-buildings-advice-consultation/">https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/news/tall-buildings-advice-consultation/</a></p>



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15328
<b>Person ID</b>	1271128
<b>Full Name</b>	Little Gaddesden Parish Council c/o Cllr John Saner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development to the north of Hemel is based on a falsely perceived need to develop a large area of green belt</li> <li>The proposal includes a plan to build a new road from the junction of the M1 at junction 8 to the Hemel/Leighton Buzzard Road (B440). It is not clear where the junction with the B440 will be. The maps suggest somewhere between Hilliers Garden Centre and Water If it is south of Water End, the bridge at Water End can hardly sustain any more traffic and has a weight restriction on it. If the aim is for the traffic to go to Berkhamsted via Potten End or to Leighton Buzzard via the B440, both these possibilities would lead to unsustainable additional traffic pressure. If the proposal envisages a bypass of Water End, that will involve the additional land acquisition not provided for in these proposals and the destruction of an historic landscape. For traffic travelling north, the obvious route to avoid the bottleneck at Water End is to go via Nettleden and Little Gaddesden which would cause unsustainable disruption to these villages</li> </ul>

The B440 is not now a trunk road and there are several villages north of Water End which could not sustain the significant additional traffic that any new link road to the M1 would involve.

- If the new road is not intended to be a link with the M1 but is intended to be an internal road servicing the new Hemel Garden Community, there will still be significant additional traffic generated on the B440, which will still have the effects outlined in 2 above

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

**Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15533

**Person ID** 1263124

**Full Name** Andrew Criddle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment**

**Hemel Garden Communities:** As stated in the HGC Charter this is a “once in a generation opportunity to have a transformational impact on Hemel Hempstead”. If HGC is to create inspirational new communities and deliver exemplar infrastructure and community facilities, then sport and leisure should be a key element of its Structured Delivery Plan (SDP).

The size and scale of the HGC developments provides significant opportunities for major new sporting hubs to be created – perhaps in association with the proposed country parks or as gateways to these. In addition, the requirement for open spaces and community centres within the individual communities of HGC can be facilitated by and developed by sports clubs (see below).

This would be in keeping with many of DBC’s HGC Charter principles and strategies including “*Active Local Stewardship*”, “*Innovative Approaches to Delivery*” and “*Vibrant Communities*”.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15570

**Person ID** 1271579

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** BOYER PLANNING ON BEHALF OF W LAMB LTD

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

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

**Proposals and Sites  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment**

- These representations have been prepared by Boyer on behalf of W Lamb Ltd in response to Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC) Draft Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020- 2038) Consultation (November 2020 – February 2021).
- W Lamb Ltd represent the owners of landholdings at Fairfields and Shendish Manor, Hemel Hempstead ("Land at Shendish") which is being promoted for residential development. The landowners control a significant area of land to the south of Hemel Hempstead, south of Apsley Railway Station up to the A41 and are able to bring forward a comprehensive development strategy for this
- The site was promoted to the Council as part of the DBC Issues and Options Local Plan Consultation in December 2017 with further details submitted to the Council in February
- These representations set out further information in relation to Land at Shendish addressing the constraints and opportunities and the unique opportunity to deliver a sustainable residential community of approximately 500 dwellings with associated infrastructure and
- The public and planning benefits to be derived from the sites location are also set out, including: the delivery of up to 500 new homes, including affordable housing; potential to include a 160 bed care village; easy access to Apsley railway station making the site highly sustainable; a community hub with village hall; a small community plaza adjacent to the station with café and live work units; a site for a 2FE primary school with pre-school nursery; and a significantly enhanced landscape
- These representations should be read in conjunction with the following enclosed studies, assessments and plans, which demonstrate the availability, suitability and deliverability for Land at Shendish for residential
- Vision Document February 2021
- Illustrative Masterplan 2021
- Transport Appraisal Technical Note Update February 2021 (containing Transport Appraisal 2020)
- Air Quality Technical Note February 2021
- Furthermore, the suite of technical reports submitted to DBC in February 2019 should be read alongside these representations, which support the conclusion that this highly sustainable site is suitable for allocation in the new Local
- Ecological Appraisal
- Arboricultural Walkover Survey
- Heritage Desk-Based Assessment

- Transport Appraisal
- Environmental Noise and Vibration Assessment
- Preliminary Landscape Appraisal
- Drainage and Utilities Assessment
- Illustrative Masterplan

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- Land at Shendish covers c.35.5ha in total and forms part of the settlement of Hemel Hempstead as indicated on the site plan in **Appendix 1**. It is located to the south-west of the town, at Apsley and is surrounded by existing development on three sides, the Manor Estate to the north, dwellings on Rucklers Lane to the south, the West Coast Mainline railway and Apsley Station to the east, with the wider Shendish Manor Estate, beyond which lies the
- The main land uses currently on the site comprise Shendish Manor Golf course (located broadly centrally within the site and proposed to be retained), Fairfields buildings and land associated with the existing agricultural
- The main access to the site is currently from the London Road, via a bridge over the railway. There are secondary access points from Rucklers Lane and a number of public footpaths also cross the site.
- Whilst part of Shendish Manor itself (excluded from the area being promoted) is a Locally Registered Park and Garden, there are no national landscape designations covering any part of the site. There are a number of existing hedgerows and tree belts which define boundaries within the site and provide screening to the surrounding

#### *Shendish Manor*

- As highlighted above, Shendish Manor itself is part of the land which is excluded from the land being promoted for
- Shendish Manor and associated outbuildings currently operate as a hotel, located centrally within the parcel of land but excluded from the actual proposed allocation (see site location plan). The area excluded from the allocation also includes Apsley Manor Farmhouse and the Golf Club building both of which are Grade II
- Notwithstanding its location within the Green Belt, the Shendish Estate (excluded from the site area) has experienced significant development over the last two decades, including additional housing (in the form of c. 8 detached executive houses, 20 barn conversions and a number of replacement dwellings) and other developments such as a large extension to Shendish Manor
- More recently, a further planning application for the construction of a free standing building to provide 30 guest bedrooms, 8 staff bedrooms, spa, leisure club and additional function facilities with car parking, together with landscaping restoration for the historic grounds was approved by the Council on 26 July 2017 (application ref: 4/02876/16/MFA).

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- The north eastern boundary of the land being promoted is defined by the railway line, beyond which is London Road, the main road in the area which contains a mix of residential properties, businesses/employment, and various scale retail opportunities. The railway station car park is accessed from London Road, with the station itself located approximately halfway along the northern boundary.
- Land immediately to the north west of the site currently comprises the Manor Estate, a pre-war housing estate, and the more recent Manor Estate Extension which is currently under The nearest primary school, Two Waters, is also located in this area.
- The wider Shendish Manor Estate forms the western boundary of the site with the A41 beyond and the southern site boundary is defined by the rear gardens of properties along Rucklers Lane. These comprise terraces and semi-detached properties towards the eastern end close to the junction with London Road under the railway
- Apsley is an established neighbourhood forming part of the larger town of Hemel It pre-dates the post-war new town development, prior to which it was a physically distinct settlement. Much of the housing, as well as retail and employment facilities, dates from the pre-war period and the area has been the focus of extensive regeneration efforts in recent years.
- The centre of Apsley is located 2.5km to the south of Hemel Hempstead town centre. The ward population (Kings Langley) was recorded at 5,214 in the 2011 census. The neighbouring ward of Apsley and Corner Hall had a population of 9,003 in that census.
- Apsley centre is less than 1km north of the site, with Apsley railway station (providing half hourly trains to London Euston) immediately adjacent to the northern site boundary. There are a number of facilities located in close

proximity to Shendish, including Doolittle Meadows Business Park, the recently remodelled offices at Westside approximately 700m from the site, Apsley Hills Sainsbury's superstore and other retail units at Apsley Mills Retail Park only 780m from the centre of the

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- These representations seek to promote a sustainable new community providing either 500 dwellings (both private and affordable), or it could comprise 439 homes together with an care village of 160 units on land at Shendish, Apsley Hemel Hempstead. The site should be allocated to help DBC meet its housing requirements under the current Standard Method, which is not currently provided for in the Draft Local Plan, leaving a shortfall of at least 1,818 dwellings over the Plan period.
- The approach would spread the delivery of housing spatially across the Borough, given the significant levels of development already planned for in the other settlements and on large regeneration sites within Hemel Hempstead, to ensure variety of housing supply and certainty of housing
- Land at Shendish could deliver early in the Plan period, ensuring the step change in growth from the current housing target to the new requirement can be achieved, particularly given the significant infrastructure requirements associated with the other larger strategic
- The site is situated in one of the most sustainable locations outside of Hemel Hempstead town centre, being located within approximately 5 minutes of Apsley Station from the centre of the site, a distance of approximately 400m. The site is also easily accessible to the bus network and is within a short distance of the existing services, facilities and shops in Apsley.
- The inclusion of Land at Shendish within the Draft Local Plan as a Growth Area would accord with Paragraph 67 of the NPPF (February 2019), which requires policy-making authorities to identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability to identify a supply of: a) deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period; and b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the
- The allocation of Land at Shendish as a growth area would therefore fully accord with the

- A Vision Document has been prepared including an illustrative Masterplan for the site, which are included within these representations at **Appendix 2** and **Appendix 3**
- In summary, the document provides an assessment of the technical and environmental constraints and opportunities that the site presents and confirms that a viable, deliverable new community of up to 500 dwellings can be achieved based on the Hemel Garden City landscape-led design principles

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- In total, the site is anticipated to be capable of providing either 500 dwellings (both private and affordable) or could comprise 439 homes, together with an elderly residential care element comprising 160 units. It will provide attractive public open space and land for a 2FE Primary School, in a part of Hemel Hempstead where primary school provision is currently
- The site is located in a highly sustainable location, in very close proximity to Apsley Station and the existing services and facilities of Apsley and Hemel Hempstead. Because of its uniquely sustainable and accessible location, the site will offer the potential for significant modal shift towards sustainable transport, in accordance with the principles of Hemel Garden Community, in a way that it is considered that no other greenfield site in the whole of Dacorum can
- The site at Shendish provides a unique opportunity to create a new village environment with unparalleled access to a main line station and the extensive services on offer in Apsley and beyond, whilst also benefitting from its historic landscape
- This will be a sustainable village, delivering a wide range of attractive, well-designed and high quality homes, arranged with distinctive character to give a real sense of
- This will be achieved by the following:

- *A new village*

- 1 The scale of the development will allow it to feel like a new village, with a series of interconnected but distinct parts.
- 2 There will be a main village centre adjacent to the railway station, with a secondary community focussed hub to the south, where the primary school is to be



- 3 The existing woodland areas on the southern, western and eastern boundaries will soften the feel of the development. Care will be taken to ensure that fingers of green are retained and enhanced within the built area in the form of existing woodland or other open space, in order to ensure a soft transition from the village to the attractive landscape beyond. This soft transition will also be evident along the access drive to Shendish Manor, which will retain its secluded
- 4 The Listed Manor is well screened from the proposed development and forms a key element to the backdrop of the village, providing an historic

- *Varied densities and character*

- 1 The village will have a greater density of development adjacent to the railway and in particular in the vicinity of Apsley Station where there will be a small square to include a station entrance and two commercial units which at this stage are assumed to be a newsagent and coffee shop / café /
- 2 The higher density core will include apartment buildings (up to 4 or 5 storeys).

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- 1 Provision is to be made for an elderly care village close to the community

- 1 Away from the core the density of development will reduce, with a varied irregular typology encouraged to create interest and character. Features will include small areas of communal landscape within the street scene and meandering interconnected roads. Retained woodland or other open space creating character and ecological value, creating a unique opportunity at Shendish

- *Sustainability*

- 1 Access to the natural environment is a clear benefit of the site's location and multiple points of connection are
- 2 The development will support modal shift away from private car usage through:

- 1 A direct connection to Apsley railway station. From there Shendish Village will be well connected to London, surrounding towns and the wider
- 2 Bus links will provide more local access, with the potential for a route to run through the

- There will be easy walking access to the immediate facilities and services of Apsley including a good range of shopping (both convenience and comparison), essential services and leisure, with a good range of pubs and restaurants nearby. The attractive marina area is within walking distance as is the existing leisure offer of Shendish Manor Hotel and Golf Course.
- 1 Reduced car provision for the higher density zone. As a result 50% of the apartments could be 'car free', relying instead on car sharing clubs and public
- 2 Aspiration for direct access to the railway station by connection into the pedestrian bridge over the
- 3 The design of dwellings to facilitate and encourage home working through providing excellent internet speeds and attractive, appropriately lit and segregated internal
- The provision of facilities on site to reduce the need for off-site travel, e.g. community facilities, local retail provision and design to facilitate home
- Provision will be made for renewable energy provision and the charging of electric vehicles including fast charging points in the village
- 1 Encouragement of cycling and walking will be made through the creation of dedicated routes through the development connecting into existing footpaths and cycleways on adjacent land, in both the direction of the train station and Apsley and also Rucklers Lane to the south and the countryside beyond to the

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- *School Provision*

- 1 A school site for a 2 form entry primary school and a pre-school is
- 1 The school buildings and playing fields are to be allocated adjacent to the community

- *Land uses*

- 1 The predominant land use will be residential, with a mixture of private and affordable, in line with local plan policy.
- 2 Some of the private residential is likely to be in the Private Rental
- 1 There will be a 160 unit elderly care village offering a range of accommodation and care
- 2 Associated community facilities could include small shops, a cafe and live work units in the Plaza (adjacent to the station) and the primary school and multi use village hall at the Community

3 Recreation facilities and open space will be

- *Design*

1 The development will have a focus on high quality design and

1 Houses will be of traditional appearance, with contemporary elements where

1 Materials will be traditional and in keeping with the character of the surrounding settlements and respectful of the character of Shendish Manor itself.

- There are a number of benefits associated with the scheme which are summarised

- The development will provide either 500 dwellings or it could deliver approximately 439 private and affordable homes with elderly residential care element comprising 160 units to meet DBC's housing requirements and provide an inclusive and mixed

#### Local Plan Reg 18 Representations | Land at Shendish Manor, Apsley

- The development is in a sustainable and accessible location providing easy access to Apsley train station and dedicated cycling and walking routes will also be provided. This will encourage a modal shift towards sustainable
- The development will incorporate renewable energy provision and provide electric vehicle charging points therefore contributing to the sustainability of the
- The development will see the creation of a new village centre and community hub with a much needed 2FE Primary School. These facilities will reduce the need to travel off-site and contribute to the sustainability of the
- The development will incorporate high quality design and traditional materials to compliment the historic setting providing an attractive place for future residents. Moreover, the development will be surrounded by woodland and incorporate open space for a healthy living environment

**Included files**

[Appendix 3 Shendish Illustrative Masterplan.pdf](#)  
[BOYER Appendix 1 Shendish Site Plan.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 6 Shendish Air Quality.pdf](#)

[BOYER Appendix 2 Shendish Vision Document.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 5 Shendish Transport Overview.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 4 Part 3a 210226 Shendish Manor promotion\\_ with Tech Assessments \(1\)-3.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 4 Part 1 210226 Shendish Manor promotion\\_ with Tech Assessments \(1\).pdf](#)  
[Appendix 4 Part 2 210226 Shendish Manor promotion\\_ with Tech Assessments \(1\)-2.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 4 Part 3B 210226 Shendish Manor promotion\\_ with Tech Assessments \(1\)-3-2.pdf](#)  
[Appendix 4 Part 4 210226 Shendish Manor promotion\\_ with Tech Assessments \(1\)-4.pdf](#)

<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15623
<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Site west of Hemel no issues. Site Fletchers Way, no issues. Site near Grovehill Park would need mitigation, ideally meadow area northwest of Margaret Lloyd Park and wide corridors through to fields at Piccotts End for the protected species in area. Green Lane/Westwick Road site - no major issues but mitigation maybe needed for protected species in area.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS15624
<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	Small site other side of Green Lane should NOT be developed and we would object fully to this as there are protected species in this area and this strip of land provides access to larger green space - strip between St Margaret's Way and Kingcup Ave.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15625
<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	We fully object to ANY development north of Punchbowl Lane, this is the area that runs up to the B487 and includes the Nickey Line, this area has a large density of protected species. We fully object to the area above the B487 and around Cupid Green Lane, Dodds Lane and holtsmere End Lane from being developed due to the large density of protected species within the area. These are the sites that we would remove from the local plan.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15626
<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	The one other site we would fully object to is the small employment site on the Maylands page adjacent to Cherry Tree Lane and Three Cherry Trees Lane due to protected species and removing foraging area and isolating the species against a road.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15627
<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	All other sites on the Maylands page and Two Waters page we have no issues with.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS15683
<b>Person ID</b>	1272801
<b>Full Name</b>	Zoe Kennedy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p>I would like to submit the attached video to the consultation as part of my feedback for the Dacorum vision 2020-2038. The video provides evidence that significant flooding occurs in one of the main area's earmarked for development behind Grovehill and Woodhall Farm. To varying extents this field has flooded many times this winter in particular, and it is somewhat concerning that innocent people will buy homes on this land in good faith, which will ultimately flood.</p> <p>The site is not suitable for a large scale residential development, and as you will see the water is running through the fields like a river. My concern is that once these properties are built, the rain water will have nowhere to go, which will flood the site and possibly other communities within Hemel that already exist.</p> <p>A similar situation arose in Leverstock Green behind BP where a field which was renowned locally for flooding was granted planning permission. The residents of this housing estate bought properties at high prices in good faith of receiving a quality home. Unfortunately, the properties have flooded since.</p> <p>Video - to be uploaded</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15738



<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>B&amp;Q and Travis Perkins</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> NO</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Adjacent to an Ecosite called 'Lawn Lane Field and Wood'. Within 20m of Boxmoor Common LWS and Common land, but separated by Two Waters Road.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Southern boundary is adjacent to Grand Union Canal.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Water voles have been recorded in the area in the past. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Create a green corridor along the southern boundary to link habitats to the east and west and along the canal. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low. Avoid Light spill on adjacent canal and woodland to the south-east.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p>

None apparent. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.

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

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15739

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Paradise Est**  
**Recognised ecology sites within Site**  
NO  
**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**  
Adjacent to 'Paradise Fields Central' LWS.  
**Other features**  
Previously developed land. Mature boundary hedgerow on northern and eastern sides. Scattered trees throughout existing development.  
**Protected species**

Bats (including roosts) are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Retain hedgerows. Buffer adjacent LWS on the eastern side. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low. Avoid light spill on boundary hedgerows and adjacent habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
Hemel Hempstead Garden  
Communities Other sites  
comment

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15741

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Plots 2 &amp; 3 Kier Park Maylands Avenue</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> NO</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> NO</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped plots with rough grass and colonising vegetation; some hardstanding. Mature woodland strip beyond the western boundary.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None apparent.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

<b>ID</b>	EGS15746
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<p><b>Plough Zone North</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Within 20m of Boxmoor Common LWS and Common land but separated by Two Waters Road.</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land with buildings and Units on hardstanding.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely although there may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposals and Sites</b> <b>Hemel Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities Other sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15748
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel</b> <b>Hempstead Garden</b> <b>Communities comment</b>	<p><b>MU/7</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Bare ground with bordering trees. Section of River Bulbourne on the northern boundary.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely, although there may be potential for nesting birds in bordering trees.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p>

Retain and enhance trees / hedgerows. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposals and Sites**  
**Hemel Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities Other sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities

**ID** EGS15760

**Person ID** 1271978

**Full Name** JOANNA HARLEY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites Hemel**  
**Hempstead Garden**  
**Communities comment**

**Growth Area HH02** Capacity 4,000. Identified for removal from Green Belt now. Should be included for development 2021-2038 rather than safeguarded.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment	
Included files	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15761
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH03</b> Hospital site. Should not be considered for redevelopment until a clear sustainable NHS strategy for this part of Hertfordshire (incl. Watford and St Albans) is confirmed and initiated.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment	
Included files	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities



<b>ID</b>	EGS15762
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b>	<b>HH06</b> Civic Centre Site. Should be reserved for cultural uses to meet DBC promise to replace the Pavilion
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities
<b>ID</b>	EGS15771
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

<p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities comment</b></p>	<p>We note the several comments throughout the Draft Plan that underpins the decision to distribute the housing allocations in the manner set out. This will result in very substantial additions to both the major settlements of Berkhamsted and Tring with extensive new releases of Green Belt to be designated as ‘growth areas’.</p> <p>Although cogently set out in the Plan, neither towns’ growth will be organic nor ‘sustainable’ – as local employment opportunities at the scale to match resident numbers does not exist and will lead to additional out-commuting.</p> <p>Far better to locate new dwellings at scale closer to centres of industry and hence employment. For Dacorum, industry is concentrated in Maylands and the surrounding area.</p> <p>We note the proposals for Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities – the land released for Growth Area HH01 (Phase 1) to be undertaken 2021 -2038 and the Growth Area HH02 – North Hemel (Phase 2) recorded as being released from Green Belt on adoption of the Plan but safeguarded for 2038 – 2050: this area is designated for around 4,000 homes etc.</p> <p>We fail to be convinced that Berkhamsted and Tring should be developed to the extent proposed for 2021-2038: the capacity to absorb the growth of over 24% and 50% sustainably is questionable. Appending HH01 and HH02 to the existing urban network is likely to prove to be the more sustainable solution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Reconsider the allocations [which in any case we dispute as being justified see <b>Q 7</b>], and defer the release of BK01 etc. from the 2021 – 2038 plan</li> <li>2 Re phase the implementation of HH02 to bring forward to 2021 – 2038</li> </ol> <p>This would bring forward some 4,000 homes which will be better located for employment opportunities.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b></p> <p>* Yes</p> <p>* No</p>	
<p><b>Proposals and Sites Hemel Hempstead Garden Communities Other sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	

# 24 Berkhamsted Proposals & Sites responses

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS69
<b>Person ID</b>	1253620
<b>Full Name</b>	John Howard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS85
<b>Person ID</b>	1255375
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Mousseau
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I'm extremely concerned about the proposed developments on the fields along the valley on the border of Northchurch that drain into the Bulbourne around the Valley Road area. This is already an area of high flood risk and once properties are in private ownership drainage reducing actions will inevitably occur. An alternative should be sought that doesn't risk flooding a large number of houses. I'm completely shocked that it would even be considered that further development should take place along the valley when there is already such a high risk of flooding and the impacts of climate change will likely be felt soon in the area.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Bulborne Cross
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS96
<b>Person ID</b>	1255447
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Sparrow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I prefer the proposals to anything to the Bourne End side of the town.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS111
<b>Person ID</b>	1254846
<b>Full Name</b>	James Martin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Area Bk06 effectively connects berkhamsted and Northchurch eliminating Northchurch as a separate entity. This is an important view for us from the north side of the valley as it is a visual connection to our rural setting.</p> <p>Area Bk07 will create a huge traffic problem where New Road crosses the canal. It is already a dangerous crossing where people want to get onto the canal, the bridge is a dangerous cycling area and it is a main pedestrian route to the school.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS141
<b>Person ID</b>	1256506
<b>Full Name</b>	Dennis Matthews
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>These comments relate to site <b>Bk08 Rossway Farm between Shootersway and the A41</b>. They incorporate my own observations over a period of some years. I live in (address removed).</p> <p><b>Environmental factors.</b></p> <p>Previous plans recognised the importance of preserving what might be described as a green lung encircling Berkhamsted. This resulted in housing being separated from fast, busy roads such as the A41. Since then traffic has increased as is apparent, for example, from the decision to close the footpath routes which cross the A41. Even at the moment with some reduction in traffic resulting from our Tier 4 status, the road remains busy, particularly in the early mornings and evenings. In "normal" times there is often a constant flow of heavy traffic in both directions past this site. The noise is considerable and when the wind is in the right direction, traffic fumes come down the strip of land next to the A41. The slope down from the road and then up to Shootersway seems to funnel the fumes into the dip parallel with the road. The noise and fumes can only be expected to increase with time. At one point the road is in a cutting and trees have been planted along it. The site is still very noisy and, at times, smelly.</p> <p>The Plan recognises the importance of environmental considerations and a Health Impact Assessment would be required before any permission was granted but the site has been included in the list of sites which the Council thinks should be developed. Such considerations and assessment would be likely only to result in attempts to ameliorate the problems. This is apparent from the narrative prepared in respect of this site. Experience of this site indicates that the trees already there and the location of the road partially in a cutting have achieved little.</p> <p>I have referred in my earlier comments to the verdict in the Inquest into the death of a little child, Ella Kissi-Debrah. The Coroner concluded that traffic pollution near her home contributed to her death. We just cannot know how bad the pollution from the A41 will get but why build new homes next to it and unnecessarily expose people to the risk of respiratory and other problems when you now have the opportunity of avoiding this? In the light of that verdict, it will not be possible to say that we did not know about the risk. Berkhamsted is surrounded by undeveloped land. If we reach the point where we have no option but to build the number of homes contemplated by the plan, why not build them in a location which is better suited to maintaining good health and a pleasant environment for the residents? In the light of what we now</p>

know, is it really appropriate to suggest building new homes next to a road like the A41 when other land exists? The principle of keeping a decent gap between the A41 and where people live is even more important now than when it was first established.

**Ecological factors.**

In Summer evenings the site is a feeding area for bats which presumably roost in one or more of the trees there. I refer to Summer evenings simply because that is when I see them but I assume that they are there all year round. The site would also seem to be home to some red kites, one or more small deer and some badgers. It is all a matter of balance but I query where the responsible balance is between disturbing the wildlife to make way for building houses on what, from a human point of view, is an environmentally compromised site.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS163
<b>Person ID</b>	1257378
<b>Full Name</b>	Jackie Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am commenting particularly in respect of BK03, BK04, BK05 and BK06: * The proposed development will change the character of the local areas, which are currently green, leafy and semi-rural/rural. This is counter to the strategic vision/objectives.

\* The proposed development will have a massive impact on the countryside and open space of these areas. Wildlife will be impacted, and local people will not be able to exercise and enjoy the countryside (which has been highly used in the recent covid crisis). Whilst there may be areas of open space constructed, unless these are linked to form a large area they will have very limited impact.

\* The proposals do not make clear how Shootersway will be improved to handle the increased level of traffic. This would need to be done in a way that is in keeping with the character of the area.

Shootersway currently has very poor drainage - as the recent wet weather has shown - with very large puddles often forming across the road. Also the pavements are poor as they are often covered with mud and/or leaves, making it difficult to safely use the pavement. Also as traffic drives through the large puddles on the road, people on the pavement get sprayed with water.

\* There is no mention of creating public transport facilities - there is currently no public transport in this area - with the increased population this will be necessary. This is contrary to the strategic vision.

\* There is no mention of additional amenities such as local shops, leisure etc. The closest shops would be a journey away, and likely people will do this by car - this cannot be good for creating a local community nor for climate change nor for parking etc. Local amenities would offer local jobs too.

\* There is very little comment in the plans about the noise and pollution effects from the A41, and no firm suggestions/requirements. This is a major road which the development will border.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS181

**Person ID** 1174360

**Full Name** Bruce Morris

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><b>Other Sites - Bulbourne Cross</b></p> <p>I believe the Local Plan already places an undue burden on the town of Berkhamsted and that with any of the chosen options these should be selected to minimise the changes visible within the commuter valley. I am aware that Thakeham and BSGCA have been mail-dropping residents about their Bulbourne Cross project claiming that it is an attractive alternative to the options already selected. I do not believe that this is true and therefore would object to its being added to the plan at this or any stage.</p> <p>Looking at their proposal it would effectively join Berkhamsted to Bourne End and therefore Hemel Hempstead. Views from the north east side of Berkhamsted, Potten End / Little Heath and Chaulden would be impacted significantly. In the medium to long term its development would undoubtedly facilitate the merging of Berkhamsted, Bourne End and Hemel Hempstead into one larger conurbation which would effectively destroy the charm of our commuter valley.</p> <p>Their claimed benefits are questionable. As an example I would argue that a reduction in traffic in Berkhamsted is doubtful as the residents would still commute to the large supermarkets, the pubs and the restaurants. The increased distance from the dwellings to the centre may actually increase the number of trips as it looks as if it further to walk. Few people cycle to nights out.</p> <p>The new country park is an area of farmland whose greenness is currently enjoyed by residents who currently walk, run or cycle past it either by the road (which would need crossed) or along the canal. Offering it as a sweetener doesn't seem significant even before its suitability is investigated properly.</p> <p>In summary I view it as an opportunistic attempt to sneak into the plan at a late stage and it should be rejected.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS200
<b>Person ID</b>	1257823
<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Ritchie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Notwithstanding the total numbers, which are excessive, the refusal to include the Bulbourne Cross development, rather than 8 separate developments off Shootersway is not acceptable. Also the agreement, to follow County Council insistence on the location of a new Secondary school, on the East of the town, is nothing to do with the house planning needs. This would also see additional two-way travel on Shootersway, from the planned housing all along the South side.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS214
<b>Person ID</b>	1258030
<b>Full Name</b>	Amy Harman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk01: It is clear that this site can deliver effectively and sustainably a large amount of housing and can effectively enhance existing road links without any further pressure on the town centre. I have seen the Thakeham plan which was mail dropped for this site, it is well thought out and I would support this plan. Unlike any other site in

Berkhamsted this site is able to deliver a comprehensive Masterplan - this is much better than the piecemeal development offered by the other sites offered in this plan.

Growth Area Bk03: It is difficult to see how this site can be utilised without an unacceptable addition to congestion on Shootersway. Currently at commuter times, despite the alterations to traffic lights at Junction of Kings Rd and Shootersway, the traffic backs up to the new development at Bearoc Park (on Shootersway).

Growth Area Bk05: Again similar to above comments - congestion on Shootersway is unacceptable at peak times. Local highway networks could not sustain additional traffic as a result of this development. This site is extremely noisy as directly adjacent to A41 (in a valley). The resultant air pollution from the A41 to any residents on this site would be unacceptable and no barriers that could be provided would make the air acceptable in this location.

Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane. This site is an unsustainable location for further housing development. The existing roads surrounding the site are one track and already congested. There is no capacity to increase connectivity. The High Street at Northchurch is highly congested with many accidents, one fatal, occurring due to speed and intensity of traffic. Air pollution is a factor in this location - the existing residents in Northchurch would suffer acutely from any further traffic in this locality. The proximity to the AONB makes it a highly undesirable location for development. The longer views into the AONB would be ruined. This site should be kept as a buffer zone to the surrounding countryside, maintaining the definition between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. New residential development should be focused to the South of Berkhamsted not ad hoc piecemeal sites such as this.

If this site is to be developed then I would make the following comments;

Darrs Lane and Bell Lane which run adjacent to this site are single track rural lanes. Darrs Lane is already used as a rat run to avoid the congestion on Shootersway and is at capacity, it is extremely dangerous for walkers/cyclists. There are currently no footpaths on these roads so they are very unsafe. These lanes would need to be made two way traffic but reduced to a 20 mph limit. There is no pedestrian / cycle links from this location to the High Street / Shootersway and therefore this would need to be addressed. Bus links would need to be included in any Masterplan.

Despite this site being on the periphery of the town centre there are no open spaces within walking distance. The only footpaths take you over farmers fields. This site would need to provide a proper open park for recreation. The open space provided as part of the Bearoc park is very small and undermanaged. It can't be used for football as the grass is not managed and there are no football nets despite being formed as football pitches. The lack of dog waste bins means the grass is covered in dog poo and unsuitable for recreation for children to play on. This space is not adequate for this amount of housing. Further open space would need to be included in any further housing development sites with dog waste facilities, playground equipment provided.

The link with the AONB in this location is really important. The top of the site (adjacent to Shootersway) needs to have sufficient landscaping and additional tree planting to soften the views towards the AONB. Built development would be

better located at the North of the site in the valley so as to protect the AONB. Any development at the south of the site adjacent to Shootersway would ruin the views into the AONB and would not not fit with the less dense development in this location.

Grims Ditch is an important Archaeological Site and would need to be properly surveyed and protected.

Many people from Northchurch miss out on a senior school places at Ashylms. There is a definite need for additional primary and senior school places in the general area.

A senior school located at the north of this site would need to be well considered in terms of connectivity. Darrs Lane is a single track Road and would struggle to accommodate any additional traffic. Walking/ cycle routes will need to be properly planned for.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS221
<b>Person ID</b>	1257070
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Williamson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	The growth area Bk01 land south of Berkhamsted is to be shoe horned inbetween two existing schools next to the A41 bypass. Primary access is to be via Chesham Rd, a one way single track road and Swing Gate Lane , a narrow winding

hilly road passing two primary schools. With 850 planned dwellings is this sustainable given that at school times both roads are very congested.

Noise and air pollution from the A41 will not be mitigated by screening alone and the vegetation will be minimised by the building of the site itself resulting in less CO2 being absorbed naturally.

You say that you will deliver SANG on site to offset potential effects of damage to the Chilterns Beechwoods you do not explain how ?

How will building a large estate enhance the settings of a number of listed buildings, historically the opposite has transpired.  
BK02 British film inst.

This is again a site to be built in an area of limited vehicle access which will result in even more pollution ,noise and congestion.

New pedestrian links and an open space should be easily accessible to existing communities,who and where are these communities who will be able to access these.

You say you will deliver new green corridors to connect to proposed wildlife corridors along the A41 wont this mean they will be subject to more noise and pollution than ever.

BK03 and BK04 Two sites accessing via Shooters Way which is totally inadequate to maintain an influx of traffic to such an extent. You state that new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle links will be contributed to, but how will this be implemented as existing roads and footpaths are narrow and unsuitable.

BK05 Blegberry gdns,more vehicles to use Shooters Way,no mention of how the road system around Berkhamsted will be able to cope or the increase in parking required.Again screening of the A41 is mentioned but however long or high this is pollution still isnt stopped.

BK06 East of Darrs Lane.Shooters Way is yet again the primary highway access but no mention is made of the impact on Darrs Lane and Bell Lane both of which are narrow single lane roads incapable of large traffic usage as will happen with these new sites. It also states that a primary school will be built ,even more traffic congestion and footfall.

BK07 Lock Field.Poor access and egress onto New Road,with the canal and railway so close to the site wont this inevitably see noise ,flooding and vibration becoming a problem.

BK08. Rossway Farm,Around 200 dwellings to have access via Shooters Way, it would seem this is now going to be a major thoroughfare seeing how much traffic will be using it.Are there plans to increase capacity of this minor road.

All of the proposed sites to be built with access to Shooters Way should be mindfull that if snow and ice are present the roads up and down the valley will be very dangerous, and in certain circumstances the schools in that locality close because emergency services are unable to attend due to weather conditions.

BK09 Bankmill.The area in danger of flooding will be safeguarded but if you build near to it surely the possibility of floods will be enhanced as the water run off areas are limited,you state that flood zones 2 and 3 will not be developed will this guarantee no flooding will ensue.I would be wary in regard to living in an area that needs a strategic flood risk assessment before building work commences.

Access to the site is onto London Road which is becoming more congested as more building is undertaken, will speed limits and junctions be adjusted to keep the area safe.

BK10. More development along Shooters Way with no plans to invest in roads and footpaths causing more traffic congestion and pollution. The strategy says to link utilities and provide extra where needed, to supply gas, water, electricity and upgrade sewage and drains, without huge disruption and major investment this will not happen.

BK11. Billet Lane. Possibly the only site that has any factors in its favour apart from the contaminated land and flood issues.

If after these issues are solved, to build on an existing used area has its benefits so long as the existing businesses are relocated or compensated.

BK12. Berkhamsted Civic Centre. The strategy states that taller buildings are acceptable where they front the High Street, but it also says that the facade on to the High Street will be retained, which statement is relevant.

With works so close to the High Street will there be a possibility that the High Street would be closed at any time and what diversions will be implemented, to only be able to use Clarence Rd to access the site surely there will be traffic implications on to Upper Kings Rd.

The noise and pollution problems will have to be taken into account in such a sensitive area.

BK13. Gossons End. Agree with the regeneration of this site.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS240

**Person ID** 1258634

**Full Name** Hassan Farran

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Strategy</b></p> <p>Firstly, I am pleased that the latest plan is excluding the Ivy House Lane proposal. It would appear that issues such as access and infrastructure and the destruction of natural beauty have rightfully been recognised.</p> <p>I note that with the proposed plan the council is looking to make decisions regarding new neighbourhoods <i>before</i> the revised government guidance on housing numbers has been released. Would it not make sense to wait for this guidance so that we can minimise the erosion of green belt land? By rushing to finalise the Local plan I fear we risk developing land that we could have preserved under the Gov't guidance.</p> <p><b>Other sites - Bulbourne Cross</b></p> <p>I have seen the presentation of this project and I immediately question the attractiveness of this project.</p> <p>1) it would connect Berkhamsted to Hemel Hempsted and erode the boundary of the historic town that is Berkhamsted. I believe it could be the proverbial 'foot in the door' for further developments between Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempsted.</p> <p>2) The extra burden on services and infrastructure cannot be overstated. There are no significant services proposed in the scheme and they make a lot of noise about the direct access to the A41 (one direction only). What about pharmacies, supermarkets, restaurants etc - all of which are in the centre of Berkhamsted. These are all services that will be very frequently visited from this development. I'd feel sorry for residents in Hall Park / Hill / Gate!</p> <p>I would urge the council to reject the Thakeham / BSGCA proposal.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS246
<b>Person ID</b>	1258857
<b>Full Name</b>	James Robinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Other Sites. Bulbourne Cross.</p> <p>I believe that the local plan places an unnecessary burden on the already heavily pressured town of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I received a mailshot recently from the Thakeham and BSGCA project. I am not convinced at all with some of the claims made and would object to this being added to the plan at any stage.</p> <p>Views from the Nort East side will be impacted and run the risk of Berkhamsted merging with Bourne End and ultimately Hemel Hempsted. This would, in my opinion. have a negative impact on the overall feel and unique charm of our beautiful commuter valley.</p> <p>The proposed country park will never be a substitute for the natural countryside we currently enjoy for walking and cycling.</p> <p>I feel this plan should be rejected.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS302
<b>Person ID</b>	1259521
<b>Full Name</b>	Asko Croft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development at Bk06: East of Darrs lane.</p> <p>The first reason against this development is the impact on traffic on the surrounding roads. 200 homes is likely to give rise to around 400 cars. These will be used for work, school, shopping and leisure trips generating considerable local congestion. This will be added to by the proposed new school on the site which will generate a considerable twice daily additional traffic peak of visiting vehicles. There will be additional traffic arising from deliveries, tradesmen and public services vehicles. This will put pressure on junctions on the A4251 including the Billet Lane junction and on Shootersway/Darrs Lane. The risks to the safety of school children who do make the effort to walk or cycle to local schools will be increased by the need to negotiate street crossings on these roads.</p> <p>The second objection reason is the environmental impact. Most vehicles will remain petrol or diesel powered for a considerable time to come, so the significant extra traffic generated by this site will have a major impact on air quality for surrounding homes and people with a negative health effect. The homes and school will likely have gas powered central heating and will in some cases instal wood-burners, barbeques, and patio heaters. All this will generate a pollution plume, typically dispersed across the town in a north easterly direction (depending on prevailing winds). This will reduce air quality in the local area.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS313
<b>Person ID</b>	1207972
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jenny Scott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS314
<b>Person ID</b>	1265588
<b>Full Name</b>	RICHARD SCOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under our names.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS315
<b>Person ID</b>	1265591
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON LEE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS317
<b>Person ID</b>	1259840
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Wheeldon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I have a strong objection to proposal BK01. Although I appreciate new housing is required this is not the location. This development would put thousands of additional vehicles down the already congested and pot hole ridden swing gate lane risking the safety and health of children at two schools. This is the least acceptable of all the sites proposed and should be rejected immediately.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS329

<b>Person ID</b>	1259852
<b>Full Name</b>	Imogen Wagstaff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk01 South of Berkhamsted - I am opposed to this proposal because it involved building on green belt land, will increase traffic on roads which do not have capacity for this. The location of the development will necessitate that most home owners will need to use a car to access supermarkets, etc in the centre of town. This is not compatible with sustainability targets. This will also impact on Ashlyn's school, and Ashlyns Hall, a listed building. It will additionally impact on the Chiltern's AONB and will involve felling trees, detrimental to flood defences and the sequestration of carbon.</p> <p>Bk03 - Haslam Playing Fields - I am opposed to this proposal. This development will involve felling trees which will negatively impact on natural ecosystems and natural flood defences for the town. It will increase traffic significantly on Cross Oak road which is already unable to cope with current levels of traffic because parts of it are single track and large parts do not have pavement and yet it is a route which many secondary school pupils have to walk along to go to secondary school. The increased construction traffic and general car traffic once the houses are built will be a hazard for pedestrians and impact negatively on the environment.</p> <p>Bk06 - East of Darrs Lane - I am firmly opposed to this development as it is on greenbelt land and will significantly increase traffic on roads which do not have capacity for it. The land should be kept as a wildlife area to support natural ecosystems and to help protect against the impact of climate change.</p> <p>Bk07 - Lock field, Northchurch - I am firmly opposed to this. My understanding is that this area is currently used for local allotments and food growing which should be encouraged and expanded in the local plan, not reduced.</p> <p>Bk08 0 Rossway Farm - I am opposed to this development, it will increase traffic on roads which do not have the capacity to support this and the proposal is for too many houses, the number of houses should be reduced significantly and more space devoted to rewilding, local food growing and sustainable community practices.</p> <p>BK13 - Gossoms End/Billet Lane - I support dwellings on top of a food store, but instead of a commercial large food store (such as Lidl which is proposed) I would prefer the food store to support reducing food miles to the area and support local farmers... a covered market for local businesses to sell locally grown food and locally produced essentials would be more sustainable in the long term environmentally and would show greater vision and commitment to achieving Dacorum's stated goals of addressing the climate emergency.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am concerned that I recently received a leaflet through my door about a proposed Bulbourne Cross site which is not mentioned in this plan but also proposes another primary school and significantly more houses... added to the 2200 houses proposed by this plan in and around Berkhamsted, this again will increase traffic and develop on land which should be kept for wildlife and is not mentioned in this local plan in any way, I would like to know why this is?
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS388
<b>Person ID</b>	1260058
<b>Full Name</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260042
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Mitchell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Redbourn Parish Council
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS434

<b>Person ID</b>	1260463
<b>Full Name</b>	Jenny Dickerson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Growth area Bk01 Land South of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>This development is massive compared to other sites around the town. The access to the site is very restrictive with traffic only being able to go <b>up</b> Chesham Road. Local access back down to the High Street would be via Swing Gate Lane. This is a well used road already with some narrow areas. At School drop off/pick up times you have a school at either end of the road which causes problems with congestion and it gets very busy.</p> <p>If you were to suggest stopping the locals parking there this would have a knock on effect on the side streets off Swing Gate Lane including my own. Our narrow cul de sac would become very busy with parked cars and cause friction between neighbours.</p> <p>The overall development suggested for Berkhamsted seems very lopsided with nearly all the sites being on the south side of the Town. This would increase the pressure generally on this side of the town. The overall development of the town is very large and would mean a large percentage increase in the size of the town with hardly any provision for the increased population.</p> <p>Most of the developments on the south side of town need access via Shootersway but to get to or from Shootersway one of the main routes is via Swing Gate Lane again. This would mean a significant increase in traffic coming up and down Swing Gate Lane. This would have a detrimental effect on those living on SGL. There is also the potential to increase accidents as people fly down SGL at speed sometimes and pulling out from the side roads is difficult especially as your line of sight can be obscured by parked cars or vans.</p> <p>The area to the top of SGL is currently open fields and a lovely place to walk through to get to the walks near to the A41. This has been particularly important over the pandemic to be able to walk a fairly short distance to get to open courtyards.</p> <p>I appreciate there is talk of a junior and senior school being built at this site and another of the sites to the south of the town but personally I do not believe this will happen. This will increase pressure on already over subscribed schools. There is no mention of any other facilities other than some local shops being put in. This will not help with pressure on things like doctors. Getting a Doctor's appointment is already hard enough without several thousand extra bodies in the town. The town has a population of approximately 20,000. You are talking about adding over 2200 new properties which would equate to at least another 4000 plus people. This is about a 20% increase in the population which is massive.</p>

This large influx of people could have a detrimental effect on the overall character of this historic market style town. Living so close to the A41 cannot be good. There must be large amount of pollutants in the air, and the level of noise at times would be unbearable. We can hear the traffic in my garden some way away.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS485

**Person ID** 1258240

**Full Name** Adele Giles

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

There is too much development proposed for this historic market town which will place undue stress on the area. The scale of the proposed sites adjacent to the A41 and the railway line should be heavily reduced at the very least, to mitigate the effects of air, noise and light pollution.

Bk07 This site shouldn't be considered due to its proximity to the railway line and the potential flood risk. Any development here would also have a negative impact on the site's position adjacent to Northchurch Common and Ashridge.

Bk09 'Areas at greater risk of flooding will be safeguarded from residential development...', surely this should read 'Areas at risk of flooding will not be considered for development'?

Bk11 What will happen to the businesses on this site if this build goes ahead?



Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS498
<b>Person ID</b>	1260783
<b>Full Name</b>	Leigh Phillips
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I think these proposals for Berkhamstead are measured and sensible.</p> <p>I have recently seen the bulbourne cross proposal and I believe this would be awful, destroying the beautiful countryside/green belt between bourne end and berkhamstead, ruining some lovely country walks and adding to the traffic on the already busy A4251. I hope that the Bulbourne cross proposal will not be considered.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS562

<b>Person ID</b>	1260995
<b>Full Name</b>	Jacqueline Chapman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I understand that there needs to be an increased provision of housing in the town. I feel that the proposals for the south and west of Berkhamsted are better than that put forward by Thakeham as 'Bulbourne Cross' on the east side.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the "Bulbourne Cross' proposals because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Dacorum policy SP3 states " ...rural locations include areas of high landscape quality... and the countryside gaps between settlements. This needs to be protected to ensure their rural character is retained and settlements keep their separate identities". The Broadway Farm area is a very attractive open landscape, and the development of 'Bulbourne Cross' would result in the village of Bourne End becoming part of Berkhamsted. As there is also a proposal for housing on the west side of Hemel Hempstead which reaches down to Winkwell, this would effectively mean a continuous line of development from Hemel to Berkhamsted which goes against the NPPF strategy to 'prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'.</li> <li>2 Although all of the proposed developments will affect the Green Belt, the Dacorum plans for south and west Berkhamsted, by being smaller sites and their proximity to the A41 dual carriageway, will have less impact than the "Bulbourne Cross' proposal which covers open rolling hills.</li> <li>3 The existing junction onto the A41 is extremely tight and dangerous, and has had a large number of accidents. This would make it unsuitable for the proposal of 1100 households using it.</li> <li>4 The distance to existing schools and the railway stations at Berkhamsted and Hemel mean that almost all residents would need to drive there. This will concentrate a very large number of vehicles in one location and in particular on the A4251. This road already carries a very high volume of traffic (for a village with a 'by-pass') as all traffic to Berkhamsted is signposted along it. Any increase in this level of traffic and congestion would cause very serious problems.</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS650
<b>Person ID</b>	1261215
<b>Full Name</b>	Judith Monteath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I wish to comment on proposals for the growth area East ofg DARRS lane. I live in Westfield road and the main reason that I bought my house where it is is the view of fields and trees from my bedroom window. I worked very hard for the NHS and feel that this view of green space, light and quiet is vital for my mental health. I have no wish to have a huge housing estate parked right outside my property. I feel it will significantly effect the value of my home as well as my mental health which you seem very keen to assure us has been taken into account. The development at the top of Durrant lane has been a nightmare in the building and has significantly increased the urbanisaion of this previously beautiful county town. I assume there will be significant compensation (financial) offered to residents affected in the way I descibe to offset the devaluation of their lifestyle and property prices. Why must we keep building over all of our green spaces when many brown field sites are still underused. I will fight tooth and nail to prevent this from going ahead
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS666
<b>Person ID</b>	1261122
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Slade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS693
<b>Person ID</b>	1256588
<b>Full Name</b>	Wendy Silcock
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Whilst I do not disagree with all the sites chosen I think the amount of green belt which will be lost is excessive. Initial development should be concentrated on the non-green belt sites such as the former Jewsons yard and the film institute. The requirement for additional housing can then be reviewed in light of current population figures and forecasts which may well show that 'green belt' development on the scale proposed is unnecessary.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The Thakeham proposal recently sent out to local residents by the company would result in Berkhamsted being joined to Hemel Hempstead through the removal of virtually all the green belt land between the two. I therefore fully support Dacorum's decision not to include this plan in its list of sites.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS700
<b>Person ID</b>	1261244
<b>Full Name</b>	Howard Rogers
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Whilst it does not appear in the current proposal, I am aware of a <b>new</b> proposal, known as 'Bulbourne Cross'. I am attaching a map from the <i>Bulbourne Cross</i> website. I would like to register my objection to the <i>Bulbourne Cross</i> proposal in the strongest possible terms. The village of Bourne End, of which I am a resident, is already subject to no less than 3 residential developments (not including the enormous and abhorrent LA3 development to the North East of the village). Whilst I acknowledge the inevitability of 'growth' in today's society, this new proposal would not only destroy an important area of natural beauty - enjoyed by many local residents as an essential resource for exercise and leisure - but would have a tremendously negative impact on the residents of Bourne End and the surrounding area.  I would like to express my support for the <b>existing</b> proposal to the immediate South of Berkhamsted (as outlined herein) as opposed to the new <i>Bulbourne Cross</i> proposal which I believe is being proffered as an alternative proposition.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Bulbourne Cross map.jpg (1)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS795
<b>Person ID</b>	1144729
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Neil Aitchison
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	However I have been made aware that a developer is promoting 225 acres of land between Hall Park and the current built extremity of Berkhamsted at Hall Park . This would be totally out of character , erodes the established policy and brings about loss of amenity and a significant concern over loss of Green Belt and coalescence of Berkhamsted with Bourne End. Any further development of Berkhamsted should be resisted due to congestion and infrastructure concerns beyond the current proposals.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS816

<b>Person ID</b>	1261428
<b>Full Name</b>	MR ALAN BUCKLE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have viewed the Bulbourne Cross proposals and spoken briefly to MPC, the Marketing Company who I understand are working for Thakeham and Dacorum Borough Council.</p> <p>I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposals to build on the site of the existing football ground in Berkhamsted. I am a longstanding owner/ occupier of one of the flats in Broadwater which directly overlooks the football ground and any development proposals, if approved, would have an enormous adverse impact on the amenity value of Broadwater.</p> <p>I am also equally concerned about the substantially increased traffic (both motorcars and delivery vehicles) which would undoubtedly be generated on the Broadwater access road in the event of such a development going ahead. This access road already serves the tennis club, the skate park/ playground and the public carpark etc and in my opinion, is already at full capacity. I would be interested to know whether a traffic impact study has yet been carried out.</p> <p>In the event of any development of the football ground, the road access (largely single track at present) would undoubtedly need to be very substantially improved. I fail to see how this could be accomplished without affecting the relative safety and security of Broadwater, not to mention the disturbance to the peace and tranquillity, where there is a thriving elderly community. The local community already take their life in their hands crossing the road to walk to the town centre. The road was only intended to be an access/ service road not a main highway.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS851
<b>Person ID</b>	334408
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Charles Toner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>HOUSING</b></p> <p>The case for more housing provision in Berkhamsted to the extent of the total of the sites listed has not been made and certainly needs to be questioned. It is clear that not all can be accommodated.</p> <p>There are problematic sites along Shootersway/ Kingshill Way . The Bearroc 2, site is currently under construction and will shortly add further traffic and pedestrians to Shootersway. There would obviously have to be exceptional reasons to contemplate sizeable housing developments off Shootersway. The sites at British Film Institute (BK02) ; Hanburys / A41(BK04) ; Haslam Fields (BK03) ; Blegberry Gardens (BK05) ; East of Darrs Lane( BK06) ; and Rossway Farm( BK08) would add over 800 houses and twice that number of cars. In reality any one of these sites could be the “last straw that could break the camel’s back. “</p> <p>In addition the large South of Berkhamsted site(BK01) is slated for 850 houses with access to the town down Chesham Road and Swing Gate Lane. These two roads also do not have the capacity for this. Chesham Road is not even a through road but diverts on to narrow roads with pinch points and runs through a housing development.</p> <p>Substantial PRIOR expansion of the road capacities and ancillary infrastructure in these areas will be very difficult and may not be possible. Unless this expansion can be put in place – these sites should not be developed. Unmanageable congestion, gridlocks and accidents would ensue.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	If , after re-examination of the need for more houses in Berkhamsted, compelling reasons emerge, there is another possible site which merits consideration. The developer Thakeham proposes to develop land at Meadway Farm to the east of Berkhamsted. Their proposal offers 1000+ houses, several amenities - sports facilities, a country park, cycle paths , a school and a local shop, without the traffic and other problems of the sites itemised above.
<b>Included files</b>	



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS857
<b>Person ID</b>	1261443
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Clive Drake
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I have lived in Berkhamsted with my family since May 1986 nearly 35 years. I have seen Berkhamsted grow into a lovely delightfull attractive and happy town admired by the many visitors and deservingly in the Sunday Times was chosen as the best area to live in in the South East. So I have had a very critical eye looking at the new development proposals hoping over the next few years the town will continue to prosper.</p> <p>Firstly I have carefully studied the 10 selected sites in the draft local plan and was very disappointed with the limited community benefits being offered and the inadequate infrastructure and I was particularly concerned over the potential increase in traffic in the town centre, which already becomes frequently congested. In comparison I was very impressed with the care, consideration and general layout of Thakeham's plans, which gave much thought to people's well-being, health and fitness all of which is becoming increasingly important in our lives and creating an environment with many large open green spaces on their land.</p> <p>The town is made up of many young families and the proposed country park will be an extremely popular addition with it's lovely large lake and abundance of wild live. Such a draw does not presently exist in the area. Also the substantial new multi sports facility will be another huge asset and the location is cleverly positioned with access directly onto the A41 so locals and visitors will avoid creating more traffic in the town centre. For a town of Berkhamsted size current sports facilities are poor and such a scheme is badly needed and will be highly desirable. This also is a big advantage over the other possible developments for new residents can avoid going into town and can easily by car access directly onto the A41. I also consider Bourne End will considerably benefit will less vehicles and slower speeds.</p>

I am highly impressed with Thakeham's green credentials and their firm commitment demonstrated by their record to date becoming leaders in this topical world issue/concern and their desire for carbon free properties being delivered at an early date.

I would briefly sum up my reasons for giving my support as follows:

- There will be new modern multi sports facilities providing health and social benefit.
- A unique opportunity giving a better future for young people.
- A new country park benefiting the whole community
- A new road infrastructure which should not add to any traffic congestion on existing roads.
- New education and community school and playing fields
- A well thought out site development layout providing a lot of green open space.
- A quality developer highly conscious and committed for a greener and carbon free environment.

I would therefore like to give my support to Thakeham and the BSGCA's proposals.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS858
<b>Person ID</b>	1259433
<b>Full Name</b>	Susan Eustace
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I would like to register my objection to the proposed Bulbourne Cross Development as it would seriously jeopardise the integrity of Berkhamsted and Bourne End and I question the proposal being the answer to the alleged weakness in the

Berkhamsted Strategy Options. Furthermore, it also shows a disregard for the Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) it adjoins.

The sensitivity of this very precious Green Belt land should be recognised. It acts as a natural buffer to the AONB which shares the same status as the country's National Parks. The sweep of this beautiful valley would be seriously compromised and lost forever should this development go ahead.

However tempting Thakeman's so called vision for Berkhamsted appears, it cannot be ignored that 1,100 homes on one site is a huge amount of dwellings. There is also very little detail on the design and nature of the dwellings, including "apartments". How many of the dwellings will be apartments and how high will these apartment blocks be? Having high rise apartments blocks in such an area would be completely inappropriate.

The proposed development would essentially join Berkhamsted to Bourne End and potentially path the way for future developments to join these two places to Hemel Hempstead creating one giant urban stretch. This would remove the natural division between town and village.

Walkers and cyclists already enjoy this beautiful area, which contributes greatly to people's general well-being. Nature, on and adjoining the River Bulbourne, is also thriving, here and now.

There are also serious doubts about Thakeman's assumption that traffic would be diverted from local routes and Berkhamsted town centre by connecting the A41. The plans clearly show that there will also be an access to the A4251, which will inevitably mean many of the new residents would be heading straight into the high street from the development. It would therefore be naive to ignore the inevitable increase to local traffic that the development would bring.

Finally a note about Berkhamsted Football Club. The plan to forcibly remove the football club from their traditional site at the centre of the community is truly appalling. I understand that Berkhamsted Sports Ground Association are working alongside Thakeman, planning to move the club to Bourne End, knowing that this site would have to be accessed by car. Ultimately the present site would then be sold to developers.

Surely, enough is enough, Berkhamsted is being swallowed up with developments. We all have a responsibility to ensure our towns and villages in Dacorum retain their individual character. Creating one huge metropolis by replacing some of our treasured Green Belt land and disfiguring the backdrop to the AONB would be a very poor legacy to hand on to future generations.

I urge that the Whakeman Bulbourne Cross development be rejected in favour of less controversial sites.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS861
<b>Person ID</b>	1261446
<b>Full Name</b>	Charlotte Szypryt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the draft Local Plan consultation - Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I would be most grateful if you could log my support for the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons I support this great scheme which I have briefly outlined below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As well as houses, I am impressed with the amount of green open space Thakeham have proposed. I feel currently the land is not used to it's full potential / appreciated. Instead of the developer cramming in as many houses as they can, they have really thought about the environment here which in this day and age is vital and this will also open up new and exciting routes for families to keep active -whether it's going on nice long walk / run or bike rides.</li> <li>- The new park proposed, will be very beneficial for the community - especially as there does not seem to be a decent one for this part of town.</li> <li>- The sports facilities proposed really excite me - these brand new facilities will encourage people to be active which is obviously important for one's health, not only physically but also mentally. I am sure this will open up many social opportunities for the young and old as well.</li> <li>- I feel the current football stadium is not in the right location. Berkhamsted is such a lovely looking town but the football stadium is a bit of an eyesore! The clubhouse is dated and not somewhere I would choose to hang around. This will give the club an opportunity to get a fresh new look which one will be proud of, in a location that will be much more suitable and hopefully will encourage more people to be a part of the club (as a spectator or a player). Traffic is always chocker block on match days which normally fall on the weekend when everyone also decides to go to Waitrose which is nearby! Yes we have a lovely new car park but this is needed for those wanting to use the town centre and there is no dedicated parking for those wanting to watch / play football. With the proposed scheme, I believe parking will be widely available, which is a big bonus and as it will be a little more out the way, traffic in the town on match days will be better.</li> <li>- Love the idea of having a direct link to the A41 - this will reduce the heavy traffic through the town and will make the town less polluted.</li> <li>- The brand new education and community facilities is again much needed.</li> </ul>

- Love the idea of zero carbon homes, electrical cycle and car charging points - they have really thought about the environment again here and this is much needed to save our planet!  
 In conclusion, this is the perfect scheme and location for a new development in Berkhamsted and therefore as mentioned above, I would be most grateful if you could log my support.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS874
<b>Person ID</b>	1261455
<b>Full Name</b>	Laura Wells
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am commenting on the proposals for Northchurch - which you have not even identified as a separate area, but instead put them under Berkhamsted! Northchurch is its own place and has a different vibe to Berkhamsted. We have a small parade of shops, a pub, two churches and a very small primary school. It feels much more like a village than Berkhamsted and has its own history and identity.</p> <p>One of my main concerns is about the sheer number of houses you are proposing for the whole of Dacorum. Whilst I know that you have a duty to build new housing, I believe these figures are based on a flawed algorithm and the number being proposed is excessive.</p> <p>I am concerned about the impact on local roads and traffic. I live opposite the entrance to the proposed site on New Road, Northchurch. The pavements are very narrow and are already dangerous for school children and pedestrians. Cars come rocketing down the hill from Ashridge and into the village and have to slow suddenly at the canal bridge which is single lane. There are always parked cars around this area due to school drop off and pick up and so already the traffic often backs up the hill. I have seen several near accidents here as cars are confused about where to wait. Cars often park across the pavement thus forcing pedestrians (inc schoolchildren and parents with pushchairs etc) into the road to get past. I feel that the added housing will inevitably make the traffic and congestion much worse and more dangerous. I cannot see how you could possibly resolve this with the bridge being single lane (and presumably part of the conservation area)</p>

I have similar road safety concerns for the site proposed near Darrs Lane in Northchurch. The little lanes up there are very narrow and single track. At the moment, you don't meet much traffic but it's a real nuisance when you do as one of you has to reverse. I cannot imagine what chaos would ensue with the increased number of cars these new houses would lead to.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS883

**Person ID** 1261478

**Full Name** Mr Stephen James

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

I write as a resident of Berkhamsted to comment on the above plan to support the proposals from Thakeham and BSGCA for an allocation to the East of Berkhamsted. I support this because it will:  
Create new and exciting local sports facilities for the people of Berkhamsted  
As the demand for sports facilities increases the space allowed for in the Thakeham scheme will be able to be used.

The Thakeham proposal will allow for new green open spaces and a new country park  
 The new sports facilities will largely be for the benefit of the young people in Berkhamsted  
 A further benefit of the Thakeham scheme is that it will reduce the traffic strain by providing a much needed link to the A 41

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS899

**Person ID** 1261484

**Full Name** Simon Wraight

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment** I saw no mention of increased capacity at GP surgeries. With it already taking over 2 weeks for a phone appointment with a GP, how will the increased population fit in with GP capacity?

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS915

**Person ID** 1261536

**Full Name** JOANNE DARVELL

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>. I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. I support this because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create new, exciting local sports facilities that have health and social benefits for many</li> <li>• Allows existing sports groups to continue to expand, as interest in sport continues to grow</li> <li>• Creates new green open spaces and a new country park</li> <li>• Invests in the future for young people in Berkhamsted, delivering a community benefit when alternatives on the western side deliver very little</li> <li>• Reducing the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41</li> <li>• Creating new education and community facilities</li> </ul> <p>Please log my comment.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS916
<b>Person ID</b>	1261537
<b>Full Name</b>	LESLEY FLETCHER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I am sending this email in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I am a local resident and I live in Berkhamsted and I want to support the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the East of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I support this because it will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; Create a new local sports facility which will have many social and health benefits for many.</li> <li>&gt; Will create new green open spaces</li> <li>&gt; Will create a new Country Park</li> <li>&gt; It invests in the future for young people in Berkhamsted</li> <li>&gt; It will reduce traffic strain on the existing roads</li> <li>&gt; It will create new education and community facilities</li> <li>&gt; Will create more affordable housing</li> </ul> <p>Please log my comments</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS917
<b>Person ID</b>	1223342
<b>Full Name</b>	Gav Collins

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I write as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan. I recently joined a Thakeham information session and I write to support the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>My advocacy is based on the following observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- better to create a new community in one area than add further pressure to central berkhamsted</li> <li>- provisions for additional sports facilities and green spaces are much needed - the facilities are in short supply in Berkhamsted</li> <li>- traffic reduction in central berkhamsted is very much required</li> </ul> <p>Please store my comments as appropriate.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS925
<b>Person ID</b>	1261542
<b>Full Name</b>	MR MATTHEW DRAKE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I would like to present to you my thoughts regarding the draft Local Plan consultation - Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I would be most grateful if you could log my support for the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons I support this excellent scheme which I have explained below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- As well as houses, I am impressed with the amount of green open space Thakeham have proposed. I feel currently the land is not used to it's full potential / appreciated. Instead of the developer cramming in as many houses as they can, they have really thought about the environment here which in this day and age is vital and this will also open up new and exciting routes for families to keep active -whether it's going on nice long walk / run or bike rides.</li> <li>- The new park proposed, will be very beneficial for the community - especially as there does not seem to be a decent one for this part of town.</li> <li>- The sports facilities proposed really excite me - these brand new facilities will encourage people to be active which is obviously important for one's health, not only physically but also mentally. I am sure this will open up many social opportunities for the young and old as well.</li> <li>- I feel the current football stadium is not in the right location. Berkhamsted is such a lovely looking town but the football stadium is a bit of an eyesore! The clubhouse is dated and not somewhere I would choose to hang around. This will give the club an opportunity to get a fresh new look which one will be proud of, in a location that will be much more suitable and hopefully will encourage more people to be a part of the club (as a spectator or a player). Traffic is always chocker block on match days which normally fall on the weekend when everyone also decides to go to Waitrose which is nearby! Yes we have a lovely new car park but this is needed for those wanting to use the town centre and there is no dedicated parking for those wanting to watch / play football. With the proposed scheme, I believe parking will be widely available, which is a big bonus and as it will be a little more out the way, traffic in the town on match days will be better.</li> <li>- Love the idea of having a direct link to the A41 - this will reduce the heavy traffic through the town and will make the town less polluted.</li> <li>- The brand new education and community facilities is again much needed.</li> <li>- Love the idea of zero carbon homes, electrical cycle and car charging points - they have really thought about the environment again here and this is much needed to save our planet!</li> </ul>

In conclusion, this is the perfect scheme and location for a new development in Berkhamsted and therefore as mentioned above, I would be most grateful if you could log my support.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS927

**Person ID** 1261541

**Full Name** Claire Kennedy

**Organisation Details** Chairperson  
Berkhamsted Gymnastics Club

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment** With reference to the draft Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan, Berkhamsted Gymnastics Club welcomes the opportunity proposed by Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Association to include a purpose built gymnastics facility in their plans for Bulbourne Cross. This development would enable the club to enhance its gymnastics provision and facilitate many more members of the community to be involved in local sport.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS929

**Person ID** 1261545

**Full Name** MR STEFAN SZYPRYT

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing this email in regard to the proposed Bullbourne Cross development in Berkhamsted and would like to strongly voice how good an opportunity I think this is for the town.</p> <p>I have frequented Berkhamsted at different times during my whole life, but have been lucky enough to be a resident in Berkhamsted since 2014 - currently at (address removed).</p> <p>In all my years coming to Berkhamsted and now living here, I have always thought that the sports facilities have been second tier for a first-tier town. They just do not align with the rest of the things the town has to offer, such as wonderful restaurants and cafes, beautiful walks/scenery and great people amongst many other things! The football stadium specifically is really poor and probably doesn't entuse any youngster in the town to get into football and commit to Berkhamsted football club. The social offering too for anyone that wants a drink after the game is limited and highly unattractive and not a place that most people would want to go and socialise, chat to friends and have some fun together in nice surroundings. From what I can see of Thakeham's plans there will be a huge array of news sports facilities which can only benefit the young children as they want to develop in sport, especially given how there is such a focus on health and well-being in the current environment. It will also bring friends and families together from a social aspect with the new clubhouse and this is only going to be positive for the town if it wants to stay at one of the best places to live in England, which it was recently voted.</p> <p>The country park and new green spaces that have been proposed as part of the development are also going to bring huge benefits to the town. Again, in the current environment there is a focus on walking, staying healthy and making the most of local surroundings. Additional green spaces to what we are already blessed with is going to allow the community to enjoy more walks, stay healthy and enjoy better life experiences.</p>

I am also impressed by the education and community facilities that are being proposed, as well as the focus on creating a green environment. There is more and more focus generally in the world on the impact we all have on the environment and the importance to protect it for the future generations. It is therefore great to see Thakeham's development focusing on wildlife, planting, green spaces, zero carbon homes and I especially like how they are committing to electrical cycle and car charging points. Thakeham are clearly developers committed to the community and the environment and so if a large-scale development is going to happen in Berkhamsted then I would love it to be this one for all the reasons stated above and many more.

I hope you consider my views on the draft local plan section 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS939
<b>Person ID</b>	1261546
<b>Full Name</b>	Theo Rodrigues
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment**

I am writing to object to the following proposals in your Local Consultation Plan:

- 1 The 'GREEN BELT' status protection for the land between Darts Lane and Bell Lane ,"HOUSES" should not be built .  
Christchurch will loose it's identity,and will become part of Berkhamsted.
- 2.Building on this site,will put extra pressure on;
  - A.Doctors
  - B.Dentists
  - C.Schools

- D.Roads
- E.Water
- F.Sewerage
- G.Policing

3.Two fields adjacent to the proposed development in Shooters have been lost in the last THREE years.

4.Can I suggest,the chair of the consultation department,if possible,could sent a scott,to see,all the development that have taken place in Colindale area,and the Henson area,near the RAF museum.

There was a sewerage problem,which affected the area up to Edgware.

Finanly,please give a kind thought for us the residents of Northchurch.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS947

**Person ID** 1205804

**Full Name** Mrs B. Watson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Bk01 Land South of Berkhamsted.

I am against the development of this greenbelt site of farmland and woodland for the following reason.

- 1 It is greenbelt and should be protected

- 2 Much is agricultural land used for food production
- 3 The woodland provides a natural noise barrier to the bypass and also it has much diversity of birdlife (as does the hedges surrounding the farmland).
- 4 Access to this site might be in the road I live in and if that happened there would be a dangerous "ratrun" of vehicles through Fieldway, Upper Hall Park and Hall Park Gate.
- 5 In my view it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and a much used green space for walking during the pandemic.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS948
<b>Person ID</b>	1261550
<b>Full Name</b>	Hailey Gilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I really would like to voice my concern on the proposal around this new development and the impact on Bourne End and its community. With all the new developments already planned in this area, adding a further 1000 houses, a school and sports centre will really have a negative impact on this lovely village. I have school aged children who are sports mad



and even i do not want this. I fully support the designated Green Belt areas and for the designated housing areas around south and west Berkhamsted . This is by far the the least impactful areas.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS958

**Person ID** 1266581

**Full Name** HELEN YOUNG

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I have particular concerns about the 'south side' development given its proximity to my house and my son's nursery. Access to this proposed development is primarily by the Chesham Road roundabout where there is already traffic at a standstill by 8am. Further, Swing gate lane cannot cope and it will result in an influx of commuter and general traffic past Swing Gate school increasing pollution for the underdeveloped lungs of children to cope with and a safety risk for them and their parents crossing the road.

I understand that to meet government targets development has to occur, but it should not be in the locations proposed. The statistics and information on which this plan is based are outdated and assign a ridiculously high (in percentage terms) amount of development to a market town. The focus should be on the development of brownfield sites and affordable housing. We all know that these proposed properties will not be affordable to the general population so it is not worth sacrificing our green space.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS962
<b>Person ID</b>	1261555
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Forster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Berkhamsted/Potten End and am Chair of the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association Ltd. I am writing in the context of the latter role on behalf of the Charity.</p> <p>We wholeheartedly support the proposals from Thakeham and ourselves for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted to include a major new community sports hub.</p> <p>As you may know, the BSGCA is a key stakeholder in the development of sport in the Berkhamsted area, owning the freeholds of the Broadwater site of Berkhamsted Football Club, the freehold of Berkhamsted Cricket Club and some part of the site of Berkhamsted Tennis and Squash Club. Our members also include Berkhamsted Raiders Community Football Club, Berkhamsted Hockey Club and Berkhamsted Rugby Club. Our charitable objective is to enhance the wellbeing of all the residents of Berkhamsted by providing facilities for their enjoyment of sport and leisure. We do not run sports clubs but provide grants, loans and nominal rents to member clubs. For further information about the charity please see <a href="http://www.bsgca.org">www.bsgca.org</a></p>

Independent reports for Dacorum Borough Council have highlighted the urgent need for a range of additional high quality sports facilities and, most recently, in the May 2020 Local Football Facility Plan. For some years we have been looking for a site that could provide a multi-sport, multi-club community sports centre that would support the growth ambitions of local clubs and enable access to high quality sporting facilities for the whole community.

Thakeham have offered to provide us with such a site of 24 acres at no cost as part of their proposed development , benefiting clubs and players not just for the next few years but for many years to come as the population of the area increases. It would be operated on a not for profit basis and would aim to expand community usage especially to disadvantaged groups. We do not believe that any of the allocations in the present Local Plan draft can provide such a significant community benefit.

The [www.bsgca .org](http://www.bsgca.org) web site provides an indication of how the new community site may be configured but it could also provide much needed hubs for additional sports such as cycling, netball and running. Together with the proposed Country Park, the residents of Berkhamsted and local villages would be able to enjoy transformational sport and leisure benefits.

We trust that these significant community benefits will be given due consideration as part of your review of the Thakeham proposal.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS976

**Person ID** 1255447

**Full Name** Andrew Sparrow

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I write as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>. I want to indicate my opposition to including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. I oppose their proposal because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involve the destruction of green belt land, the construction of a 1,100 home housing estate, and create a huge ribbon development from Northchurch through to Hemel. Erosion of the green belt and the coalescence of these distinct communities does not fit with the local plan's current policy of housing provision by smaller builds around existing settlements.</li> <li>• Increase the already noticeable traffic strain on the area's existing roads by locating a new housing estate several kilometres away from Berkhamsted and Hemel town centres and railway stations</li> <li>• Seek to create an unwanted "sports hub" (with an associated 400 hundred car parking spaces) when all of the established sports clubs in Berkhamsted (cricket, tennis, football) do not want to move from their existing town centre locations. The proposal also involves the sale of the Broadwater stadium which provides a valuable community resource in the centre of the town. Over 3,500 people have signed the football club's petition opposing the sale of their historic home and the conversion of a football ground into ~ 125 flats.</li> <li>• Building of housing, schools and sports pitches right next to the A41 has a host of obvious problems - pollution, noise, and extensive terracing of the current hillside landscape - and will materially reduce the green buffer between the bypass and the town.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS977
<b>Person ID</b>	1260803
<b>Full Name</b>	Rollo Prendergast
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The Local Plan is already out of date. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In August 2020 the Government put forward a proposed new Standard Method. This lifted the average delivery for Dacorum to 1,023 (the same as under the 2017 method) even higher than 922 p.a. under the 'mutant algorithm' (and on which the current Local Plan is based). This despite the major uplift being intended for <u>20</u></li> </ul> </li> </ol>

major cities by 37%, to drive housing into urban areas and encourage brownfield development. Why then has this led to an increase in delivery for Dacorum, hardly a 'major city'. *Has the Borough Council challenged this?*

- What is the Borough Council's response to the unprecedented fall in UK birth rate, the lowest since records began and 2/3 of the rate in 1920, even though the overall population was 22 million fewer in 1920; the fall in European migrants by 1.3 million over the last year; 80,000 excess deaths in 2020 due to COVID-19, and beyond 2020? *Does the BC have any views on how these factors will affect demand for housing in this area?*

## 2 Brownfield opportunities in town centres?

- 54 retailers failed last year in the UK, which involved 5,214 stores closing. The Financial Times reports that the demise of major chains which 'acted as high-street anchor tenants across the country puts hundreds of smaller towns and city centres at risk'.
- *Is the Council going to follow the 'Housing and economic needs assessment' guidance per the MHC&LG 16th December 2020 Planning Newsletter?*  
*If so, what actions are planned with regard to possible surplus provision of retail space in the Borough's town centres and opportunity for change of use for housing?*

## 3 Supporting Housing Delivery and Public Service Infrastructure

- *Is the Borough Council participating in the 'Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure' consultation (published 3rd December 2020), in order to support change of use, to reflect structural changes in consumer spending and thereby free up commercial space for housing?*
- *Does the Council embrace the opportunity and have ambitions to spare some greenfield development as a result? Has the Borough Council risen to the opportunity set out in the 16th December 2020 statement by the Housing Secretary, to apply to the new £100 million Brownfield Land Release Plan funding and started to prepare bids?*

## 4 Piecemeal Approach

- The planning process puts location of planned dwellings (Borough planning level) ahead (in time) of planning the necessary infrastructure (care of CC, private sector utilities). This results in piecemeal plots surrendering any concept of a holistic approach and integrated environmental response. I refer in particular to Berkhamsted Proposals & Sites, Growth Areas BK01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 08 and 10 ('SW Berkhamsted'). While funding will be derived from S106 and CIL, these will be provided by a collection of developers with no overall stake in the overall infrastructural and environmental impact.
- An example of how this can go wrong can be observed in the chaotic traffic management system at the junction of King's Road and Shootersway/Kingshill Way. This system was installed as a condition of approval for Bearroc Park, and should be a warning to residents of what can be expected in future. The work resulted in at least 12 occasions where the junction over the last 2 years has had to be excavated to re-install services correctly to rectify numerous errors by sub-contractors. The junction itself is suboptimal, with a minimal filter

lane for traffic coming up Kings Road: that traffic has to take its chance when turning right onto Shootersway, there being no dedicated light sequence for this movement.

- This problem will be soon compounded by the developments approved for Hanburys (103 Class C2 units) and The Old Orchard (17 residential apartments), which will debouch straight onto this junction. In due course, traffic from the 90 dwellings planned for the current BFI site Growth Area BK02, will also directly enter this junction. To the West of Shootersway, some 180 metres from this junction, it is also planned that 150 dwellings will be built on Growth Area Bk03, Haslam Playing Fields and 70 dwellings on GA Bk04. A total of 430 new dwellings, which does not take into account other windfall developments under way in the vicinity: e.g. Little Kingshill, Appledore and Larchmore - connection of services to the latter 2 developments has caused substantial traffic congestion lasting days, back across the A41 Chesham Road flyover. Imagine the disruption that building works will cause on Shootersway with the development of all the above dwellings.
- Pavements down the very narrow top end of Kings Road from this junction in places will only allow one pedestrian at a time. Thus, the desired and environmentally friendly 20-30 minute pedestrian access to the High Street and station, will have to be via this steep, narrow and dangerous route.
- Taylor Wimpey has skillfully used local media to give the impression that the company itself will invest £2m on resources and infrastructure in Berkhamsted as a result of Bearroc Park Phase 2. This will in fact be a contribution to the Borough CIL and will not necessarily be applied to mitigate infrastructure demands in the area in question. This pattern is likely to be repeated over the life of the Local Plan, as currently framed.  
*How much of this contribution and similar CIL contributions in future, will be used to redress the infrastructure blight (see items 5. et seq below) in the immediate area of SW Berkhamsted caused by the development of over 2,000 dwellings?*
- The Royal Town Planning Institute, in their May 2019 report 'A Smarter Approach to Infrastructure Planning' comments:

'Local Government needs to recognise the importance of early and collaborative engagement across boundaries to support infrastructure planning, and to align the infrastructure requirements of their spatial visions. The differing and emerging forms of strategic planning (both statutory and non-statutory) need to be both acknowledged and assessed. Wider adoption of strategic (including county wide) infrastructure plans should be encouraged. [Royal Town Planning Institute May 2019]

'Engagement happens too late ... far too far down the line to make a meaningful contribution to their ability to forward plan.' (*Energy provider*) *ibid*

'There needs to be more formalised working arrangements to consider development options at an early stage of preparing a Local Plan so that a preferred strategy is identified which integrates the location, scale and type of development with the infrastructure needed to support it in a way that can be funded and delivered effectively.' (*Survey respondent, District Council*) *ibid*

'This lack of visibility, and perhaps ownership of infrastructure planning, was reflected in findings related to the resourcing of infrastructure planning with very few local authorities being confident they have either the funding, staff, or information needed to deliver the infrastructure to support their vision.' *ibid*

## 1 Suboptimal Sites because of Natural Topography

The aspirations set out in Policy DM51 require that 'sustainable transport measures should be delivered early on in the development to establish green travel behaviour from the outset of occupation' and to 'encourage the switch away from the private car (Movement and Access 21.1)'

However, in the scramble to comply with Government demands, the Call for Sites has ignored the basic topography of the Bulbourne valley and supports sites which cannot deliver these goals.

- The process has thrown up, in response to the Call for Sites, a totally suboptimal collection of sites that will depend on an access 'backbone' consisting of Shootersway and Kingshill Way, and 'ribs' of narrow (single vehicle width) side streets down to the High Street and station: Darrs Lane, Bell Lane, Durrants Lane, Cross Oak Road and Kings Road. At points along these side streets, the pavements are only one pedestrian wide or even non-existent. Built in Victorian times, they will not allow expanded vehicle, cycle or pedestrian traffic. Journeys, using this infrastructure, will inevitably be in motor vehicles. It might be possible for able-bodied citizens to get down to the High Street and station on foot or by bicycle; most will not choose to do this, especially if it entails a journey back up a 5% gradient (Category 4, Tour de France), laden with shopping.
- One aspect of the Bulbourne Cross proposal has much to be commended is the fact that the development would be on a similar contour line to Berkhamsted High Street and seeks to provide viable pedestrian and cycle access to the town and station.
- It is not sufficient to call for contributions 'towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station' and the local road network if the physical location of the SW Berkhamsted sites and immanent topographical limitations thereof prevent any feasible solution. This is surely kicking the can down the road. *Without proper prior analysis, how can sites which will be entirely dependent on the feasibility of this access infrastructure even be tabled?*
- The large scale developments set out for Tring, on the other hand, are well placed for access and without notable topographical disadvantages.

## 2 Land Price vs Affordable Housing

- The high market price of land in the SW Berkhamsted (Growth Areas BK01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 08 and 10) will drive up the average cost of housing. Other areas not included in the Local Plan (e.g. the land covered by the Bulbourne Cross development which borders onto a brownfield site (Bourne End Industrial area)) will not be as expensive, especially given the current owners' apparent desire to ensure their land, if adopted, put to good use for the benefit of the community. The land was withheld from the Call for Sites, as the owners were not driven purely by commercial concern. They are attracted by a development there which ensures a holistic environmental and community-driven use.
- In the DESG, Policy DM2 aims to secure 40% 'genuinely' affordable housing in the areas in question, with an expectation that 'the cost will need to be substantially more than 20% below local market prices and rents'. To take for example the cheapest existing properties in the area (new build) - a 3 bed semi in Bearroc Park Phase 2 @ £510k, a 20% discount would imply a sale price of £408k: not really affordable, when the average UK house price stands at £250k. The average new build price in Hertfordshire is currently £419k.

- Favoured developers such as Taylor Wimpey and Crest Nicholson do not specialize in affordable housing. Their USP is detached executive-type residences with reliable profit margins. The piecemeal approach to sites will only hinder the achievability of affordable housing due to scale.

3 Location of Future Secondary School

The currently stated preferred options Bk 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 08, 10 and Bk 13 total 1,480 houses, located to the East of the town.

If secondary pupils are to be encouraged to walk to school to avoid two way vehicle traffic building up along what will become a very busy road, those coming from the East of town (along Kingshill way and Shootersway) will have no pavement along Shootersway after Durrants Lane, with cars travelling at up to the National speed limit. Access via Bell lane Lane has no pavement and is a single-track road on a steep hill. In total, the last stretch could entail a walk to school of 1 mile without the benefit of pavements.

*Is it planned that the Borough Council will acquire the relevant verges to create pavements/cycleways and has discounted the possibility of ransom strips being set up, which have form in this borough?*

4 Pollution

- *What considerations have been examined in respect of noise and vehicle pollution resulting from planned development in SW Berkhamsted alongside the A41?*
- *Are there any plans to provide an additional access to the A41, west of the existing Chesham Road access, so as to draw traffic away from these areas, and to prevent congestion and pollution along Shooters Way and Kingshill Road?*

5 A better, holistic solution?

- The main merit of a scheme like Bulbourne Cross is the holistic approach (vis a vis environment and transport) even if this does not give the BC the freedom to use S106 or CIL which is the default modus operandi. ‘Local authority Infrastructure Delivery Plans evidence both uncertainty about, and severe shortfalls of, funding for their infrastructure ambitions. They resemble ‘wish lists’ of projects rather than prioritised strategies for achieving place-based outcomes, with CIL and S106 contributions widely highlighted as the panacea for addressing resource gaps.’ [Baker and Hinks 2009, PBA 2016].

The Bulbourne Cross proposal also addresses the well-known shortfall in the borough’s sports facility provision as well as providing a holistic solution to environmental challenges, which are not realistically addressed in the Council’s ‘wish list’: Draft Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2038 - Climate Change & Sustainability.

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

Appendix F.7 New settlement - Bovingdon Airfield

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS978
<b>Person ID</b>	1259476
<b>Full Name</b>	Roger Macklin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>. I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. I support this because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create new, exciting local sports facilities that have health and social benefits for many</li> <li>• Allows existing sports groups to continue to expand, as interest in sport continues to grow</li> <li>• Create new green open spaces and a new country park</li> <li>• Invest in the future for young people in Berkhamsted, delivering a community benefit when alternatives on the western side deliver very little</li> <li>• Reduce the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41</li> <li>• Creating new education and community facilities</li> <li>• The alternatives within the existing confines of Berkhamsted will have a very negative effect on the health and wellbeing of the residents.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS993

<b>Person ID</b>	1261639
<b>Full Name</b>	Marie Drake
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I have lived in Berkhamsted for nearly 35 years and being very proud of my town I am concerned over future developments that may harm the area.</p> <p>I have looked at Thakeham's plans and I must say I am highly impressed and therefore would like to record my support. I briefly set out my reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new road system directly linking into the A41 and the clever layout should prevent further congestion in an already busy High Street.</li> <li>• Thakeham's green credentials showing strong commitment and care in a highly topical issue.</li> <li>• Much needed excellent multi sports facilities positioned alongside the A41 meaning again traffic in the town centre is not effected.</li> <li>• The promotion of health and social benefit.</li> <li>• A country park with large lake protecting wild life and with so many young families in this area this would be highly popular.</li> <li>• A new school and playing fields again a big requirement in the town.</li> <li>• The developers care and consideration for people's well being and fitness by the creation of bike routes and the amount of open green space planned on this land.</li> </ul> <p>I believe the whole community will be receiving considerable benefits from these proposals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS1025
<b>Person ID</b>	1261660
<b>Full Name</b>	Mx S. A. Ferrier
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to register my objection to the proposal for 60 dwellings on Lock Field.</p> <p>! Safety concerns for a road coming out onto New Road immediately after the canal bridge which would be virtually blind to traffic coming up the hill which has the right of way. Also the road on the bridge is only 2.85 metres wide between kerbs. 60 houses would produce at least 120 cars using this access plus a multitude of home delivery vans etc. There is only footpath on the other side of the road and this is very narrow.</p> <p>2 Surface water runoff down New Road. There are no drains above the canal bridge. Flooding would be a problem.</p> <p>3 Loss of designated Green Belt Status.</p> <p>4 This land is used by the rail network for access for maintenance. Where would they go?</p> <p>5 There is no mains for sewage disposal on that side of the canal bridge, 60 houses with cesspits or septic tank.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1050
<b>Person ID</b>	1261668
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Maynard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to record my concerns/objections relating to a proposed development of 60 new dwellings in Lock Field accessed from New Road, Northchurch included in the above Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serious safety concerns due to increased traffic, poor visibility for cars coming over the canal bridge, unsafe access from the lock Field site onto New road north above the pinch point at the canal bridge and the single track of the canal bridge itself. The bridge is too narrow for sustained construction traffic.</li> <li>• Significant impact from additional vehicle journeys with additional cars from the proposed development (probably at least 2 per household), increasing airborne pollution levels near St Mary's school and further issues with parking, especially during drop off/pick up times. This will have a particular impact on my property which is 2 up from the cemetery in New Road which even now causes difficulties for our access/egress at these times.</li> <li>• Narrow single pavement across from the proposed development necessitating crossing a busy, fast road.</li> <li>• Surface water run - off issues and potential for flooding.</li> <li>• No mains drainage north of the canal</li> <li>• Higher density housing on this side of New Road compared to the housing on the other side where I live</li> <li>• Impact on our views and vistas across border Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> <li>• Loss of designated Green Belt Status and protection for species rich hedgerows.</li> <li>• Impact on wildlife corridor to canal and nearby wildlife sites and sites of Special Scientific interest including deer, badgers, 80+birds and butterflies and other protected species.</li> <li>• Impact on the village identity of the Northchurch community and its relationship with the open countryside.</li> <li>• Capacity of the school to cope with increased pupil numbers.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1056

<b>Person ID</b>	1261673
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Brian Rumph
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I understand that you intend to build 200 houses on land between Durrants lane and Darrs Lane. The area is fed by two single track roads and Durrants Lane. The traffic using Durrants Lane is getting worse with the school an d houses at the top. Also is a short cut to the bypass. I object to the plan the roads won't cope.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1103
<b>Person ID</b>	1261701
<b>Full Name</b>	Raeeka Yassaie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	As I've said before, I don't believe the numbers have been calculated correctly and I am very much against greenbelt land being used in this way given the numbers can't be justified.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1152
<b>Person ID</b>	1261822
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Scott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The volume of housing being allocated to Berkhamsted is too high and will undermine the nature of a market town. Most of the housing sites being proposed will result in increased traffic as they are too far from the town centre to promote walking. When the A41 was built it was promised that the A41 would not become the new town boundary; in this proposal it is. Building satellite suburbs reliant on motor transport in a market town is unsympetic to the character of the town. In this regard the plan's description of "vibrant communities" is not credible. Berkhamsted is the "vibrant community" the plan should support and the volume of housing proposed undermines this.</p> <p>In particular the increase seen in traffic on Shootersway is already undermining the quality of the local environment. Even in the COVID lockdown the volume and speed of traffic has made walking and cycling less pleasant. Shootersway still has some of the character of the country lane in once was and pavements in many places are narrow (e.g. Kings Road to Cross Oak stretch) and on Kings Road itself (the most direct walking route to the town centre) which is unsafe</p>

and a deterrent to walking. Additional housing on Shootersway will exacerbate this situation and it is hard to see how the roads can be improved even if that was desirable, bearing in mind the current character of the area.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1155

**Person ID** 1261828

**Full Name** Ben London

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

The proposed site at South Berkhamsted is inappropriate and a poor option for a number of reason. I strongly object to the proposal with the following key objections:

1. Vehicle access will be a significant problem for the local community and the provision proposed in the plan will not be sufficient for the number of houses. Swing Gate Lane is has two schools on it in additional to a busy junction with London Road. I have reservation about road safety and the volumes of traffic introduced by building significant houses at the top of Swing Gate Lane. A new junction with the A41 would be the only practical way to support this volume of traffic.

2. The site is extremely close to the A41, which will lead to both noise and pollution issues for residents were properties to be built at this site.

3. This green land currently provided a buffer of green space between residential dwellings and the A41, encroaching on this land will remove this green buffer and lead to housing right up the A41. Sites such as the British Film Institute would be far more appropriate given that this site is already developed and it doesn't adjoin directly on to the A41.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1187
<b>Person ID</b>	1261852
<b>Full Name</b>	Donna Francis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Ref Bk 07 - Lockfield, Northchurch</b></p> <p><b>concern 1</b> - the road system in and around the lower end of New Road area struggles at the best of times with accommodating traffic coming in from the Ashridge direction and from the High street direction and there are constant bottlenecks at both sides of the small single traffic bridge over the canal, and these are not limited to typical peak periods as the area also gets a lot of traffic in good weather when families with camper vans etc use the roads to go up and sit around the common areas so the review needs to think wider than usual road usage.</p> <p>When Bridgewater estate was built there was an agreement as part of the planning to create a bypass road from New Road up into the estate via Springfield Road at the point opposite or thereof sunnyside allotments as it was deemed appropriate to alleviate the burden into Northchurch High Street and the development there was capable of handling that burden as it was built with that in mind to alleviate the subsequent tail backs into Berkhamsted itself. If you look at the road and housing developments at that point in the Bridgewater estate where it backs onto New Road there is certainly</p>



plenty of scope and unused space, yet this was not completed at that time and this new development proposal will certainly add to the already pressured connectivity infrastructure and I propose that previous plan is resurrected to build a road connecting directly to the train station. Bearing in mind without it, any traffic ultimately from that Ashridge direction that wants to get to the station will join everyone else and those that wish to reach the A41 will find the need to then join the pressure on Durrants, Darrs and Shootersway to make that access, and given the proposal also wants to build there, the road links are going to become an issue for all concerned thereby conflicting with the very purpose of an A41 bypass being built.

**concern 2** - linked to the above are the issues associated with ST. Mary's primary school. It's choked at pick up and drop off already and this will not help and so the points I raise above are suitably relevant to that connected issue. The children need to breathe as much as possible.

**concern3** - to build houses that will deter from the natural beauty of the canal path as it exists only to have house placed there at risk of flood and noise and possibly vibration pollution from the canal and rail sandwich they will be between seems to be banking issues for later only to tick a short term box to squeeze as much into the proposal as possible. The numbers could still be met with this development as I note there are comments stating there is a need to reach 16,600 but the volumes outlined include reference to reaching 16,899 so it appears overall the Dacorum target is exceeding the minimum requirements so could afford to drop this smaller scale yet impactful site.

**concern 4** - I do not consider that the 'village' of northchurch is being treated as fairly as other villages in the development scope who seems to be given more due consideration of their size and their character. Northchurch is by default being treated as nothing more than a sub postcode of the market town of Berkhamsted and that in my opinion is contradictory to the overall premis of attitude to the develo0ment plans for this location and should be determined more in keeping with its status as a village.

**concern 5** - there is little information as to the significance of the archeological site issue that is referred to in the plans to be able to provide a comprehensive consideration to what the impact might be.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1257
<b>Person ID</b>	1253932
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Scrivens

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Primarily commenting on BK01, but my comments are equally valid to a lot of the other proposals across Berkhamsted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1283
<b>Person ID</b>	1145427
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Glenister
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b><u>BK 01 - South Berkhamsted - Swingate Lane</u></b> I would like to object to the proposed housing development on south Berhamsted Greenbelt land for the following reasons;

- The proposed building site in South Berkhamsted is situated on arable farmland, levelling plateau above the steep sided valley. There are no rivers in this area presenting a major sustainability problem with regards supply of adequate water (potable drinking water & wastewater) for such a large number of proposed houses. Presumably water would need to be pumped to the areas which is clearly not sustainable.
- A significant loss of Green Belt here would create urban sprawl, contrary to one of the main purposes of the Green Belt. Currently there is a strong Green Belt boundary which forms a clearly defined and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, this site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment. An imp
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.
- Road access to the site is not suitable for such a large number of houses. There will be congestion due to schools at each end of Swingate Lane and limited or no parking area.
- Much of the development here would be highly visible, being on a prominent ridge top location. In particular it is likely to be visible from the AONB, affecting its setting.
- Development of this site will result in the loss of cultivated arable farmland. We need all the farmland to grow crops and be self-sufficient especially now that we are no longer part of the European Union as from 1st January 2021.
- The site is greenfield and there would therefore be loss or damage of some habitats. The site also includes Long Green wildlife site, which could be adversely affected by development. A designated wildlife site (woodland) is located in the south-eastern corner of the site, adjacent to the A41. There are TPOs located in the north-eastern area of the site.
- This site is located along way (2 km) from the train station, bus stops and town centre though the gradient between the town centre and the site is likely to discourage walking and cycling, which could result in increased car use and growth in the level of greenhouse gas emissions. Whilst the site is situated 2km of the railway station there remains the likelihood that a proportion will commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car.

- The site has a poor relationship to existing town centre services and facilities, employment land and the railway station. The distance from the town centre and the ridge top location would discourage walking and cycling. Consequently, large-scale development would place significant pressure on the local highway network, particularly Swing Gate Lane, the Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction and Kings Road, especially given the possible cumulative impact of existing and other promoted development. Such cumulative development will also have a significant impact on the A41, which currently experience serious congestion during peak periods at the M25 junction and the exit at Aylesbury.
- The proposal purports to offer an opportunity to create a new planned neighbourhood expansion of the town with a range of associated local services and facilities. But the proposed local store and pub are likely to prove unviable. Neither is the proposed development of a size that would have the potential to secure a range of social, leisure and community facilities. It would form an estate dominated by commuters a high proportion of whom would commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car, making a limited contribution to enhancing a sustainable and vibrant market town.
- The site is not of a size to deliver larger-scale infrastructure, contributing to the improvement of transport links. The creation of an east-west link road (connecting Swing Gate Lane with Chesham Road) would not benefit the wider community. At the Core Strategy Hearing the Inspector accepted that this link was simply required to facilitate the proposed new development and could not be taken as a benefit for the community as a whole. It would facilitate access to the A41 from this site and thereby exacerbate the congestion problems on the A41.
- The suggestion of a bus loop would not be viable; bus routes in Berkhamsted have declined in recent years.
- A new primary school on this site does not fit with the existing provision for new schools in the present Plan.
- There would be loss or damage to habitats, such as the Long Green and Brickhill Green wildlife sites. Development of this site threatens ancient woodland (Long Green).
- The density of 35 dwellings per hectare (dph) is too high for the edge-of-town and is incompatible with neighbouring character areas.
- The western part of the site is located in the Ashlyn's Hall estate which is of local value as a heritage asset with the Grade II Listed Buildings associated with Ashlyn's Hall being in close proximity.

The County Archaeologist has identified that there is potential that archaeological remains are present in the area between the A41 and Berkhamsted, including the possibility of nationally important remains that may be worthy of preservation in situ. Archaeological assessment would therefore be required before the submission of a planning application.

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

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

- “The urban biodiversity of the six major settlements in Dacorum needs to be considered with respect to the nature of the ecological resources of the Borough as a whole and their immediate hinterland. The ecological networks and processes that exist at the broad scale are important in helping sustain the habitats and wildlife within the urban areas and are also important in providing additional resources that can be accessed by local communities.
- The pattern of biodiversity resources within urban areas should be developed and maintained. These include those with statutory and non-statutory designations as well as sites or features of more local importance, including Open Land designated within the Local Plan.
- Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves and Wildlife Sites should be protected from adverse development appropriate to their status. The maintenance and enhancement of these assets will be encouraged through management. Ultimately these are the most intrinsically valuable wildlife resources and represent critical capital within the urban context.

- Locally valuable 'Wild space' areas should be protected, particularly where consistent with Open Land designated within the Local Plan. Management should seek to enhance their ecological interest. These sites provide the wildlife corridors, networks and stepping stones that help sustain ecological processes within the settlement. Although they can vary in size and ecological function, where appropriate the protection of corridor features should include the standard guidance provided by British Standard 5837:2005 in relation to trees and advice from the Environment Agency concerning wetlands. The remaining areas of designated Open Land may also be important or potentially so ecologically.
- Links to open countryside and other recognised sites of wildlife value should be protected and enhanced with appropriate management where possible. These help to sustain the ecological processes to and from the settlement itself, as wildlife does not stop at the edge of a settlement boundary.
- New sites should be enhanced or created for their wildlife value where appropriate, especially where consistent with Open Land. These can help to offset areas of deficiency or improve public accessibility.
- All opportunities for Local Nature Reserve designation should be explored and suitable sites designated to help towards meeting English Nature's target for their provision.
- Finer grained wildlife support should be developed and maintained using the 'Greenspace Factor' principle and policies to protect and / or plant trees, hedgerows and other vegetation, which will contribute to the delivery of sustainable development.
- The principles of sustainable development should be followed across the borough with respect to biodiversity resources, including opportunities to address deficiencies through planning gain."

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **CONCLUSION**

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

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

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

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

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

### **Bk09: Bank Mill Lane**

This area is a natural flood plain in close proximity of the Bulbourne River. It would be very unwise to build houses on a flood plain and in fact exacerbate flooding issues.

The area is a natural habitat for birds and mammals. Concreting onto this area will remove their habitat and cause an imbalance of our ecosystem.

Mill Lane is a tranquil waking area in close proximity to the centre of the town an intouch with nature away from buildings, people and traffic. This should be maintain for health and well being purposes for residents and visitors to Berkhamsted.

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and into adjoining open countryside.
- Distance from the town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.
- Impact on setting of the River Bulbourne.
- Reduction in the degree of separation between the town and Bourne End

In addition I would like to make my own reasons for objecting to this areas for housing.

- Important nature area for birds and animals to feed on grubs and insects near the river
- Expansion of town to east – would significantly alter Gateway to Berkhamsted
- Located in Berkhamsted Conservation Area
- Impact on adjacent AONB
- Risk of flooding identified in assessment
- Distance from town centre – walking or cycling route to town adversely affected by any additional traffic to/from South Berkhamsted

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1293

**Person ID** 1259116

**Full Name** Tring in Transition (TinT)

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1315
<b>Person ID</b>	1261996
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Howe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Far too many new dwellings. How was this 'calculated'? What consideration was/has been given as a result of Brexit, COVID-19 pandemic and Climate Change?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1320
<b>Person ID</b>	1262009
<b>Full Name</b>	N Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Serious consideration needs to be given to how existing road infrastructure can cope with all the additional development planned on sites which will take their access of Shootersway. Shootersway is already a very busy road, especially during peak times with school runs and is often backed up from the traffic lights at the top of Kings Road to the roundabout at Cross Oak Road. I cannot see how this road can cope with the inevitable increase in traffic.</p> <p>Density should be pushed on other available land, pricipally the land South of Berkhamsted.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1342
<b>Person ID</b>	1145350

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Edward Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Every saturday will be carnage as the new poulation of 30k descend into town. Not acceptable
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1352
<b>Person ID</b>	1261962
<b>Full Name</b>	Claire Crouchley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk07 Lock Field, New Road, Northchurch</b> I object strongly to this proposed development of 60 homes north of the canal bridge on New Road.

There would need to be a potentially dangerous new access onto New Road at a point where the road is narrow, with a single pavement on the opposite side, and where there are already often cars parked, making visibility very difficult. The access would be just above the single-lane very narrow canal bridge.

The increase in traffic volume will make an already difficult area for driving safely considerably more dangerous and will increase the airbourne pollution levels.

There are potential problems of surface water run-off and flooding. The proposed development is of a high density and there is no mains drainage north of the canal.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1353
<b>Person ID</b>	1262043
<b>Full Name</b>	Humphrey Norrington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Music Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am writing on behalf of the Berkhamsted Music Society where I am the chairman. The Society regularly uses the Civic Centre for our five concerts each year.

We find the auditorium about the right size for our audiences, and the stage suits the small number of players. When the Police Station moved in, we lost the convenience of the old green room. The new one is a long way up the building. As a citizen of the town, I think it would be important that the facilities provided by the Civic Centre be updated or any least maintained. It is the only satisfactory place for events, while the site cries out for fuller development.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1362

**Person ID** 1262046

**Full Name** Mr Richard Abraham

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites** Over development of Berkhamsted and Tring - the two areas I've known for over forty years - with, it seems to me, a  
**Berkhamsted comment** complete disregard for the present population, the history associated with big market towns and their environment.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1372
<b>Person ID</b>	221909
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Stephen Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the development proposals for Berkhamsted as outlined in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) and also to the unsolicited Thakeham proposal for Bulbourne Cross.</p> <p>The algorithm on which the consultation is based has been withdrawn by the Government. The algorithm which has replaced it uses out of date data. To continue until a new algorithm is established is a waste of public money. The reason for insisting on continuing to develop a plan based on unsound assumptions demands an answer as quite candidly it falls below the expected governance standard and is open to challenge on that alone, especially given the potential legal cost exposure. What is the reason please?</p> <p>Government policy is now to rebalance the economy of the UK to support the development of the Midlands and North where brownfield sites exist and thereby take the pressure off greenfield sites in London and the South East. Releasing greenbelt land in London and the South East undermines this so-called 'Northern Powerhouse' policy.</p> <p>Greenfield sites need to be retained for agriculture in a Brexit and climate change environment where the UK needs to be more self-sufficient than previously. Reliance on imported foods is becoming increasingly unwise in view of the need to reduce carbon emissions from transport sources and the need to guarantee food security in an increasingly unstable world political environment.</p> <p>Water supplies in the aquifer in the south of England are unable to meet current demand, increasing the possibility of water shortages. This is particularly acute in the chalk areas of the Chilterns.</p> <p>The location of Berkhamsted within a narrow valley makes access difficult, especially in view of the existing housing stock on through roads near the centre of town which has limited off street parking provision. The steepness and</p>

narrowness of many of these residential roads, often with alternating directional traffic flow, makes cycling and walking relatively unattractive leading to high levels of car use within the town. Residents of new housing developments on the edge of town are even more likely to use a car to reach the centre of town due to the distance. There is no evidence that existing public transport services have been able to provide a realistic alternative to use of the car, so it is unrealistic to believe that new services linked to new developments will be sustainable. In view of the developed nature of the town centre, there is no ability to improve traffic capacity or flow, let alone provide cycle lanes or off-street parking for residents. Increasing the size of the town is therefore fundamentally unsustainable and fails to meet plan objectives, despite evident window-dressing.

The evidence of recent developments such as Bearoc Park in Berkhamsted is that the new housing provision has largely been of the style and price that is most profitable to developers. Minimal social housing obligations mean that these developments have had little impact on meeting the housing needs of existing local residents and has only served to attract new people from outside the area. While that may help local maximise authority income, it fails to meet local needs and pays lip-service to sustainability goals.

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

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1388
<b>Person ID</b>	772477
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr. Roy Warren
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Manager Sport England
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area BK01 Land South of Berkhamsted

The Social and Community requirements of this allocation should specifically include new outdoor sports facilities to provide clarity to all stakeholders that on-site sports facility provision will be expected. This is the only residential allocation in Berkhamsted that would be large enough to justify on-site sports facility provision being made to meet the additional needs that the development would generate plus opportunities exist to meet these needs through extending the adjoining sites that include sports facilities. While it is not necessary to quantify the amount or type of sports facility provision at this stage, the need to make provision should be made explicit to avoid misinterpretations at a later date that there was a not a need to make any on-site provision because it was not specified in the policy.

Growth Area BK03 Haslam Playing Fields

No objection is made to this allocation on the basis that it is proposed to replace the playing fields at Berkhamsted School's Haresfoot Campus and a related site allocation has been made in the Local Plan for this (Site CY04). While acknowledging that this has been confirmed in the related allocation, it is requested that the allocation requirements of Growth Area BK03 specifically require the replacement sports facilities to be equivalent or better in terms of quantity and quality on the site of the Haresfoot Campus. This is because it is the proposed development on the Haslam Fields site that justifies equivalent/better replacement facilities to be provided in policy terms rather than the Haresfoot Campus allocation. This would help avoid any potential misinterpretation of the requirements of allocation BK03.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1394

**Person ID** 1262057

**Full Name** BRIAN FRANCIS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would urge you to stick with your original plans for development in Berkhamsted. I think the council has been sensitive to character of the town. By filling in irregularities in the town boundary. It increases housing without losing character. Sound planning.</p> <p>But the new housing plans by the developers of the proposed Bulbourne Cross would going Berkhamsted onto Bourne End. And hence Hemel. And anyone with a C in GCSE geography knows that that just defeats the whole point of Green Belt. To stop the development of the South East into a greater greater London..</p> <p>And those houses could be accomodated by your well thought out existing plans. I think the developers are having public consultations on the 13th and 14th January..</p> <p>I hope you thwart them. And stick to you plans.</p> <p>I no longer live in berkhamsted. I live in Hemel now. But I feel it's important to keep the character of the local area.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1399
<b>Person ID</b>	1262060
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDY SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I'm writing in response to the consultation about planned housing in Berkhamsted. I completely disagree with the number of houses proposed. This seems very excessive, especially considering the local infrastructure, with not enough doctors, dentists and schools. currently.</p> <p>I am also very concerned about the traffic levels, particularly on Shootersway, where I live. This is already shockingly bad after the new Bearroc park development, and will no doubt get worse with the second phase of this under way.</p> <p>So the proposed building of 4-5 new housing projects around Shootersway is ridiculous, with only one access to the A41. Surely there should be less projects at this side of town, or another slip round to the A41 MUST be considered at the other end of Shootserway, to ease congestion of all the traffic heading along to Kingshill.</p> <p>I particularly worry about the safety and health of my children living on what is already quite a busy road, but will become worse over time, with an increase of traffic and population levels.</p> <p>I fully understand the need for more housing, but the plans proposed just don't seem reasonable at the moment and more consideration of where to build and how many is definitely needed.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1425
<b>Person ID</b>	1262068
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Emma Starnowska-Reed
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The 'wildlife corridors' are simply a narrow strip along the A41, and don't connect with any meaningful habitats (no proposed tunnels for wildlife to go under A41 to access further green/habitat areas.)
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1429
<b>Person ID</b>	1262072
<b>Full Name</b>	GORDON CARDNO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>. I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. I support this because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create new, exciting local sports facilities that have health and social benefits for many</li> <li>• Allows existing sports groups to continue to expand, as interest in sport continues to grow</li> <li>• Creates new green open spaces and a new country park</li> <li>• Invests in the future for young people in Berkhamsted, delivering a community benefit when alternatives on the western side deliver very little</li> <li>• Reducing the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41</li> <li>• Creating new education and community facilities</li> </ul> <p>Please log my comment.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1431
<b>Person ID</b>	1262074
<b>Full Name</b>	GARRY HOBSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am steadfastly against the proposal by Thakenham et al for their proposed destruction of the greenbelt between Bourne End and Berkhamsted.</p> <p>It is an absolute disgrace. If this development goes ahead it will remove the entire green belt between Bourne End and Berkhamsted thereby preventing any countryside walks in that area. The occupants of these houses will undoubtedly come through Bourne End to 1. access the site and will also 2. access the east of Berkhamsted for shopping and other facilities. This will dramatically change the living conditions in Bourne End. The better proposal by far is the current draft plan by DBC which allows for about 860 houses to the south of Berkhamsted keeping the traffic and facilities in Berkhamsted where they should be!</p> <p>I trust that you will take my views on board and lobby against the adoption of the Thakenham proposal.</p>

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1432
<b>Person ID</b>	1262074
<b>Full Name</b>	GARRY HOBSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am writing in support of the current DBC proposals for circa 860 houses in Berkhamsted. The better proposal by far is the current draft plan by DBC which allows for about 860 houses to the south of Berkhamsted keeping the traffic and facilities in Berkhamsted where they should be
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1436
<b>Person ID</b>	1262080
<b>Full Name</b>	MR PETER NORMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I attended a very interesting Zoom presentation explaining an alternative proposal to provide additional housing for Berkhamsted. I was especially impressed by the green credentials described and the provision of an eco friendly country park for the whole community. The park would incorporate many small initiatives to support wildlife including homes for birds, bats and hedgehogs all of which I would wholeheartedly endorse. The development would also offer extensive sporting facilities with pitches catering for a range of sports and access to other leisure activities. I understand there would also be a sports pavilion with changing rooms and social amenities.</p> <p>Based on what I have been shown I would like to support this project. Please could you take my views into consideration when making any decision on planning issues. Could you also confirm that you have received this communication and let me know if there is anything else I am able to do to put my views forward.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1475
<b>Person ID</b>	1253872
<b>Full Name</b>	Georgia Huelamo
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

The proposed East of Darrs Lane (in the Parish of Northchurch not Berkhamsted as stated in the Plan), development should not go ahead.

Surrounding roads - Bell lane, Granville Road, Darrs Lane, Shootersway is already congested, dangerous and any further increase in traffic will impact on the air quality and cause immeasurable noise pollution for residents along these roads. This will impact on the safety of children walking to school. Granville road is of particular concern. Already a rat run for those trying to avoid a congested high, a rat run for those dropping children off to schools, congestion from social centre activities, church activities, those dropping down from shootersway to go along into berkhamsted via granville road, those racing along from westfield to get to Tesco shops, lots of road rage already with cars backing up into tight spaces ruining residents cars, reversing because of car pile up and back log. The noise, pollution and damage to cars has been an absolute nightmare and this Darrs lane development is going to make it worse. Its just not acceptable.

The gardens backing onto the field being proposed for the Darrs Lane development, have mature trees which are home to Tawny Owls, bats, foxes, (comment removed) and deer along with other wildlife which will lose their habitats if the development goes ahead. The row of trees, between the field and the gardens prevents landslide mud coming into the gardens from the field and should be protected from any felling by developers or individuals.

The land is also in the vicinity of AONB and as well as ensuring the protection of the AONB area itself, the Borough Council must also ensure the protection of the SETTING of the AONB. This is the land outside the boundaries of the AONB (Darrs Lane) where inappropriate development would impact on the special qualities of the AONB, due to its visual intrusion but also due to noise, vehicle traffic and pollution as per the 2019 Glover Report.

I do not support the building of 200 houses, school or park in the Northchurch East of Darrs Lane development. It will be devastating to the environment, community and heritage of Northchurch.

Lock Field Northchurch

This development is poorly sited and will be a flood risk. Its also a wildlife site, with rare species along the water course which will be destroyed and will wreck an ecosystem. Additionally, traffic pollution will affect air quality and with the bridge already a leading route toward Ashridge and beyond, will become congested and dangerous for children walking to school.

All other sites (apart from the British Film Institute development).

This huge development of the green corridor along the A41 will cause immeasurable impact on the environment and climate. Air and noise pollution from the A41 (I have two recording which demonstrate noise pollution from A41, taken from Granville road area, which I have not been able to upload and would like to ) and Shootersway route out to the A41 will suffer congestion significant congestion at the end of Shootersway/top of Kings Road.

The density of housing needs to be reconsidered.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) specifically states (paragraph 11b) that Sustainable Development for local plans means, amongst other criteria, meeting housing needs 'unless policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development', listing Green Belt, AONB's and SAC's amongst such 'areas or assets' in footnote 6.

Dacorum Borough Council has failed to follow this national planning policy to take these areas, such as the loss of Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), into account when proposing the number of houses that should be built.

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1487

**Person ID** 1142526

**Full Name** Mrs Angela Goddard

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Specifically in Darrs lane site and Northchurch canalside site, you are going against every resident in the village, and spoiling what is an historical village so that Taylor Wimpey can scoop up a massive profit and disappear, laughing all the way to the bank. Do any of those planners live locally? This is not democracy, and the houses in the main are not even social houses, but tacky, squeezed together pseudo smart over priced rubbish.

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1520
<b>Person ID</b>	1261839
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Langridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I'd like to register my opposition to the proposed number and location of houses planned to be built on the areas of Shootersway and Kingshill Way. My main objection being that the Berkhamsted infrastructure won't cope with additional homes, oversubscribed schools and traffic congestion.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1530
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>1 BK01 Land South of Berkhamsted</p> <p>I am against the development of this greenbelt site of farmland and woodland for the following reason.</p> <p>1 It is greenbelt and should be</p> <p>2 Much is agricultural land used for food</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1531
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	c.The woodland provides a natural noise barrier to the bypass and also it has much diversity of birdlife (as does the hedges surrounding the farmland).
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1532
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	d. Access to this site might be in the road I live in and if that happened there would be a dangerous "rat run" of vehicles through Fieldway, Upper Hall Park and Hall Park Gate
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1533
<b>Person ID</b>	217987
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Watson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	E. In my view it is an area of outstanding natural beauty and a much used green space for walking during the pandemic.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1585
<b>Person ID</b>	1261809
<b>Full Name</b>	Pam Ferguson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The sites in South Berkhamsted BK01,02,03,04,05,06 are along the ridge top and down steep valley sites and will lead to increased traffic flows down unsuitable roads . These sites are positioned on what historically was described as a green lung between the A41 and the outskirts of the town offering protection to the town . Berkhamsted and Tring are historic Chiltern market towns whose character should be preserved and not destroyed by huge unsustainable housing developments .

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The Bulbourne cross site should be considered . I appreciate the site could be described as linking Berkhamsted and Boune End but the developers current proposals offer a more sustainable transport and climate change policy . The development also provides much improved sporting facilities for the town, educational facilities and a significant green space in the country park.I would only consider this site if the housing numbers are challenged .
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1594
<b>Person ID</b>	1149465
<b>Full Name</b>	David Reavell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Bulbourne Cross Berkhamsted. Alternative more sustainable and deliverable sites such as the proposed but unallocated site known as Bulbourne Cross on the Eastern edge of Berkhamsted should be allocated in place of some of the proposed Tring allocations. This offers a comprehensive and balanced development which would enhance the facilities and attractiveness of Berkhamsted without overwhelming the town. In contrast the proposed developments at Tring would fundamentally change the towns character and cause many harmful impacts without any major additional facilities being provided with only replacement of existing ones being proposed there is no true enhancement being offered to the town.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1624
<b>Person ID</b>	1262282
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa Rowe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1262276
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Giulia Bunting
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk02 British Film Institute</b></p> <p>BFI supports the allocation of the BFI site at Kingshill Way. The site is in the control of the BFI as landowner and there are no known abnormal restrictions that could impact on the site's deliverability. The site makes a minimal contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt, as confirmed by the Council's commissioned Green Belt assessments. The site would make a positive contribution to meeting local housing needs in a sustainable location. The site is a developable site in a suitable location and there is a reasonable prospect that it will be available and could be viably developed within the Plan period.</p> <p>In terms of specific requirements for the site set out in the emerging Plan BFI has the following comments:</p> <p><b>Urban Design Principles:</b> BFI notes that the requirement for the provision of public open space (including on other adjacent allocations). Further it is proposed that there is a network of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations. BFI questions if it is feasible to provide meaningful open space and a network of pedestrian links on all sites and how this will be facilitated in practice, on the basis that sites are likely to be delivered in a phased manner.</p> <p><b>Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport:</b> BFI notes a requirement to contribute towards off-site enhancements to the local road network, including but not limited to junction improvements along A416/Kingshill Way, Kings Road, Shootersway and A4251/Berkhamsted High Street. On the basis that any development proposal will be accompanied by a Transportation Assessment it should be noted in the site requirements that contributions should relate to the scale, impact and thus mitigation measures in relation of any specific development proposal.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:</b> BFI notes that as part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, there is a requirement to deliver new green corridors on site which connect with proposed new wildlife corridors to the south of the site, along</p>

the A41. BFI queries how this will be facilitated in practice, on the basis that sites including those to the south of the site are likely to be delivered in a phased manner.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1656

**Person ID** 1259430

**Full Name** JOHN Goffin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

I have received a leaflet from Thakeham regarding Bulbourne Cross which they wish recipients to forward to DBC expressing support for the Bulbourne Cross proposals.  
I believe that this method of approaching the council with a mass blanket submission is unethical and should be disregarded by DBC.  
I wish to express my opposition to these proposals which would seek to make Berkhamsted and Bourne End into one single urban sprall and which could lead to Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted becoming one single urban area.

Thakeham refer to a new country park and green open spaces but this is already green space and will be significantly reduced by the housing developments proposed.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1658

**Person ID** 1262328

**Full Name** JILL GOSS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Re:-Objection to Dacorum Local Consultation Plan - NORTHCHURCH

1/. The removal of Green Belt Status.

This land has the PROTECTION OF GREEN BELT and SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON.

2/. Two fields adjacent to proposed development in Shooters Way have been lost in the last 3 YEARS

3/. The proposed development between Durrants Lane across the Darrs Lane will add such and increase in traffic from these new houses that it will make living and driving in Northchurch a miserable proposition. These roads are already taking far too much traffic and are constantly full of potholes and dangerous conditions to not only drivers but pedestrians especially Darrs Lane where school children have to walk up with no footpath or street lighting. It is like using a racetrack hoping you get to the top before you meet a car coming down. The 3 Lanes you are planning to use with the increased traffic are Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and Durrants Lane and are what they are called LANES not roads. They are too small in their design to cater for all this heavy flow of traffic that these extra houses will produce. Currently Phase 2 has not yet been completed and occupied therefore the impact of their vehicles is not yet known. There is already a pollution monitor placed outside Northchurch Parsh Office due to excess pollution so more traffic would lead to exceeding the recommended levels. This monitor is extremely important to test emission levels to safeguard our children using the local schools as many children do walk as parents find it is quicker than taking the car due to traffic. Durrants Lane/High Street traffic lights were put in place because on the increased traffic from Berrock Park but has only caused more queues with cars exhaust polluting the air as children and parents come out of the school gates.



4/. It has become extremely difficult to get a doctors/dentist appointment due to increased numbers of people that have now moved into the area as Northchurch doesn't have a doctors surgery or dentist. Schools are also already over subscribed. Berkhamsted roads especially the town is under so much pressure constantly. This is not being seen at the present time as people are not travelling to work school etc because of the pandemic so the full picture cannot be asessed until things return to normal.

5/. The proposed site in New Road, Northchurch is in such a dangerous position as far as traffic access. New road joining the A41 is very difficult to pull out and the proposed junction from this estate is right by a small canal bridge which is not strong enough to take the extra traffic that a new build would require.

I have lived in Northchurch for over 40 years and have had three children who have gone to St. Marys School, Bridgewater, and Ashlyns. It has always been such a lovely friendly village with families settling here for many years and children also returning with their families. Please help us protect our village from overdevelopment.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1661

**Person ID** 1262333

**Full Name** KEVIN LANE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Yes / No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I've just had a leaflet put through my letterbox about this new proposed development, And I must say it sounds really good with 40% affordable homes for the local community.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1662
<b>Person ID</b>	1262332
<b>Full Name</b>	Keith Pollard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair of Trustees Berkhamsted Raiders
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Site allocation within the draft Local Plan

We have reviewed the Dacorum documents related to the various sites currently within the Local Plan and the proposed Bulbourne Cross site.

With regard to the current draft of the Local Plan and the site allocations therein, we have serious concerns about the lack of consideration given to the provision of supporting facilities for sport.

Growth Area Bk01 Land South of Berkhamsted

. 850 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk02: British Film Institute

. 90 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields

. 150 dwellings

. Replacement sports facilities to be provided on the site at Haresfoot CampusBK

. NO MENTION of provision of ADDITIONAL sports facilities

Growth Area Bk04: Land between Hanburys and A41

. 70 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk05: Blegberry Gardens

. 80 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane

. 200 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch

. 60 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm

. 200 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk09: Bank Mill Lane

. 200 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk10: Hanburys

. 50 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities

Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm

. 40 dwellings

. NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities  
 Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site)  
 . 40 dwellings  
 . NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities  
 Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre  
 . 16 dwellings  
 . NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities  
 Growth Area Bk13: Gossoms End / Billet Lane  
 . 30 dwellings  
 . NO MENTION of provision of sports facilities  
 So, within the 13 sites proposed within the Local Plan, there is ZERO mention of how these sites will provide the supporting infrastructure to meet the sporting needs of an expanded local community.  
 . Within the major development - Growth Area Bk01 – there is an opportunity for Dacorum BC to ensure that a significant area of land is dedicated for sporting use. In the present draft plan for this site, there is just 1.9ha of land which is envisaged for sporting use. This is clearly insufficient to meet current needs or, indeed, the future demand that will be generated by the development.  
 . The 12 smaller sites are owned by disparate developers. There will be no opportunity for providing a dedicated sport facility to support the growth in demand.

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

Bulbourne Cross  
 This site is not in the current draft of the Local Plan. We understand that the intention is that this site will replace ten smaller developments around town and will deliver the community infrastructure that the smaller sites cannot deliver. We are aware of the support that the Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Association has given to the inclusion of this site. In terms of provision for sport and leisure, this site clearly goes some way to meeting both current and future demand for sports facilities for the local community through the gifting of 10ha of land to the BSGCA and the development of an extensive sports facilities meeting the needs of football, rugby, gymnastics, netball, and other activities.  
 Conclusion  
 The Charity Trustees believe that the Local Plan MUST make adequate provision for sport and leisure, and specifically football, and that a coordinated sport and leisure facilities plan must be linked to any approved housing development. To put this into context and to provide the required additional number of pitches, one football pitch per 150 houses will be required.  
 Within the current site allocations, it is clear that there has been insufficient consideration of how the demand for sport and leisure facilities will be met. Dacorum BC must ensure that if the current site allocations are adopted, there will be a radical rethink of how these sites will make provision for sport. If the Bulbourne Cross proposals gain approval, then these will help to offset the current under supply and accommodate future demand. However, the Bulbourne Cross site

alone will not provide the facilities to fully meet current and future demand. Additional provision will be required in ALL sites that are approved.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1663

**Person ID** 1262327

**Full Name** Michael Mumford

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Comments applying to Bk02, Bk03, Bk04, Bk05, Bk06.

The development proposed is grossly excessive in the light of the infrastructure to support access, transport and the density is out of line with existing housing.

To illustrate this, traffic levels on Cross Oak Road are already excessive leading to frequent congestion and severe hazard to pedestrians given that there is a footpath only on one side of the road and that does not cover the entire length.

More generally, the development is unrelated to local employment or infrastructure support and would lead to serious overloading of transport.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1693

<b>Person ID</b>	1165136
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs J.D Battye
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	We have received details of a proposal for development from Thakeham ( Bulbourne Cross) which appears to be a model for infrastructure-aware, sustainable development. We understand that the proposal has been rejected by DBC. While we do not support any unnecessary development on Green Belt Land and consider present housebuilding targets inappropriate we point out that the Thakeham proposal has set a standard which we would expect the Borough to ensure all other developments attain.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1712
<b>Person ID</b>	1149470
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Fiona Reavell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Alternative more sustainable and deliverable sites such as the proposed but unallocated site known as Bulbourne Cross on the Eastern edge of Berkhamsted should be allocated in place of some of the proposed Tring allocations. This offers a comprehensive and balanced development which would enhance the facilities and attractiveness of Berkhamsted without overwhelming the town. In contrast the proposed developments at Tring would fundamentally change the town's character and cause many harmful impacts without any major additional facilities being provided with only replacement of existing ones being proposed there is no true enhancement being offered to the town.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1725
<b>Person ID</b>	223955
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Local Plan states that DBC itself is not responsible for most infrastructure, but has an “<i>enabling role</i>” in providing infrastructure. It also says that “<i>growth will need to be carefully managed in order to take account of existing local highway, primary + secondary schools, service constraints + open space deficiencies in the town.</i>” [Pgs 21-222]</p> <p>If there are already “<i>open space deficiencies</i>” it doesn't make sense to gobble up any remaining open spaces.</p> <p>The Local Plan recognises that some Berkhamsted schooling is already at capacity and new schools will be required with more houses. [23.125] It is irresponsible of DBC to suggest more building without a firm commitment to/plan for new schools.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1726
<b>Person ID</b>	223955
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The Local Plan admits that <i>“there are few opportunities for new road capacity in town”</i> [23.120]. The A41 ByPass was built to remove congestion from the town. Filling in all the green spaces both between the town and the ByPass, and in the town, will simply replace all that congestion as people drive to shops, schools, the railway station and health centres. More congestion leads to more air + noise pollution, which results in a less healthy environment and a less attractive town.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted



<b>ID</b>	EGS1728
<b>Person ID</b>	223955
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Over the years, local shops, newsagents post offices and doctors surgeries have been closed. I am sceptical that proposed new local services to be included in the new housing developments would actually be built and maintained.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1729
<b>Person ID</b>	223955
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Christine Widdows Doughty
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	How can sewage and water provision be supplied without harming the surrounding fragile chalk landscape?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1764
<b>Person ID</b>	406469
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Stephen Douglas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Too many houses proposed for Berkhamsted along land bordering A41
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1787

<b>Person ID</b>	1154047
<b>Full Name</b>	Brendon Sparks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Turning to the proposal section detailing individual sites proposed for development in the Borough - Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. They will also increase traffic into/out of Berkhamsted as few will attempt traversing on foot up such steep sided areas. This will further exacerbate to parking, but of more concern is congestion due to the narrow streets and main road.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1791
<b>Person ID</b>	1262381
<b>Full Name</b>	MR DAVID BAILEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1792
<b>Person ID</b>	1262385
<b>Full Name</b>	MR ALAN CLARK
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Im Absolutely disgusted that Dacorum are even thinking that THAKEHAM OR FAKEHAM.alongside yourselves should even be thinking that this is a good idea. Uprooting our football club in lower kings road. To put them somewhere up by mcDonalds. People travel by train to watch Berkhamsted play football. The older generation. Supporters take a gentle stroll along the town to watch Berhamsted play.</p> <p>I do note that Jimmy knowles field is in this plan also. The one with the lake in it. Otters have been spotted in this lake by me and other people. Water vole have been seen there Great crested newt have been spotted there. THE 3 ABOVE ARE HIGH ON THE PROTECTED SPECIES LIST There is a few resident kingfisher numbers. To make this anything other than what it already is, is a ludicrous idea. I for one will be in touch with the Nature Conservancy Council. also i will be e mailing Chris Packham to inform him he is doing some great work with stop HS2 and because he is on television a lot im sure he throw some weight and some light behind stopping this. I will need a reply please. Because lets face it anybody that comes under Dacorum. Not a lot of people trust you to do anything that is for the good for Dacorum. Reply please to make sure my voice is heard . I DO NOT SUPPORT THAKEHAM/FAKEHAM,S/ DACORUMS PROPOSALS IN ANY WAY SHAPE OR FORM. please reply or do i need to put my response in writing to get a response.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1821
<b>Person ID</b>	1262358
<b>Full Name</b>	Jennifer Scott

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I support BRAGs findings on this topic:</p> <p>This is a crucial section because the promotion of the majority of the Growth Area sites come as a direct result of DBC Planning changing the policy of Green Belt protection based on the perceived exceptional circumstances that the 922dpa figure is a sacrosanct target that must be adhered to despite Central Government consistently giving directives that it is not a target.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit.</p> <p>The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good and are itemised under each of the sites below, followed by BRAG’s additional comments.</p> <p>Bk01 - Land south of Berkhamsted</p> <p>Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strong countryside/Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>▪ Development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location.</li> <li>▪ Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.</li> <li>▪ Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.</li> <li>▪ Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.</li> <li>▪ This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.</li> <li>▪ Not well related to existing housing.</li> <li>▪ Visual impact on important gateway to town from A416 and A41.</li> <li>▪ Proximity of A41 bypass.</li> <li>▪ Potential impact on the setting of Ashlyn’s Hall.</li> </ul> <p>In addition BRAG makes the following objections</p> <p>This land has been promoted many times before and the largest parcel within Bk01 has been robustly rejected by previous Planning Inspectors –“The present Green Belt boundary runs along the rear boundaries of the properties fronting Upper Hall Park which in my view forms a clearly defined, firm and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, the site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment.”</p>

Nothing has physically changed. Indeed, the Stage 3 Green Belt Review commissioned by DBC clearly supports the strong boundaries that exist now, while conclude that “strengthening” to the new boundaries would be required only if the land is released i.e. releasing the land from Green Belt would weaken the strong defensible boundaries that previous inspectors have referred to.

Furthermore, the review’s Landscape Findings labels Bk01 as “Moderate-High” for both Susceptibility and Sensitive, but that summary includes the “moderate” label for the land to the furthest west of Bk01 which is physically detached from the larger parcels to the east where the majority of building would take place. On its own this land would be given a “High” rating.

Site Appraisals raise significant issues:

- Substantial loss of Green Belt land and major southward expansion of the town on the open upper valley sides up to the A41.
- The loss of productive farm land.
- Impact on the Green Gateway into the town – impact on transition area from urban to countryside
- The land is not well related to existing services and facilities in the town centre.
- Located at a distance from the town centre which would discourage walking and cycling – in addition the gradient between the town centre and the site may make walking and cycling difficult
- Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Located near A41 – noise levels could affect health and wellbeing even with the proposed acoustic bunds in place
- Large-scale development will place significant pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network.
- The ability of these roads to accommodate additional traffic should be tested, particularly Swing Gate Lane and any potential to upgrade it. How can it be kept as a secondary access?
- Capacity of Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction and other local junctions will need to be confirmed, especially given cumulative impact of existing and other promoted development.

Sustainability

Site Appraisal acknowledges that the distance from key facilities and services and its valley ridge location would discourage movements by foot or cycle

Site Appraisals all negative issues – mitigation relies on

- The proposal offers opportunity to create a new planned neighbourhood expansion of the town with a range of associated local services and facilities. It is of a size to deliver largescale infrastructure and contribute to improving transport links through the creation of an east-west link road (connecting Swing Gate Lane with Chesham Road), although this will need to be tested. It also allows potential to secure a range of social, leisure and community facilities.

BRAG gave evidence at the Core Strategy showing that the so called benefits are unlikely to materialise, are not sustainable or are simply required to facilitate the new development itself, giving no benefit to the wider community and indeed would pile extra stress on the already creaking infrastructure. In particular:

- Proposed east-west link is promoted as benefit to the wider community. However, at the Accessibility session of the Core Strategy Hearing the Inspector accepted the conclusions of all attendees (including DBC and Herts County Council Highways Department) that the 'link' could not work as promoted by the developer and was simply required to facilitate the proposed new development. As such it cannot be accepted as benefit for the community as a whole and is shocking that it appears as such in a DBC site appraisal. It is likely to generate rat runs – cutting out road system around Chesham Road (which is one-way for the majority) and Shootersway – leading to unintended consequence of massive congestion as cars are forced down Swing Gate Lane – which does not have the capacity – and then additional traffic on all the Hall Park estate roads as cars seek to avoid traffic jams with A4251
- Additional 2000 cars (c6,000 car movements per day) – contrary to local plan policies and creating increased greenhouse gas emissions.
- Parts of this ridge top location would be highly visible from AONB land and intrusive
- Commuter estate – lack of community cohesion – no contribution to vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'
- Suggestion of new primary school – rejected by DBC at Core Strategy.
- Affordable housing – cut off from town and all facilities – requirement for car – will not generate vision of 'inclusive community'
- Not appropriate siting for growing elderly population. An increasing elderly population will have more reliance on cars etc and the distance from town and all vital facilities will be a key factor in their integration into the community or isolation from it.
- Previous suggestions to improve traffic flow in Swing Gate Lane by banning parking totally unfeasible and detrimental to community.
- Additional dangers of steep roads in winter. In recent years, bad winters have become a regular occurrence and, in some cases, freezing conditions have lasted for several days. Most roads leading south out of the valley were not cleared or treated and buses either found them impassable or proceeded with great difficulty. Refuse collection had to be cancelled and four wheel drive vehicles had difficulty in coping. The inaccessibility of the hills caused many drivers to abandon their cars on the London Road, exacerbating travel problems. The weather-related accessibility problems for any developments on the valley ridge will require some form of snow clearance programme. This definitely has not happened in recent years mainly on the grounds of cost and once, we believe, when there was a national shortage of salt. We can find no evidence that this particular issue has been addressed.



- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and usage, for any purpose, remains low.
- Suggestion of 'bus loop' not viable solution as clearly demonstrated at Core Strategy Inspection. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement for 850 homes to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- Important issue – TRL states "The scale of development at this site is out of scale with employment opportunities in Berkhamsted and therefore it is likely that many of the new dwellings will be occupied by commuters to other towns/areas for work. Whilst the site is situated within 2km of the railway station there remains the likelihood that a high proportion will commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car."
- Berkhamsted railway station and commuter line to Euston is already at full capacity – pre-pandemic.
- Suggestion of local services and facilities shown not to be viable at last Core Strategy inquiry – BRAG has letters from commercial surveyors relating to local retail provision not being a sustainable option.
- Suggestion of local employment opportunities in 'local centre' or business units – generate more car journeys – not viable anyway.
- GP / health provision – town struggling to meet current demand. National shortage of GPs – unlikely that a new practice would be established on South Berkhamsted site – significant distance to current practices.
- Suggestion that "this increased number of residents in the town would make facilities and shops more viable" – they have already identified the difficulties in accessing the town and facilities – will either massively increase congestion and drive away business from the town – or will commute out and use other towns and facilities – in either case providing NO 'sustainable Prosperity' to Berkhamsted
- Impact on wildlife – reduction on wildlife corridor – forcing wildlife to cross A41 – TRL recognises loss or damage to habitats including Long Green wildlife site and Brickhill Green wildlife site

- Development of site threatens ancient woodland (Long Green), while environmental policies suggest this would be an ideal area to plant more trees and expand existing woodland rather than creating more pollution.
- Suggestions of managed woodland doubtful – who would have responsibility?
- Area of Archaeological significance affects part of the land.
- Site appraisal says the ‘Potential linkages with B-h2 could be explored’– would exacerbate all the problems and block wildlife corridor even more.

#### Bk02 British Film Institute

The local objective to “Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site” has clearly been dropped.

Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.

#### Bk03 Haslam Playing Fields

Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school and BRAG were told by the school that it was a legal condition that they could not develop the land – it was gifted to be used as sports fields.

Presumably, the school have found legal way round these conditions, but clearly at the very least promoting the land goes directly against the spirit of the gift and the benefactors stated wishes. If it is surplus to the school’s current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that

would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch

- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk04 Land Between Hanburys and A41

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the

problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.

- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk05 Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)

Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.

In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road at a point opposite to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that

would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch

- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk06 East of Darrs Lane

Land between Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darr's Lane (two sites)

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Strong countryside boundary.
- Impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB.
- Impact and visibility of development on valley sides.
- Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.

In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Fails to meet Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided highly unlikely
- Suggestion that it is relatively close to shops at Northchurch risible – steep gradient and distance'
- Parking at Northchurch already insufficient – no capacity for additional cars from ridge top
- One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by

the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch

- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Suggestion of 'bus loop' therefore not viable solution. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- Site falls within area of Archaeological significance
- Adjacent to Chilterns AONB
- Same arguments on accessible housing – distance from facilities and services
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk07 Land at Lockfield, Northchurch

Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site

- Site is insufficient on its own, but could be phased with other land.
- Some distance from the town centre.
- Next to the Chilterns AONB.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- The canal bridge on New Road is narrow and results in poor pedestrian access to local facilities.
- Visually prominent site.
- Proximity to railway line.
- Impact on setting of the canal.

In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Close to canal – undermines Berkhamsted Vision “protecting key historic and environmental assets such as the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne”
- Close to Northchurch AQMA

- Traffic congestion at junction of North Road with Northchurch High Street will be exacerbated
  - Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge
  - Parking difficulties and concerns for safety of children attending St Mary's School
  - Noise from railway
  - Distance from town centre services and vital facilities
- Bk08 Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)
- Some distance from the town centre.
  - Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
  - New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
  - Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
  - Very close to the A41.
  - Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision
  - facilities and services not accessible
  - Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
  - Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
  - Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
  - Site of archaeological significance
  - Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
  - Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
  - No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
  - Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
  - Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the

numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

#### Bk09 Land at Bank Mill Lane

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and into adjoining open countryside.
- Distance from the town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.
- Impact on setting of the River Bulbourne.
- Reduction in the degree of separation between the town and Bourne End

In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Expansion of town to east – would significantly alter Gateway to Berkhamsted
- Located in Berkhamsted Conservation Area
- Impact on adjacent AONB
- Risk of flooding identified in assessment
- Distance from town centre – walking or cycling route to town adversely affected by any additional traffic to/from South Berkhamsted
- Suggestion of provision of local play space – edge of town not a practical site
- Adjacent site delivered NO affordable homes – suggestion that this site will deliver 20 affordable homes ....

▪ Suggestion of specialist elderly person's accommodation on site – at a distance from the town centre facilities and services – residents won't be walking and cycling to the town Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulborne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.

#### Bk10 Hanburys

Already adopted, but is an example of master planning failure. BRAG was invited to participate in planning the development with the owner's representatives and the DBC planners. What is currently proposed bears no resemblance to the agreed Master Plan and has been changed without reverting to the local community.

#### Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site)

Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities' needs and provides employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council's objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they



acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.  
 Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street  
 Given Dacorum Council's track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.  
 Bk13 Gossoms End / Billet Lane  
 Lidl are understood to be seeking a developer purchaser to provide the foodstore and parking on a leaseback basis and build the residential element to its own account. Any element of affordable housing in the existing consent should be retained.  
 Are there any other sites in Berkhamsted that you think should be included in the Plan?  
 NO  
 The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document.  
 The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1846
<b>Person ID</b>	1262473
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr William Tannett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposed increases in dwellings indicated in the plan will overwhelm this area. We already struggle with water resources, crowded roads, very busy hospitals and schools and other infrastructure.</p> <p>Our wonderful local Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Trust are already overcrowded and would suffer further damage from increased footfall. A visit to the Ashridge Monument at the weekends will demonstrate to you the existing crowd problems.</p> <p>The pandemic has changed behaviours, has this been taken into account? This will result in changed behaviours, the extent of which is not yet clear.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1862
<b>Person ID</b>	1262482
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Adam Townsend
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1866
<b>Person ID</b>	1262481
<b>Full Name</b>	Madeleine Donohue
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>All sites will need appropriate health services provided particularly general practice.</p> <p>BK12 Civic Centre development</p> <p>This should include a public space along the lines of the current hall which could be used for theatre, large meetings and exhibitions. Other spaces for community use - meeting rooms for groups up to 100 should be available as there is very little available within the town.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1901
<b>Person ID</b>	1144389
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sarah Tester
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I have today received a flyer through the post asking me to respond in a positive manner to the proposed development from Berkhamsted to Bourne End.</p> <p>I am , however, opposed to this development and disagree with their statements:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 bulbourne cross does not provide a once in a generation opportunity as we already have a football stadium, the supporters of which are very anti moving their stadium further away from the station.</li> <li>2 we already have acres of green space and plenty of allotments and are part of an area of outstanding natural beauty, why do I need a new one.</li> <li>3 this development will increase through traffic in Berkhamsted for access to schools, Waitrose, cinema and train station, including visitors and supporters to the 24 acres of sports facilities, etc. We already have a significant traffic congestion issue during school term time.</li> </ol>

- 4 where do the primary schools children go when they go to senior school?
- 5 overall the proposals will significantly impact on health and well-being of the local community and even the new community that it intends to serve, the environment will be impacted through sheer weight of traffic, loss of wildlife habitats and destroy our market town.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1970
<b>Person ID</b>	1262696
<b>Full Name</b>	Dan Vials
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically <b>Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b>.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS1978
<b>Person ID</b>	1262704
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne and Colin Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I write to say I am in total agreement with the statements put forward by “One Voice” alliance. We have had no communication whatsoever from Dacorum Council regarding the consultation but have had a direct appeal to support the Bulbourne/Thakeham project which is totally ludicrous but is made to sound very appealing. The Bulbourne proposals must be rejected instantly and permanently.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1988
<b>Person ID</b>	1262713
<b>Full Name</b>	Dan Prince
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wanted to write as a member of Berkhamsted Rugby Club in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Local Plan section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. There is a real need for new sports facilities within Berkhamsted to cater for new and existing residents. The new sports facilities – including a dedicated Rugby pitch - are an important part of creating a healthy community. It will particularly benefit local sports groups such as the Rugby Club.</p> <p>These proposals really deliver something different and special for Berkhamsted , not just houses, and I don't feel any other site proposed for the town can do this.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1995
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and

pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS1997

**Person ID** 1143683

**Full Name** Mr Peter Brown

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.

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



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1998
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS1999
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2000
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2001
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2002
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS2003
<b>Person ID</b>	1143683
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Peter Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The main issue is that the sites on the south of Berkhamsted, whilst naturally limited by the presence of the bypass, are a long way from the centre of the town, and moreover a long way uphill from the centre. Consequently there needs to be some clarity of thought as to appropriate transport links - to suggest that making better provision for cycling and pedestrian access to the centre does not meet the need for sustainable transport, because people will not be accessing from these locations by foot or cycle. There must be a policy of local environmentally sustainable forms of transport, sufficiently adequate to discourage people using their cars to access the centre.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2023
<b>Person ID</b>	1262601
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield (and BK06 East of Darrs Lane)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lockfield is situated off New Road in Northchurch, a village and parish with its own identity and defined by DBC as semi rural. Northchurch predates Berkhamsted and has one of the oldest churches in Hertfordshire. Northchurch is distinctly different from Berkhamsted. The village is surrounded by outstanding views of the Chilterns (AONB) and has direct access to Northchurch Common and Ashridge National Trust forest</li> <li>2. Lockfield is a valuable wildlife corridor north to and south from Ashridge and along the canalside east to west. Spaces for wildlife are required to be well connected (Choltern AONB). A Northchurch Parish Council Newsletter has listed 80+ birds seen in this area</li> <li>3. Lockfield is adjacent to the canal with its chalk stream, The Bulbourne. Chalk streams are recognised as a globally rare habitat. It has international significance and falls under the category of a priority habitat under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. It is likely that additional buildings and changes in nearby roads will increase the probability of damage to the river ecosystem not to mention interrupt the wildlife corridors required.</li> <li>4. Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no stated exceptional reasons in the local plan for these boundaries to be reviewed. In fact post Brexit, mid pandemic and with a net export of 1.3 million people from the UK, it seems unlikely there are any exceptional circumstances to warrant green belt being considered for development, particularly one as valuable to wildlife as Lockfield. I urge DBC to scale down the proposed developments within Dacorum to prevent irretrievable and unnecessary damage to Green Belt, protecting Lockfield from development should be a priority.</li> <li>5. Established houses in New Road have a density of 10 homes per hectare but the Lockfield site proposes 27 homes per hectare, this does meet the requirement of new builds being sympathetic to the local character of the area. A 50 dwelling proposal has previously been rejected but in this local plan this has risen to 60, increasing the likely of higher rise as well as density. The site also houses a railtrack site and includes the main railway line tunnel portal, all of which limits further the usable land.</li> <li>6. Any dwellings particularly of any height built in Lockfield will compromise my view significantly. I look out directly over Lockfield and the view onwards to the Chilterns (AONB). One of many beautiful photos attached. System does seem to allow me attach more than one</li> <li>7. Any dwellings on Lockfield will have a direct impact on my quality of life as not only will my beautiful view be compromised but I walk regularly down New Road and along the canal enjoying the natural world on offer.</li> <li>8. The Lockfield site would not have a safe exit. New Road is particularly narrow along the proposed site and there is a blind spot just south of the canal bridge. This makes crossing the road by car or in person particularly difficult. Any pedestrian would have to cross the road as New Road only has one narrow pavement on the opposite side from Lockfield, potentially dangerous particularly with cars being much quieter.</li> </ol>

9. The pavement is too narrow for safe wheelchair use so the Lockfield site is compromised for the use of people with disability. It is also difficult to walk two abreast so discourages families to walk together.
10. The Lockfield proposal includes the potential for another 120 car users. New Road is already heavily congested at rush hour, school start and end times and at weekends when families return from Ashridge. Another 120 cars would increase the risks from the road particularly outside of the school
11. Pollution has already been identified as a problem by the junior school at the bottom of New Road, an additional 120 cars has the potential of making this worse. The sign outside St Mary's already asks car drivers not to allow their engines to idle outside of the school, they could be asking another 120 more if Lockfield was to go ahead
12. The rural aspect of this road must not be underestimated. Wildlife is frequently seen such as muntjac and fallow deer and horses recently escaped onto the road causing considerable mayhem.
13. In the last month alone, I have seen two accidents, one where two vehicles clipped each other because of the narrowness of the road and another this month (Feb 2021) necessitating an ambulance, police car and fire engine. The road is not wide enough for increased two way traffic particularly a planned increase of potentially 120 cars. Statistics on accidents on the canal bridge (3) demonstrate the difficulties drivers encounter in this area
14. New Road has a single track bridge immediately south of Lockfield, construction traffic would find accessing Lockfield difficult and would the canal bridge cope with construction traffic?
15. There is really very little opportunity for safe cycle paths with limited widths of road and pavement.
16. Lockfield is currently used by Railtrack, will any build impact on their ability to get to the tunnel in an emergency? Will Railtrack's continued use impact on the land available?
17. In Lockfield the main railway line emerges. The portal of the tunnel not only takes up more land space but it is largely unprotected, access to the rails is possible and raises significant safety concerns.
18. There is no mains drains north of the canal bridge. Other considerations for potential developers of the Lockfield site which impact on the build cost is that there is a Cadent gas installation on site, overhead electric lines and copper wire telephone lines and previous Railtrack work may have left chemical pollutants.
19. The Lockfield site was subject of a surface water run off flood warning during heavy rain of 31st January 2021 and a flood alert on 7th February 2021. The NFWS shows that part of Lockfield is at medium risk of flooding.
20. New Road is bordered by an old and productive hedge alongside Lockfield. It clearly supports significant wildlife as can be seen from the animal tracks, birdsong heard and butterflies seen. The latter include a variety of delicate blues, the orange tip butterfly and fritillaries. There has been an increase locally of tortoiseshell butterflies.
21. The local plan does not consider the Glover Report 2019 which recommends that the Chilterns AONB becomes a National Park. The setting of it is identified as hugely important for those living by it but not within it. My house enjoys beautiful views over Northchurch, the hills of Wigginton, north west over Tring and up to Ashridge. BK06 and BK07 will seriously impact these views and I will try and include photos of these views although they are far more beautiful in the spring, summer and autumn than in the winter.

The views are unequivocally one of Northchurch's finest features and bring real joy to myself and I am sure many others and so important for our mental health. I draw back my curtains every morning to be greeted by the views across Lockfield to Wigginton and beyond and everyday it is different and always beautiful. The view is by no means urban.

22. The Darrs Lane proposal BK06 may well have an impact on the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation and it seems inappropriate to consider it for development before the Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Exercise is carried out - otherwise it seems that the conclusions have been preempted.

23. Have observed the devastation of the flora on Durrants Lane, the prospect of seeing Darrs Lane being given similar treatment fills me with panic. A picture from Google Earth shows the Durrants building site devoid of vegetation, this just must not happen to Darrs Lane and at the very least buffer zones are needed to protect the Darr's Lane Ancient Woodland which must be policed to ensure they are delivered on.

24. Archeological investigations have been acknowledged to be needed on the Darrs Lane site suggesting again that it is premature to include this site in the local plan.

25. A crucial aspect of the local plan which I challenge is the scale of the total development and the calculation on which need for housing is based.

26. BK06 plan appears to be being considered prematurely with assessments not completed and many questions yet to be answered .

27. BK07 Lockfield on the other hand provides invaluable wildlife corridors and stunning views, it has a nearby chalk stream and if the conservation and environmental arguments were not enough, the sheer SAFETY arguments surely should keep Lockfield from being built on?.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	DBC should review the town centre following the effect of Covid-19 and stay within the town boundaries.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">View over Lockfield BK07.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2030
<b>Person ID</b>	1262604
<b>Full Name</b>	Ray Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk07 Lock Field is a wholly inappropriate site for a housing development. It is a recognised wildlife corridor linking Northchurch Common with the canal. The vegetation screen along its boundary with the canal is an important part of the strategic canal corridor, as is the vegetation lining New Road. The walk from Northchurch Lock along the towpath to Dudswell is currently a pleasurable country ramble. We especially enjoy seeing the various species of waterfowl that nest in the vegetation that fringes Lock Field and the distinct break between Northchurch and Dudswell, which would be eroded by development at Lock Field. That development would no doubt be used in the future as an excuse to build up to Dudswell.</p> <p>Lock Field is set in a rural context separated from the village of Northchurch by the canal, allotments and the Bulbourne and opposite is Northchurch Cemetery. There are only a few houses nearby which are set back and rural in character. To anybody driving along it, New Road down to the canal bridge is a country lane, (see photograph). This is not an urban site, there are overhead power lines, telephone and internet are delivered over copper, not fibre optic, there is only one, narrow footpath along New Road, and the houses there have septic tanks and soakaways, which safely recycle water back into the chalk aquifer. Any road access from Lock Field onto New Road would be constrained by the narrow canal bridge, with its poor sight lines, and the edge of the railway tunnel cutting, which is roughly level with the <i>Give Way 100yds</i> in the photograph.</p> <p>It is impossible to see how the large number of daily vehicle movements into and out of Lock Field could be managed safely without destroying the rural character of this part of Northchurch. The majority of cars and delivery vehicles will go down New Road, past the School and onto Northchurch High Street. Pollution levels on Northchurch High Street exceeded safety limits eight times in 2019, and even once in 2020, despite COVID-19 restrictions. There are no serious proposals to reduce traffic in this plan, so quality of life in Northchurch will be reduced.</p> <p>Bk06 This is another unwarranted intrusion into Green Belt. The site contains a scheduled monument and ancient hedges, which will not be respected by developers. Once a established bank and hedge is destroyed it cannot be replaced overnight, and the same goes for woodland copses and other established natural habitats. It is impossible to see how such a large and intrusive development as that proposed on Darrs Lane will not be an eyesore when viewed across the valley.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	4597D98A-F903-454E-8502-259F8223D72E.jpeg
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2077
<b>Person ID</b>	1262748
<b>Full Name</b>	christopher syers
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41) The proposed plans will mean Berkhamsted will engulf Northchurch and ignore the distinct village community. It is on green belt taking up agricultural land and sites housing next to the by-pass appears to undo the work of the community years ago when the by-pass was built to site it away from houses - now it's being used as an excuse to build up to its boundary. The plans for Berkhamsted will ruin the green belt and the rural aspect of the town and the reason many people live here.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2079
<b>Person ID</b>	221837
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Wakely
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to development at Bk01 because of the impracticability of providing adequate supporting infrastructure without unacceptably increasing the environmental damage, traffic congestion, air pollution, and risk of worsening road safety, and the burden on already overstretched roads, parking, schools, health services, sewers, surface drainage, water and other utilities. I am also opposed to the development of any green belt land until all other available sites have been fully utilised. Green belt development should only then be allowed to meet the need for social housing for people who are completely unable to afford to either rent or buy here currently. I do not agree that Green Belt should be used at all to allow developers to generate excessive profit.</p> <p>The proposal fails the criteria for a sustainable development on the grounds that it would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- permanently remove from production valuable arable land</li> <li>- therefore reduce the availability of locally sourced food</li> <li>- increase carbon emissions, as, despite the claims made by GUI, there is no evidence in the proposal that buildings and roads would be constructed using carbon neutral materials, and there is no evidence that energy needs would be provided using green power sources</li> <li>- increase car use, as the proposed additional public transport (even if it were actually provided) would be inadequate to meet the transport needs of residents living so far from the town centre amenities</li> <li>- I do not accept that the biodiversity net gain provision will prevent the development having a severe impact on local wildlife diversity, particularly on species which are already suffering dramatic declines - the fields included in Bk01 currently provide nest sites for red listed skylarks and the adjoining hedgerows for red listed yellowhammers as well as numerous other bird and small mammal species; see <a href="#">birds-of-conservation-concern-4-leaflet.pdf (bto.org)</a> <a href="http://www.rspb.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/keyspecies/birds/skylark.aspx">http://www.rspb.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/keyspecies/birds/skylark.aspx</a></li> </ul> <p>In addition, if allowed, the proposed development would create a precedent meaning that further development on Green Belt land adjacent to the A41 Berkhamsted bypass could not in future be effectively resisted.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2096
<b>Person ID</b>	1262784
<b>Full Name</b>	MR JEFF PEARSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I was disgusted to receive a post card from 'Thakeham' (Bulbourne Cross project) just now proposing to build 2,000 new homes and sports complexes etc, and asking me to lobby in support!
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2101
<b>Person ID</b>	1262792
<b>Full Name</b>	JAMES EWING
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have received a flyer encouraging me to support the Thakeham/BSGCA Bulborne Cross development.</p> <p>I would like to object to the way in which Thakeham/BSGCA is distributing leading flyers in this manner with such limited information.</p> <p>I would also like to object to the proposals themselves. Berkhamsted High Street and the A41 are already traffic jams in the normal course of events and building this number of new homes (with or without the sports facilities) simply cannot be supported in the circumscribed geography of this valley. Covid 19 notwithstanding, Berkhamsted will always be a commuter town and the infrastructure is heaving as it is. Replacing open space with more open space for cycling simply does not address that reality and simply increases the density of people using the same set of roads and railways.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2104
<b>Person ID</b>	1253932
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Scrivens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I'm writing to record my views and objections to the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038). I've studied the plans, and as a long-term resident of Berkhamsted can say that the plans for the town are ill-conceived for several reasons.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2014 based ONS data which will result in a significant overestimate of housing needs and brings into question the soundness of any local plan which is based on them.

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

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

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

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2125
<b>Person ID</b>	1262807
<b>Full Name</b>	IAN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	CHAIR BERKHAMSTED FILM SOCIETY
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am writing on behalf of Berkhamsted Film Society who have been regular hirers of the current Civic Centre hall for more than thirty years.  In considering the future of this site, we would request that a suitable auditorium for showing films is included.

In our view the lack of a central venue, close to convenient parking and large enough to accommodate our audience size would severely impact our future viability as a volunteer-led community cinema group serving over 150 local members and guests. We have not been able to identify alternative venues in the locality that are both financially affordable and convenient for our membership in the longer term. I should also point out that we are regularly asked for help providing projection facilities in the Civic Centre for other local groups and charities.

Thus we request the proposed design should include an auditorium able to seat about 120 to 150, with a built in retractable screen of approximately 5metre width. The space should be capable of black-out and should have provision for ceiling mounted video projection and a multi-channel sound system.

A secure area for equipment storage should be either at the rear or immediately adjacent to the auditorium. A meeting area for members to mingle and for discussion would be welcomed, as would a preparation area for food and drinks. Disabled access and a hearing loop provision would be appreciated by many of our less able members.

We appreciate this opportunity to have our needs recognised. Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS2132

**Person ID** 1262814

**Full Name** MARK SHATTOCK

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I write as a concerned resident of Woodliffes, New Road, Northchurch, Berkhamsted (HP4 1LN) regarding the proposed development of 60 new dwellings on New Road (Ref Bk07).



I believe this development would cause a serious safety concern for local residents. The increased traffic it would generate would be wholly inappropriate in this area. The entrance to the site would be very close to an already overcrowded and dangerous section of road, namely the single lane over the canal bridge. Visibility is poor at this section of road and the entrance to the Lock Field site would make this much worse. I worry that the construction traffic required for the development would be a danger and huge inconvenience to local residents and once completed the extra traffic generated by 60 additional homes on this site would have a significant impact including increasing pollution levels in the area – which is also located next to the St Marys primary school playing field.

The road only has a narrow pavement on the opposite side of the road to the development and this is also an issue as residents in the new development would be forced to cross the road in what is a dangerous area with poor visibility.

The road has very poor drainage and resembles a river after a heavy downpour increasing the concerns.

All properties above the canal bridge are cut off from the mains sewerage, meaning the area does not have the required infrastructure to support the development.

As a resident of Berkhamsted I believe there are other areas far more suited to new housing.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS2163

**Person ID**

1262830

**Full Name**

MARY CASSERLEY

**Organisation Details**

CHAIRMAN  
BERKHAMSTED LOCAL HISTORY & MUSEUM

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing on behalf of Berkhamsted Local History &amp; Museum (BLHMS) in response to the proposed Berkhamsted Civic Centre re-development plans</p> <p>As BLHMS works closely with Dacorum Heritage Trust (DHT) which is sited directly behind the Civic Centre we feel strongly that the new developments must take into consideration not only ourselves, but all the existing community groups currently housed there. Many of these groups like ourselves are charities.</p> <p>We would envisage the new development to house a dedicated purpose built museum/research centre.</p> <p>We feel it is important that the site would need to be accessible from the High St frontage, whilst retaining the architectural integrity of the conservation area - this in turn could link to Butts Meadow behind, or incorporate access from Prince Edward St.</p> <p>Many community services who operate from there have long-standing pre-existing arrangements, such as Berkhamsted Art Society, Sunnyside Rural Trust etc. along with many other community services.</p> <p>We would like to see the opportunity for some affordable housing and affordable working space in its development, this would enhance the community feel of the area, mixing community, commercial and residential use to become a vibrant community asset. After all, the name CIVIC CENTRE says it all really, doesn't it?</p> <p>We are aware of the Governments UK's zero emissions targets 2050. This re-development could prove to be an improvement on its current capacity and use, benefitting all.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2181
<b>Person ID</b>	1262755
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Disgracefull overdevelopment of one side of a historic town which has already had loads of development. It involves the destruction of the green belt, woods and wildlife and is encroaching on an area of outstanding natural beauty. All the residents on that side of the town loose all of their sizeable green space of any size and will be penned in by houses and a main road A41. The promise of access to school land as a green area is not viable as has been shown by other schools in the town because school buildings within the sites are vandalised. One side of the town will be massively over built in comparison to the other side and sited up the side of the valley. Little thought has been given to the impact, health and welfare of a vast number of residents that live in these areas in the persuit of housing. We seem to be more interested in building affordable housing and old peoples residences for people that don't even live in the town than the thousands of people who already. The planning matrix is outdated and been rebuffed by other councils already and COVID has changed things further with an increased death rate particularly amongst older people. I also fail to see how the properties will be within keeping of the character of the houses already there as a lot of the houses
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites. This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at BK01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11)and ridge top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations in any way.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2209
<b>Person ID</b>	1262841
<b>Full Name</b>	Nada Ryan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	All these sites are basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2271
<b>Person ID</b>	1262907
<b>Full Name</b>	David Beaumont
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk06 - These fields currently provide an edge to the green belt around Berkhamsted, with Durrants Lane to the west. Although not classed as an AONB, the view of them from the other side of the valley is outstanding. The Green Belt Review Final Report Part One (page 20) notes that this area has 'moderate to high sensitivity to change'. I suggest that Durrants Lane should be maintained as the boundary.</p> <p>Covid and Brexit have created so many problems that it seems unnecessary to add to them by removing yet more agricultural land. Additionally, countless people have used these fields for their restricted exercise over the past year contributing to their mental wellbeing.</p> <p>The proposals state that 'growth will be transport / accessibility and infrastructure led'. Yet there is little infrastructure in place currently for these proposals and no public transport. The proposals make play of encouraging walking and cycling but these fields are steeply sloped from Shootersway. Is everyone really going to walk or cycle to work, especially as there is little local employment? Furthermore, 200 homes will bring extra traffic, more pollution and more damage to the environment. Potentially 200 extra commuters could be trying to get to the station or A41/A4251 each day; Shootersway</p>

cannot possibly be improved to that extent so drivers will attempt to use Darrs, Bell or Durrants Lanes or Cross Oak Road, none of which are suitable.

Changes to buying habits suggest that on-line purchasing will continue at a high level after Covid. An estate of 200 homes will probably attract further traffic for such deliveries.

The effects on the parish of Northchurch could be disastrous. Somewhere the proposal suggests that the small shopping complex could become the focal point for these new houses. But that would mean yet more traffic to an area that already has an air quality issue.

When plans were put forward for the development at Shootersway/Coppins Close questions over traffic were dismissed on the basis that a survey had been taken. What evidence is there that the roads will handle the increased traffic from this proposal?

Physically these fields present a challenge. The slope is very steep to the north, sink holes have been an issue in the past, and water run-off has been a problem. Plus, the public footpath needs to be maintained.

Culturally the fields have interesting flora and archaeological implications.

I cannot support the development of these fields.

Bk07 - This proposal fails on the basis of the extra traffic that will be generated on to a narrow bridge at New Road and the proximity of St Marys school. I believe this is also a site that floods.

Bk03/04/05/08 - My objection to these proposals are similar to those for Bk06: a lack of infrastructure, increased traffic, more pollution and erosion of green space.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS2311

**Person ID** 488516

**Full Name** mr hugh siegle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to all of the Green Belt sites listed being developed and in most cases consider the site specific requirements are formulaic/ tick box proposals which demonstrate a lack of real awareness of the sites and their locations and the impact development will have on the local infrastructure and environment.</p> <p>The reasons for Bk01 being rejected for development in 2013 remain unaltered. This is merely a re-hash of the then owner's proposals. It is Green Belt and should remain so. In terms of site specific requirements I comment on one, access etc. Swing Gate Lane is already subject to congestion at school times . The stretch from Woodlands Avenue to London Road, A4251, provides parking for residents and at times is single lane. Vehicles avoiding this bottleneck will filter through the Hall Park roads.Physical improvements to the junction with London Road are impossible. This will also be one of only 3 cycle routes to the Town centre.</p> <p>Vehicles and cyclists using the primary access, Chesham Road, have two routes to the High Street and Town centre: north on Chesham Road to Hill Top and Three Close Lane, or south on Chesham Road to Kingshill Way and Kings Road, A416.There is no scope for physical junction improvements.. Pedestrians can use all these routes and all of Chesham Road but there is no direct access from Chesham Road to the public footpath through Berkhamsted School playing fields.. In what way will the sustainable transport and pedestrian/cyclist improvements be made?</p> <p>Bk03. This should remain as playing fields. There is a shortage. That the School claim they can replace them is irrelevant; it provides no net gain of a vital facility. The School has played a prominent role in the town for centuries and should continue to do so by supporting community needs. The local sports charity can manage the facility.</p> <p>Bk11. Over the years employment opportunities in Berkhamsted have diminished. This site should be retained in its existing use and continue to provide services to the community.</p> <p>Bk12. The public facilities including the hall must be retained.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS2312
<b>Person ID</b>	610662
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Antony Harbidge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>This is a crucial section because the promotion of the majority of the Growth Area sites come as a direct result of DBC Planning changing the policy of Green Belt protection based on the perceived exceptional circumstances that the 922dpa figure is a sacrosanct target that must be adhered to despite Central Government consistently giving directives that it is not a target.</p> <p><b>It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit.</b></p> <p><b>The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good and are itemised under each of the sites below, followed by BRAG’s additional comments.</b></p> <p><b>Bk01 - Land south of Berkhamsted</b></p> <p><b>Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong countryside/Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>• Development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location.</li> <li>• Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.</li> <li>• Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.</li> <li>• Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.</li> <li>• This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.</li> <li>• Not well related to existing housing.</li> <li>• Visual impact on important gateway to town from A416 and A41.</li> </ul>

- Proximity of A41 bypass.
- Potential impact on the setting of Ashlyn's Hall.

### **In addition BRAG makes the following objections**

This land has been promoted many times before and the largest parcel within Bk01 has been robustly rejected by previous Planning Inspectors – *“The present Green Belt boundary runs along the rear boundaries of the properties fronting Upper Hall Park which in my view forms a clearly defined, firm and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, the site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment.”*

Nothing has physically changed. Indeed, the Stage 3 Green Belt Review commissioned by DBC clearly supports the strong boundaries that exist now, while conclude that *“strengthening”* to the new boundaries would be required only if the land is released i.e. releasing the land from Green Belt would weaken the strong defensible boundaries that previous inspectors have referred to.

Furthermore, the review's Landscape Findings labels Bk01 as *“Moderate-High”* for both Susceptibility and Sensitive, but that summary includes the *“moderate”* label for the land to the furthest west of Bk01 which is physically detached from the larger parcels to the east where the majority of building would take place. On its own this land would be given a *“High”* rating.

Site Appraisals raise significant issues:

- Substantial loss of Green Belt land and major southward expansion of the town on the open upper valley sides up to the A41.
- The loss of productive farm land.
- Impact on the Green Gateway into the town – impact on transition area from urban to countryside
- The land is not well related to existing services and facilities in the town centre.
- Located at a distance from the town centre which would discourage walking and cycling – in addition the gradient between the town centre and the site may make walking and cycling difficult
- Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Located near A41 – noise levels could affect health and wellbeing even with the proposed acoustic bunds in place
- Large-scale development will place significant pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network.
- The ability of these roads to accommodate additional traffic should be tested, particularly Swing Gate Lane and any potential to upgrade it. How can it be kept as a secondary access?
- Capacity of Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction and other local junctions will need to be confirmed, especially given cumulative impact of existing and other promoted development. Sustainability



Site Appraisal acknowledges that the distance from key facilities and services and its valley ridge location would discourage movements by foot or cycle

Site Appraisals all negative issues – mitigation relies on

- The proposal offers opportunity to create a new planned neighbourhood expansion of the town with a range of associated local services and facilities. It is of a size to deliver larger-scale infrastructure and contribute to improving transport links through the creation of an east-west link road (connecting Swing Gate Lane with Chesham Road), although this will need to be tested. It also allows potential to secure a range of social, leisure and community facilities.

BRAG gave evidence at the Core Strategy showing that the so called benefits are unlikely to materialise, are not sustainable or are simply required to facilitate the new development itself, giving no benefit to the wider community and indeed would pile extra stress on the already creaking infrastructure. In particular:

- Proposed east-west link is promoted as benefit to the wider community. However, at the Accessibility session of the Core Strategy Hearing the Inspector accepted the conclusions of all attendees (including DBC and Herts County Council Highways Department) that the 'link' could not work as promoted by the developer and was simply required to facilitate the proposed new development. As such it cannot be accepted as benefit for the community as a whole and is shocking that it appears as such in a DBC site appraisal. It is likely to generate rat runs – cutting out road system around Chesham Road (which is one-way for the majority) and Shootersway – leading to unintended consequence of massive congestion as cars are forced down Swing Gate Lane – which does not have the capacity – and then additional traffic on all the Hall Park estate roads as cars seek to avoid traffic jams with A4251
- Additional 2000 cars (c6,000 car movements per day) – contrary to local plan policies and creating increased greenhouse gas emissions.
- Parts of this ridge top location would be highly visible from AONB land and intrusive
- Commuter estate – lack of community cohesion – no contribution to vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'
- Suggestion of new primary school – rejected by DBC at Core Strategy.
- Affordable housing – cut off from town and all facilities – requirement for car – will not generate vision of 'inclusive community'
- Not appropriate siting for growing elderly population. An increasing elderly population will have more reliance on cars etc and the distance from town and all vital facilities will be a key factor in their integration into the community or isolation from it.
- Previous suggestions to improve traffic flow in Swing Gate Lane by banning parking totally unfeasible and detrimental to community.
- Additional dangers of steep roads in winter. In recent years, bad winters have become a regular occurrence and, in some cases, freezing conditions have lasted for several days. Most roads leading south out of the valley were not cleared or treated and buses either found them impassable or proceeded with great difficulty. Refuse collection had to be cancelled and four wheel drive vehicles had difficulty in coping. The inaccessibility of the hills caused many drivers to abandon their cars on the London Road, exacerbating travel problems. The weather-related

accessibility problems for any developments on the valley ridge will require some form of snow clearance programme. This definitely has not happened in recent years mainly on the grounds of cost and once, we believe, when there was a national shortage of salt. We can find no evidence that this particular issue has been addressed.

- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and usage, for any purpose, remains low.
- Suggestion of 'bus loop' not viable solution as clearly demonstrated at Core Strategy Inspection. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement for 850 homes to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- **Important issue** – TRL states "*The scale of development at this site is out of scale with employment opportunities in Berkhamsted and therefore it is likely that many of the new dwellings will be occupied by commuters to other towns/areas for work. Whilst the site is situated within 2km of the railway station there remains the likelihood that a high proportion will commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car.*"
- Berkhamsted railway station and commuter line to Euston is already at full capacity – pre-pandemic.
- Suggestion of local services and facilities shown not to be viable at last Core Strategy inquiry – BRAG has letters from commercial surveyors relating to local retail provision not being a sustainable option.
- Suggestion of local employment opportunities in 'local centre' or business units – generate more car journeys – not viable anyway.
- GP / health provision – town struggling to meet current demand. National shortage of GPs – unlikely that a new practice would be established on South Berkhamsted site – significant distance to current practices.
- Suggestion that "*this increased number of residents in the town would make facilities and shops more viable*" – they have already identified the difficulties in accessing the town and facilities – will either massively increase congestion and drive away business from the town – or will commute out and use other towns and facilities – in either case providing NO 'sustainable Prosperity' to Berkhamsted
- Impact on wildlife – reduction on wildlife corridor – forcing wildlife to cross A41 – TRL recognises loss or damage to habitats including Long Green wildlife site and Brickhill Green wildlife site
- Development of site threatens ancient woodland (Long Green), while environmental policies suggest this would be an ideal area to plant more trees and expand existing woodland rather than creating more pollution.
- Suggestions of managed woodland doubtful – who would have responsibility?
- Area of Archaeological significance affects part of the land.
- Site appraisal says the 'Potential linkages with B-h2 could be explored' – would exacerbate all the problems and block wildlife corridor even more.

## **Bk02 British Film Institute**

The local objective to “*Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site*” has clearly been dropped. Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.

## **Bk03 Haslam Playing Fields**

Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school and BRAG were told by the school that it was a legal condition that they could not develop the land – it was gifted to be used as sports fields.

Presumably, the school have found legal way round these conditions, but clearly at the very least promoting the land goes directly against the spirit of the gift and the benefactors stated wishes. If it is surplus to the school’s current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
  - facilities and services not accessible
  - Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
  - Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance

- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

#### **Bk04 Land Between Hanburys and A41**

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
  - facilities and services not accessible
  - Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
  - Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car

- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

### **Bk05 Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)**

#### **Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site**

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.

#### **In addition BRAG makes the following objections**

- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
  - facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road at a point opposite to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt

- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

### **Bk06 East of Darrs Lane**

#### **Land between Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darr's Lane (two sites)**

#### **Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons**

- Strong countryside boundary.
- Impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB.
- Impact and visibility of development on valley sides.
- Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.

#### **In addition BRAG makes the following objections**

- Fails to meet Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
  - facilities and services not accessible
  - Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided highly unlikely
- Suggestion that it is relatively close to shops at Northchurch risible – steep gradient and distance'
- Parking at Northchurch already insufficient – no capacity for additional cars from ridge top
- One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car

- Suggestion of 'bus loop' therefore not viable solution. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- Site falls within area of Archaeological significance
- Adjacent to Chilterns AONB
- Same arguments on accessible housing – distance from facilities and services
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

#### **Bk07 Land at Lockfield, Northchurch**

##### **Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site**

- Site is insufficient on its own, but could be phased with other land.
- Some distance from the town centre.
- Next to the Chilterns AONB.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- The canal bridge on New Road is narrow and results in poor pedestrian access to local facilities.
- Visually prominent site.
- Proximity to railway line.
- Impact on setting of the canal.

##### **In addition BRAG makes the following objections**

- Close to canal – undermines Berkhamsted Vision “protecting key historic and environmental assets such as the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne”
- Close to Northchurch AQMA
- Traffic congestion at junction of North Road with Northchurch High Street will be exacerbated
- Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge
- Parking difficulties and concerns for safety of children attending St Mary's School
- Noise from railway
- Distance from town centre services and vital facilities

### **Bk08 Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)**

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision
  - facilities and services not accessible
  - Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
  - Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

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



### **Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons**

- Encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and into adjoining open countryside.
- Distance from the town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.
- Impact on setting of the River Bulbourne.
- Reduction in the degree of separation between the town and Bourne End

### **In addition BRAG makes the following objections**

- Expansion of town to east – would significantly alter Gateway to Berkhamsted
- Located in Berkhamsted Conservation Area
- Impact on adjacent AONB
- Risk of flooding identified in assessment
- Distance from town centre – walking or cycling route to town adversely affected by any additional traffic to/from South Berkhamsted
- Suggestion of provision of local play space – edge of town not a practical site
- Adjacent site delivered NO affordable homes – suggestion that this site will deliver 20 affordable homes ....
- Suggestion of specialist elderly person's accommodation on site – at a distance from the town centre facilities and services – residents won't be walking and cycling to the town

Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulborne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.

### **Bk10 Hanburys**

Already adopted, but is an example of master planning failure. BRAG was invited to participate in planning the development with the owner's representatives and the DBC planners. What is currently proposed bears no resemblance to the agreed Master Plan and has been changed without reverting to the local community.

### **Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site)**

Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities' needs and provides employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council's objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.

**Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street**

Given Dacorum Council's track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.

**Bk13 Gossoms End / Billet Lane**

Lidl are understood to be seeking a developer purchaser to provide the foodstore and parking on a leaseback basis and build the residential element to its own account. Any element of affordable housing in the existing consent should be retained.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document.

The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS2339

**Person ID** 1262984

**Full Name** Deborah O'Sullivan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire’s hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”, it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2365
<b>Person ID</b>	1261830
<b>Full Name</b>	alistair budd
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>All of the proposed developments along Shootersway will increase the traffic flow towards in the main the Kings road junction . This is already an issue especially at rush hour times .I cannot imagine how the junction can be redeveloped further to mitigate this given it has only just been upgraded .Further traffic flows will use the valley side roads only one of which [Durrants ] is really suitable for two way traffic flows . Whilst others like Darrs lane are single track .</p> <p>Clearly pollution is an issue with increased traffic flows as mention above . But also for a number of the sites building next to the A41 .</p> <p>The further west the sites are along Shootersway the more rural the existing landscape .The further from central Berkhamsted , transportation and services . So Blegberry Gardens ,Rossway Farm and Darrs lane will all have relatively poor access to central Berkhamsted . With extrememly limited access to Northchurch shops down the single track lanes of Bell lane and Darrs lane .Cycling ,walking and public transport are not viable for these sites .The Darrs lane site especially seems like a development to far .Not just because of transport and inadequate infrastructure which applies to all the Berkhamsted sites . But in particular because of its postion overlooking Northchurch . Currently if you the stand on the edge of Ashridge you can look across Northchurch and St Marys framed by the open valley side to the south . Just imagine that valley side developed . Dominating the valley settlement, it would be a visual disaster , not to mention the issues of run off , slumping of the valley side etc .If we must have such a development then landscaping on a very large scale will be required . major tree planting and not just a few small trees of the sort developers think is adequate as at Bearroc park.</p> <p>In fact Bearroc park 2 is a good example of a site that should have been shielded from surrounding roads by a broad wildlife belt to allow an area to restrain its rural charater, as well as the environmental benifits . Rather than just another estate planted on a piece of countryside without thought for its surrounding area . Its a shame because the houses look to be well designed and most people like to look out onto greenery .</p> <p>.</p>

	All sites
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	It is not clear as to why the Thakeham Bulbourne cross development appears to have been rejected at this stage . It appears to be no worse or better than most of the other Berkhamsted site proposals . It at least has attempted to build a neighbourhood community . Rather than just building another estate next to an existing one .
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2434
<b>Person ID</b>	1227518
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John LOWRIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS2452
<b>Person ID</b>	1263074
<b>Full Name</b>	Faith Comninos
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object strongly to the planned development of West Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The proposals for building on Shootersway is disproportionate to the area. The number of houses us excessive given the available infrastructure.</p> <p>When we moved to the area in 1988 the bypass was not yet built. One of the arguments for diluting the impact was the green belt on the Berkhamsted side of the road. The trees would offset the fumes and absorb some of the noise pollution. By building on those areas it is highlighting the lies that were told at that time.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2453
<b>Person ID</b>	1263074
<b>Full Name</b>	Faith Comninos
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	If more houses have to be built which itself is a moot point I would advocate the Bulborne Cross development which although using more green belt land does provide the area with additional infrastructure.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2457
<b>Person ID</b>	1262981
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Mabley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Scale needs to be carefully considered to avoid sprawl and protection of footpath access to green infrastructure
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2488
<b>Person ID</b>	1153910
<b>Full Name</b>	DAGNA HORNER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	If achieved, the Bulborne Cross plan would join Kings Langley to Tring in one long ribbon development. Indeed the whole of this area would be joined onto London in urban sprawl. I understand that this plan by Thakeham is not under consideration and hope it remains that way.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2491
<b>Person ID</b>	1259206
<b>Full Name</b>	Greg Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development titled Growth Area Bk01.</p> <p>This will increase traffic on narrow lanes which cannot be widened and are already a nightmare to navigate during the morning and afternoon school runs. Swing Gate Lane cannot handle any more traffic or parents parking up whilst picking up kids which already spills over into the surrounding small narrow streets creating chaos at times. Creating a new school along with thousands more residents in this area will be a disaster for local residents in terms of traffic congestion &amp; pollution.</p> <p>How many old growth trees will be cut down in green belt land to accommodate more overpriced, expensive homes most cannot afford miles away from the town centre? This does not align with the councils stated 'green and environmentally friendly' themes in this document. What it will mean is more people driving massive SUV's in our narrow streets creating further gridlock on our roads.</p> <p>Bad for the environment</p> <p>Bad for the current residents and our quality of life</p> <p>Good for Developers profit margins at our expense</p> <p>Bad idea all round</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	This is what the council should be focusing on. Building on existing brownfields sites, unused office/commercial spaces and NOT destroying irreplaceable green belt land and turning Berkhamsted into another outer suburb of Greater London
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2496
<b>Person ID</b>	1263098
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Flockhart
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am commenting about all of the greenfield sites listed in the Berkhamsted section.</p> <p>Greenbelt - it is not acceptable to build new houses on greenbelt land. This is in short supply and the defines the very nature of a market town.</p> <p>Location - all of the greenfield locations are, by their very nature, a long way from the centre of town with its shops and amenities. Berkhsamted already has too many cars and a traffic problem - with associated risks to children and air quality. Adding houses that are so far away that the only practical way of reaching town is by car will only compound current problems. Developers always raise plans to install bus routes or encourage cycling too - these are never followed through - if they are, i would like to see the detailed figures about who is regularly communiting to the shops up and down 1in 4 hills by bike. I image the numbers are low.</p> <p>Infrastructure - the impact on infrastructure of this level of building is not fully mitigated. A new secondary school would be needed.</p> <p>Type of homes - i accept there is a need for additional housing but i don't accept there is a need for only large flint-fronted executive homes on the outskirts of affluent towns. Instead, we need a balance of housing types. Brownfield and infill sites, where affordable homes on small pockets of infill land is a good idea and should be encouraged. More large executive houses which are driving distance from the centre of town are not additive and instead detract from the nature and amenity of a town like berkhamsted.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2518
<b>Person ID</b>	1263140

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr B & Mrs A Goddard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1262938
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Steven Barker
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Please see attached statement 20107_Reps.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Please see attached statement 20107_Reps.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">20107_Reps.pdf</a> <a href="#">20107_Reps.pdf (1)</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2584
<b>Person ID</b>	1262037
<b>Full Name</b>	Jason Silver
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Most of the proposed sites on green belt land and this is not something I am willing to support, should be re thought and/or the numbers challenged
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2606
<b>Person ID</b>	1263220
<b>Full Name</b>	MR COLIN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The Thakeham plan would effectively join up Berkhamsted to Bourne End and hence Hemel Hempstead and must not go ahead.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS2612
<b>Person ID</b>	1263221
<b>Full Name</b>	JAN COWPER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am a local resident residing at [ADDRESS REMOVED] and wish to support the (Bulbourne Cross) proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA in the east of Berkhamsted to be included in the above plan and for its subsequent approval.</p> <p>I strongly approve of the housing requirements being centralised rather than the proposed current patchwork. This delivers the opportunity to provide integrated community facilities together with a wonderful opportunity for new and exciting local sports facilities which will benefit the whole community. In addition their proposal offers a country park between the A41 and the canal/railway line which ensures the preservation of green space again for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>I would like to be kept informed of how the comments are being collated and the subsequent outcome of the decisions made.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2621
<b>Person ID</b>	1263224
<b>Full Name</b>	MR JOHN KIRKBY

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I would like to express my opposition to the proposed Bulbourne Cross development. As far as I can see this is a green field development and is not in the Dacorum Plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2627
<b>Person ID</b>	1263228
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLOTTE COWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing in response to a concerted PR campaign by a company wishing to develop Bulbourne Cross in Berkhamsted for housing, in place of the main Council proposal to build at the Northchurch end of town.</p> <p>www.bulbournecross.co.uk</p> <p>The Bulbourne Cross plan would involve ruining more precious marshland habitat, already being chipped away at that end of town. Berkhamsted is becoming very built up and is in great danger of losing its overall character. This development in an important nature reserve is totally unnecessary, please put the environment first and stick to your original plan of building at the Northchurch side of town.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2646
<b>Person ID</b>	1263233
<b>Full Name</b>	ALAN AND CAROLE CHURCH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Having read the Local Plan referred to above and the plethora of correspondence from Thakeham Homes encouraging local residents to mail in support for the proposed Bulbourne Cross development, I am writing to register our objection to the Thakeham plans on the following grounds:</p>

The proposed development of “green field” sites isn’t in keeping with the Local Plan eths of using brownfield sites where possible,

The proposed development would result in a “string development” from Berkhamsted to Bourne End with little demarcation between the two,

The Thakeham proposal makes much capital of the provision of sports facilities but Berkhamsted is already well-served in this regard (2 sports centres, football and cricket clubs, bowls club, 4-5 private gyms, etc.).

Likewise, it advertises “50 acres of green space and a country park” – the land proposed for development is already “green space” and comprises considerably more than 50 acres.

In summary, we believe that the proposals represent a diminution in the quality of the local environment and are out of kilter with the objectives of the Dacorum Local Plan compared to alternatives proposed for other areas of Berkhamsted, and therefore wish to strongly register our objection.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2783
<b>Person ID</b>	1262722
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin McCready
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	The level of proposed development is completely unsustainable and appears to only be focused on increasing dwellings in every available space, with no consideration to the infrastructure challenges already apparent in Berkhamsted, thus increasing pressure on routes tht bypass the high street. A transparent strategy to maximise cash from developers (targeting cash from those exiting London) at the expense of the current inhabitants.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2800
<b>Person ID</b>	1207011
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Neil Aitchison
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	However I have been made aware that a developer is promoting 225 acres of land between Hall Park and the current built extremity of Berkhamsted at Hall Park . This would be totally out of character , erodes the established policy and brings about loss of amenity and a significant concern over loss of Green Belt and coalescence of Berkhamsted with Bourne End. Any further development of Berkhamsted should be resisted due to congestion and infrastructure concerns beyond the current proposals.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2824
<b>Person ID</b>	1263206
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Great Gaddesden Parish Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	1253616
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Andrew Farrow
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2838
<b>Person ID</b>	1263016
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanna Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This is over development of Berkhamsted which the market town cannot tolerate. Access around the market town of Berkhamsted is circumscribed at all times by the impact of the canal and the railway. Berkhamsted is set in a valley. And as the plan says: "there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town". As

a town set in a valley with only one main crossing the county's engineers comment the traffic lights already operate at over capacity. This results in residents choosing to avoid the main roads in the town centre or travelling to shop elsewhere. All the proposed sites are up hills along the top of the valley. Berkhamsted is a hilly place, so people will drive not walk into town so increasing traffic congestion along the A4251 and pollution. The existing road network cannot tolerate this increased burden of cars. I can see NO significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed onto Shootersway, Kings Road to town /station and various rat-runs ( Bridgewater Road) to avoid inevitable congestion.

All the proposed sites infringe on the green belt of Berkhamsted and Chilterns AONB.

My comments:

**Bk01 South Berkhamsted.** Green Belt. The ' Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not specified. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how will Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times be kept as a 'secondary' access.

**Bk02 BFI** Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.

**Bk03 Haslam Field.** Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school. Even more important now that we keep green spaces for young people to use for exercise and to keep fit. ( for health and well-being)

**Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch** Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy. The canal is a very important tourism asset within Berkhamsted and the Borough of Dacorum. Development shouldnot be countenanced along this priceless asset. Once lost it is gone for ever as green space and an important wild life corridor.

**Bk09 Bank Mill Lane.** Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. It is on the flood plain. It is an irreplaceable asset to our local green space.

**Bk11 Jewson.** Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.

**Bk12 Civic Centre.** Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.

Yes / No

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2849
<b>Person ID</b>	1261529
<b>Full Name</b>	Valerie Crawley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am against the land south of Berkhamsted BK1 proposal. This will be a loss of more agricultural farmland. The country needs to become more self sufficient, but more and more of our farmland is disappearing. This proposal would also have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring farmland. Swing Gate Lane is also access to 2 local schools and the extra traffic using the road would be dangerous.</p> <p>Of the sites proposed, I think BK11 would be better as this is already has buildings on it and BK9 which would have good access from the A4251 and is not on arable land, it is within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>I am against the Thakeham/Bulbourne Cross being included in the proposal and have sent a separate email outlining the reasons.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2912
<b>Person ID</b>	1262892
<b>Full Name</b>	Jean Farrer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I support the detailed comments made by the One Voice Alliance.</p> <p>I would like to make some specific points from my own detailed knowledge of Northchurch where I have lived for 40 years. I have an allotment on the lower site opposite St Mary's school and observe the difficulties of traffic, parking, pollution and staying safe daily.</p> <p>I tend the 3 flower beds outside the Tesco parade of shops for the council as a volunteer and am acutely aware of the total traffic chaos there. To add to this is unworkable.</p> <p><b>I object to the presentation of the historic community of Northchurch, which has its own Parish Council, as West Berkhamsted.</b> It is not, and it never has been.</p> <p>Northchurch has its own character and community and should be reinstated as a separate settlement. As a resident of Northchurch I am not even permitted to speak at Berkhamsted Town Council meetings.</p> <p>Northchurch should not contribute to the level of housing you suggest as part of the Berkhamsted developments and a clear green separation should be maintained between them.</p> <p>I appreciate that Northchurch connects to Berkhamsted along the A 4251, but it should maintain a green separation zone keeping the current boundary between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane.</p> <p>The population of Northchurch is approx a seventh of Berkhamsted yet is being asked to provide a quarter of the new housing. This is disproportionate.</p> <p><b>Growth Area BK07 – Lockfield, Northchurch.</b></p> <p>I regard this as the most dangerous of all your proposed sites for development.</p> <p>Access from the Lockfield site to New Road is highly problematic.</p>

New Road is a very fast, busy route from Dunstable through the Ashridge Estate with its junction by St Mary's School and Church at Northchurch High Street,

Lockfield (as its name suggests) is right by the narrow Grand Union Canal bridge – which is already a pinch point allowing only single file traffic, with members of the public joining and leaving the towpath there. There is no pavement on the Lockfield side going south up New Rd and only a single person pavement on the other side of the road. From the canal bridge to the school we see parents with small children struggling to walk along the narrow pavement. From Compass Point, sheltered housing complex, to the canal bridge there is no pavement at all.

There should have been a relief road built from New Rd through the Chiltern Park Estate when there was an opportunity. This was blocked by the final phase of housing at Chiltern Park – so there is no opportunity at all to relieve the traffic in this area. The cumulative effect of increasing the households by 2k in Berkhamsted and Northchurch will also make the pressure worse on this road as it is such a popular route.

It feels dangerous to even stand on the pavement now.

I am concerned about the pollution near the school and the safety of those who have to walk, cycle and drive along New Road.

Apart from the primary school, there is sheltered housing for more vulnerable people at Compass Point and just further up from the Lockfield site, SunnySide Rural Trust which provides support and work for people with a learning disability.

Parking is also a significant issue for all who use these facilities near the Lockfield site and access the allotments and the canal towpath.

The prospect of creating safe cycle and walkways into Berkhamsted from here are a fantasy. There is no space to widen roads or to create off road provision. People in this area are hobby walkers and cyclists and frankly, with few employment opportunities, they will either be working from home or commuting by car. It is 2 miles to Berkhamsted station. The High St itself cannot be widened and is highly dangerous for cyclists and walkers currently.

Lockfield is the connecting area between the canal and the AONB at Ashridge, which people flock to everyday. It provides a corridor for wildlife. Housing, particularly at the density suggested, will detract from the entrance to the Ashridge common land. I have no confidence that developers would be sensitive to the landscape here. Witness the 3 storey houses on the Chiltern Park Estate which are a visible blot on the landscape from the other side of the valley.

Lockfield is the access point for Network Rail to provide engineering and maintenance to the railway line which carries 140 mph trains at they enter the tunnel under Chiltern Park estate.

This site should be removed immediately from the Plan on safety grounds as per previous assessments by the Council itself,

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

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The site which has been set aside for the development of a Lidl shopping store and some flats should become fully residential. That area is already brownfield and could be developed with some density with affordable housing without harming the environment. This is near the junction of Billet Lane and the A4251 between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. There is sufficient supermarket shopping in Berkhamsted and Tring already.</p> <p>Although Bovingdon has come further down your settlement hierarchy, I think it could offer more possibilities for development by using the Bovingdon Aerodrome site. It is also connected well to Hemel Hempstead for roads and employment.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS2942
<b>Person ID</b>	1263430
<b>Full Name</b>	Pru Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Whilst these developments are listed separately - BK02,3,4,5,6,8,10 - all put HUGE pressure on Shootersway and are out of proportion with the nature of the area. The access junction at Shootersway/Kings Road is already a slightly dangerous and busy junction and it's difficult to understand how it can be improved any further to accommodate what could be over 1,200 cars a day (assuming 1.5 cars per dwelling).</p> <p>The exit from Shootersway is again down narrow streets or out onto narrow country lanes which doesn't feel right for the area. Cross Oak road is already hugely congested as a rat run and this will put pressure on the narrow Darrs Lane, private lane of Shootersway Lane plus Durrants Lane which has a school at the bottom and shouldn't become a rat run more than it is already.</p> <p>It feels like a grotesque over development of the area and disrupting beautiful green spaces, playing fields and nature areas.</p> <p>I don't buy the provision of a 'wildlife corridor' (BK04) when you are destroying hectares worth of sites to create new homes. This is just PR puff!</p>

There is no mention of new community facilities in these areas and even if just half the houses were built we need a provision of a small shopping area to prevent congestion going into town for food/drink.

BK11 - keeping the semi rural feel and mature planting is vital to this area but I struggle to see how this is going to be achieved with the sheer number of homes planned.

BK01 - The access to this new development feels like it will put huge pressure on one of Berkhamsted's most historic areas (Ashlyns School) and it has such a narrow access way in an area that is always teeming with children from Ashlyns and Berkhamsted School. This needs revising.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS2998

**Person ID** 1258924

**Full Name** Natalia Maghdoori

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3022
<b>Person ID</b>	1263485
<b>Full Name</b>	MR ANDREW REYNOLDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to object strongly regarding the housing developments in our area of Northchurch.</p> <p>Any new houses in New Road will cause massive traffic issues at the junction with the High Street. This is also 'Green belt' land and should not be developed.</p> <p>More housing in the Darrs Lane area will again cause massive congestion and again Green Belt land is being sacrificed. We do not have the schools, doctors surgeries and shop parking areas to accommodate more and more housing.</p> <p>This is just not the correct location for these new houses. I object most strongly to these plans.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3023
<b>Person ID</b>	1263485
<b>Full Name</b>	MR ANDREW REYNOLDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to object strongly regarding the housing developments in our area of Northchurch.</p> <p>Any new houses in New Road will cause massive traffic issues at the junction with the High Street. This is also 'Green belt' land and should not be developed.</p> <p>More housing in the Darrs Lane area will again cause massive congestion and again Green Belt land is being sacrificed.</p> <p>We do not have the schools, doctors surgeries and shop parking areas to accommodate more and more housing.</p> <p>This is just not the correct location for these new houses. I object most strongly to these plans.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3032
<b>Person ID</b>	1263493
<b>Full Name</b>	JEAN RITCHIE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	It makes sense to me to allow the Bulbourne Cross development to go ahead, because is incorporates recreational facilities and allotments. IT also (at the moment) includes a commitment to build a new primary school. This development, in an area that does not include any buildings etc of merit, would provide half the housing designated for Berkhamsted, and 40% of it would be affordable.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3055
<b>Person ID</b>	1146084
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jason Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In responce to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.

What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.

Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.

Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3056

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3058
<b>Person ID</b>	1146084
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jason Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least</p>

100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3059

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.

What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.

Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.

Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3060

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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



<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No</p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS3061</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1146084</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jason Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3062
<b>Person ID</b>	1146084
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jason Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p>

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”, it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3063

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.

What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.

Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.

Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3065

**Person ID** 1146084

**Full Name** Mr Jason Parr

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3075
<b>Person ID</b>	1263501
<b>Full Name</b>	mr Jon Long
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Founder and Managing Director Bayridge Sports
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>The town needs more community sport and recreations facilities and so I strongly believe that developments that include provision for sports pitches and facilities should be prioritised.</p> <p>The most promising proposal in this respect is the proposal from Thakenham and the BSGCA.</p> <p>However, there appear to be two major weaknesses with this proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The developer is undertaking to provide space for sports and recreation facilities but seems to be expecting BSGCA to finance these. The proposed mechanism of financing this is the sale of a sports facility in the heart of the town by BSGCA. This seems wrong. The town should not have to lose one facility to gain new ones. Surely the developer (Thakeham) should be able to finance the laying of pitches, construction of modest clubhouse and other facilities as part of its master plan, particularly given the scale of the home building that is included. This is a model that has been applied to good effect in other parts of the world that I am familiar with.</li> <li>2. There appear to be no assurances on the timing of the creation of the sports facilities. Too many of these projects in the UK seem to end up with promised facilities not being completed to standard or, in some cases, at all. For a project like this to proceed there should be a clear undertaking that the community facilities should be made available at the very beginning of the project build rather than at the end.</li> </ol> <p>I hope that these points will be carefully considered.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3087
<b>Person ID</b>	1263499
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Angela Burgin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3089
<b>Person ID</b>	1263508
<b>Full Name</b>	EVA THORPE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As part of the Consultation process for the above development, I would like to register deep concerns about this development and the due to the towns infrastructure and current Green Belt.</p> <p>As a local resident I have lived close to Swing Gate lane my entire life and the traffic on this and surrounding roads is already to heavily congested and although there will be connecting roads on to the bypass, the main route into the town will still be via Swing Gate Lane which causes me great concern as the road can not deal with the amount of traffic already and is full of pinch points, particularly at school start and finish time. I fear for the children safety already with cars speeding around and the roads infrastructure will not be able to deal with the increase of traffic into the area. I am sure the plan will be to divert the traffic via different routes, but this of course will not make any difference, as the fasted route will be via swing gate lane.</p> <p>The plan's also suggest Sustainable Development, nothing in this can be fully evidenced and justified as required by the NPPF to remove designations, this is not a sustainable nor representing of the environmental role of planning.</p>



Our local residents are deeply concerned with the allocation of housing proposed in this and surrounding Green belt areas in Dacorum as it takes away Green Belt, robbing the community of an important resource and farm land that contributes to food supply stability and also to our children's well being. The area is already built up, we have a small garden and rely on the area for nature walks, dog walking and exercise.

I deeply do not want this to go ahead in its current format, so am stating that as a local resident I am deeply opposed to these proposals

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3096

**Person ID** 1263509

**Full Name** Mr John R Maclean

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No** No

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

I WISH TO OBJECT TO THE PLANS AS OUTLINED BY BSGCA.

Reasons. 1 Berkhamsted does not need more football pitches or the removal of open countryside to provide the sports facilities which are being used as a cover for a large scale and inappropriate development.

2. Affordable housing is not really affordable in this area. If it was shared ownership with a reputable Housing Association it might just about be acceptable but it's a whitewash as it is.

3. No extra dentists doctors or housing for teachers in an area already creaking.

4. This development will merely fuel the flight from London to the detriment of the area.

5. No use of brownfield sites.

6. Linear development of the sort that will break down the distinct and attractive nature of the different settlements along the valley.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3109
<b>Person ID</b>	1261485
<b>Full Name</b>	Douglas Adams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Surplus brownfield office space.
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3176
<b>Person ID</b>	1263545
<b>Full Name</b>	KATIE QUAITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I live in Berkhamsted and my children walk to school in Northchurch. One day, a lorry mounted the kerb about 3 seconds before my young child was about to turn from our footpath on to the kerb. He was lucky to not be knocked down and killed. I, like many others, have lived in perpetual fear of the traffic on New Road for years and you want to add dozens of houses directly opposite the location of where this incident took place.</p> <p>New Road is a dangerous road leading up to Ashridge and this development by the canal will be directly opposite this footpath. It cannot sustain the housing that is going to be built there. The traffic is horrendous and with Year 5&amp;6 children walking from the Chiltern Park area, along with toddlers and primary aged children running along to school, there is every likelihood there will be a horrendous accident if these houses go ahead. The footpath is too narrow to cope with more residents in the area, particularly post pandemic where social distancing is next to impossible and old housing opens directly on to the pathways there near the top of the road. We often see endless traffic jams along this road waiting to turn on to the high street. Northchurch will be gridlocked. If every house has one car or more - some houses will have two or three - it will be a disaster for the peaceful rural area we live in.</p> <p>There is a proposal to build a bridge over the canal as I understand it. This won't stop the traffic flow as the main access to Ashridge. It means you will be soon putting in another road from Bridgewater where currently a herd of deer lives, not to mention dreys of squirrels and other wildlife. We value the peace and rural aspect of Northchurch and this new proposal threatens this completely.</p>

We know many elderly people - elderly relatives and friends of ours in fact - enjoy the allotments where this canal side housing estate will reside. It is a truly unique and special place but boosting the population here, by the burgeoning original 19th century canal bridge will add to traffic noise and pollution thus impacting the tranquility of the area.

We used to live in the road directly in front of the field where the other large development is earmarked. We have been to planning meetings before but were made to feel like we had no voice. We now look across at that field. So we know that a school was promised with the Bearroc development and Doctor's Surgery and park. But none of it has happened. I cannot see any other facilities happening even though hundreds of homes have already been added to the town in the ten years we have been here. The character has changed and if you continue in this vein, it will cause irreversible damage to the area. Any resident will tell you they struggle to get doctors' appointments and school places. I'm waiting for a place at secondary school so I know what I'm talking about - every parent is anxious as so many had to appeal last years for Ashlyns. It's a nightmare.

Please stop the overdevelopment of our lovely town and in particularly, the village of Northchurch. We attend the church and can tell you, the main road is noisy and hectic. We stand at the memorial to mark every November 11th and cars rattle past, sometimes crawling. A child was killed on this road in 2017 just walking home from brownies and in 2013 I witnessed the aftermath of a car hitting a year 2 boy. An ambulance was called and he was treated in the pub car park. I have been clipped by a wing mirror on New Road and my husband has too - and I expect if you ask anyone else living in the area, they will have. On that note, there are times when children are poorly and you have no choice but to drive to the school to drop things off or collect them and there is zero parking. But it is necessary to stop sometimes - I remember having a poorly child recuperating from an operation but I needed to pick up my pre-schooler but I couldn't leave my sick child so they had to come with me. You cannot stop people parking, the parents need some access - regardless of whether this impedes the housing plans. The pub will not allow access anymore so it is imperative New Road remains as accessible as possible within the remits of safety. The canal side development simply cannot be allowed to go ahead.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3192

**Person ID** 1261759

<b>Full Name</b>	Lauren Higgins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I want to support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted. I support this because it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create new, exciting local sports facilities that have health and social benefits for many</li> <li>• Allows existing sports groups to continue to expand, as interest in sport continues to grow</li> <li>• Creates new green open spaces and a new country park</li> <li>• Invests in the future for young people in Berkhamsted, delivering a community benefit when alternatives on the western side deliver very little</li> <li>• Reducing the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41</li> <li>• Creating new education and community facilities</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3196
<b>Person ID</b>	1261529
<b>Full Name</b>	Valerie Crawley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b></p>	<p>I am writing with regard to the draft Local Plan Consultation and I do not think the Bulbourne Cross site should be included in this for various reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, this is over 200 acres of arable farmland that will be lost. With Brexit and the current pandemic, this country needs to be more self-sufficient, but more and more of our farmland is disappearing and has been for many years.</p> <p>I grew up in Bourne End, my family moved there in 1922. During my lifetime the A41 bypass has been built, cutting through the farmland and cutting off the farms from the rest of the village, and bringing with it the problems of fly tipping and litter. In recent years the Wards timber mill site has been developed for housing, which I think is a good place for housing. The LA3 development is planned for the Hemel Hempstead side of the village, joining it with Hemel Hempstead. I don't think it is a good idea developing the Berkhamsted side of the village, which will join it with Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The A41 regularly floods near to the Bourne End junction and the roads between the on and off exit also flood. This part of the A41 has received no maintenance to the drainage since it was built. The pipe that takes away the run-off water was blocked at one stage with debris and litter and suckers growing in it. Having a development of this size next to the A41 is only going to make the flooding problems worse.</p> <p>Thakeham did say they would look at improving junctions if necessary, which I think would be necessary as the slip road on to the bypass is too short and with the increased amount of traffic will become more dangerous. The traffic into McDonalds at times is queuing up to the roundabout. This will cause chaos for vehicles wanting to enter or exit the new development.</p> <p>With some of the main sports clubs in Berkhamsted proposing to relocate to the new playing fields, this is going to bring in even more traffic as the site won't be within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>Thakeham, in their online meeting, said they would probably "gift" the park land on the other side of the A4251 to the Town Council. This will obviously require some upkeep, particularly if it is going to be more diverse than it is currently, and this will be at a cost to the taxpayers.</p> <p>The proposed housing development will also be detrimental to the nearby farms. There are already a large number of people walking in the countryside, which has increased immensely since the first lockdown. I don't have an objection to people enjoying the countryside, but a lot of these people don't keep to the footpaths, they don't keep their dogs under control near livestock, and they don't clear up after their dogs. This problem will get much worse if the proposed development goes ahead as it will bring many more people to the area.</p>

This is being advertised as a sustainable, carbon neutral, alternative to the other proposals. I can't see how 1,100 houses can be more sustainable and bio-diverse than what is already there. I also wonder if it would be an alternative, or in addition to the other proposed sites? Thakeham were talking about working with the proposed Swing Gate Lane site so it is likely that would still go ahead?

In my opinion, with the way retail is moving online and more people working from home, I believe there will be more town centre sites becoming available for conversion to housing which should be considered before building on the Green Belt.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3228

**Person ID** 1263500

**Full Name** Jessica Haigh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I am absolutely shocked that '**Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm**' is even being considered as a development site, let alone for 200 houses. This whole area is within the greenbelt, a habitat to a multitude of wildlife, as well as woodland. Destroying and developing on this land will be detrimental to the environment and the beautiful wildlife we have here in Dacorum.

12.29 hectares of land is also nowhere near large enough to accommodate 200 reasonable-sized houses, parking, roads, and public outdoor space. This number should be seriously reconsidered and reduced. It will be much better for current and future residents to have a reduced number of high-quality houses built than 200 small new builds, with no room for parking, or outdoor space.

Additionally, this site is in very close proximity to the A41, meaning the houses will experience a lot of noise pollution, as well as poor air quality. There is a causal link between poor air quality and health, which would mean any occupant of a property built here will be putting their health at risk. I would advise re-evaluating the many health risks of developing housing here, as well as the impact it has on the environment.

Finally, the road network here is very poor. Shootersway is already very busy and congested, and with all of the additional developments, it will be even more so. Additional and alternative roads and routes will need to be built and considered to accommodate this development, let alone the additional developments around Berkhamsted. The A41 is also a very busy road, with regular incidents and accidents happening on a weekly basis. Developing here will put unnecessary strain on this road, and could lead to an increase in future accidents and incidents. This whole area also has poor public transport links, which means it will be likely that all house owners here will own a minimum of 1 car, meaning at least an extra 200 cars will be on the road. Berkhamsted, Northchurch, and Tring do not have the infrastructure to support this.

I would also like to raise some questions about several of the other sites in question. **Growth Area BK02 - British Film Institute** is home to the BFI archive and is a lovely place for local people to visit. If this site is being developed on, where will this be moved to? This site is also difficult to get to, additional roads and infrastructure need to be considered and planned. Finally, being so close to the A41 may cause air pollution, as well as noise pollution. Please ensure this is thoroughly investigated before considering developing on this land.

**Growth Area BK07** is also a concern. These potential dwellings will be right next to the canal. Not only will this disturb residents on the canal, but it could cause excess pollution within that area. Additionally, could the canal be a flood risk to residents? Also, this development is very near the railway track, which will cause high levels of noise pollution. It may be better to have fewer houses within this area so that they are not directly next to the track.

I strongly advise you to reconsider all 3 of these development sites, particularly Rossway Farm. The lack of infrastructure, the risk to our health, and the critical damage to the environment are just some of the reasons why this development should not go ahead.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3239

**Person ID** 1263566

**Full Name** Frances Read

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3265
<b>Person ID</b>	1261862
<b>Full Name</b>	adamconnors
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>BK07: Lock Field, Northchurch</b></p> <p>An additional 60 households using New Road (B4506) for access is problematic. Traffic on New Road already regularly queues beyond Bridgewater Hill. This has a significant impact on the air quality in this area.</p> <p>New Road has a number of pinch-points which won't be possible to mitigate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The single-lane canal bridge</li> <li>- Parked cars associated with the school</li> </ul>

- Permanently parked cars outside Compass Point
- The busy junction with High Street

Junction improvements won't be sufficient. It's difficult to imagine any effective mitigations that will work within the constraints of the area. No plan is offered here.

There are roughly 60 dwellings currently in the area using New Road for access (although the road takes additional traffic associated with Ashridge). This proposal will double the number of households attempting to use this road for access.

No plan or investigation is offered to mitigate the significant congestion issues and air quality impact of this development. Given the constraints of this area, this road cannot sustain a development of this size.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3372

**Person ID** 1263693

**Full Name** Ruth Colderwood

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK01 02 03 04 05 06 08 10  
 Most of the housing is situated on the south side of town nearest the A 41, this will make the area very densely populated. We are losing a lot of green space where people currently can walk. There has already been significant housing put on

this side of town near to Egerton School, which has increased traffic significantly so trying to get in/out of town has been much more difficult, whether along the high street or Shootersway. This will only get worse.  
Environmentally I do not think this is a good option. It will increase pollution significantly and reduce peoples sense of well being

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3373

**Person ID** 1261609

**Full Name** DEBORAH CROOKS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The government algorithm for calculating the number of new homes required is flawed as stated in Inside Housing "Councils have complained that the government's new planning formula "seems to have been made without any assessment of demographic, market needs, delivery or capacity issues".

2. The strategy should be focusing on protecting the Green Belt to absorb carbon emissions and keeping our natural heritage.

The developments intended for Berkhamsted along the A41 these areas were designed as nature corridors when the A41 was built. The buidling on these sites will have a negative impact for the wildlife in this area.

3. The increase of population will obviously have an impact on the increase of traffic and pollution that is linked to this. Traffic congestion is already a problem in Berkhamsted and this issue would become even worse.

4. The quality of life will be affected detrimentally by the increase in density of housing and traffic.

5. The infrastructure of berkhamsted could not cope with the huge increase in population.

I welcome the commitment to genuinely affordable housing to be included in developments in Berkhamsted and Tring but believe affordable needs to be properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.

The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.

The plan must guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.

To sustain an increase in population, improvements in infrastructure need to be implemented as houses are built. These are commuter towns and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3434
<b>Person ID</b>	1263764
<b>Full Name</b>	Katie Quaite
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	<p>Bk07 is for social development on top of a major railway line which is noisy and the houses will literally shake. It overlooks a tranquil setting where the elderly and local community members attend two allotment sites providing necessary wellbeing for what is an ageing community. It also overlooks an elderly retirement complex and home. To add family housing here would be a mistake.</p> <p>It will stand out as a blight on the rural landscape and be dangerous in case of rail derailments with the fast line to Scotland passing through here.</p> <p>The turning for the development is opposite a footpath where children walk by themselves to school. We have had close calls in the past where children have nearly been knocked down by vehicles turning and mounting the pavement. Traffic to Ashridge will become blocked - New road is often at a standstill as it is in rush hour and at other times of day, particularly at weekends.</p> <p>Furthermore, the setting attracts Mountjack deer, kingfishers and other local wildlife and this wildlife will now disappear.</p> <p>Bk08 and Bk07: The overall numbers proposed across the borough are too high and the individual identity of Northchurch has been overlooked. It will disappear and become absorbed into Berkhamsted. The infrastructure is not there around the Darrs Lane area. Badgers, foxes and other wildlife live in the field adjacent to Darrs Lane. There have been countless road accidents around Darrs Lane, including a serious motorbike one going down the hill and a death of a child on the High Street. My friend's car was driven into just pulling out of Covert Road as people fly down the hill. This is a rural setting and these proposals will change the very nature of our environment and the reasons we were attracted to living here. Furthermore, we do not know if we have places at the local secondary school because it is oversubscribed and many people had to appeal last year. These houses are priced at over £500k so not being made for the welfare of future generations but rather for the developers' pockets.</p> <p>And finally, to ask us to do this during lockdown when children are at home and many people are struggling to cope is despicable. Many of my peers will not be able to comment as they cannot find time to breathe, nevermind comment here. It shows shortsightedness by the council and a disregard for community voices.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS3438</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1144421</p>

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Philip Catchpole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am commenting on Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>The proposals are for a major development of an arable field which currently provides a green area separating the urban area from the busy A41. The loss of this area to housing will severely impact on the local roads and particularly Swing Gate Lane, which currently serves three schools and is very busy during pick up/drop off times. This road is narrow especially between Woodlands Avenue and the main road where cars are parked on one side. The road is also steep which is an additional hazard since cars descending tend to drive too fast for the conditions.</p> <p>The noise pollution and toxic emissions from the A41 traffic will impact on the proposed housing and is a potential health hazard. Although measures are proposed to minimise the visual impact on the green belt and AONB these can never compensate for the loss of what we currently enjoy.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3445
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>DBC is well aware both through evidence and representations from the sporting community over many years as having a significant need for increased sporting facilities (especially playing field space) to meet the needs of its existing population. It is vital therefore that additional organised and casual playing space for the major increase in population proposed in this plan is an infrastructure priority.</i></p> <p><i>We are also surprised that the provision of significant new Sports facilities is not recognised as a vision objective for Berkhamsted as it is for Tring.</i></p> <p><i>For these reasons DSN strongly recommends that the Bulbourne Cross site proposed by Thakeham but not included in the proposed sites for consultation, be reconsidered by DBC. The proposed development at Bulbourne Cross includes a proposed sporting hub to be created. The planning of this hub has been done in partnership with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charitable Association and local clubs, who would manage the site and ensure it is both viable and sustainable.</i></p> <p><i>Should this site not be selected then it is critical that a major new sporting hub for Berkhamsted be an essential requirement within other propose sites in the town.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><i>DBC is well aware, both through evidence and representations from the sporting community over many years, that there is a significant need for increased sporting facilities (especially playing field space) to meet the needs of its existing population. It is vital therefore that additional organised and casual playing space for the major increase in population proposed in this plan is an infrastructure priority.</i></p> <p><i>Therefore, we would submit that Bulbourne Cross(as proposed by Thakeham Homes in association with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charity Association), which incorporates a consolidated and sustainable new multi-facility sporting hub, should be given preference over all other sites in Berkhamsted. The proposed site covers approximately 92 hectares on land to the east of Berkhamsted and north west of the village of Bourne End.</i></p> <p><i>The BSGCA are a local charity, who have been running for nearly 100 years, and are committed to improving sports facilities for residents across Berkhamsted. Because of the lack of sport provision both within Berkhamsted, and Dacorum Borough as a whole, the BSGCA have been looking for a site for a ‘sports hub’ for many years, in order to grow and develop the sport and leisure provision in and around Berkhamsted.</i></p> <p><i>The proposals include nearly 32 acres of land for new sports provision including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• A new full size hybrid pitch with stadium, designed to meet FA Step 2/3 standards</i></li> <li><i>• Five new youth pitches for 94 youth teams</i></li> </ul>

- A new full size 3G community pitch for football and multi-use
- A new full size multi-use pitch
- A new rugby pitch
- New indoor 'double-height' gym
- New indoor members facilities, including a member's bar/ clubroom and committee room space
- A new community bar, with club space, together with meeting/ training rooms
- Indoor changing rooms for different age groups and match officials
- New indoor event space for community hire
- Pedestrian and cycle links into the sports areas to encourage sustainable travel
- 400 car parking spaces to cater for larger crowds on match days, accessed directly off the A41, reducing traffic in Berkhamsted Town Centre.

*The proposals also promote:*

- A route and direct access from the A41 to the A4251
- New pedestrian/cycleways to link the town to the new sports facilities
- Retention and enhancement of landscaping, habitat and species diversity
- A new Country Park
- New community facilities such as formal and informal recreation and Primary/
- Secondary schools (where required)
- Around 1,000 new homes, delivered as carbon neutral.

*For all these reasons DSN strongly that the Bulbourne Cross site proposal from Thakeham which has not been included in the proposed sites for consultation, be reconsidered by DBC. The planning of this site and its sports hub has been done in partnership with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charitable Association and local clubs who would manage the site and ensure it is both viable and sustainable.*

The Plan states in relation to Berkhamsted proposed sites:

*"23.110 These Growth Areas will come forward in a comprehensive, cohesive and co-ordinated manner. Their scale offers benefits for infrastructure co-ordination and delivery, enabling a fuller range of site and town-wide infrastructure needs to be considered and planned for, especially the need for two 2FE primary schools, a 6FE secondary school and significant levels of formal and informal open space."*

*Comment: The need for many new schools acknowledges the scale of population increase proposed which will also put tremendous strain on already massively stretched sporting and leisure facilities; so, as with education, sporting infrastructure must also be provided to meet the increased demand. However, sports infrastructure provision seems to have been omitted from consideration for Berkhamsted within the plan. This is exacerbated by the fact that the benefits of the Bulbourne Cross site have been rejected even though it is a much more beneficial site to meet overall housing, sporting and recreational needs in Berkhamsted than the proposed sites.*

*This plan and strategy is a final opportunity to address the problem of shortages in playing pitch space in the town as well as indoor and ancillary sporting facilities which will become a critical issue if not addressed in this plan.*



The Plan states:  
 23.131 Policy SP21 - Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted  
 Item 7 of Masterplan Delivery for Berkhamsted - "...deliver the infrastructure requirements set out in the Dacorum Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Berkhamsted."

*Comment: If, as it should, the Infrastructure Plan for Berkhamsted is expected to meet the significant need for large scale increase in playing field space and other sporting facility development, then this will be made almost impossible given the mix of sites currently proposed within the Emerging Strategy for Growth. The constricted nature of the Town and the exclusion of the Thakeham Homes Bulbourne Cross site means that this Local Plan will fail to deliver item 7 and make it a failure that it will be impossible to put right at any time in the future. This is a last chance opportunity to deliver item 7 and it will fail if not addressed in this plan*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3448

**Person ID** 1012318

**Full Name** Mrs Jane Hennell

**Organisation Details** Area Planner  
 Canal and River Trust

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

BK07 Ecological enhancement to the canal corridor welcome. Consideration needed regarding use of canal towpath as a sustainable transport route and possible improvement and mitigation required as a result. Opportunities to provide access points and facilities for water based recreation to be explored with the Canal & River Trust and local sports groups.

BK09 Should include 'contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station, including off-site provision' to consider enhancement of the canal towpath as a sustainable transport route.

BK11 Should include 'contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station, including off-site provision' to consider enhancement of the canal towpath as a sustainable transport route. Public open space and canalside enhancement need to be carefully considered and pedestrian cycle access provided

onto the canal towpath. Opportunities to provide access points and facilities for water based recreation to be explored with the Canal & River Trust and local sports groups.

BK13 Should include 'contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station, including off-site provision' to consider enhancement of the canal towpath as a sustainable transport route. Public open space and canalside enhancement need to be carefully considered and pedestrian cycle access provided onto the canal towpath.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3461

**Person ID** 1262625

**Full Name** Katie Guest

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

BK06

This site is one of the most beautiful places in Northchurch, flanked by hedgerows and ancient trees with extensive views over the valley.

I object to any development on this site for the following reasons:

It is in the greenbelt - sites designated for protection for good reasons

Habitats: the hedgerows (which run down Darrs and Bell Lane) provide physical homes for insects, birds, mammals (a whole food chain is contained in a hedge), complimentary habitats to the field between the roads and back of Granville

Road and a route of passage connecting the farmland (e.g. bats use hedgerows as flight paths to commute between roosts). I have seen mice, foxes, badgers, butterflies and hedgehogs along these hedgerows. It's common to hear tawny owls at dusk (particularly this time of year) and see bats whizzing around. Many birds (including the hedge sparrow) flit up and down them in search of the many insects within. Our garden backs onto Two Oaks Pony sanctuary and our night camera picks up visiting badgers and foxes daily. Bats are abundant and birds such as jays, blackcaps, goldcrests and woodpeckers come too. All animals need a territory and to them our garden along with other gardens and the pony sanctuary is a natural extension of the farmland and hedgerows of this proposed building site.

Flora: All year round this area is full of plant life, from snowdrops and daffodils in the spring to bluebells in May along the hedgerows, and Ivy which creeps along the stone wall in Bell Lane. I am not a tree expert but there are many really old one on both sides of Bell Lane. At this time of year the birdsong is wonderful when walking down there.

Mental Health: a circuit up Pea Lane, along Shooterway and down Bell Lane is my daily walk and has been for a year. The views as you descend Bell Lane across the valley are stunning. And Bell Lane is a sunken old single track road which rarely has cars going up or down. People feel safe along this road (as opposed to Darrs Lane where trucks and vans still race up and down even though it is single track). It really has the feel of 'getting out into nature and connecting with nature' which we have learnt through this pandemic is really important for all of our mental wellness.

Congestion and Pollution: building houses on this site would add a significant increase in traffic on all surrounding roads - Shootersway, Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and down in Northchurch high street. Northchurch high street is already congested due to the popularity of Tesco Express and there being a post office there. The parking there just about copes with the existing numbers of residents in Northchurch (and of course some from Berkhamsted who come for convenience or later on a Sunday when other shops are closed). But adding hundreds more houses to Northchurch would severely impact the issue. The current roads are just not up to supporting more traffic, and the answer is not to make them wider!!! (all hedgerows and all the life within them would be lost). Pollution comes with traffic (we are nowhere near a world free of petrol/diesel cars yet unfortunately). And pollution from cars plus emissions from houses would cause air quality issues in all the surrounding areas.

BK08: I object to any building here for the following reason

This rural land (which is full of trees, fields and wildlife habitats) is a natural pollution and noise barrier between the A41 and Northchurch/Berkhamsted. As we know, trees play an important role in removing pollutants such as carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide from the air. This natural process has benefits for all the surrounding areas not just Northchurch. We should not be considering any development which involves chopping down trees or removing any plant life. We are simply too dependent upon it, and once it's gone its irreplaceable as we know. It would also not be nice for new residents to be so close to such a busy road. This whole area should be left in peace to continue doing what it is doing so well.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3469
<b>Person ID</b>	1159198
<b>Full Name</b>	Edward Hatley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. I fully support the objections outlined in the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group submission (qv).
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3485
<b>Person ID</b>	1263805
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	See my response below on other site for Berkhamsted
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><i>The site at Bulbourne Cross in Berkhamsted (on land to the east of the town of Berkhamsted and north west of the village of Bourne End) as proposed by Thakeham Homes in association with Berkhamsted Sports grounds Charitable Association which incorporates a consolidated and sustainable new multi-facility sporting hub, should be given preference over all other sites in Berkhamsted. The proposed site covers approximately 92 hectares on land to the east of Berkhamsted and north west of the village of Bourne End.</i></p> <p><i>The BSGCA are a local charity, who have been running for nearly 100 years, and are committed to improving sports facilities for residents across Berkhamsted. Because of the lack of sport provision both within Berkhamsted, and Dacorum Borough as a whole, the BSGCA have been looking for a site for a ‘sports hub’ for many years, in order to grow and develop the sport and leisure provision in and around Berkhamsted.</i></p> <p><i>The proposals include nearly 32 acres of land for new sports provision including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• A new full size hybrid pitch with stadium, designed to meet FA Step 2/3 standards;</i></li> <li><i>• Five new youth pitches for 94 youth teams</i></li> <li><i>• A new full size 3G community pitch for football and multi-use;</i></li> <li><i>• A new full size multi-use pitch;</i></li> <li><i>• A new rugby pitch;</i></li> <li><i>• New indoor ‘double-height’ gym;</i></li> <li><i>• New indoor members facilities, including a members bar/ clubroom and committee room space;</i></li> <li><i>• A new community bar, with club space, together with meeting/ training rooms;</i></li> <li><i>• Indoor changing rooms for different age groups and match officials;</i></li> <li><i>• New indoor event space for community hire;</i></li> <li><i>• Pedestrian and cycle links into the sports areas to encourage sustainable travel;</i></li> <li><i>• 400 car parking spaces to cater for larger crowds on match days, accessed directly off the A41, reducing traffic in Berkhamsted Town Centre.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The proposals also promote:</i></p>

- A route and direct access from the A41 to the A4251
- New pedestrian/cycleways to link the town to the new sports facilities
- Retention and enhancement of landscaping, habitat and species diversity
- A new Country Park
- New community facilities such as formal and informal recreation and Primary/
- Secondary schools (where required)
- Around 1,000 new homes, delivered as carbon neutral.

*For all these reasons I submit that the Bulbourne Cross site proposal from Thakeham which has not been included in the proposed sites for consultation, be reconsidered by DBC. The planning of this site and its sports hub has been done in partnership with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charitable Association and local clubs who would manage the site and ensure it is both viable and sustainable.*

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS3520

**Person ID**

1263824

**Full Name**

Nichola Criddle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

*The site at Bulbourne Cross in Berkhamsted as proposed by Thakeham Homes in association with Berkhamsted Sports grounds Charitable Association which incorporates a consolidated and sustainable new multi-facility sporting hub, should be given preference over all other sites in Berkhamsted. The proposed site covers approximately 92 hectares on land to the east of Berkhamsted and north west of the village of Bourne End.*

*The BSGCA are a local charity, who have been running for nearly 100 years, and are committed to improving sports facilities for residents across Berkhamsted. Because of the lack of sport provision both within Berkhamsted, and Dacorum Borough as a whole, the BSGCA have been looking for a site for a 'sports hub' for many years, in order to grow and develop the sport and leisure provision in and around Berkhamsted.*

*The proposals include nearly 32 acres of land for new sports provision including:*

- A new full size hybrid pitch with stadium, designed to meet FA Step 2/3 standards;*
- Five new youth pitches for 94 youth teams*
- A new full size 3G community pitch for football and multi-use;*
- A new full size multi-use pitch;*
- A new rugby pitch;*
- New indoor 'double-height' gym;*
- New indoor members facilities, including a members bar/ clubroom and committee room space;*
- A new community bar, with club space, together with meeting/ training rooms;*
- Indoor changing rooms for different age groups and match officials;*
- New indoor event space for community hire;*
- Pedestrian and cycle links into the sports areas to encourage sustainable travel;*
- 400 car parking spaces to cater for larger crowds on match days, accessed directly off the A41, reducing traffic in Berkhamsted Town Centre.*

*The proposals also promote:*

- A route and direct access from the A41 to the A4251*
- New pedestrian/cycleways to link the town to the new sports facilities*
- Retention and enhancement of landscaping, habitat and species diversity*
- A new Country Park*
- New community facilities such as formal and informal recreation and Primary/*
- Secondary schools (where required)*
- Around 1,000 new homes, delivered as carbon neutral.*

*For all these reasons I submit that the Bulbourne Cross site proposal from Thakeham which has not been included in the proposed sites for consultation, be reconsidered by DBC. The planning of this site and its sports hub has been done in partnership with Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charitable Association and local clubs who would manage the site and ensure it is both viable and sustainable.*

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3531

**Person ID** 1263810

<b>Full Name</b>	David Tolfree
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Removing areas of recreation such as Haslam playing fields should be the last on the list. These areas are for health & well being. If all places allocated are built on, the population will increase within Berkhamstead, which would cause major issues with traffic when travelling through the high road. It cannot cope with the amount of traffic at the moment!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3541
<b>Person ID</b>	1263834
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Illes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Whilst there is very specific comment on the type of housing to be permitted in each area, there is precious little specific information about infra-structure. Typical of this is Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch. This development will lead out onto New Road between the canal bridge and the railway tunnel exit. This can be a highly congested area already because of the single lane bridge over the canal and later in the centre of Northchurch. Yet, there is no real mention of a proposed solution to this. What does "Contribute towards off-site enhancements" mean? If the developer will only make a contribution, who is funding the rest?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3604
<b>Person ID</b>	1258862
<b>Full Name</b>	Tim Beeby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01</p> <p>The case for releasing Green Belt land for development has not been made and indeed was rejected by Councillors in the Core Strategy and yet this very large site results in the irreversible loss of over 33 hectares of our valuable green belt. It also removes the buffer between the town and the A41. Residents on the site would be subjected to both airborne and noise pollution from the A41.</p> <p>It's ridge top position makes it highly visible from the surrounding hills.</p> <p>The site is beyond the natural walking and cycling range from the existing services and facilities in the town centre (including the Railway Station) especially due to its position at the top of steep hills.</p>

As the Local Plan does not include any new employment sites, inevitably most residents will have to commute to work and a good proportion of those would have to do so via the station. This would massively increase traffic up and down Swing Gate Lane, a road with 2 infant/junior schools on it. If the east/west link to Chesham Road materialises it may mitigate against some of the increase in congestion around Swing Gate Lane and the Hall Park estate roads but would be of no benefit to the wider community and would contribute to the feeling that the site is semi-detached from Berkhamsted, therefore making no contribution to the vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'. The suggestion of a new community hub acknowledges that the site does not integrate with the town.

There are frequent sewage/waste water issues at the bottom of the Hall Park estate (by the A416), suggesting the current sewage system is already struggling to cope. There is no explanation in the plan as to how this would be mitigated.

It is unlikely that there would be any new health provision on the site and the existing GP's are already at capacity.

'As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' - this is disingenuous. It is not possible to deliver a net gain while removing a large area of Green Belt and the buffer (and wildlife corridor) with the A41.

850 homes is likely nearly 2000 people and 1200 cars. It seems inconceivable the Council could impose those numbers all in one area of the town without also having firm plans to improve the existing infrastructure and for all the above reasons, I object to the use of this site.

For similar reasons, I object to Bk03, Bk04, Bk08 and as a general point I do not support any proposal to increase the size of Berkhamsted by 25% or Tring by 50%, which I think is totally out of proportion to their existing size and therefore will totally change their historic character.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3626

**Person ID** 1145631

**Full Name** Mr Alastair Greene

**Organisation Details** Clerk  
Little Gaddesden Parish Council

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3655
<b>Person ID</b>	1263902
<b>Full Name</b>	JANICE MAYNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(ADDRESS REMOVED) I was born in Berkhamsted and the football club has been a big part of my life. How the Council could even contemplate moving the Club to Bourne End is absolutely ridiculous. As I can testify many supporters from the away teams arrive by car, bus or rail and many more walk to see the matches. How are they supposed to get to the proposed site in Bourne End? If they have no car they won't be able to attend the matches. This area is an amazing green space – football, tennis and bowls are all catered for here. There is a childrens playground and also a skateboard

park adjacent – also the Canal Fields are used for picnics etc and we do not want the extra traffic here with many more houses. I thought green space was very important to this government. The building of new houses is not a good idea – we have no infrastructure to support it – no hospital, not enough school places for children.

To build more houses right in the centre of the town is very shortsighted. If the football club is moved in a very short time there will be no club at all. The ground was given to the town for football in perpetuity.

Please do not allow this to happen – the lovely spaces in the centre of the town should be preserved at all costs.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3664

**Person ID** 222269

**Full Name** Georgina Tregoning

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3676
<b>Person ID</b>	1263917
<b>Full Name</b>	Matthew Norman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft local plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan. I DO NOT support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3681
<b>Person ID</b>	1263919
<b>Full Name</b>	Brian Catchpole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Section 23.1.</p> <p>I OBJECT to the proposal from Thakeham and the BSGCA on the grounds that</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure at the east end of the town, specifically shops and GP provision, which will inevitably lead to increased traffic flow into town. The proposals do not adequately address this issue.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure for cycle access into town from the east side. If the developers were to include a dedicated cycle route (eg by upgrading the canal path) this would go some way to mitigate.</p> <p>There are high voltage electricity pylons running through the development. This may carry a HSE risk.</p> <p>The 'country park' will be located close to the main Berkhamsted sewerage works. This location is not particularly pleasant during the warmer months.</p> <p>Although a Primary School is proposed, it is unclear how the impact on Secondary School numbers (eg Ashlyns) will be addressed.</p> <p>Altogether, I feel that the proposal does not appropriately address the additional infrastructure required for a development of 1,100 houses at this location.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3684
<b>Person ID</b>	1263922
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Tatham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamsted, myself and my family are opposed to the Bulbourne Cross development for the two following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Green belt land between Berkhamsted and Bourne End will be lost.</li> <li>2 The proposed "direct link to the A41" will be too close to the existing Boxmoor junction to make any definite easing of the current local traffic in Berkhamsted.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my email and i would be keen to read your response.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3699
<b>Person ID</b>	1263936
<b>Full Name</b>	NICK GOSS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Re:-Objection to Dacorum Local Consultation Plan - NORTHCHURCH</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/. The removal of Green Belt Status.</li> </ol>

This land has the PROTECTION OF GREEN BELT and SHOULD NOT BE BUILT ON.

2/. Two fields adjacent to proposed development in Shooters Way have been lost in the last 3 YEARS

3/. The proposed development between Durrants Lane across the Darrs Lane will add such and increase in traffic from these new houses that it will make living and driving in Northchurch a miserable proposition. These roads are already taking far too much traffic and are constantly full of potholes and dangerous conditions to not only drivers but pedestrians especially Darrs Lane where school children have to walk up with no footpath or street lighting. It is like using a racetrack hoping you get to the top before you meet a car coming down. The 3 Lanes you are planning to use with the increased traffic are Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and Durrants Lane and are what they are called LANES not roads. They are too small in their design to cater for all this heavy flow of traffic that these extra houses will produce. Currently Phase 2 has not yet been completed and occupied therefore the impact of their vehicles is not yet known. There is already a pollution monitor placed outside Northchurch Parsh Office due to excess pollution so more traffic would lead to exceeding the recommended levels. This monitor is extremely important to test emission levels to safeguard our children using the local schools as many children do walk as parents find it is quicker than taking the car due to traffic. Durrants Lane/High Street traffic lights were put in place because on the increased traffic from Berrock Park but has only caused more queues with cars exhaust polluting the air as children and parents come out of the school gates.

4/. It has become extremely difficult to get a doctors/dentist appointment due to increased numbers of people that have now moved into the area as Northchurch doesn't have a doctors surgery or dentist. Schools are also already over subscribed. Berkhamsted roads especially the town is under so much pressure constantly. This is not being seen at the present time as people are not travelling to work school etc because of the pandemic so the full picture cannot be assed until things return to normal.

5/. The proposed site in New Road, Northchurch is in such a dangerous position as far as traffic access. New road joining the A41 is very difficult to pull out and the proposed junction from this estate is right by a small canal bridge which is not strong enough to take the extra traffic that a new build would require.

I have lived in Northchurch all my life and so do my parents who are in their 80"s. I do not want to see the village loose its character and feel we need to do all we can to preserve the Green Belt for future generations to enjoy.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted



<b>ID</b>	EGS3739
<b>Person ID</b>	1263908
<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Burger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Berkhamsted is busy enough without adding 2200 new homes. This is an outdated survey and does not take into the effects of Brexit and Covid. Destroying the precious green that makes this area so attractive would not only be an environmental disaster but a logistical one too, there is no way the trains could cope, they are busy enough during the rush hour without adding a minimum of 2200 new people using it. The high street is also very busy and although its suggested another Highstreet will be created it will almost certainly create an influx of people to Berkhamsted. Finally the A41 is very busy during peak times, how do you expect it to cope with 2200 new people driving up and down it?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3757
<b>Person ID</b>	1263921
<b>Full Name</b>	sarah diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Once they build on the proposed sites we will loose beautiful countryside forever. The houses they are building are not fit for purpose.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3776
<b>Person ID</b>	1263939
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Dawkins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>This response relates to Growth Area Bk09: Bank Mill Lane.</p> <p>As outlined in the responses to questions 2 and 8, in light of the Government's announcement on 16th December 2020 that it will change the formula that calculates housing need with the effect of moving development away from the South East of England and greenfield sites to urban areas of the North and the Midlands (Footnote 22: <a href="https://www.housingtoday.co.uk/news/jenrick-launches-revised-housing-numbers-algorithm/5109565.article">https://www.housingtoday.co.uk/news/jenrick-launches-revised-housing-numbers-algorithm/5109565.article</a>), Dacorum</p>

Borough Council should first update the Draft Local Plan to match the updated housing need and only commence the Regulation 19 Consultation once that exercise is complete.

Assuming, as expected, that the updated formula reduces the housing need for Dacorum and urban redevelopment sites should be prioritised in line with the NPPF, it follows that Green Belt sites should be removed first from the Draft Local Plan.

Based on the characteristics of its situation relative to other greenfield sites in the Draft Local Plan, Growth Area Bk09: Bank Mill Lane (Footnote 23: Map 37, p309: Draft Local Plan) should be removed from the Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:

- 1 This site does not support the economic growth strategy for Dacorum. Policy SP5 – Delivering the Employment Strategy (Footnote 24: P43-44: Draft Local Plan) – identifies Hemel Hempstead, Tring and a number of countryside locations as employment growth areas. Berkhamsted in its entirety does not feature. Moreover, there are identified surpluses in office land in Watford, Three Rivers and St Albans, as well as significant capacity on the East Hemel Hempstead sites (Footnote 25: Para 8.12, p44: Draft Local Plan), suggesting that all planned housing development around Hemel Hempstead should be retained.

Although situated further from the M1/M25, Tring is at least identified as an Employment Growth Area, supporting its increase in population.

While some new jobs may be available from the proximity to London, the Bank Mill Lane site is not well situated for the Berkhamsted Rail Station and there are also significant infrastructure challenges (see point 2 below).

Being on the eastern edge of the town, it should also be noted that Bank Mill Lane is poorly located with respect to existing employment opportunities in Berkhamsted, which are “concentrated in the western part of Berkhamsted” (Footnote 26: Para 3.5, p18, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020).

- 1 There are significant infrastructure issues because of the topography of the town and lack of identified funding to improve public transport. There is already a high number of car journeys to work within Berkhamsted, which according to the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study of November 2020 is “considered very high especially given to the compactness of these towns compared with larger settlements in Hertfordshire and elsewhere” (Footnote 27 Para 3.65, p33, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020). Traffic modelling of the proposals shows there will be “increases in traffic flows [...] on [...] sections of the High Street/London

Road which could have localised impacts” (Footnote 28: para 3.87, p40, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020).

The report further outlines that “the challenges faced in Berkhamsted demonstrate that there is a lack of provision for movements from the residential areas in the south of the town to the retail and employment areas in the town centre and the north of the town, as well as the railway station. The A4251 London Road/High Street causes the most severance as it is a more heavily trafficked road which may cause more difficulties for people to cross. It also causes local disruption. (Footnote 29: para 5.10, p72, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020) “Further development in Berkhamsted is also likely to increase dependence on the A4251 which runs through the centre of the town, increasing congestion and journey times. (Footnote 30 para 5.104, p99, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020)”

The issue over the volume of traffic on London Road – the only access road for Bank Mill Lane, which unlike some other sites is some distance from the A41 – will not be solved by the measures outlined (Footnote 31: SP-B8 – Spatial Package Berkhamsted 8 Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020) as traffic cannot be routed onto adjacent roads without causing worse congestion elsewhere and “there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town” (Footnote 32 para 23.120, p226 Draft Local Plan). While the Draft Local Plan identifies the outcome that, “given their ‘edge of town’ locations, the strategic Growth Areas will need to focus on ensuring they are well connected, accessible to the town centre and railway station, and public and sustainable transport options are enhanced, (Footnote 33 para 23.121 p226: Draft Local Plan)” it does not provide a strategy for delivering this with the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, suggesting “other barriers in relation to perceptions of public transport that also need to be overcome including potentially affordability/value for money relative to alternative modes, or perceptions of reliability and comfort (Footnote 34: para 5.96, p98, Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020)” Such required improvements are currently underfunded (Footnote 35: Table 52, p145, Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan, November 2020).

Network Rail believes that the Draft Local Plan will result in an increase in passenger numbers at Berkhamsted rail station (Footnote 36 para 9.43, p44, Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan, November 2020). The single lane road under the railway bridge providing access from Lower Kings Road to the station car park on Brownlow Road already creates significant congestion at peak times and this will be exacerbated through the very likely increase in those wishing to park at the station (Footnote 37: this observation would have been made had the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020 been conducted in non-Coronavirus times and is a deficiency in the study. See para 5.2, p71 of the study). There is no funding earmarked to improve vehicle access or to expand the double storey car park which is likely to return to being used to full capacity once the pandemic is over (Footnote 38 SP-B6 – Spatial Package Berkhamsted 6 – Station Area, p110, Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan, November 2020). By contrast, a master planning exercise has already been completed at Hemel Hempstead Station (Footnote 39 para 9.44, p44, Draft Dacorum

Infrastructure Delivery Plan November 2020) and the location of Tring Station well outside of the town boundary makes it more amenable to development and improvement.

- 1 With no close access to the A41 and the increases in traffic noted in section 1 and 2, the site will exacerbate air pollution issues on London Road and critically, at the junction with Swing Gate Lane, home to an infant school. It may also increase pollution further up Swing Gate Lane, where a junior school is located, given new community facilities to be developed at Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted (Footnote 40 p299: draft local plan).

Paragraphs 102 and 103 of the National Planning & Policy Framework of February 2019 outline that the environmental impacts of traffic should be taken into account, including appropriate opportunities to avoid any adverse effects, and authorities should seek to reduce congestion and emissions to improve air quality and public health. The location of Bank Mill Lane makes it inevitable that congestion will increase, in particular along London Road/High Street, where the shallow speed bumps and many incidences of on-street parking already block the carriageway, creating informal chicanes, and probably increase congestion and worsen air quality (Footnote 41 para 5.23, p75 Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study, November 2020). Making this situation worse would run counter to the NPPF, and would be particularly damaging to quality of life given the location of the two schools.

- 1 In the central part of the site there is a high risk of flooding. The south west herts level 1 strategic flood assessment appendices set out in the evidence base do not appear to have been completed but separate analysis from the Governments flood warning information service (Footnote 42: <https://flood-warning-information.service.gov.uk/long-term-flood-risk/map?eastings=500462&northing=207091&map=SurfaceWater>) shows there is a high risk of flooding through the centre of the site.

*[Please see attached flood map image]*

Indeed, there was a significant flood in the area after heavy rainfall on 9 August 2019 as can be seen from this photo of London Road adjacent to the proposed site:

*[Please see flooding photo]*

The south west Hertfordshire level 1 strategic flood risk assessment of October 2018 makes clear (Footnote 43: para 13.1.1, 105, SW Hertfordshire Level 1 SFRA October 2018) that “the NPPF supports a risk-based and sequential approach to development [...] so that development is located in the lowest flood risk areas where possible; it is recommended that this approach is adopted for all future developments within South west Hertfordshire. New development [...] of land should

wherever possible seek opportunities to reduce overall level of flood risk at the site for example by [...] relocating development to zones with lower flood risk”.

- 1 Unlike all other Berkhamsted sites, the entire site is located within Berkhamsted conservation area (Footnote 44: [http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/berkhamsted-conservation-area-boundary--updated-2015.pdf?sfvrsn=c310209e\\_4](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/berkhamsted-conservation-area-boundary--updated-2015.pdf?sfvrsn=c310209e_4) ). As noted in the Settlement Hierarchy report, Hemel Hempstead differs from the other settlements in respect of it being a planned ‘new town’ (Footnote 45 para 3.4.2, Settlement Hierarchy Study Main Report, October 2017), in contrast to the historic nature of Berkhamsted which dates back to the 10th Century (Footnote 46 <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berkhamsted> ), and thus all planned development for Hemel Hempstead should be retained and indeed new areas added should they be available.

Policy DM27 – Landscape Character and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – states that “all development shall help conserve, restore or enhance the prevailing quality, character and condition of Dacorum’s natural and historic landscape (Footnote 47 p114, Draft Local Plan)”. The Borough Council is unable to comply with this policy if the Bank Mill Lane site remains in the Local Plan. Within the key sensitivities outlined in the Local Plan related to the site, it says: “Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities: the key characteristics of Berkhamsted conservation area, primarily the setting of the Grand Union Canal (Footnote 48 p310, Draft Local Plan)”. As the whole site is in the conservation area, it is not possible for a development to mitigate this sensitivity; indeed, the way this section is written suggests it is not understood that the entire site is part of the conservation area.

Any development on this site would also compromise Policy DM43 – Historic Environment – which states that “Development proposals should preserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment of Dacorum” (Footnote 49: p150 Draft Local Plan). As set out in section 2 above, developing on this site will increase traffic flows in the historic centre of Berkhamsted and around the rail station which is adjacent to Berkhamsted Castle, dating back to 1066.

In the landscape sensitivity study of April 2020 (Footnote 50 P4, Part 2, Landscape Sensitivity Study), the site is ascribed a moderate-high susceptibility score regarding development character/edges and perception. Relative to other scores for other Berkhamsted growth areas, this suggests this site should be removed from the Draft Local Plan. Moreover, the Landscape Assessment of the Lower Bulbourne Valley (51:

[http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/landscapecharassess\\_f23\\_area118lowerbulbournevalley.pdf?sfvrsn=0](http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/landscapecharassess_f23_area118lowerbulbournevalley.pdf?sfvrsn=0) ) states that this area should be improved and conserved, and that a strategy should “limit built development” (Footnote 52:

[http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/landscapecharassess\\_f23\\_area118lowerbulbournevalley.pdf?sfvrsn=0](http://web.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/planning-development/landscapecharassess_f23_area118lowerbulbournevalley.pdf?sfvrsn=0) ).

There are three subsidiary points

- 1 The site is poorly located with regard to new retail development. The further dacorum retail study of June 2020 noted the new retail development at Gossoms End on the western side of the town and would not “advocate allocating for a large new foodstore in Berkhamsted at the current time” (Footnote 53 p58, Further Dacorum Retail Study, June 2020)
- 1 There is a risk of odour from Berkhamsted Sewage treatment works. This point is raised by the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan in relation to the proposed development at the South of Berkhamsted (Footnote 54 para 15.62, P117, Draft Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan, November 2020) but is likely more pertinent to the Bank Mill Lane site given its closer proximity to the works. The report states that further assessment is needed to ensure “that future occupiers would not be adversely affected by odour”.
- 1 The site was not included in the “site allocation 2006-2031 written statement” (Footnote 55 pp119-123 site allocations 2006-2031 written statement), which was adopted as recently as July 2017 after thorough analysis and met the housing target at the time. It follows that no site from the 2017 plan should be removed from the Draft Local Plan without first removing Bank Mill Lane.

In conclusion, the Draft Local Plan should be updated for the new Government Housing Need formula before progressing to Regulation 19 consultation and that, in the highly likely event that the housing need is reduced for dacorum, Bank Mill Lane should be removed from the Draft Local Plan as a result of the issues raised above.

Even if the Dacorum housing need is not reduced, the site should be removed from the Draft Local Plan given the site, at only c50 dwellings, creates less than 0.3% of the total housing supply for Dacorum and yet has significant issues attached; and moreover, it is technically not even needed to deliver against the pre-existing housing need which is 303 dwellings less than the current Draft Local Plan envisages being built.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	It is important to comment on a proposal by Thakeham to create Bulbourne Cross (Footnote 56 <a href="http://www.bulbournecross.co.uk">www.bulbournecross.co.uk</a> ). While this area does not currently feature in the draft local plan, the developer is arguing for its inclusion in place of other Berkhamsted developments.

It would be a serious misjudgement to add this site to the Draft Local Plan as all the arguments in section 1-3, 6, 7 and 8 in the response to question 5 apply but their impacts are even more extreme given this site would provide over 20 times the number homes of Bank Mill Lane or 22% more homes than Bank Mill Lane and the area south of Berkhamsted combined.

Critically, this proposal would join Berkhamsted with Bourne End in contravention to section 13 of the NFFP which stipulates two of the purposes of the Green Belt as being a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; and b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another (Footnote 57 [www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2) , para 134, p40).

This proposal should be rejected.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3798

**Person ID** 1263953

**Full Name** Nikki Sargento

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

I write to oppose the Bulbourne Cross development we totally disagree with this development due to more pollution to the area more traffic on the roads that are already too busy never mind all the other developments that are already going ahead in the area that will put pressure on the roads and lanes in the area. Then there's the issue of more green belt being built on and the lose of habit for all animals that live in these spaces. They seem to be trying to get round all of these issues by spouting that the development will be carbon neutral what a lot of bollocks if they think by ripping up



mature trees and plant some more in there place to become "carbon neutral" its rubbish don't cut down and distroy the environment to start with when it's not necessary. Has nobody learnt anything from Sir David Attenborough THE PLANET WILL NOT SURVIVE IT WE DO NOT TAKE ACTION!

Why are developers not looking outside the box especially when we have been through soo much in the last year which will change the world as we will never go back to how it was full stop and to be honest change is required as we cannot continue in the same glib way we have done in the past.

From this pandemic we need to learn and do things differently for example there is already a glut of empty office space which is only going to grow as company's look at doing things differently as we have proved remote working is very viable. Then there are the shops that were already standing empty and again even more will be standing empty over the next year as the highstreets that we know will not be required anymore, so why can these not be re purposed into homes or whatever else is required rather than destroying acres of green belt and the environment?

We just find the whole thing totally distasteful and unnecessary.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3809

**Person ID** 1263958

**Full Name** Stephen Marsh

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

I have also looked at the proposed Bulboure Cross development from BSGCA and Thakeham and largely for the above reasons I'm even more against this proposal. Specifically:

- 1 As per point 1 above this proposal erodes the green belt considerably more than the current draft plan and joins Berkhamsted and Bourne End up eroding the green belt around both settlements. It also leaves considerable space around the development and the two existing settlements and sets a precedence which will make it hard to argue against developers in the future wanting to build on these remaining spaces.
- 2 As per point 2 above this site is even further way from the station with no transport solution proposed and will drive up traffic through the town centre.
- 3 The proposed sport facilities are on the far south west edge of the development and a long way from where most people live in Berkhamsted. In fact the facilities are not even in Berkhamsted but Borne End. As such unlike the current sports facilities virtually everyone will have to drive there to use them including dropping off and picking up children (which generating double the number journeys per child). All this will also drive up traffic through the town.
- 4 As per point 4 above as far as I can tell there are no plans to locate large food shops, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, churches, restaurants, bars, public buildings etc on or near this development. So to access these facilities virtually all trips will be by car.
- 5 As per point 5 above with no or poor public transport this could leave a significant minority isolated.
- 6 The school and sports facilities are located in an exposed position, close to the busy A41 and service station, in the direction of the prevailing wind and with virtually no protection from trees or embankments. As such will suffer substantial noise and air pollution.
- 7 There are high voltage power lines crossing the site with seemingly no plans to reroute them, leaving a set of very unsightly, and at times noisy, pylons and cables cutting straight through a residential area. With some also arguing high voltage cables close to residential property can be damaging to health.
- 8 The proposal puts forward the developments separate junction to the A41 as an advantage. I disagree. Currently the route between Bourne End's residential area and the A41 junction (along with the industrial estate) is blocked off. I presume this has been done for a reason. This proposal would open up this access via the new housing estate connecting the A41 to the equally busy London Road. This is likely to create a cut through (ie a "Rat Run") straight through the new residential area for cars, delivery vans and potentially even HGV's.

I would ask you to **not** include the Bulboure Cross development in your plan and amend your plan to reflect my first seven points.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS3819

**Person ID** 1263962

**Full Name** Susie Alderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As above, that the number of houses is not realistic resulting in over-development on green belt land.</p> <p><b>(response to question 1)</b> As a resident in Berkhamsted I believe this plan imposes a massive over development on an already stressed environment, with severe implications for the integrity of the Green Belt and our status as an AONB. Our countryside is precious and finite and it is therefore critical that land is not lost to development unnecessarily.</p> <p>The plans propose an over development of protected green belt land, the Chiltern's AONB and the Chiltern's Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. The Council has an obligation to protect the AONB and its environs.</p> <p>The council does not appear to have used up to date figures to calculate housing need. Using the most recent official government projections, from 2018, should result in a housing need of around half of that currently proposed in the plan. Therefore a large area of green belt land would be destroyed un-necessarily.</p> <p>There do not appear to be evidence based carbon reduction targets mentioned and how the plan proposes to meet these.</p> <p>The plan does not appear to address the need for improvements in infrastructure which such a large scale plan would need e.g. traffic congestion and already stretched healthcare provision.</p> <p>Have brownfield sites been considered as an alternative, the government allows commercial and office space to be converted to residential, as well as adding additional storeys on top, without the need for planning permission. With recent changes brought about by Covid and Brexit these options should be looked at.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3827
<b>Person ID</b>	1263658
<b>Full Name</b>	Nicola Egerton-king

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Too much development planned in green belt. Too many extra houses for the town's roads. New residents will not all cycle.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3831
<b>Person ID</b>	1263975
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Fred Ferrier
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I would like to object to the proposal growth area Bk06: East of Dates Lane. 1. In places the sides of the valley are sensitive and potentially unstable. 2. The new school run will cause unacceptable congestion on narrow lanes which are already overburdened.

3. Threat to historic woodlands and loss of agricultural land.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS3832

Person ID 398904

Full Name Mr Paul Stananought

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

I refer to the above Plan which provides for some 1700 houses to be built on precious greenbelt Land off Shootersway, Kingshill Way and Chesham Road. I object most strongly to this proposal, on the following grounds.

This proposal has serious implications for Berkhamsted, our local Infrastructure, oversubscribed schools, worsening congestion, road safety, increased pollution and reduction in greenbelt land, all of which will have a detrimental affect on the quality of life for the residents of this charming market town.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3883
<b>Person ID</b>	1263994
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Selinger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	BTC leadership team Berkhamsted Theatre Company
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Ref BK12</b> <b>Berkhamsted Theatre Company</b></p> <p>BTC is a multi-award winning amateur theatre group providing an opportunity for the residents of the town and surrounding area to participate in the performing arts.</p> <p>BTC currently rent a converted commercial garage located behind the Civic Centre for use as a Workshop and store for Sets, Props and Costumes. We would like to see this replaced by similar facilities in any redevelopment.</p> <p>BTC would like to use the Civic Centre for their larger productions however the current performance space is not appropriately equipped so we use the Court Theatre in Tring.</p> <p>BTC would welcome the development of the performance space either as a modern fully equipped 160 to 200 seat theatre, or if this is not possible as a smaller more intimate well equipped venue of say 30 seats that could be used for small or experimental productions / comedy club / commercial hire etc. There are several other performing arts groups in the town who would want to take advantage of this development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3884
<b>Person ID</b>	1263982
<b>Full Name</b>	Lisa York
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I object to further housing
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3898
<b>Person ID</b>	1263998
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lara Dixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Berkhamsted and Tring have already been impacted by rapid housing development. This development cannot continue unhindered. The only people who will benefit will be the developers and their bank accounts. These towns sit within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the green spaces , open farmland and natural habitats in and round the towns are precious to the local population. The development plan does not minimise the impact on the Green belt or this AONB, in fact it appears to encourage its destruction.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Only brown field sites should be considered. I am in favour of the development of the piece of land off Billet Lane (next to Jewsons) in Berkhamsted. Developers should be using such pieces of land but tend not to do so, as it more cost effective and profitable to build on green field sites. The council should make developers use brown field sites and not consider green field sites in and around Berkhamsted and Tring.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3910
<b>Person ID</b>	1264012
<b>Full Name</b>	Michelle Gorrod
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	We disagree with the local plan to build over 2000 new houses in Berkhamsted off Shootersway, Kingshill Way & Chesham Road and for the football club to be moved outside of the town.



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3952
<b>Person ID</b>	1264025
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Sherwen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This is on valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS3984
<b>Person ID</b>	1264039

<b>Full Name</b>	David Hampton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK01: Land South of Berkhamsted Too few local jobs and facilities to support amount of residents proposed resulting in a strain on the community and commuting either by road or train. Damages beautiful countryside and the setting of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4002
<b>Person ID</b>	1261840
<b>Full Name</b>	Rachel Heath
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This is a very large development proposal which will have serious impact on the existing two schools. Currently the fields provide a buffer with the A 41 and have provided good walking during the pandemic. These ancient hedgerows, pathways and fields are good for wildlife - we have seen so many different birds and animals and they will disappear with building work. The roads down into town and to the A 41 junctions will become seriously congested at key times and there will be no alternative due to the linear nature of the town. Already pinch points at the top of Kings Road create major traffic delays during term time in particular so with increased housing at Haslam Field etc it will be problematic for cars exiting any new estate to join Shootersway. Pavements on Shootersway are very poor, narrow, beside large puddles on rainy days and incomplete after Durrants Lane making it unsafe to walk. (I try to walk to work to the Hospice from Hall Park end but that last bit is so dangerous). Extra cars will not make it any safer. More children walking to school will further be at risk. Berkhamsted will become a busy congested city, and will no longer be an historic market town.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4014
<b>Person ID</b>	1264044
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Groom
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Whilst I don't dispute the requirement for new homes in the area, I do question the volume and proposed locations.</p> <p>Current proposals would see a huge increase in traffic on busy roads / walkways &amp; an increased demand for services that are already in high demand.</p>

- The focus of the current proposals are almost entirely housing, with insufficient provision for schools, amenities & shops that the increased population will necessitate.
- Proposed access to the sites are via already congested, residential roads that will be unable to cope with the increase in traffic
- Commitments to the environment, technology & affordable housing are very questionable based on the detail in existing plans
- Alternative sites for development, such as those within the Bulbourne Cross plan, that provide one unified site with schools, facilities & direct access to A41 should be thoroughly examined

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The alternative Bulbourne Cross development should be thoroughly examined, given the unified site, school & amenity provision, direct access to A41
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4023
<b>Person ID</b>	1264050
<b>Full Name</b>	Denise Leahy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am commenting and opposed to specifically BK03 - BK04 - BK05 - BK06.

I am not opposed to new housing and appreciate the demand, but I oppose building on greenbelt with little or no mention of improved infrastructure.

The proposal fails to outline how any of these areas will be improved. There is already an issue with congestion, traffic and drainage on Shootersway and there is little evidence to disprove that this will only be hugely increased.

I am opposed to building on greenbelt land and next to ANOSB, when there is nearby Brownfield available to meet the demand for housing.

There is also no mention of new schools, despite primary schools in the town already at full capacity. As with secondary schools, how will Ashlyn' school deal with admissions.

Air and noise pollution has not been discussed despite a huge increase in congestion from Shootersway to Northchurch on what are small narrow roads with poor pedestrian paths.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4024

**Person ID** 1264056

**Full Name** Sarah Lines

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** Growth area BK01: Land South of Berkhamsted. I strongly disagree with this proposal echoing many of the comments here.

I personally think using brownfield sites should be the first priority before considering these greenbelt sites that are so important for our wildlife and mental health.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4040

**Person ID** 1264084

**Full Name** Martin Hyland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Growth Area Bk01

As a resident of Swing Gate Lane I do feel there are far too many houses being proposed and will, if approved, reduce the amount of green land that makes Berkhamsted what it is. I do have concerns around the Air Quality aspects as well as whether the infrastructure of Berkhamsted can cope with such a huge increase in housing.

I do think that such a huge increase will put a real strain on local facilities in Berkhamsted and Tring and will have a real negative effect on the environment.

I do think that more affordable housing is required and it is easy to classify everyone who objects as a NIMBY but we do need to recognise that Berkhamsted has a wonderful village feel which is great for bringing up our children and having a huge increase in housing will impact this.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4041
<b>Person ID</b>	1261199
<b>Full Name</b>	Will Bentley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>On the whole there should be a vastly reduced number of houses, taking into account the latest projections available from ONS for the borough as a whole and the guidance and provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>I understand that of the 2,236 houses proposed afor Berkhamseted pproximately 1700 are to be built on sites to the south (off Chesham Road) or to the southwest/west (off Shootersway and Kingshill Way). The impact that this will have on residents and the already stretched infrastructure, has clearly not been raised or suitably considered when the plan was developed, nor I fear the impact on the health and the safety of the residents, road users and pedestrians (including many school children).</p> <p>The plan shows that Shootersway/Kingshill is to become the prime access point for an additional 830 dwellings. This is in addition to the c180 houses built or being built through phases 1 and 2 of Bearroc Park. Traffic regularly back up along these roads from the A41 as far as Shootersway Park – some ¾ of a mile – and this is before the impact of Bearroc Park (Phase 2) is known.</p> <p>The sites proposed in Berkhamsted West are, as I am sure you are aware, too far to walk to the Station or centre of town, nor are they on (or have easy access to) public transport routes and thus are actively encouraging the use of private cars. Further, three of the four main routes into town (Darr’s Lane, Bell Lane and Cross Oak Road) are, at some</p>

point, single lane further adding to the congestion and by association, pollution in the area. Many of the proposed sites back on to the A41 and would suffer significant traffic noise and pollution making them a fairly undesirable place to live. These plans, as you can see, are wholly unworkable and must be contrary to the health, environmental and green consideration any planning and development should align with.

I recognise that Berkhamsted and Dacorum as a whole has an obligation to contribute to the UK's housing need. I am not suggesting no housing should be built but I would urge a more equitable distribution of housing delivery across Berkhamsted to areas that are equally, if not more, suitable than those in Dacorum's plan (see next question for specifics)

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>To reiterate the overall number of houses included in the plan, and for Berkhamsted is disproportionate to the identified needs based on the most recent government information and should be reconsidered as a whole, however some housing will need to be buld in Berkhamsted but this should be more equitably located and make better use of existing infrastrcutre, for example (and my apologies as I do not have access to tools that allow me to provide a RED Line Boundary Map - (its a rediculous ask - who does!)) to proportionally allocate a reduced volume of housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• East – East of Swing Gate Lane along London Road: great connections to the A41 at Bourne End and on existing public transport routes to Berkhamsted Town Centre and the station</li> <li>• West – to NorthChurch and Dudswell: great connections to the A41 at Wiggington along the A4521 and on existing public transport routes to Berkhamsted Town Centre and the station</li> <li>• North – (the more affluent area of Berkhamsted which I note is entirely absent from Dacorum's plan!) along Ivy House Lane: walkable to the Town Centre with great proximity to the station</li> </ul> <p>This would not only deliver a greater choice to residents and future residents on where they can live, but more equitably distributes the impact on services, roads and other infrastructure, and in many instances reduces this impact by making greater use of existing infrastructure and public services.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4045
<b>Person ID</b>	1263438
<b>Full Name</b>	Angelika Goff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 to 05, plus 08:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- You cannot seriously expect that people will walk or cycle between these new sites and the main amenities in town, it is too far, and too steep esp. if you consider people may also carry shopping, have small kids or have limited mobility. You have not provided any credible plan on how this significant volume of new inhabitants making use of town amenities is meant to reduce journeys, or what concrete plans you have for a competitive and eco-friendly public transport. On the contrary, the volume of housing planned for this site will significantly increase car journeys into town, further congesting an already overcrowded road network (which cannot really be extended), leading to further harmful emissions and the associated risk to all our health and lives.</li> <li>- Your commitment to social &amp; community is more than vague - a retail unit, including what exactly? And there is more to community life than that. What are your provisions for older people? Medical facilities? Play areas for children? You will have to offer a lot more if you are serious about making this an actual community, rather than just another satellite town where everyone will drive into the town centre for shopping, leisure, health, social life etc.</li> <li>- Due to the hugely inflated housing target, you are proposing to concrete over most of the green open spaces between Berkhamsted and the A41. If the housing target was more in line with actual prediction, some of these spaces would be retained - which should be a priority for you, given the importance of green spaces to our physical and mental wellbeing, not to mention the environment.</li> <li>- Given the location of these sites, and the latest examples of extensive development across town, I have serious reservations that this will indeed deliver the type of housing required, esp. genuinely affordable housing. The housing built in similar sites recently seems to mainly be exec homes in the mid/high 6-figure, if not 7-figure price range - hardly affordable housing.</li> </ul> <p>These new sites IMO contribute nothing to your strategy - and therefore should be rejected, or at least the housing planned here should be significantly reduced, in line with actually projected need.</p> <p>"new development will need to be located in places which have excellent access to jobs, shops, services, can quickly and easily be reached by sustainable public transport and benefit from high quality walking and cycling infrastructure. Even where journeys are made by sustainable methods it is important to minimise journey lengths, reducing demand on transport infrastructure and delivering greater health and wellbeing."</p> <p>Esp. on the last part - 'minimising journey lengths, reducing demand on transport infrastructure' is exactly what you are NOT doing with these new sites.</p>

I should be interested to know what our legal options are given DBC's apparent disregard to our health & wellbeing, given harmful submission have been proven to cause excess and premature deaths.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4046

**Person ID** 1264129

**Full Name** Paul MacCarthy

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** Bk01 - I would like my adjoining land included within the site, it abuts the road access and if not included would create pockets of land unable for sensitive development due to the Green Belt designation, whilst all around is or has been developed.

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment** I assume the parcels of land i have suggested would be added to Bk01 if agreed, however if this have to be considered on their own, i have attached them to this section also

**Included files** [Schedule of site appraisal proforma Completed 02.24 \(2\).pdf](#)  
[Schedule of site appraisal proforma Completed 02.24 \(2\).pdf \(1\)](#)

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4052
<b>Person ID</b>	1207786
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Sites in General</b></p> <p>Most of the sites are on Greenbelt land and no exceptional reasons with supporting evidence for release for development have been provided</p> <p>During the preparation of the Core strategy (2013) the land between the A41 and the town was regarded as a “ green lung” for the town, absorbing emissions and noise from the A41 and protecting the town. Now it seems it’s OK for people to absorb the pollution and put up with noise.</p> <p>Wildlife corridors are to be provided, on all sites, giving access to where? - the next wildlife corridor? Given the contiguous nature of the Shootersway sites, from the cemetery to Rossway and Darrs Lane where is the displaced wildlife supposed to go, given there are no open fields left? Are tunnels under the A41 to give access to the fields on the other side being considered? There are certainly Badger setts on the Rossway /Blegberry sites.</p> <p>I note the statements about delivering a net gain in biodiversity – How does that work, when destruction of massive areas of Greenbelt and ancient hedgerows is proposed with only token areas of public open space and wild life corridors remaining</p> <p>Shootersway is an ancient way, with equally ancient hedges supporting massive biodiversity along its edges, with particularly in the vicinity of the Darrs Lane and Rossway sites . No commitment is given to the preservation of these hedges, in fact their destruction in part is inevitable with access to sites proposed from Shootersway.</p> <p>It’s difficult to comment on the green space provision on the sites, since. I understand the hectarage figures provided are simply formula based and may bear no relation to the actual provision.</p> <p>I have walked all the sites, to which there is access and given their proximity to the A41 it should be noted that the traffic noise and emissions will have significant impact on the amenity of properties built there. There is cursory mention of mitigation measures, with no detail in the plan.</p>

I have great concerns about the impact on Shootersway, particularly in rush hours, not only from the amount traffic generated from the dwellings, but from the number of access points onto Shootersway, in a relatively small area with traffic attempting to feed into, in normal times, a line of stationary traffic from Kings Road to beyond Crossoak Road, crossing oncoming traffic from Kingshill Way/Kings Road.

I would also mention the Core Strategy assertion that “*The open valley sides and ridge top locations are especially sensitive to new building and development in these locations will not be supported*” appears to have been dumped, simply to provide unsupportable housing Numbers.

Statements that

“*Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate landscape sensitivities*” are again just ineffective words, as evidenced by the current development at Bearroc 2.

## **Sites**

### **Bk01 South Berkhamsted.**

This site was rejected in 2013 – there is even a video of Mr Doe explaining DBC’s reasons for its rejection. Those reasons are still valid, but appear to have been overridden by the desire to meet the housing numbers handed down from government. This does not constitute the exceptional reason required to release Greenbelt Land for development. There would be an inevitable impact on Swing Gate Lane, a residential road which would be the logical access road into the town (despite its designation as a secondary access road) avoiding the town centre traffic lights.

### **Bk02 BFI**

Presumably BFI have put forward this site as they plan to move.

Comments as per general comments above

Unsustainable site because of local topography and distance from the town centre

Loss of employment

Building in the vicinity of a listed building should not only not detract from a listed building but should actually enhance it. Not really possible with the development proposed.

### **Bk03 Haslam Field**

Comments as in General Comments above

I understand this was gifted to the school in perpetuity for sports facilities. No doubt the school has found ways round this.

School playing fields are counted as open space in a town already short on this, and losing green space within the town for space outside the town (Haresfoot) away from the public eye and accessible only via a busy road without a footpath should not be an acceptable alternative. If the school no longer require this facility, perhaps it could be used to provide similar sports facilities to those proposed on the Bulbourne Cross development. Making facilities available to the town, and retaining the "green space" would also addresss Berkhamsted School’s charitable obligations.

Unsustainable site because of local topography and distance from the town centre

A cycle link to the town is proposed this is not in the STS. There are no safe cycle routes from Shootersway to the Town Centre due to the topography, volume of traffic and narrow roads.

#### **BK04 Behind Hanburys**

Unsustainable site because of local topography and distance from the town centre  
Comments as in general comments above

#### **BK05 Blegberry**

Comments as in general comments above.  
Unsustainable site because of local topography and distance from the town centre

If this site is to connect into the main sewer on Shootersway, the sloping nature of the site means sewage will need to be pumped, with the associated problems already experienced on similar sites in the same area.

#### **BK06 Darrs Lane Northchurch**

Comments as General Comments above

Unsustainable site because of local topography and distance from the town centre  
Will severely impact the village of Northchurch, which has 1 shop and limited parking.

Will cause coalescence between Northchurch and Berkhamsted – I note that the plan as already accepts this, calling the village of Northchurch West Berkhamsted . The primary reason for Greenbelt in the NPPF is to prevent coalescence of settlements – there is therefore no justification for the development of this site.

It will destroy the the view from the AONB across the valley and from New Road

The statement that the proposed park is a SANG – a destination to mitigate against public use of Ashridge and the Chiltern Beech woods is ludicrous, if the formula based size 0.36 ha in the IDP has any validity.

The existing small recreation area in Northchurch is 1.1 ha and is hardly an alternative destination to 2,226ha of Ashridge, and the proposed park is only 1/3 of that

The STS proposes no interventions on Darrs Lane, a narrow road, stretches of which are one way, even though as a direct access route the local shop with post office and cashpoint, the Chippy, St Mary's school, and Church, the George and Dragkn Pub and to Tring (Tesco), traffic will inevitably increase substantially with the build out of this site.

No protection is proposed for Bell Lane also adjacent to the site, and a narrow ancient sunken way currently little used by traffic. This has been mooted by locals as a possible cycle/pedestrian only route, south of the housing at the bottom - could consideration be given to this?

#### **Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch**

The Transport Study interventions to New Road to mitigate the impact of this site, are a nonsense given the narrowness of the road, with narrow/no pavements and gardens right up to the footpath edge. The impact on St Mary's school and the many children who walk down the narrow footpath to the school should not be overlooked.

New road is a dangerous narrow road where traffic travels too fast down the hill, past this site, with frequent accidents and often gridlock caused by parked cars and delivery vehicles. There are numerous reports of pedestrians being hit by

wing mirrors, because of the narrowness of the pavement, and it's virtually impossible for a child and parent to walk side by side.

This is a particularly stupid site for development and is currently a valuable wild life site which it would be a shame to lose for a development which would add to the danger of the road and have low amenity value for residents due to the proximity of the West Coast Line with over 200 trains per day

<https://www.realtimetrains.co.uk/search/detailed/BKM/2021-02-21/0000-2359?stp=WVS&show=all&order=wt>

### **BK08Rossway**

Comments as per general comments above

Particularly ridiculous to call this a sustainable site. None of the town's facilities or station are remotely accessible except by car.

### **Bk09Bank Mill Lane**

Green Belt and at the entrance to the town

The Bulbourne a rare chalk stream crosses the length of this site E -W and care must be taken to avoid its damage or pollution

I welcome Policy DM62 to protect waterways, avoid culverting, and to maintaining a 10m clear zone either side of the stream, though it is difficult to understand how pollution of the waterway during build out could be avoided. Presumably Road and foot bridges over the Bulbourne would also be required, to ensure connectivity within the site.

The area is prone to flooding

Train noise will be an issue for residents due to its proximity to the West Coast Line

### **BK10 Hanburys**

This proposal has already been superseded by events. The Masterplan has again been ignored, and a proposal for 103 extra care apartments has been recommended for approval. Taken with the approval of 17 flats on the adjacent site – 80 of the Windfall target of 200pa for the Borough and 217for Berkhamsted over the period of the plan will have been reached before the plan is even adopted.

### **Bk11 Sarthe Business Park**

A site of great value to the community for the employment and services it provides. Whilst undoubtedly a more sustainable site than the others proposed due to its location on the valley floor, within walking distance of the town centre, station, sports facilities and surgery, there is no way that it should be developed for housing, with the loss of small businesses serving the community and the employment opportunities that exist there. ( I note that the plan whilst proposing > 2200 dwellings proposes no new employment provision)

### **Bk12Civic Centre**

Similar comments to those on BK 11 with the addition of the likely loss of a much used public amenity. There may an opportunity for some development, but existing businesses and facilities should not be lost.

### **BK13 Gossoms End**

I understand that this site has now been sold, having been given planning permission for a supermarket 6 years ago. The plan suggests another supermarket is required, but presumably this is now not guaranteed on this site. If this is so, this would be a sustainable brownfield site for residential development, being on the valley floor within walking distance of the town centre, station, sports facilities and surgery.

No alternative site for a supermarket is proposed.

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

I would prefer that DBC challenged the housing numbers, but if we are stuck with these high numbers, I would wish the Bulbourne Cross development to be reconsidered as an alternative to the proposed developments along Shootersway.

The proposal offers truly sustainable housing, and build, and community benefits not offered by any other site. It will undoubtedly generate additional traffic but so will all the sites and I believe this would have less impact on Berkhamsted.

- A new access to the A41 would keep commuter traffic out of the town
- Access to the Town Centre, Station, Waitrose and Parking can be reached via the Water Lane Carpark, without adding to the congestion at the High Street/ Kings Road junction
- There maybe less traffic to the station if people choose to go to Hemel Station where tickets are cheaper and there are more trains
- It would not add to the rush hour gridlock on Shootersway/ Kings road as the proposed developments will.
- The proposed “ country park” alongside the canal with parking close by, may well alleviate some of the pressure on Ashridge and the Chiltern Beech woods(SANG) – which cannot be said for the proposed “open spaces” in the smaller developments.
- A built primary school not just land made available, and contribution to a secondary school in W Berkhamsted.
- The downside is it’s a large area of Greenbelt – but all the proposed developments are on Greenbelt, and the “Shootersway sites” currently offer the town some protection from A41 pollution. The Green Belt in question is currently farm land, so not a strong area in terms of biodiversity. It also coalesces the town with Bourne End ( albeit with the proposed pitches not housing) and Bourne End Residents may not be comfortable with this.
- It is an opportunity to have the type of development that all developments should be. A mixed community rather than just housing.
- Sustainable homes, sustainably built, to standards in excess of those proposed by DBCs to address the climate emergency, including 40% affordable, with significant benefits for the whole town. I would hate to see this dismissed only for it to come back in 5 years time as the standard Taylor Wimpey type development, as with BK01.
- If you would like to check out their Pease Pottage site (and a smaller site with a similar ethos) the planning application is Mid Sussex DM/15/4711. They seem to have provided the community benefits to which they committed

For what it's worth Thakeham have given assurances in an email that they do not promote and then sell on sites – they build out themselves, but at the same time I have some concerns over their ability to build out a site of this size - given 600 is their largest site to date and their build rate is about 300 pa ( Director's report in their accounts). They are also now seeking to develop numerous other large sites eg 3000+ in the Oxford/Cambridge arc  
I still believe their proposal merits further consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4057

**Person ID** 1264163

**Full Name** Richard Stevens

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** BK08,BK05,BK03,BK02 Whilst there is certainly some space for new builds in these areas, in addition the new housing that has already been completed on Shooterway this year, but the numbers mentioned in this proposal seem extreme and would create a huge amount of traffic (along with the assoicated pollution and safty issues) on Shootersway and Kings Road.  
Both of these can be fairly busy roads and they both have one or more schools on them which are chaotic during school drop off time, with traffic and children arriving by foot.  
I do note their is a comment to improve infrastructure to support the extra traffic, but it is hard to see how this could be effectively implimented.  
Although not specifically related to these proposals, the increased traffic would have an impact on the approach to Berkhamsted station and the limited parking there.  
So while we accept at least some of these areas are needed we do question the numbers and the density of the dwellings in this proposal.

**Yes / No**



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4112
<b>Person ID</b>	488120
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs J Toon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk01 - Bk12: I object to these site proposals on the basis that the housing allocation numbers set by Central Government are wrong. They have been produced using projections from 2014, which has resulted in a higher number of houses proposed for Dacorum than previous calculations with more recent projections. Therefore these numbers do not accurately reflect future housing needs and need to be revised.</p> <p>These proposals also contradict point 23.102 that growth will be transport/accessibility-led and upgrade local infrastructure and increase capacity. None of these sites take into account the local road network to the amenities and all of them decrease capacity, rather than increase it. The only infrastructure that seems to have been considered is schools. The proposed parks are only a token replacement for the existing green spaces the developments would take away.</p> <p>I also object on the basis that these proposals are not in line with the following Local Plan Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mitigating and adapting to climate change: Section 23 notes that Berkhamsted is suitable because of its railway and road links and vibrant town centre, which, it notes, are situated on the valley floor. However, most of these sites are on top of the long, steep hills so that car use to reach the amenities of the town would increase immensely. This would mean more pollution and reduction of air quality for existing residents.</li> <li>- Conserving and protecting the environment: The majority of these developments have been planned for Green Belt land, which would be lost forever, along with numerous plant and animal species currently living there.</li> </ul>

- Ensuring an attractive built and historic environment: The proposals would change the character of Berkhamsted forever and would take away much of what makes the town attractive at present. The proposals also destroy the village character of historic Northchurch.

- Promoting and facilitating sustainable transport and connectivity: Since the majority of and the largest developments are proposed for areas that are realistically only accessible by car, transport links are not sustainable. There is no mention of cycle lanes or improving pavements even where that is possible. It will also make congestion in and around Northchurch and Berkhamsted worse. We live in Northchurch and currently drive up to Shootersway to reach the A41, as the High Street is frequently already congested. Almost all these developments are expected to use Shootersway as their primary access road, which will make the road congested too and will result in us having to find alternative routes and increase our journey time. This will also impact on our wellbeing as residents and will be worse for the environment.

Both Berkhamsted and Northchurch have a historic core along their most important transport routes so that there is no scope to widen the roads to allow for cycle lanes. That's why these developments are not compatible with this objective.

- Supporting community health, wellbeing and cohesion: Increasing traffic and pollution in Berkhamsted and Northchurch, building on the green belt, destroying the village character of Northchurch and wonderful nature that surrounds the village and with that opportunities to enjoy nature and the outdoors, will worsen all of these things for residents.

- Enabling the delivery of infrastructure: The proposed infrastructure improvements are inadequate. There is no mention of improving the local road network (which is not always possible anyhow), more parking spaces in Berkhamsted, doctor's surgeries to support the developments.

My specific objections are as follows:

Bk01: I object to this proposal because there is insufficient access from this site to Berkhamsted town centre and this site contravenes all the objectives mentioned above. Chesham Road is partly a one-way street, providing access only FROM the High Street and only halfway down FROM the development. It also leads past Ashlyns secondary school. As a parent of children at the school I know that it is a single-track road at school drop-off and collection times resulting in traffic queues in both directions. Part access TO the High Street would be via Hilltop Road, which is residential and has several traffic-calming islands - it does not have the potential to take a potential additional 1700 cars and neither is it meant to.

Swing Gate Lane on the other side has similar issues. It is a fairly narrow road, has cars parked on it from existing houses and leads past two primary schools with the same issues as above. It is simply not capable of taking the amount of traffic this site would bring.

Bk06: I object to this site as it contravenes all the objectives I mentioned above. This large number of houses would destroy the village character of Northchurch instead of preserving this historic and attractive village (the proposal is wrong to state that this is an urban development - most of the land is behind Granville Road, which is part of Northchurch village).

It would also destroy a large amount of green belt irrevocably, which completely goes against the objective of preserving the environment. Opportunities for walking, enjoying nature, the views of the green hills surrounding us would be lost. All of these things would have a detrimental impact on the wellbeing and the health of Northchurch residents, which also contradicts an objective of the Plan.

Again, the Plan completely fails to take into account the local road infrastructure and fails on the transport objective. Primary access is supposed to be from Shootersway, however it unrealistic to assume that people would take this route when trying to access the railway station or the town's amenities. Also given all the existing new developments and the ones in the Local Plan that are supposed to use Shootersway as their primary route, Shootersway, which is a 30mph residential road, will be congested with the amount of traffic generated from all these sites and people will try to use other roads, such as Darrs Lane and Bell Lane.

Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are called 'lane' for a reason: they are rural lanes, very narrow and single track in some areas. On Darrs Lane, cars driving up the hill frequently have to reverse halfway down the hill to give way to a car coming from the top, which they couldn't see due to bends in the road. Bell Lane doesn't actually provide access to the High Street, cars will have to either go left on Granville Road, which is single track thanks to the cars parked there or right on Westfield Road, which is also fairly parked up by residents and cannot sustain so much additional traffic. Both these roads are completely unsuitable for the amount of traffic the new development plus a school would bring.

Both Darrs Lane and Bell Lane also lack pavements for the parts further up the hill so it is not realistic to expect people to walk. Cycling is only for the fittest, as both are steep hills. This does not align with the environmental objective of the Plan either. The families with small children and older people who are expected to move into these new houses would definitely drive.

Widening these lanes, which is not specifically mentioned in the Plan, would result in ancient hedgerows and the habitats of numerous species to be lost, which goes against the environmental objective.

Bk07: I object to this proposed site again. As residents we objected when it was first proposed and the circumstances have not changed. This site is completely unsuitable as the primary access road, New Road, cannot take the additional traffic of potentially 120 cars, which goes against the sustainable transport objective. New Road is a fairly narrow rural road (cars frequently drive on the pavement to avoid oncoming cars). It has a pavement only on one side, the opposite side of the proposed site. The pavement is only wide enough for one person to walk on, badly maintained and therefore dangerous. Cars approach from Ashridge with considerable speed. Cars going towards Ashridge speed up after the bridge. There have been 4 accidents on that stretch of New Road in the past 4 months. Existing residents have been struck by passing cars when walking down the pavement and many do not walk their children to school down that road as they deem it too dangerous.

The bridge across the canal is single-track, historic and cannot be widened, which not only cannot sustain the additional traffic from the proposed site but is also the reason New Road frequently turns into a single track with bad visibility when cars park there near the bridge. Congestion queues can go back into Ashridge. The extra pollution and the increased danger from the vastly increased traffic would result in loss of quality of life for us residents and contravenes the environmental and wellbeing objectives.

Residents of the proposed site would go into Berkhamsted or Tring via the High Street and this would take them past St. Mary's primary school. Thanks to existing housing around the school and parking issues, adding up to 120 cars from the site would increase road dangers and pollution for residents, children and parents.

While cycling should be encouraged it is only possible along the canal, as Northchurch High Street is too narrow and cannot be widened for cycle lanes. A cyclist on the narrow High Street will hold up traffic behind him, which increases pollution and danger for road users and residents along the road. Therefore cycle lanes along the main transport route are not a realistic proposal.

Furthermore, this site proposal does not comply with the objective to preserve the environment. Local scientists have found the site is home to numerous animal and plant species, which would all lose their habitat.

Lastly, this side of the canal and this part of Northchurch village is very rural and quiet. We have deer and badgers going through our gardens. Adding a further 60 houses would impact badly on this part of the village and change the character of it. As residents, our quality of life and also our health and wellbeing would be impacted adversely by the change in our neighbourhood, as well as the increase in traffic caused by it.

Bk13: I approve of this site because it has been derelict and unused for years. We were promised a Lidl but it was never built. This side of town could do with a supermarket, especially a budget one, as the next Aldi/Lidl is a 20-minute drive away and many people could walk to this one instead of driving to Waitrose or Tesco, which would have a positive impact on pollution. This would indeed align with some Plan objectives.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4114

**Person ID** 1264243

**Full Name** Howard Smith

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The amount of new building appears disproportionate with the ONS 2018 housing requirement figures and is based instead on the 2014 figures. A less than rigorous reevaluation of work already carried out has resulted in an fudge of figures to justify the destruction of large swathes of green belt area. The amount of such greenfield development is disconcerting considering the amount of brownfield sites in the area. Increasing density on existing communities rather than developing alternative sites clearly brings us to an amalgamation of areas - Kings Langley merging with Hemel Hempstead merging with Berkhamsted. It is interesting that the specification of amenities being provided in the new developments contains the word "should" in regard to propose enhancements of amenities, rather than 'must'. Local services such as healthcare are under enormous strain as things currently stand. No binding requirement for developers to provide new facilities will clearly place unsustainable pressure on facilities and, as past history in the Dacorum area and other regions have shown us, the value that developers hold on maintaining their responsibilities versus the profit that can be made is not an equitable one.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4151
<b>Person ID</b>	1264210
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	myself
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264200
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Fiona Fulford
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	How can the outlined 'delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' be possible when wildlife corridors will be removed and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants. In addition if the Thakenham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.  It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The area utilised should be reduced as this number of houses is not required
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4234
<b>Person ID</b>	1264269
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul de Hoest
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Numerous local groups have commented on this consultation including Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG), Berkhamsted Citizens Association, CPRE, Chiltern Society, Berkhamsted Town Council, Dacorum Green Party, Berkhamsted and Tring Labour Party to name a few. <b>I agree with the stance taken by all of these groups.</b> The fact that all these (and there will be others) are providing the same substantive message from the local population to you should demonstrate that these proposals do not have the support of the people. I do not propose to add to your reading burden by rehashing all of their points but I do make the following observations.

- 1 Green Belt: This plan inflicts a 25% increase in housing for Northchurch and Berkhamsted: 2250 homes of which 1750 are on existing Green Belt land (78%).

Various Governments have made numerous statements in support of the protection to our precious Green Belt over the years. As recently as December 16th 2020 this Government, in a published a response to the recent white paper consultations stated, with reference to protected landscapes and Green Belt, "We should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places." This draft plan makes a mockery of such statements as the growth in homes across the borough is driven entirely by a national target that bears no relation to actual local need, topography or infrastructure.

The National Planning Policy Framework (19 February 2019) (NPPF) states: "The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (Paragraph 133 NPPF)." Releasing Green Belt land on the scale envisaged in this draft plan ought to be difficult to justify since paragraph 136 of the NPPF is totally clear that: "Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans." The "exceptional circumstances" that could justify release of Green Belt land on such a scale are simply not evidenced in these documents.

- 1 Character: the town is recognised for its charm and character. The 2013 Core Strategy affirmed the Borough's commitment to maintaining the unique linear valley configuration of the town and recognised the importance of preserving the ridge skyline. Most of the sites chosen are on the southern ridge above Northchurch and Berkhamsted thus renegeing on that commitment and creating a massive urban sprawl that fundamentally would alter the character of the town.
- 1 Connectivity: It is already acknowledged that the town centre is prone to excessive congestion. These new homes are predominantly sited over a mile away from the town up the steep valley sides. There seems to be no acknowledgement that the associated additional traffic flow cannot be accommodated. There is no scope for widening roads to facilitate traffic flow and the main cross roads in the centre of town is already at logjam for much of the day (outside of Covid restrictions). There are no bespoke cycle ways in Berkhamsted and the existing footpaths that could connect these sites to the central hub were constructed as narrow high sided gloomy corridors.
- 1 Environmental damage: the Green Belt is not just a "nice to have" or just a route for people to pass through. Important as these things are the Green Belt is also a thriving mature habitat for vegetation, animal life and water retention. Destroying this natural environment cannot be replaced by planting a few trees somewhere else. Natural habitats have evolved over centuries and cannot be manufactured anew elsewhere. The soils are a valuable

source of water retention that prevents flooding down into the town but also allows the water to seep through the layers to replenish in part the aquifers upon which we rely for water.

- 1 Water and sewage: there are already water shortages in the area and the River Bulbourne chalk stream is now regularly prone to drying up, again destroying generations of natural habitat. The water companies can only supply the necessary water by degrading these amenities further. Until a national water network is developed so that water from plentiful areas can be moved cross country to areas of water shortage this fact alone should prevent building on this scale.
  
- 1 Employment: the plan is completely out of balance. 2250 new homes requires 4000 new jobs. Where are these jobs to be found in this plan? Almost none in Berkhamsted and in fact the Jewsons industrial estate is to be repurposed for residential housing. Despite some likely post-covid increase in home working these developments will create even greater traffic flow as people drive either to the A41 or through the centre of town to Tring, Hemel Hemstead or cross town to the station. This makes a mockery of the sustainable communities pledge in the strategy guidance documents of last year. It also guarantees further increases in CO2 emissions thus undermining the climate emergency pledges made.
  
- 1 Medical and Social Care: Despite the addition of an expected 6,000 people there are no plans to increase the already overstretched medical, dental and social care facilities.
  
- 1 Recreational provision: not only does the filling in of all this Green Belt land mean that for the existing residents pedestrian access to reach natural countryside but there is little commitment in this plan to maintaining high quality access and green corridors. There is no commitment to increased parkland provision - considered essential for child development and mental well being. There is a shortage of sports pitch provision and despite the release of Haslam Fields, currently a sports field owned by Berkhamsted School, no additional provision is provided.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4282
<b>Person ID</b>	1264327
<b>Full Name</b>	MATTHEW GITSHAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Concern regarding increased traffic congestion and road safety.</b> Regarding the proposed developments for Northchurch in particular, the Lock Field development would lead to increased congestion and road safety concerns at the New Road canal bridge and entrance to Southbank Road, around St Mary's School, at the junction between New Road and the High Street, and also further up New Road towards Northchurch Common, where speeding on the straight road is already a problem. These areas are all used as routes to school by local children. The proposed development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes, and around Shootersway, will also lead to increased traffic congestion and road safety concerns.</p> <p><b>Concern regarding harm to local rural character.</b> Regarding the proposed developments for Northchurch in particular, the proposed scale of housing development will harm the rural and small-scale village feel of Northchurch village. Building on Green Belt land will remove rural land from our village, the scale of proposed new houses will harm the small-scale village feel of Northchurch village, and the increased traffic will also harm the village environment – but widening roads to address increased traffic would harm the village feel of the single track country lanes. The New Road single-track canal bridge is listed and contributes to the beauty and historic village feel of Northchurch, and so could not be widened, yet building 60 new houses next to this bridge will inevitably lead to significant increased congestion and road safety concerns in areas regularly used as routes to school by local children.</p> <p><b>Concern regarding failure to address climate emergency and biodiversity emergency.</b> Dacorum Borough Council has rightly declared a climate emergency, but the proposed development prioritises economic growth and greenfield land development over addressing the climate emergency and biodiversity emergency. A carbon reduction plan or pathway (required to meet the current national climate obligations of net zero by 2050) should underpin and guide any proposed housing development, but that has not occurred here – this work should be done and inform revised proposals. I am concerned about the impact of the Lock Field and Darrs-Durrants Lanes developments on local biodiversity. I am also concerned about the flood risk at the proposed Lock Field development.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4339
<b>Person ID</b>	1264321
<b>Full Name</b>	David` Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	personal
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264318
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	David Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.</p> <p>It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4366
<b>Person ID</b>	1262873
<b>Full Name</b>	Donna Atkinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposed site in Northchurch, Darrs Lane, will completely change the entire feel of the village. Northchurch is a village very separate to Berkhamsted and this development will merge the two places together, having a detrimental effect on the environment and community.</p> <p>In Northchurch and Berkhamsted we are close to the A41, particularly at the top of Darrs Lane and rely on the green spaces to act as a buffer from the already very busy road.</p> <p>As a young family we enjoy country walks in our nearest green spaces and the proposal to develop the Green Belt land around the houses at the top of Darrs Lane, would completely change the landscape and we would be very concerned about the increased level of traffic. Darrs Lane is a small country lane and would be ill prepared for the proposed development, it is already struggling to cope with current usage and would not sustain the increase in use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4377
<b>Person ID</b>	1152050

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Christopher Talbot-Ponsonby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>1. The Thakeham Bulbourne Cross proposal must not be considered or included. This stretch of Green Belt land extends up to Bourne End and is part of the London Green Belt to ensure that there are sufficient rings of open space around London.</p> <p>2. The proposed increase sports facilities, replacing that at Broadwater, would mean that transport would have to be used to get there. This is particularly so, as many of the existing users are young and would be unable to get there by themselves.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4385
<b>Person ID</b>	1264349
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHEN BARTH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to your green belt development proposals. All development should be in brown field sites.</p> <p>My objections to the proposals for Berkhamsted are below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The sites along the A41 will put a huge amount of traffic along Shooters Way and make the junction with Kings Rd overloaded.</li> <li>1 The Town's utilities will not be able to cope. The water supply is insufficient. The sewage system will not be able to cope and result in the risk of pollution to our water table.</li> <li>2 The footpath on Kings Road, which will carry all the walkers into town is unsafe at the upper part and needs to be widened.</li> <li>3 The town centre can not cope with the increased congestion</li> <li>5. The GP services can not supply a good service at present. We have one of the worst provision of medical services in the country. They will not be able to cope with the increase in population</li> <li>6. The schools will not be able to cope. Secondary Pupils have to leave the town already. Where will the children from these developments go to school?</li> <li>4 The traffic in the rush hours will be terrible.</li> <li>5 The over increase in national housing should be in the North East and North West where there is demand</li> <li>9. There is no conclusive evidence of any shortage of supply in Dacorum or Berkhamsted over the current plans.</li> <li>6 No exceptional reasons have been shown for developing the green belt as required by the Law.</li> <li>7 There is no public transport for the A41 sites, so there will be a huge increase in traffic and air pollution and traffic accidents.</li> <li>8 There is no employment need for these residents, so they will be commuters. This proves that there is no need for the housing here! And further, The trains are already overcrowded and parking at the station overloaded</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4392
<b>Person ID</b>	1262218
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Phethean
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am a new(ish) resident to Dacorum having moved here in 2017. Should the following plan for growth stretch until 2038, I will be 60 years old by the end of the period and my children will be 29 and 27.</p> <p>Of course, everyone will report on the issues which affect them. For me, it is very much about infrastructure. Having moved from a village where housing grew exponentially in the ten years we were there, I saw the effect that an increase in population had on the number of cars, the pollution, the parking, the strain on services and the local schools. I also noticed an increase in flooding partly due to the removal of trees and increase in impermeable driveways.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a lovely market town. Building on the outskirts will increase the traffic to the centre, pollution will rise. The UK has just registered the first death from pollution and by widening the town you will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) increase the traffic driving into the centre because its too far to walk</li> <li>2) Increase pollution levels by building on the green land between A41 and town designed to mitigate this</li> <li>3) increase the need to drive to local schools by not providing any in the vicinity of the new housing</li> </ol> <p><b>How is this "mitigating and adapting to climate change"?</b></p> <p>It is important that education is effectively planned for. It is absolutely not acceptable to say "whilst we do not directly provide healthcare and education facilities". It is my view that you absolutely have a responsibility to create space for schools, dentists, doctors surgeries etc. It is not good enough to take no responsibility for essential services which must be guaranteed.</p> <p>There is already pressure on local hospitals which will be further strain on them.</p> <p>My children are 11 and 9 and if I could, I would like to see Berkhamsted gain its own Grammar school. The catchment areas for Bucks have shrunk, which has limited these opportunities. My understanding is that the catchment area for Ashlyns falls short of the children wishing to go there showing a need for more choice in the area.</p>

The same is true for planning for Sports spaces and communal areas. These have never been more essential to ensure children's well being and health.

Sidestepping these huge responsibilities is inadequate and I want to see a commitment to these essential services before we increase the population by any more housing development.

My children have a lot of growing up to do in Dacorum and it's important I fight for what they need. This plan does not account for any of them, nor reassure me that they are a priority and so I object in the strongest terms.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4398

**Person ID** 1264353

**Full Name** David McGill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

No

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b></p>	<p>Does Berkhamsted not already have perfectly modern and substantially adequate sporting facilities which you're proposing to move to justify building 2000 homes?</p> <p>We have Ashridge, thousands of acres, The Chilterns, an area of outstanding beauty. We're surrounded by Hertfordshire farms and open fields with a river and canal. You propose a '50 acre country park?' To supposedly 'add open space' to the aforementioned thousands of acres we already have so as to justify your 2000 home build?</p> <p>The town population is around 19,000.</p> <p>2000 homes will have 2 adults per home and probably 2 children in them. Therefore 8000 additional people to Berkhamsted in total. Nearly a 50% increase in the current population. The main road into Berkhamsted is backlogged and inaccessible every morning by people travelling into the town centre, not for the A41. Many of these new residents will want to access the town for different reasons, for supermarkets etc. It's small enough at present and only just suffices for the current population. There will be an overflow of people and traffic contrary to your brochure which states that this will reduce traffic in Berkhamsted town centre?!! People won't travel via the A41 to get to the town's central supermarkets which have only recently had car parks increased in size to accommodate current residents.</p> <p>There is no need to move/rebuild the sporting facilities or develop sports facilities or a new country park. It's clear this is to solely justify the excessive building.</p> <p>I appreciate that new homes need to be built and more affordable for those willing to work hard and save for mortgages, just as I did. I moved here from Harrow, to be away from a now overpopulated town that has lost its soul and appeal for many reasons, including vast house building and population.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4415
<b>Person ID</b>	1264062
<b>Full Name</b>	James Metcalfe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am unhappy with the amount of green belt land being built on.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4418
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area BK02: British Film Institute.</b></p> <p>This is a site to be built directly on to the heavily congested Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction. The junction will require radical upgrading to ensure the safety of pedestrian and residents as well as through traffic. This junction is crossed by many secondary school pupils that walk to and from school. Maintaining a safe and healthy environment at this location will be challenging if not impossible.</p> <p><b>Growth Area BK03: Haslam Playing Fields.</b></p>

This development will involve felling many trees which will negatively impact on natural ecosystems. Development of this site cannot be utilised without exacerbating congestion on Shootersway. Currently at commuter times, despite the alterations to traffic lights at Junction of Kings Road and Shootersway, the traffic backs up to the new development at Bearoc Park (access also on Shootersway). It will also increase traffic significantly on Cross Oak road that is already unable to cope with current levels of traffic because parts of it are single track and large parts do not have pavement and yet it is a route which many secondary school pupils walk along to go to secondary school. The increased construction traffic and general car traffic once the houses are built will be a hazard for pedestrians and impact negatively on the environment. It must be recognised that Haslam Playing Fields were gifted to the Girls school as playing fields. Existing playing fields should be preserved for essential green field sites for the health of everyone.

**Growth Area BK04: Land Between Hanburys and A41.**

The same arguments apply to both BK03 and BK04. Access to BK04 would have to be gained via the Haslam Playing Fields development of the very narrow Denny's Lane.

**Growth Area BK05: Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)**

The proposals do not make it clear how Shootersway will be improved to handle the increased level of traffic. Shootersway is a residential road and should not be used as a highway, especially HGVs, accessing the A41. Serious consideration must be given to the provision of a new junction to the A41 close to the Durrants Lane junction. This new access to the A41 would significantly reduce congestion at the Kings Road / Kingshill Way junction. Shootersway currently has extremely poor drainage particularly on the bend close to Shootersway Park. Exceptionally large puddles often form across the road. The pavements are often covered with mud and / or leaves, making it difficult to use safely. The traffic drives through the large puddles on the road, people on the pavement get sprayed with water. It would help if DBC cleared the drains on this bend, they have been completely choked with debris for many months. The site would be extremely noisy as it is directly adjacent to A41 (in a valley). The resultant air pollution from the A41 to any residents on this site would be unacceptable and no barriers that could be provided would make the air acceptable in this location.

**Growth Area BK06: East of Darrs Lane.**

Shootersway is yet again the primary highway access but no mention is made of the impact on Darrs Lane and Bell Lane. Both lanes are narrow single lane roads incapable of large volumes of traffic. This development would be on greenbelt land. The Draft Plan states that it will deliver a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on site to offset potential effects of damage to the Chilterns Beechwoods. The Draft Plan does not explain how?

The High Street at Northchurch is highly congested with many accidents, one fatal, occurring due to speed and intensity of traffic. Air pollution is a factor in this location - the existing residents in Northchurch would suffer acutely from any further traffic in this locality. This site should be kept as a buffer zone to the surrounding countryside, maintaining the definition between Berkhamsted and Northchurch.

Darrs Lane is extremely dangerous for walkers/cyclists. There are currently no footpaths on these roads, so they are very unsafe. These lanes would need to be made two way for traffic but reduced to a 20mph limit. There is no pedestrian / cycle links from this location to the High Street / Shootersway and therefore this would need to be addressed.

Despite this site being on the periphery of the town centre there are no open spaces within walking distance. This site would need to provide a proper open park for recreation. The open space provided as part of the Bearoc park is small and undermanaged. It is not suitable for football as the grass is not managed and there are no football nets despite being formed as football pitches.

Grims Ditch runs through this area and is an important Archaeological Site and would need to be properly surveyed and protected.

**Growth Area BK07: Lock Field, Northchurch.**

This development will create a traffic problem where New Road crosses the canal. It is already a dangerous crossing where people want to get onto the canal, the bridge is a dangerous cycling area, and it is a main pedestrian route to the school.

**Growth Area BK08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)**

The same concerns as BK04 and BK05 apply at this location. Around 200 new dwellings would need to have access again via Shootersway. The number of houses planned needs to be reduced to ensure noise and pollution from the A41 do not adversely affect residents. Development at this location needs to sympathetic with urgent need for a new access junction to the A41.

**Growth Area BK10: Hanburys**

Yet more development along Shootersway with no plans to invest in roads and footpaths causing more traffic congestion and pollution. The concerns relating to BK4,5, and 8 are equally applicable here.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4423
<b>Person ID</b>	1263916
<b>Full Name</b>	MARK TYLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I write this email in total objection to both the proposal for Bulbourne Cross to be considered as a suitable development outside of Berkhamsted, and also the manner and approach taken by Thakenham in promoting this concept.</p> <p>I have received email, I have no idea where they gained my email address. I have been leafletted at home, mail shot at home and questioned whilst out walking the fields on my views, and how they could be used to gain support for this proposed amendment to the Dacorum plan. It is appalling behaviour.</p> <p>I have attached some photos of the very recent mail shot that has been sent to all residents in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>For your wider consideration in the proposed amendment to the Dacorum Plan I have also attached photos of the fields identified in the proposal, the current beautiful green belt land and the impact on any possible proposal on the views from around Berkhamsted. All photographs have all been taken from either public roads and footpaths, as far afield as Fields End hamlet and Frithsden Beeches, Castle Hill.</p> <p>I request my objection to the both underhand and inappropriate method of canvassing Berkhamsted residents and this proposal to amend the Dacorum Plan be recorded.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Thakeham leaflet and Berkhamsted photos V1.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4430
<b>Person ID</b>	1264382
<b>Full Name</b>	Barbara Frost
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>My comments are below concerning the proposed developments for Berkhamsted / Northchurch outlined in your Local Plan as above.</p> <p>I object very strongly against the 2 sites in Northchurch, 200 new dwellings between Durrants Lane and Darrs Lane and 60 new dwellings off New Road between the canal and railway lines.</p> <p><u>Durrants Lane/ Darrs Lane</u></p> <p>You are obliterating the green views across the valley, by concreting over grass fields right next to our Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Brown sites need to be developed, not building on Green Belt.</p> <p><u>New Road Northchurch</u></p> <p>This proposed development is just ludicrous! New Road is busy: south of the canal is a primary school and associated traffic. It's single file over a narrow and weak bridge, the proposed site exit/ entrance is just by this bridge !!!! There is no mains drainage north of the canal, has that been addressed ? Already we are told there is a water shortage in our area, what about that. What infrastructure is required for that ?</p> <p>What about doctors; dentists, schools? You are proposing to "enable " these facilities ! where are the details, once the developers have been and gone what guarantee/s have Dacorum got that these facilities actually happen?</p> <p>The Government backed down on the "matrix" on determining how many new houses required, but Dacorum have NOT adjusted their figures accordingly. Less are required!</p> <p>Personally both sites will make a detrimental impact on the quality of my life because of increased road traffic, pollution and loss of the beautiful countryside I have lived in for excess of 45 years.</p> <p>Final point is that the town of Berkhamsted was built along a valley and unless you live close to the town centre, a car is necessary. If you think in my 70 plus years you expect me to carry my shopping up to Northchurch Common by foot or by bicycle, instead of my car, you really must be joking !</p> <p>Please consider all the above points and cancel the proposed developments.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4431

<b>Person ID</b>	1264383
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Wheeldon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I strongly object to the obscene and excessive proposed housing developments for Berkhamsted. The town does not have the infrastructure to support anywhere near the number of additional houses proposed and it would be wrong to build on the greenbelt so unnecessarily.</p> <p>I especially oppose the proposed development at the top of Swing Gate Lane in the fields near Thomas Coram School. This road is already over used and if you were to build hundreds more houses on these fields a significant further risk would result to the children attending both Thomas Coram and Swing Gate Primary. The road is in disrepair and additional traffic would only worsen the situation.</p> <p>There is no desire for or support of these ill thought out proposals. Stop them immediately.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4438
<b>Person ID</b>	1264385
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs G Radford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to formally object to the following proposals in your Local Plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The removal of yet more land from the “GREEN BELT” status in Darrs Land and Bell Lane where land still has protection and as such should remain as such and not be developed on.</li> <li>2 All these extra homes will bring much hardship to already overstretched infrastructure and services, such as doctors surgeries, dentists, schools and roads.</li> <li>3 A proposed site in New Road provides yet more issues for local roads and access</li> <li>4 Whilst I appreciate the need for new private and HA housing there needs to be more consideration to existing Green Belt and more housing on brownfield areas</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4472
<b>Person ID</b>	1264316
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Turner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK06 – I currently have views looking over the fields. The proposed development will ruin our view. Of greater significance, is further destruction of much needed green space. This has a detrimental impact on the environment in what is already a heavily populated and built-up town. We need to put more focus on protecting what limited green space is available, not recklessly building all over it and destroying habitats for wildlife, as if they were of no concern.</p> <p>Whilst I agree a second secondary school is required, the proposed location needs to allow children to walk/cycle to school safely. No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes. In addition, improvements to roads or traffic flow.</p> <p>Site falls within area of Archaeological significance</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4479
<b>Person ID</b>	1264399
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Sarah Battersby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a Northchurch resident, there are two sites on the plan BK06 Darrs Lane / Bell Lane/ Durrants Lane and BK07 (Lock Field) that I know very well. I very much object to them being developed for housing, or anything other than wildlife/ other conservation for the following reasons:</li> <li>I have suffered from anxiety and depression in the past and find that the beautiful view of the fields down and across the valley provided by BK06 and BK07 from my home helps my mental health. Even bungalows would spoil</li> </ul>



this view and I would be most upset if higher homes were built, particularly on Lock Field. The view is priceless and irreplaceable.

- As a resident of Northchurch, I really value the rural feel of where I live and consider our community as having a different character to that of Berkhamsted. The communities of Northchurch and Dudswell regard our environment as semi-rural and have no wish to become an extended urban environment. The separation provided by the Green Belt sites BK06 and BK07 are important to maintaining this character.
- Both sites contain areas that are of significance for wildlife biodiversity, including roadside rural hedges, tree-lined verges and woodland. It is very important that there is a very wide area left undisturbed around these areas. BK06 has Beech woods classified as Ancient Woodland and pockets where protected animals and plants live that will be damaged by more people trampling on or near them. I have seen Hedgehogs and House Sparrows in the road verges of both sites. These were once common but their numbers have now declined so much they are vulnerable to extinction. They should receive active protection from the Council as they are Priority Species under the UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework and on the IUCN Red List. I also have seen many animals moving in and out of Lock Field through small gaps in the Hedge along New Road. It gives them a refuge from traffic on their way to the canal to drink. Other animals I have seen include deer, badgers, foxes, bats, toads and many species of birds including Red Kites and owls.
- The BK06 and BK07 hedgerows and those along Shootersway areas BK05 and BK08 are species rich and contain at least one species of butterfly listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act. The Bluebells that grow in the verges of Bell Lane are very beautiful too and I would lose all faith in a Council that would sacrifice them to housing.
- The most important reason that I want both BK06 & BK07 rejected is because of safety concerns. The lanes around BK06 are single track in places and lined with hedges that should be preserved. If a school is built these lanes will be used by families both to drive to school and who live in the new houses regardless of where the entrance to the school is. There is no footpath at all in places on Bell's Lane and Darr's Lane and so unless a footpath was built on the field side of the hedge leaving the protection of the hedge in place, children are at risk. I used to visit the pony sanctuary there and know first-hand just how little space there is to allow a pedestrian to step back from traffic – in places none. For some Northchurch and Dudswell children and their parents it would mean a daily walk along a steep lane with one way pinch-points used by two-way traffic.
- As a former pupil of St Mary's Northchurch I also know how dangerous the narrow path is along the whole of New Road from the Common to the school and there is far more traffic now than then. Anyone standing on the Lock Field side cannot be seen by vehicles coming up the hill until they are over the bridge and cars often speed up the hill on their approach to the bridge to assert their right of way. From the Lock Field side there is an added danger. Vehicles coming up the hill are heard long before they are seen and the growing number of quiet electric cars increases the chance of a pedestrian crossing the road not realising that a car is coming. Removal of the hedges would *not* make a significant difference to safety improvement and would greatly diminish the value of the site as part of the designated Wildlife Corridor to Northchurch Common from the canal. There are many cars parked in New Road and even cars travelling within the speed limit are a danger to children and older residents due to the narrow pathway along what is, essentially a country lane.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4508
<b>Person ID</b>	1264405
<b>Full Name</b>	Natalie Beecroft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to these four proposed sites that will harm Northchurch directly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bk05 Blegberry Gardens in Berkhamsted (3.5ha)</li> <li>• BK06 East of Darrs Lane (22.73ha)</li> <li>• Bk08 Rossway Farm (12.29ha)</li> <li>• BK07 Lock Field (2.2ha)</li> </ul> <p>Specific points as follows:</p> <p><b>BK06 East of Darrs Lane</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no extraordinary reason or need for Green Belt to be encroached and these plans should be stopped immediately</li> <li>• This Green Belt land prevents the unrestricted sprawl of Berkhamsted into the village of Northchurch. If this land is developed on our village will be made obsolete.</li> <li>• The site is located between two narrow country lanes and is unsuitable for development with restricted access.</li> <li>• These fields can be viewed from across the valley within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Northchurch is unobtrusively nestled within the value below it, but development would irreversibly change this vista to one of rooftops.</li> </ul>

- This area has historical legacy which must be protected.
- The loss of this space will have a certain impact on the mental wellbeing of my family, and friends in my community. The 'space' is what attracted us to this semi-rural village life and the loss of biodiversity will be devastating.
- The site is located on a steep hill. The adjacent town of Berkhamsted is already over-developed for its topography, and the result is heavy run-off and steep side, narrow car-lined roads. Consequently, there is only one throughfare through Northchurch and Berkhamsted which is already highly congested. Keeping this Green Belt land green is highly important to the absorption of water above our village.

**BK07 Lock Field**

- This is completely unsuitable from a safety perspective. The road and canal bridge are extremely narrow and already a danger to local primary school children.
- There is therefore no extraordinary reason or need for Green Belt to be encroached and these plans should be stopped immediately
- It would constitute additional environmental damage to the chalk stream

**Bk08 Rossway Farm**

These are attractive fields that form a green barrier between developments and the A41 traffic. My family often walks through them and we see lots of wildlife including foxes and badgers which use this space as a corridor, hemmed in by the A41 to the south.

In summary, Berkhamsted and Northchurch do not have the physical space to sustain such a population increase. From transport infrastructure to utility requirements and the unavoidable impact on our unique natural landscape and resources.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4543

**Person ID** 1261836

**Full Name** Richard Sutton

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>My family and I moved to Dacorum in 2018 to settle in Berkhamsted for at least the next 25 years. Over this time, we look forward to developing ever stronger links throughout the community and watching our young children grow to adulthood. As such, we have a vested interest in seeing the Borough grow in a way that works for all its citizens – both existing and new.</p> <p>Against this backdrop, I wish to formally state my strong objections to the ‘Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth’. The evidence suggests that, if this plan is approved, your personal legacy will be of considerably worsening towns and communities within the Borough. For new residents moving to the area and for those already here. For all ages. And for all financial situations. I suspect you don’t want to be remembered after you leave this office as the person who caused such damage to an area. So, I ask you to fundamentally rethink.</p> <p>Due to the COVID-19 constraints on travel and mingling for the past year, my experience, and hence prime objection, focuses on the portions of the Local Plan relating to developments in the Berkhamsted area.</p> <p>To summarise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Flawed modelling of number and type of housing required would fail to meet the actual needs of the voters moving into the area, whilst disrupting those already here far more than is needed.</li> <li>2. Inadequate commitment to transport infrastructure needs to accommodate the changes proposed would result in a legacy of decades of traffic congestion for voters in Dacorum and visitors to the area.</li> <li>3. Insufficient provision of water supply, wastewater disposal and other infrastructure would leave households with shortages and damage the local water table, with knock-on considerations around subsidence and environmental impact.</li> <li>4. Unworkable assumptions around public transport and foot / bike journeys would see considerable increase to carbon emissions in the Borough and considerable travel delays around vital transport hotspots (town centres, schools, rail stations, etc.).</li> <li>5. The above worsening of conditions for the new and existing voters in the area also comes with an ecological cost due to the loss of green belt. If green belt is to be repurposed, it must be done in a way that makes the greatest positive impact for the current and future residents of Berkhamsted. This plan wastes that sacrifice.</li> </ol> <p>These are fundamental flaws in the strategy underpinning the ‘Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth’. As such, this plan should be rejected outright, and a new plan drawn up that addresses the actual needs of the area for today and the long-term success of the Borough.</p> <p>These points are expanded below.</p>

### **Incorrect Assumptions for Housing Provision**

Whilst accepting that there is an undeniable need for more housing, in particular for more genuinely affordable housing, the scale of proposed development in Dacorum is out of balance with the long-term needs.

The Local Plan does not take account of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 11, footnote 6, which allows local authorities to restrict the scale of development due to other planning constraints including impacts on the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Recent Government guidance on calculating housing need has been, at best, confusing. The algorithm for calculating housing need that has been used by the Council is a flawed means to calculate the housing needs of the Borough, based on old data.

The correct calculation of the housing needs in Dacorum should be based on the most recent and relevant data, which is currently the 2018 based Office for National Statistics (ONS) projections. Instead, the Local Plan is based on calculations using outdated 2014 based ONS data, which results in a significant overestimate of housing needs.

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

"More broadly, we heard suggestions in the consultation that in some places the numbers produced by the standard method pose a risk to protected landscapes and Green Belt. We (Government) should be clear that meeting housing need is never a reason to cause unacceptable harm to such places. ...

Within the current planning system the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for the area, and it is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made. It does not override other planning policies, including the protections set out in Paragraph 11b of the NPPF or our strong protections for the Green Belt."

### **Failure to Provide Adequate Supportive Infrastructure**

Looking at the proposed developments on Green Belt land, there is insufficient consideration in the Local Plan for the provision of new infrastructure or upgrading the current infrastructure to support the scale of the proposed developments.

Taking a specific example of transportation, consider area 'Bk01 - South of Berkhamsted'. This proposes adding 850 residential units with 2 ways out of the development:

1. Emerging immediately next to a secondary school of over 1300 pupils; and
2. Passing two primary schools on a single, narrow residential road with a 10% gradient and car parking on both sides.

These roads are heavily congested during normal times with the current population – the road by the secondary school backing up during school run times to the main A41 route into and out of the town. Adding 850 households of cars will lead to transport paralysis for the new residents, the homes already in the area, pupils of the schools and people trying to access Berkhamsted from the A41 during peak times.

Similarly, increasing the number of dwelling by over 1,800 in the Berkhamsted area will result in a considerable increase in vehicular traffic through the centre of the town – a route that is already heavily congested at peak times at the A4251 / A416 junction and along the High Street. This is due to the historic layout of the town along a valley with steep sides meaning there are only these two roads into and through the town.

For the increase in population proposed in the Local Plan, there would need to be a considerable extra investment in road widening, traffic flow control measures and new roads to bypass the congestion points inherent with a medieval market town situated in a steep river valley.

**Impact on Green Belt and Other Designated Land**

The Local Plan states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”. This strategic principle is then violated by the declared mission to provide at least 100% of the Council’s self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity.

Noting that 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns AONB, this approach comes at considerable environmental cost.

As such, the Local Plan must be fundamentally reworked to avoid such contradictions in strategic goals and principles.

You are now faced with a personal choice.

Whether to be remembered for taking the easy choice and sticking to an inherently flawed plan that will deeply damage the Borough of Dacorum forever – your lasting legacy – or to take the brave decision and do what is right – to reject the current plan and come back with one based on the actual needs of the current and future voters and households of Dacorum.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4554
<b>Person ID</b>	1264418
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Roberts

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have grave concerns relating inparticular to road safety. The additional traffic flow into a network of roads that have not been designed for additional traffic flows will place particularly young people at risk. I have made an assessment of the traffic flows and considered some network analysis and assess that congestion will increase considerably and the increase risk of harm to people is unacceptable. I donot believe this has been assessed in a credible manner. this rates additionally to BK02 - BK08. Congestion is evident along the entire road network already, The road network also forms part of the Chiltern Cycling Routes again placing further risk to those inviduals that is not acceptable. Those making the planning decisions I assume will be personally accountable if they have not shown due diligence in their assessment of the increase in traffic flows onto a congested residential network.</p> <p>The amount of safe space to exercise outdoors will be eroded considerably as a result of the increase n building and have a significant impact on mne and my families health.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>have grave concerns relating inparticular to road safety. The additional traffic flow into a network of roads that have not been designed for additional traffic flows will place particularly young people at risk. I have made an assessment of the traffic flows and considered some network analysis and assess that congestion will increase considerably and the increase risk of harm to people is unacceptable. I donot believe this has been assessed in a credible manner. this rates additionally to BK02 - BK08. Congestion is evident along the entire road network already, The road network also forms part of the Chiltern Cycling Routes again placing further risk to those inviduals that is not acceptable. Those making the planning decisions I assume will be personally accountable if they have not shown due diligence in their assessment of the increase in traffic flows onto a congested residential network.</p> <p>The amount of safe space to exercise outdoors will be eroded considerably as a result of the increase n building and have a significant impact on mne and my families health.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4562

<b>Person ID</b>	1262731
<b>Full Name</b>	Julie Battersby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to the land that most of the peripheral sites in 'Berkhamsted' occupy being classified as 'urban' land and this particularly applies to BK01, BK04, BK05, BK06, BK07, BK08 and BK9 which are currently farmland or similar, and bordered by rural hedgerows, copses and lanes. These sites currently, in my view and the view of my family and friends, are rural or semi-rural, as reflected in the current status of these sites as Green Belt land. The Council is mis-applying the term 'urban' and this biases public opinion in favour of development. This is clearly inappropriate if the consultation is meant to be fair and balanced. The Crown Publication "Rural and Urban Classification Guide 2004" recommends caution when using a classification that it is not supported by public opinion. Had there been a longer consultation period when the UK was not in lockdown, I would be in a position to provide empirical evidence of local opinion on this matter, but that opportunity has been denied me by the short consultation period and ineffective communication. Our household only received the Local Plan 'Brochure' less than two weeks before the consultation deadline after bringing the matter to the attention of the Council. Either extend the consultation period or accept my view in this regard.</p> <p>If many Dacorum sites are approved and lose Green Belt status, it appears from the Stage 3 Green Belt Review that other adjacent sites will also be re-designated to facilitate future housing, or other damaging development. This secondary release programme includes a designated Wildlife Site adjacent to BK07 Lock Field. I <b>object most strongly</b> to this principle and practice. This is tantamount to an erosion of the Green Belt by stealth and is an action that in my view does not meet the standards of transparency expected in Local Government. All Green Belt sites throughout Dacorum that would be subject to secondary re-designation to facilitate housing or commercial development should have been included in this Local Plan consultation if it was indeed the intention of the Council to release them for development.</p> <p>I am concerned about all the Green Belt sites on the edge of the Berkhamsted proposal, but particularly and in order of most important to retain, sites BK06, BK07, BK08 and BK05 which all contribute to the outstanding view from Northchurch over the valley and adjacent Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. I strongly oppose any housing development on these sites. They should remain within the Green Belt and continue to receive protection. Their strategic position in my view means that the justification of development for housing based on exceptional circumstances should not be applied as the need to preserve them as Green Belt and an extension of the AONB is even more exceptional.</p> <p>As previously stated, there is also the presumption that Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Dudwell are all one and the same community. This is not and has never been the case and my assertion is founded on the historic beginnings of these</p>



settlements. Dudswell and Northchurch both pre-date 'Great Berkhamsted' and have retained both a character and a community focus that is distinct from Berkhamsted and also from each other. Berkhamsted is a town. Northchurch is a village and Dudswell is a hamlet. We want to retain the distinction and separation that is supported by our green fields and what remains of our rural lanes, specifically BK06, BK07 and BK08. I regard it as a negative move for Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Dudswell residents to lose their individual settlement identity afforded by these highly regarded fields.

I also take issue with the concept that our three settlements are somehow morally obliged to shoulder a significant proportion of the proposed Dacorum development and accept that integrating overspill from Watford is somehow a good thing to be looked forward to. There will be little real benefit to our communities with an overall development on this scale, particularly as it is based on an unsound needs assessment. Proof is provided that a more accurate needs assessment for Dacorum is no more than 8300 dwellings when need is recalculated based on evidence I presented in earlier sections. Need is lower than this if reports of population decline are taken into account. Consequently, the case to develop up to 83% of homes on Green Belt land collapses as the exceptional circumstances need no longer applies to overrule the protections in the NPPF for most of the Green Belt sites in Dacorum. Reducing the requirement for homes on Green Belt land in Dacorum to 17% and applying this lower figure to the 'Berkhamsted' proposed Green Belt sites together with the non-Green Belt site contributions shows that no more than 424 homes  $((1750 \times 0.17) + 40 + 86 = 424)$  are required as a contribution to the Local Plan from Berkhamsted and only then if the Council chooses, against the request of constituents like myself, not to prioritise the preservation of existing Green Belt.

I am not against development for housing *per se*. I actively support development on the brownfield sites BK11, BK12 & BK13 and trust the focus of home-building on these sites will be on flood-damage-resistant designed affordable smaller homes / social housing; and where watercourses and native species hedges are present, the preservation of a minimum 10m buffer zone adjacent to the watercourse or hedgerow to support wildlife and biodiversity preservation.

Also, although I would prefer them to be preserved, particularly BK03 and BK04, I would also be willing to accept development of sites BK02, BK03, BK04, BK10 and BK09 (if there was no additional proliferation of housing development towards Bourne End) if all of the following applied:

- ponds and their verges are retained
- copses, hedgerows and trees are preserved with Hedgerow Retention Orders and Tree Preservation Orders that include a minimum 10m natural buffer zone (15m for mature trees) adjacent to hedges and any associated ditches, verges and banks.
- sufficient land is left natural (min 10m buffer) to ensure the wildlife corridors (adjacent to the A41 and watercourses) are preserved and continue to support dispersion and maintenance of biodiversity, with additional space if expansion of the A41 through the creation of a further lane or hard shoulder is anticipated.
- gardens are separated by hedges (native species) or barriers with floor-height cat-flap sized holes to enable wildlife movement between gardens
- dwelling design was not above three storeys in height plus roof.
- a higher proportion of homes were small (ie one to three bedroomed) and affordable

This would provide 486 homes plus windfalls, which exceeds the revised 424 target.

Please also see site specific comments below:

**BK01:** The verdant area on the South West of the site seen on entering and leaving Chesham Road at the A41 junction creates an excellent first impression of Berkhamsted as a prospering market town. There are many characterful mature trees and this opulent greenspace with landscaped borders compliments the character of Ashlyns School and Ashlyns Hall, which are both fine statement buildings. It would be an 'own goal' if this enduring introduction to Berkhamsted was damaged by this development.

My primary objection to this site is on the grounds of road safety. Increasing use of the current access route in the South-West end of BK01 and designating it as the main entry site creates a predictable hot-spot for road traffic accidents. Unless a fifth exit is created directly from the A41 roundabout or further East into the main body of the estate, there would be a substantial increase in traffic going in both directions along the top section of Chesham Road passing Ashlyns School and Berkhamsted School Playing Fields. The congestion right round from Hill Top Road and beyond Ashlyns School is frequently severe due to insufficient roadside parking, particularly on event days and further pressure would greatly increase the risk to children during school run and peak travel times. Re-positioning the main entrance in Swing Gate Lane rather than Chesham Road would not nullify this problem as a high proportion of drivers who need to use the A41 to reach Tring or Chesham would most likely find a route that takes them from Swing Gate Lane via Chesham Road to the A41 entrance. In addition the mid to top section of Swing Gate Lane on the approach up to and beyond Chestnut Drive is exceptionally steep, even by Berkhamsted standards. There will be access and safety issues due to lack of tyre traction when winter ice and snow are present and an ongoing slog uphill required from pupils using the proposed school. Its location is so challenging that most parents living off site will choose to drive their children to school rather than walk up Swing Gate Lane.

Whilst I applaud the consideration of housing for older people I do not believe this is the most suitable site to build them on. The thought of still-independent, but aging residents trying to walk to and from town up this section of Swing Gate Lane makes me gravely concerned for their welfare, as does the thought of more buses pulling into Chesham Rd at peak times, or sliding down Swing Gate Lane in winter. Although a retail unit is planned for the site, it would need to include at least a mini-mart with post-office and ideally a chemist and hairdresser in order to serve the needs of elderly residents who do not have reliable private transport suitable for steep terrain. It is unlikely that the business demand from a community of 850 people would be sufficient to support such a retail unit.

Archaeological investigations should have been carried out in advance of this consultation to fully inform residents of the historic nature of the site. The site in places forms part of the historic route of lanes from Shootersway to London Road and Sugars Lane at Bourne End. I note and support your recognition of the need to retain and enhance the existing Wildlife Site and this should go further to protect the wildlife corridor, as an isolated Wildlife Site is less resilient to external pressures. Some very old mature rural hedgerows and copses remain that should be conserved by Hedge Retention and Tree Preservation Orders incorporating a natural undeveloped buffer zone of a minimum of 10m for the hedges and 15m for all woodland to allow for root growth and wildlife dispersion. It is vital that the wildlife corridor along these hedges and adjacent to the A41 is retained and enhanced and, if development is approved, wildlife tunnels under the A41 should be introduced; however, the site is in Green Belt and should be protected as such.

**BK05:** The whole of Shooterway with its tree lined verges and ancient hedges (see Evidence) supports the identity of Berkhamsted as a rural town and provides a habitat to many vulnerable species listed under S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act. It is essential that the habitats within these hedges and woody verges are preserved and the concept of semi-rurality incorporated into its Urban Design Principle.

I am concerned that the historic and ecological value of the 'characterful boundaries' is not recognised. 'Improving the character' is a subjective perspective that gives on-site developers considerable leeway to ruin a valuable ecological asset. Damage to an existing hedge by pulling up by the roots or flattening associated verges and ditches should be avoided although hedge trimming and gap-filling with native species are acceptable acts of maintenance that support the maintenance of biodiversity. Also 'Tidying up' of the tree-lined verges where understory plants are removed should be avoided as these will remove the diverse understory and mature canopy species.

These important requirements should be enforced by Hedge and Tree Retention Orders to protect the habitat of the many listed species that live there. The Wildlife Site area to the North West is particularly species rich and it is essential that footfall is discouraged by good design that allows for a 15m buffer zone around the periphery to protect the roots (See Evidence) . Any back gardens that face the Wildlife Site should have cat flap sized holes at ground level in fences or preferably native hedgerow species planted to allow wildlife movement within gardens such as hedgehogs from the wildlife site.

Shootersway has a relatively high accident rate as it is a route taken by children from Ashlyns School and Edgerton Rothesay walking home and there is only a footpath on one side of the road. Visibility is restricted due to a kink in the road and through lack of street lights. The turning close to this site at the top end of Durrants Lane is particularly dangerous at night. According to Crashmap Between 2010 and 2019 (inclusive) there were 14 road traffic casualties between Bell Lane and Kings Road and therefore I do not support further development along this road. If the site is approved for development with an intention to provide a road-side pathway, I recommend it is situated inside the current roadside hedgerow as an alternative to removing the hedgerow. This avoids intruding on the Wildlife Site and gives greater protection to children from motorists. I also recommend traffic calming measures such as road humps are installed from the junction of Cross Oak Road through to Darr's Lane and a suitable distance beyond.

If approved, the incorporation of a large pond would support biodiversity as ponds appear to have been lost from the Taylor Wimpey site located opposite Shootersway; and small mammals, birds, insects and amphibians would benefit immensely. Locating a pond strategically would also help ease surface water run off issues during heavy rain.

The site is in Green Belt and I would prefer that it should be protected as such.

**BK06:** First of all I would like to share a purely personal perspective on BK06. I **love** looking at these fields from across the valley. They make me feel good about myself and reduce the stresses of the modern world. They are a constant source of pleasure and delight as the season's change - from the greenery and shade of the summer, to the autumnal colours of the leaves, to the snow gathering in hollows in the field and on to the awe and wonder of the Bluebells in the hedgerows in spring. Closer up they provide a source of delight and fascination during a leisurely stroll, such as finding an interesting rare plant in flower, listening to birds with their different song patterns and watching the insects as they go about their business. The intricacy of life and the amazing diversity provided by these sites to someone with an

interest in ecology like me and to whom a rural connection is important, is priceless. The total experience these fields provide is based on their extreme age and species-richness, which as a graduate Biologist, I know with certainty, could not be matched or replaced in my remaining lifetime by the proposals in the new development. In short, they are important to my well-being.

I regard myself as a member of a community that lives in a semi-rural, not urban setting. Residents are privileged to enjoy BK06's fantastic views across and down the valley in both directions and beyond to the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and I have a deep seated conviction that the entirety of this experience is something I have a duty to ensure will be handed on to my children and their friends in the community. I moved from Berkhamsted to Northchurch precisely because of this semi-rural feel and distinctive village character and I feel very strongly about retaining it by remaining physically separated from Berkhamsted by farmland. Losing this Grade 3 arable farmland not only deprives the country of high quality versatile farmland diminishing our national self-sufficiency and resilience, and increasing our carbon footprint through transport of imported food, it also destroys the character and identity of our village.

The development plan proposes access to the Darr's Lane site through Shootersway. This will inevitably destroy parts of the ancient Shootersway hedgerow that was surveyed, found to be 800 years old and reported by Joan Hands in a 2010 Dacorum Heritage Trust publication. Most of Bell Lane and Darr's Lane are probably of similar age as these lanes are deep and high sided from centuries of use. The Thames Valley Archaeological Service 2016 carried out a desk based assessment off land of Durrants Lane and found that a rare surviving example of mediaeval plateau ridge and furrow farming had been recorded across the field that lies North of Grimm's Dyke and adjacent to Bell's Lane which supports that they have been in use for hundreds of years. It is not clear if these ridge and furrow still exist and this is another reason why an Archaeological investigation should have been carried out prior to the consultation, but it is clear that these hedgerows deserve recognition as a local heritage asset with character worth preserving through continuance of use and ongoing management. Furthermore they are currently protected under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 as a rural hedge. If the proposals are approved, these hedges and woody verges should be protected by Hedge Retention and Tree Preservation Orders as otherwise they will lose their protected status.

As a general rule, the older the hedgerow, the greater the number of species and biodiversity of all life found in and around it. That includes the verges, ditches and walls in the immediate vicinity. The hedgerows and woody verges of Bell's Lane, Darr's Lane and Shootersway and pockets within the fields are species-rich and contain species that are a priority for conservation. This includes the White Letter Hairstreak Butterfly a 'Species of Principal Importance' listed under the S41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and also classified as Endangered on the Red List. Other notable species I am aware of include, but are by no means limited to, Skylarks (classified in the UK as Red under the Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the Red List for Birds 2004) and Hedgehogs (which are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Priority Species under the UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework and the IUCN Red List for British Mammals). There are also plants typical of Ancient Woodland (another species rich habitat) including Bluebells, Lords & Ladies and Violet Helleborine. I trust you will consult Herts Environmental Records who will be able to advise of species that are recorded onto the Hertfordshire Ecological Network Dataset, but please be aware that absence does not mean they are not there.

Those habitats which are of principle importance for the conservation of biodiversity in England are also listed in Section 41 and are classified by the Hertfordshire Ecological Network Dataset. All of site BK06 is either listed as a Value 1 Wildlife Site, which Herts Local Nature Partnership recommends should be avoided for development and protection, or a Value 2 area that they recommend should be considered for habitat enhancement, not development.

Planting saplings, shrubberies and grass lawns are method frequently relied upon by developers to be their claim to, or evidence of increasing biodiversity in their on-site development; however these rarely compensate for the breadth of wildlife lost when either Ancient Woodlands are damaged or isolated, veteran trees are felled, or established rural hedges are pulled up. These habitats take many years, often hundreds, to become species rich with specialist- habitat species. They are not easily replaced and the habitat specialists are usually not able to thrive in the new and different landscaped habitat. Under S40 of the NERC Act 2006, "Every public authority **must**, in exercising its function, have regard to, in so far as it is consistent with the proper exercise of these functions, to the purpose of **conserving** biodiversity". Please note the emphasis is on **conserving** biodiversity **not** replacing it. The Council has a duty to have due regard for the **conservation** of biodiversity under this statutory instrument on Site BK06 and therefore the whole of Site BK06 should be protected from development.

I have already mentioned earlier in this section that Shooterway has been the scene of 14 casualties in the last 10 years. There were a further two accidents reported in Darr's Lane. Road safety is a great concern for Darr's Lane and Bell Lane as both lanes are single track in places and without pavement in much of their upper sections. There would be significantly increased traffic using these lanes by parents wishing to get their children to school who would avoid walking due to the steepness of the route they would need to take if they live lower down the valley. Widening the lanes by removing the hedgerows would destroy their historic and ecological value. Therefore, if approved, the challenge would be to provide a safe road traffic route from the High Street to Shootersway and keep the hedgerows intact.

A critical factor with Bell Lane is that there is a sharp kink in the lane at the bottom end where it is bisected by Granville Road/ Westfield Road and access directly down Bell Lane is blocked to the High Street due the narrowness of the lane. One suggestion I have heard is that Bell Lane should be made into a cycleway and pedestrian pathway with access-only traffic. I have issues with that proposal because cyclists would be travelling at speed down the hill and will pose a risk to children. Also the sharp kink in the lower section near the road will require rapid breaking or risk of collision with traffic from Westfield Road. To reach the High Street the traffic would have to negotiate Granville Road which is usually congested with parked cars. I am not in favour of developing BK06 but if it were approved then I would suggest making Bell Lane one way *up* the hill and Darr's Lane one-way *down* the hill as far as the turning into Granville Road. A pathway and cycle pathway could be constructed on the field side of the hedgerows to minimise the need to walk in the sunken lanes themselves and I would suggest a footbridge over Bell Lane to connect that area of development to the Darr's Lane field site. As earthworks to flatten the sunken lanes would not be required this would probably be a more cost effective alternative.

I am also concerned that in a Council report (see attached evidence) there is a map showing 'Sensitive sides' of the valley across this site. What is sensitive and has it changed? I would argue that whatever made this site sensitive and unsuitable for housing in previous proposals still remains. I am also concerns that there are reports of sunken areas

near Darr's Lane which suggest sink holes may be present. It is imperative these are fully investigated before any decisions regarding housing development are taken.

The prospect of development occurring on these fields distresses me greatly including from an historical, ecological and well-being perspective. I also have concerns about the safety of this development even with the alternatives set out here. ***All things having been considered in depth, I wish to be crystal clear that I do not support development on either of the two fields that form this site. They should be left as arable farmland, allowed to continue to be managed as before to preserve the existing specialist habitat wildlife found in numerous pockets right across the site and also protected as designated Green Belt land from damage.***

**BK07:** The reasons I am totally opposed to the current development proposals for this site are legion, but I will confine myself to the most important. I also provide an alternative suggestion to housing development which will support the aims of the Strategic Plan.

My primary concern regarding housing development on this site is that of safety. I have considered many options and regardless of where the access point to the Lock Field development was placed on New Road and what further measures were put into place, they would not resolve the problem of additional risk to the public from road traffic collision without barring vehicles from New Road altogether. New Road is essentially a country lane with a 90 degree bend at the top, a narrow single person footpath along the opposite side of the road from Lock Field and a narrow single track bridge immediately below the entrance to Lock Field. The bridge was not built to withstand regular heavy construction traffic and the edge of the road itself near the Lock Field entrance is brittle and fragmenting due to erosion from surface water run-off which flows in torrents down New Road after heavy rainfall.

Cars are parked both day and night along the length of the footpath above the bridge up to the Sunnyside allotments and the entrance routes to Bridgewater Hill and South Bank Road are not apparent until drivers are close to them. Traffic moving up and down the hill competes to use the remaining side of the road and there are frequent cases of road rage on the bridge from drivers who feel their right of way was infringed. Moving the entrance up the hill would not relieve this problem. On-site developers would incur prohibitive additional expenses in order to negotiate around the gas pressure equalisation distribution hub that is located above the current entrance and cars leaving the site would be required to turn sharply to avoid parked cars and oncoming traffic.

Vehicles moving up the hill Northwards have right of way over the bridge and often suddenly speed up when crossing the bridge or travelling up the hill to reach a gap before traffic coming down the hill. On the Lock Field side, the canal bridge has a very narrow and short footpath and this is where pedestrians tend to stand when crossing from the canal as it is the safest point in the vicinity of the bridge. This is because ***the bridge itself is at an angle to the road and the sight-line on the Lock Field side of the road is badly impaired both to motorists and pedestrians.*** This cannot be corrected unless the characterful Lock House is partially demolished and the bridge significantly widened and straightened. It is not until a car is actually on the brow of the bridge a few metres away from the entrance to Lock Field that it can be seen from Lock Field and even those vehicles that remain within the speed limit are taken unawares by pedestrians in the vicinity of the bridge. Cars can be heard long before they can be seen, but this is a dangerous cue to rely on as quiet electric cars become more common.

St Mary's School and Nursery is located immediately below the bridge and there is a significant problem with congestion at peak travel times and during the school run. My daughter was a pupil at St Mary's School and a mild asthmatic. There were occasions when pollution levels meant that she had to use her inhaler on the way to school. Pollution from car exhaust is an issue to the extent that the School leadership feels the need to display a poster informing drivers not to idle their engines. Air pollution levels on the High Street (which is just a few hundred metres away from Lock Field and the School) have exceeded Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010 limit values for PM10 Particulate Matter nine times in the past two years and once for Nitrogen Dioxide (See Evidence) despite reduced traffic due to Covid in the past year. These levels can be predicted to increase with the increased traffic caused by the developments in Berkhamsted and Tring in the medium term. Congestion and pollution levels will not be resolved by the proposed congestion relief measures on the High Street junction. This is because part of the problem is that many parents, particularly those on the way to work, feel it is too dangerous to walk and this tips their choice in favour of driving there instead. I know this from personal experience. Lock Field is part of the green lung of Northchurch and should be retained as part of pollution control measures.

Supervising small children on the footpath is particularly difficult as the pathway is so narrow they have to walk in single file, which is a frightening prospect for any parent with a child of nursery age who is lively and independent, or a 'runner' (apt to run away without warning). Older children in pairs and dog-walkers frequently walk in the road on their way to the High Street and Northchurch Common. About five years ago when walking on the pavement at the less congested end of New Road just below Bridgewater Hill, I was spun around by a vehicle catching my arm with their wing-mirror as they drove down the hill. I know other neighbours who have had similar near misses. Footpath congestion in New Road will increase with housing development and with it the probability of a serious accident occurring will also increase. Crashmap accident statistics demonstrate that in the 10 years between 2010 to 2019 inclusive, four road traffic accidents were recorded at the junction of New Road and the High Street, one fatal; five at the top of New Road near the sharp bend and three in close proximity to Lock Field itself. There was a further serious accident by Lock Field just this month that involved ambulance services. To add to this residents are aware that there have been countless minor collisions and near-misses that have not been recorded. ***These safety issues are impossible to resolve cost-effectively or practically and mean that BK07 should be immediately withdrawn as a proposed site for housing development.***

The site has other considerations that add to the design build issue and cost. The pipework of a gas pressure equaliser distribution unit on the periphery of the site will require protection from damage from traffic and groundworks. There is a Network Rail compound that is still used towards the centre of the site. Network Rail requires continued access to the railway track for maintenance and most importantly in the event of an emergency, especially if one should ever occur in the railway tunnel. There are very high levels of noise and ground shake cause by freight trains and triple glazing and other noise and vibration reducing measures will be required. The houses in New Road above the bridge do not have access to mains drainage and rely on septic tanks and old copper internet cabling. Provision for mains sewerage and new internet facilities would add an additional cost. A further consideration is waste surface water run-off contamination from domestic pollutants such as oil leaked from car engines. This could cause an environmental issue to the canal and chalk stream ecology of the River Bulbourne if it runs into the canal. This is quite possible because areas of the site are at risk from surface water running off the dry valley and hillside above, causing flooding following heavy rain. The Lock Field site was the subject of a surface water run-off flood warning during heavy rain on 31st January 2021 and a Flood

Alert on 7th February 2021 (See Evidence). The National Flood Warning Service shows that part of the site is at Medium Risk, meaning that each year that section has a chance of flooding between 1 and 3.3%. House design would need to take account of these points, decreasing flexibility and adding expense.

The greenery of Lock Fields and particularly the hedgerows adjacent to the road and canal all contribute to a beautiful view from the houses south of the Canal, from New Road and the adjacent Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The animals, birds and butterflies that can be seen on the borders are delightful and watching them is a source of leisure and pleasure for myself and other residents. Birds that I have seen in the past year include a Kingfisher, Redwing, Hedge Sparrow and Tawny Owl, to name but a few. All of these species have declined significantly in the UK and are classified on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern as Red or Amber. Animals I have seen in the vicinity include the Common Toad, Common Lizards, Badgers, Bats and Hedgehogs which are also protected species. The vista that is provided by Lock Field will be irreparably damaged if housing is built on the site, particularly if dwellings are three storey or more and high density, or removal of the boundary hedges is required, so I wish to lodge an objection to both these design aspects and recommend that if the site is approved for housing that the hedgerows and riparian wildlife are preserved using Hedgerow Retention Orders with a minimum 10m undeveloped buffer zone to the interior.

Lock Field has a unique and outstanding attribute. It links two major wildlife corridors that have been recognised by the Council and that are shown on the map 'Emerging Strategy For Growth, Core-strategy - Berkhamsted Vision', seen on page 7 of the hyperlinked document. The two corridors are the Strategic Wildlife Corridor along the canal and the main wildlife corridor North from the canal up to Northchurch Common. *The former is acknowledged in the site-specific proposals for Lock Field, but the wildlife corridor North through Lock Field, is not.* This is a serious and prejudicial oversight. Lock Field is positioned adjacent to a designated Wildlife Site and it links to other habitat prioritised for protection such as the Site of Special Scientific Interest on the Northchurch Common. Although the habitat of Lock Fields site does not currently qualify as a site that is of high enough value (Value 1) to qualify for protection under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, the Hertfordshire Ecological Network Dataset (provided by the Herts Environmental Records Centre) recognises that a significant part of the site has high potential to do so, as it forms an important component of the local ecological network and so deserves recognition as site capable of providing important biodiversity enhancement. It provides not only a habitat, but also an opportunity for migration, dispersal and genetic exchange for wildlife which adds to the resilience of priority species. The Herts Local Nature Partnership Planning Task Group advise that it and other Value 2 (purple mapped) areas **should be avoided by development and protected by the development management system, i.e the Local Plan.**

I therefore propose that Lock Field takes an alternative role to that for housing in the Local Plan. That is, I propose that it retains its Green Belt status and instead the whole site is designated as a 'biodiversity offset net gain area' managed by a new local community charitable trust, or body, affiliated to Northchurch Parish Council. As there are safety issues for access, the site would initially be a low footfall ecological resource managed by volunteers to increase biodiversity, which could later be expanded to allow increased community access for education, exercise and leisure (for example, if nearby complimentary sites or funding to create a footbridge over the canal became available). This would retain the prized view and truly contribute to enhancing biodiversity of vulnerable species in Dacorum. It would provide a meaningful long-term alternative to supporting the biodiversity of fast-responding species that tend to be the initial colonisers of



landscaped green spaces. I am prepared to volunteer my time and expertise for such a project and I have relevant qualifications and experience. These include, but are not limited to, being a graduate Applied Biologist, who specialised in ecology, resource management and population dynamics, with a PhD that centred on behavioural ecology, particularly of amphibians.

**BK08**– The issues associated with BK08 that lead me to object to inclusion of this site are similar to those in BK06 regarding preservation of Green Belt, the ancient hedges, maintenance of wildlife corridors and loss of attractive views and landscape adjoining the designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Priority species under S41 of the NERC 2006 Act have been found here and demonstrate the habitat should be a priority for biodiversity conservation and enhancement. I stress this is different to biodiversity mitigation by substitution which does little to preserve specialist habitat and vulnerable species. It is essential that Hedge Retention Orders and Tree Preservation Orders are applied to roadside copses and hedgerows to protect S41 species if approved for development, but I trust that the Council will appreciate the heritage and ecological qualities of this site, retain it within the existing Green Belt and remove it from the housing development proposals.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

There is too much development proposed as it is.

**Included files**

[Evidence Berkhamsted Site Specific.docx \(1\)](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS4595

**Person ID**

1262255

**Full Name**

AJ W

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

From the outset i note that the target is flawed, it is not a target to be reached no matter the consequences, central government have consistently said that these are not targets that need to be reached if there are circumstances that mean that it cannot be achieved. Protection of greenbelt land is one such circumstance. The core strategy rejected a number of sites giving valid and detailed reasons for rejection yet these are now being ignored simply because there is a 'target' to hit. The reasons for rejection of these sites remain valid and robust arguments and should be highlighted.  
BK01

Strongcountryside/Greenbelt boundary.

Development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location.

Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.

poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment and station.

Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.

This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41

Not well related to existing housing.

Visual impact on important gateway to town from A416 and A41.

proximity of A41 bypass.

Potential impact on Ashlyns Hall.

Nothing has physically changed since these were correctly noted and DBC should remain aligned to the core strategy.

Furthermore:

It is too far from town centre thus promoting vocal in heavy transport, walking and cycling will be discouraged due to distance and gradient.

Too close to A41 and associated traffic noise.

Such a big development will place pressure on infrastructure of town, especially roads.

Local roads will not be able to cope with traffic, Swing Gate Lane will be swamped and increase in traffic will endanger school children trying to do the right thing by walking to school.

Increase in road useable will create rat runs through Hall Park estate etc when trying to avoid traffic jame (created by the additional 2,000 cars from the new development).

Increase in pollution, Berkhamsted already over national limits in areas, is this something we really want for the people of Berkhamsted.

Will turn into a commuter estate cut off from town centre.

Euston line already at full capacity.

Difficult to get GP appointment and dentist appointment as it is, there is no provision for additional practices and BK01 is located some distance from existing practices (none of which have good parking).

Large impact on wildlife, reduces the wildlife corridor, environmental policies would suggest that this area would be prime for further planting not increasing pollution and concreting over. Long Green is ancient woodland that will be threatened by this development.

The increase in residents will not support trading in the town, it will more likely dissuade people as they will find it too busy and will find elsewhere to spend their money leaving a once thriving town with the empty shop frontages seen in so many other towns where overdevelopment has led to commuter belt areas with no vested interest in the areas they were supposed to be included in.

BK02

There are no site specific requirements for using this land.

BK03

Haslam was gifted to the school and it was done so in faith would be used as playing fields and not developed, clearly the school have found a loophole. Irrespective of this is not suitable to build on for the following reasons:

Too far from town centre

Important transition area between town and countryside

Too small to offer additional leisure facilities for wider town.

Close proximity to A41 and incumbent noise pollution.

Doesn't meet Berkhamsted or Dacorum vision other than adding housing in that there are no facilities available, public transport is not available and walking cycling is prohibitive given distance and gradient of location.

Negative impact on an area of outstanding natural beauty.

BK04

Too far from town centre

Important transition area between town and countryside

Too small to offer additional leisure facilities for wider town.

Close proximity to A41 and incumbent noise pollution.

Doesn't meet Berkhamsted or Dacorum vision other than adding housing in that there are no facilities available, public transport is not available and walking cycling is prohibitive given distance and gradient of location.

Negative impact on an area of outstanding natural beauty and existing tree preservation orders.

BK05

Exit onto Shootersway already over stretched road at a point opposite to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of

the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.

BK06

I agree with the objections to building on this area that were outlined in the core strategy and have highlighted these

Strong countryside boundary

Impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB

Impact and visibility of development on valley sides

Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment and station.

Please also note that I feel that it doesn't meet Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers, in that facilities and services are not accessible and walking cycling will be unlikely given its distance from town and gradient of hills that would need walking up.

There is not sufficient parking in Northchurch, this area already suffers with parking issues outside Tesco.

One of the main issues with the current development was the increase in traffic and yet DBC are suggesting further development of these areas with the additional issues of traffic, air and noise pollution that it will inevitably involve.

The site is in an area of archaeological significance.

BK07

As outlined in the core strategy as set out by DBC

Site is insufficient on its own

Some distance to town centre

Next to Chilterns AONB

Site is too small to offer scope for additional town wide leisure space

The canal bridge on New Road is narrow and results in poor pedestrian access to local facilities

Visually prominent site

Proximity to railway line

Impact on setting of canal

To add to this:

I also feel that traffic congestion at New Road/High Street will become much worse

Very narrow road and path after canal bridge causing safety concerns

Parking and safety of children at St Mary's not thought about

BK11

Will increase traffic at junction of Billet Lane and High Street, already a busy junction with people avoiding the High Street. Goes against council target of achieving 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floor space. Reduces employment.

BK12

Please leave the residents of Berkhamsted with some space in which nurture the fractured and somewhat broken community of our town, this space is used. Please think of the community groups.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4597

**Person ID** 1060575

**Full Name** Mr Steve Jay

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** General -Broadly support the proposed site allocations. Would register strong opposition to the possible Bulbourne Cross proposal which would have a totally disproportionate impact on the green belt.

Yes / No No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4620
<b>Person ID</b>	1263087
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Kondys
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have received marketing information/invitation to respond from developer Thakenham on "Bulbourne Cross".</p> <p>I have tried to find information on this on the Dacorum website but can't see anything so assume no planning application has been made. Is this correct?</p> <p>In any event I strongly object to this "Bulbourne Cross" proposal for the following high-level reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is on farmland not proposed for development in the Dacorum Local Plan.</li> <li>• As such it is not required to meet the requirements in the Plan (and these requirements themselves are not evidenced).</li> <li>• It represents linear development that would effectively join Berkhamsted to Hemel Hempstead and represents urban sprawl.</li> <li>• It involves moving Berkhamsted Town FC facilities out of the current location in Berkhamsted (so important that this remains where it is).</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4622

<b>Person ID</b>	484366
<b>Full Name</b>	mr richard dickinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I disagree with the Local Plan and the number houses proposed, In particular the proposal to overdevelop along Shootersway.</p> <p>This busy road already suffers excessive volumes of traffic as the Bearroc site continues to grow. With regular tailbacks blocking residential side roads with congestion at the traffic lights at the junction with Kings Road.</p> <p>The corona pandemic has resulted in some temporary reduction in private cars but the increase in online deliveries has created a new problem.</p> <p>When the pandemic ends private cars will revert to previous levels and grow together with exacerbation from online deliveries.</p> <p>Shootersway cannot accommodate further traffic increases.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4633
<b>Person ID</b>	1264482
<b>Full Name</b>	RICHARD FROST
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The plan to build houses just above the canal off New Road Northchurch with access on to the narrow B4506 and narrow old canal bridge will create a very, very dangerous junction on a very busy road.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4634
<b>Person ID</b>	1264482
<b>Full Name</b>	RICHARD FROST
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The case of Bulbourne Cross is a perfect of example of a developer trying to deceive people into thinking that their horrible development is good for the environment and wildlife. They are only in it for the profit. Their bizarre promise to build “ hedgehog hotels “ really demonstrates that they have no understanding of wildlife and countryside issues at all. They even seem to suggest the new residents will be keen to cycle everywhere, and that the traffic in Berkhamsted Town Centre will not increase. This is utter nonsense.



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4641
<b>Person ID</b>	1264486
<b>Full Name</b>	JIM JEFFERSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regard to the point above and specifically Draft Local Plan- Section 23.1 Berkhamsted Delivery Plan, I wish to object most strongly to the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for the following reasons:</li> <li>• The Plan calls for an 800 mixed housing estate to be developed along both sides of Swing Gate Lane. This housing plan should be scrapped as it is not needed to fulfil the current, up to date housing density estimates. Additionally, this development would put immense pressure on the surrounding infrastructure not to mention the safety and security of Thomas Coram Primary School.</li> <li>• This development will project above the horizon due to being a hill crest position and as such will have a great detrimental effect on the whole AONB. The development will be visible from a great distance and would be a blot on the current landscape. (Previous planning applications have been rejected on these grounds).</li> <li>• As to the proposal to create sports facilities and a country park in the area between Berkhamsted and Bourne End, this will change the entire rural feel of the area, an area that residents already enjoy. It will effectively join Berkhamsted to the outskirts of Hemel Hempstead inevitably losing its own identity.</li> <li>• This is Green Belt land and in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and current, up to date Government guidelines state that these areas should be protected.</li> </ul>

- The proposed suburban leisure facilities are already provided for a short journey away in Hemel Hempstead and the surrounding towns
- This area (The Bourne Gutter) is a conservation area in which protected species of various flora and fauna can be found. This should not be disturbed until all other possible options have been ruled out.
- I feel that this application should be rejected given the justifications sited above and that the best use of the land for the local population of Berkhamsted and its many visitors who are attracted to the historic town is to leave it as Green Belt land.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS4686

**Person ID** 1264495

**Full Name** Ian Fyfe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** I feel strongly that the proposals for Berkhamsted are unrealistic, not balanced and not supported by adequate infrastructure.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4713
<b>Person ID</b>	1264500
<b>Full Name</b>	GARY AND HEATHER FRIEND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The Thakeham Bulbourne Cross suggestion is much better in that it is a more comprehensive proposal & I like the sports fields/cycle lanes etc, but it is just way too big & uses far too much greenfield space.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4776
<b>Person ID</b>	1264252
<b>Full Name</b>	Patricia Jennings
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK07, BK06,BK08,BK05, In my opinion the impact on Green Belt and AONB have not been taken into account with the proposed housing developments. The number of new homes should be re calculated using data from 2018 that states less new housing will be needed. I believe that the proposed developments without Northchurch and Berkhamsted would place an insurmountable burden on ALL infrastructure services. An increase in traffic will cause more congestion, air pollution, a more dangerous environment as the local roadways have been built within a rural as opposed to an urban situation. School places, healthcare facilities, water supply, waste water, sewage management all need very serious consideration.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4782
<b>Person ID</b>	399110
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Glaysher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I have lived in Berkhamsted for over 25 years over which time I have seen many changes to the town. Notwithstanding my overall objection to the Plan, if further significant numbers of new houses are to be built in Berkhamsted then I think it would be better that at least some of these are build to the East of the town as proposed by Thakeham in the 'Bulbourne Cross' development. The new community facilities proposed as a part of the development would benefit the town overall and the additional proposed access to the A41 would reduce traffic through the town with the junction at Shootersway Lane and Kings Road and at the roundabout by the A41 already very busy at rush hour and at school opening/closing times.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4793
<b>Person ID</b>	1264462
<b>Full Name</b>	Penny Clifton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I wish to comment on several sites in and around Berkhamsted. I believe that the numbers proposed by Dacorum BC as a whole are flawed, but this is particularly evident when looking at the target of 'at least 2,200 new homes' for Berkhamsted and Northchurch. Berkhamsted has already more than contributed to a substantial increase in local housing stock in recent years, far more than is justified and with no associated improvement in local infrastructure, and expanding the town further is not justified by the demand - only by the desire of developers to use pristine land in a desirable town. The town already has significant problems caused by air pollution, with toxic levels of pollution regularly recorded in the centre of town. The transport assumptions in the plan are unsustainable (building on the tops of ridges will mean more

people using cars) and would mean increased overcrowded and congested roads. The idea that Berkhamsted residents in new hilltop sites would cycle is highly unlikely due to the steep gradient of hills.

The town is on the edge of an AONB and this, plus its green belt, need to be protected for generations to come. The use of greenfield sites will have an immense impact on the area, ruining much of the beautiful countryside which is typical of the Chilterns and adding to road congestion. The plans lack investment in a decent infrastructure; they lack recognition of the area's special environment and ecology and pose a threat to the area's chalk streams through increased pollution.

This part of Dacorum has many unique constraints such as the adjoining AONB and the green belt. This should be protected as there is no evidence in the plan that the circumstances are 'exceptional', the only way in which it can be used for development.

In 2013 the Core Strategy report noted that development in Berkhamsted "has to be balanced against the need to protect the town's historic character and setting", but the plans for Berkhamsted fail to reflect this.

The town does not have the health and education infrastructure to absorb a 24% increase in dwellings and 31% increase in its urban footprint. Proposals for a new school have previously been rejected.

Most proposed Berkhamsted sites are located on the sides of the valley and tops of hills. The green belt and greenfield locations in particular cannot be regarded as sustainable due to their location.

1. West Berkhamsted - this should really be referred to as Northchurch in recognition of the fact it is a separate community. The proposals in this plan will add about 50% to the population of Northchurch meaning the village will not exist in any recognisable form.

1.1 Darrs Lane, Bell Lane: The Core Strategy rejected this option citing the following reasons:

- a. Strong countryside boundary.
- b. Impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB.
- c. Impact and visibility of development on valley sides.
- d. Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.

Nothing has changed since this assessment.

Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. The choice of Darrs Lane is therefore premature. These are also particularly beautiful fields which contribute to the aesthetic appeal of the area and their loss would irrevocably damage the character and beauty of the area around the town. Without buffer zones like these, the ancient woodland and wildlife corridors would be lost.

1.2 Lockfield is highly unsuitable for development due to its location. New Road is narrow, potentially dangerous and already has high levels of congestion and pollution. Lockfield is in the green belt and there is no justification for its use. It provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The Grand Union canal is bordered by a chalk stream, which has international significance; any development or changes in the road could irrevocably damage its ecosystem.

2 Billet Lane/Jewsons. This site is unsuitable due to existing traffic congestion on Billet Lane and the dangerous access to and from the site. The plan's residential development for this site takes away an important local employment opportunity and community resource.

3 South Berkhamsted. This area has already been rejected for consideration several times, including in the Core Strategy. The reasons given still hold true today; nothing has changed.

As noted in the Core Strategy, it provides a strong countryside and green belt boundary; providing a buffer between the existing built up area and A41. The area is poorly located for access to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station (etc) - these are among the numerous reasons that were given at the time. Previous planning inspectors have also said: "The present green belt boundary ..... forms a clearly defined, firm and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, the site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the green belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment."

The use of this green belt land and major southward expansion of the town on the open upper valley sides up to the A41 would mean the loss of productive farm land and impact on the Green Gateway into the town – impact on transition area from urban to countryside. The land is not well related to existing services and facilities in the town centre, and is at such a distance that people would be discouraged from walking or cycling. In addition the gradient between the town centre and the site may make walking and cycling difficult. The site is located near A41 and noise levels would affect health and wellbeing of residents. Lastly, this large-scale development will place significant pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am aware of the 'Bulbourne Cross' proposals being promoted by Thakeham. These should also be rejected for the same reasons. There is no justification for using green belt land which would add to an urban sprawl joining Berkhamsted with Bourne End.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4840
<b>Person ID</b>	1264475
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk03, Bk04, Bk05. Bk06, Bk07, Bk08, Bk09, Bk10, Bk11, too many houses on green land.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS4986
<b>Person ID</b>	1264545
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Mclver
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK01-BK12 Social and Community - this is very vague. What are the new community facilities proposed? We need more community spaces, indoor and outdoor eg new halls and gardens.



Schools are already oversubscribed so one more primary school would be inadequate for the proposed growth in population in this small town. Investment will also need to be made into Ashlyns School.

Also what sports facilities will be added? I object strongly to the proposal to move the historic site of the football club away from walking distance of the town centre and railway station.

I object to all plans which involve building or affecting the views and quiet countryside provided by the greenbelt surrounding Berkhamsted. This countryside is vital for everyone's wellbeing and there is no proof that the housing developments proposed are necessary. There is only a perceived need (proposed by developers) which is not sufficient to justify the interruption to priceless and irreplaceable countryside and the resulting disturbance of irreplaceable natural Chilterns habitats and wildlife, flora and fauna.

Retail unit? Are you sure this will be necessary given the massive shift in consumer habits (people are genuinely consuming less, more online purchases and a drive towards being greener). Surely more community facilities to alleviate loneliness would be more beneficial and not threaten existing retail businesses who are bravely struggling to continue serving the community through lockdown.

What new play facilities are planned in Berkhamsted for children? These are vital for young parents and their offspring but are already getting overcrowded without an influx of a higher population.

Allotments are already very oversubscribed, waiting lists lasting years and the council is obliged to provide enough for residents. They are only going to get more popular as time goes on and many more allotments should be provided for in any development please. These are a very healthy community asset alleviating loneliness, and promoting wellbeing at every level, thereby reducing other demands on local services.

Kingshill Way and Shootersway are already very over-busy at peak times especially since the new housing estate was added recently in Shootersway. Significant further congestion is likely given the proposed BFI site development. This is unacceptable. There also needs to be pedestrian crossings at the top of Kings Road please to safeguard children many of whom use this route to walk to Ashlyns and the Collegiate.

The Civic Centre is fine, we don't need a new one thank you.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5018
<b>Person ID</b>	1264554
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Malcolm Allen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman South West Herts Conservative Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><b>Thakeham's Bulbourne Cross Proposal.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 This Proposal has been received by many Berkhamsted house holders after the Local Plan Consultation documents were received. Our Branch believes that two things need to be done.</li> <li>2 <b>Reconsider the proposal as an 'alternative' but not 'in addition to' the Local Plan for the 630 houses on the south Berkhamsted ridge and the 260 on Darr's Lane /Northchurch.</b></li> <li>3 <b>Carry out a careful audit of Thakeham's ability to finance the schools and other facilities proposed.</b></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Although it can be considered as an incursion on Green Belt and strip development it is no more so than the Green Belt incursion and strip development along the South Berkhamsted Ridge proposed in the Local Plan. In any case the sports pitches and school grounds at the Eastern and Western Ends of the Bulbourne development put a 'green' limitation on this effect.</li> <li>2 These are sports grounds the town needs as has been brought to our attention in the recent Local Dacorum Football Facilities Plan and which are not catered for in the local plan. Indeed Haslam's Field will be sacrificed for 150</li> </ol>

houses. The school which will benefit, has other pitches for its pupils but provides no value whatsoever to the community. The Bulbourne Cross proposes an array of sporting and social facilities.

- 3 The proposed primary and secondary schools will be a huge asset for the new residents and are sited to cater also for the 850 new houses planned behind Ashlyns/Swing Gate Lane. The current Local Plan shows a vague conception for a school to the West of Berkhamsted but nothing definite and it appears to be an afterthought and not integral to an overall plan.
- 4 There will be access to an additional junction onto the A41 thus relieving congestion and, further traffic in Berkhamsted and relieving the strain on Shootersway and Kings Road. The provision of cycle paths to the station is a major benefit.
- 5 The landscaping plans and new Country Park in an area currently little used by our citizens will be an asset to the town.
- 6 If more housing is needed this is a wonderful opportunity to improve Berkhamsted by planned, facility led development rather than impose development on natural green spaces and provide no additional facilities to make them pleasant places to live. The development shows positive gains for the Berkhamsted community and relieves the adverse effects of current plans along the south Berkhamsted ridge.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5043

**Person ID** 1264557

**Full Name** Natalie Crane

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment** These are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5076
<b>Person ID</b>	1264258
<b>Full Name</b>	Fintan FitzPatrick
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Included in comments on Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5130
<b>Person ID</b>	1264555
<b>Full Name</b>	Rick Freedman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01: (as with all sites) inclusion of areas/percentage within the site for wildlife, biodiversity, access and community inclusion is required to comment in full. Giving the entire land area over to private housing would be tragic. This particular site gives public amenity due to the view of it from the other side of the valley, as well as the rural approach into the town from the A41. If this entire site is given over to housing, Berkhamsted character of appearing "nestled" in a rural setting will disappear.</p> <p>BK02: No objections to the inclusion of this site- but it obviously comes with transport and infrastructure concerns, especially during construction.</p> <p>BK04: Similar to BK01, giving over all of this land to housing threatens the character of the town as observed in the approach from the A41 - however much less traffic would be approaching from this direction. The wildlife site may offset this. More details required, how big is this, and how can it deliver a net gain in biodiversity when the area is currently open space?</p> <p>BK05: Similar to BK04, but concerns seem to be reflected in BK05 that weren't included on BK04? (For all of the above - preservation of mature trees to shield the developments and limit the damage to character should be ensured. Baerroc Park is a good example of losing the "forestry" feel of Shootersway and turning it into a generic suburban approach.)</p> <p>BK06: Confirmation of the status of the school (council or private? will it be primarily for local secondary students? when would it be delivered?) is essential to comment on this fairly. The loss of such a large area of green space, which can be seen by thousands of houses on the other side of the valley would be a terrible loss, but if large amounts of this were school fields and land put into community use this may be acceptable.</p> <p>BK09: Strongly oppose development here due to the high density of protected species making this area a natural habitat, in addition to the access issues. This is the first piece of community land along the canal/A4251 since the Moor, and due to being on the river can't be replaced. It's an attraction of the town, especially to canal boaters and walkers along the footpath. Please don't release this site.</p> <p>BK10: No comments - already released!</p> <p>BK11 - acceptable for high density affordable/social housing.</p> <p>BK12 - strongly support developing here, but direct DBC to B-HIVE local project regarding this area.</p> <p>BK13 - acceptable for high density affordable/social housing.</p> <p>The loss of such a large area based on such extreme housing targets is very inappropriate. There are several areas that can be released/repurposed to continue development without needing the volume proposed. If we can bring targets lower, more suitable proposals could be made.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5174
<b>Person ID</b>	1264544
<b>Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Personal comment
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264539
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Bethan Fox
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.</p> <p>It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5179
<b>Person ID</b>	1264509
<b>Full Name</b>	Hannah Fox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.</p> <p>It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5191

<b>Person ID</b>	1264602
<b>Full Name</b>	Tim Falla
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am deeply concerned about the sites identified as BK03, BK04, BK05 and BK06 and strongly oppose.</p> <p>All these sites are situated off Shootersway which is already unable to manage the current traffic at peak times. Queues to the BFI junction can exceed 1km on school days.</p> <p>Furthermore the the traffic surveys identified both Darrs Lane, Durrants Lane and Bell Lane as playing key roles to support the extension yet also identified they were single track and unable to cater for an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Furthermore these sites are local on key green land which provides flood management for the A41.</p> <p>Growth and housing is important, however these sites appear poorly chosen, alternatives like Bulbourne feel more feasible as they do not rely on existing heritage infrastructure.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5229
<b>Person ID</b>	1264606



<b>Full Name</b>	Paulette Milego
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>RE. BK06: East of Darrs Lane</p> <p>Proposed development plans would have a devastating impact on Northchurch, a small rural community to which the proposed high-density housing is completely unsuited. Our residents are older than national average who have chosen the village for a quiet, peaceful life.</p> <p>It is surprising to see the plan does not distinguish between Berkhamsted and Northchurch – a separate community with its own distinct character and separate Parish Council, whose identity the plans threaten.</p> <p>The proposal would almost double the current population of a 1, with a significant increase in traffic and pollution and further congestion. The proposed areas of development are productive agricultural fields, surrounded by single track rural lanes with no pavements, unsuitable for an increase in traffic and pedestrians.</p> <p>My own residential street, Granville Road, is already a rat-run with drivers cutting through to avoid the long traffic queues on the A4251 and the already congested high street. This is already a danger for local children as the street is lined all along with residents' parked cars. Further development would exacerbate this and increase idling traffic next to our Primary school and lead to further cases of asthma, already high in this narrow valley which traps fumes.</p> <p>The current consultation timing and process are flawed. Residents only received information in print form about the consultation 4 days before the deadline – too late for postal responses in a community whose older residents are often not confident in responding online or do not have access to the internet and thus effectively excluded. It is rushed and ignores lockdown and the pandemic mean we have been unable to see any physical plans.</p> <p>Our Green Belt, ancient hedgerows, local wildlife corridors and biodiversity need to be protected in line with national environmental policy and 2030 carbon zero targets. The local constituents treasure their spectacular views across the valley to woodland and green fields in both directions and the local footpaths are very well used and crucial for our well-being and mental health</p> <p>Instead the focus should be on developing brownfield sites available in the area.</p> <p>The proposals do not address national housing shortages - the need is for social housing, low-priced homes in urban centres near public transport hubs and employment opportunities. The plans are for expensive houses whose owners would have to rely on cars to travel to commercial centres and work</p>

They run counter to the national Levelling Up policy and focus on SE around London when businesses and government departments are moving North

The increases of 1,000 homes a year are triple the number the Council needs according to the latest ONS figures

I chose to come and live here 30 years ago precisely because of the rural nature of the village and the surrounding green fields – a welcome respite from our work in London. Three of the fields (Wishing Tree Field to locals and the two across Shootersway) form part of a route for my daily walks. These footpaths are popular amongst residents of all ages and their dogs and help forge bonds between residents. Developing them would have a significant detrimental impact on my mental health and well-being and on the local community and our way of life. Please listen to your constituents.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5237

**Person ID** 1264608

**Full Name** Nicola Beadle

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.

It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5273

**Person ID** 1264610

**Full Name** Deborah Pollard

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Too much development versus what is actually required & not enough social housing & infrastructure support for what is proposed or needed.

Overall loss of space, lack of additional green spaces added, limited environmental consideration & new transport requirements considered.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5274
<b>Person ID</b>	1175740
<b>Full Name</b>	Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Organisation Details</b>	The Berkhamsted Schools Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	1175743
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Kevin Rolfe
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Group Director, Development & Planning Aitchison Raffety
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We have openly and positively engaged with DBC throughout the entire local plan process and commit to continuing to do so. We have held a number of detailed meetings with officers to ensure that DBC are aware of the BSG plans for education, sport and local community and infrastructure investments.</p> <p>BSG do not intend to comment upon other sites nor to support/object to DBC's position on other sites. The only proposal /sites that we wish to comment upon are the BSG owned sites at Haslam fields, proposed housing site BK03, page 302/303 and the proposed receptor sports provision site at Haresfoot, CY04 on page 341.</p> <p>We support DBC in making both of these allocations and consider them both to be entirely appropriate for all the reasons stated throughout this consultation response. We have also set out in great detail in our previous justification documents to the Issues and Options consultation process, the reasons why these sites should be allocated and we update and reiterate some key comments below.</p> <p><b>Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields</b></p> <p><b>[PLEASE SEE IMAGE 1 &amp; 2]</b></p> <p><b>Previous consultation/emerging draft plan</b></p> <p>In September 2017 DBC produced a first draft plan for Cabinet, intended to proceed to consultation. In that draft plan, the front section only of Haslam Field was a site that DBC were intending to recommend as a housing allocation. The front section of the site is 3.79 hectares and was proposed for 100 homes. At that time, DBC were working on housing delivery of 756 dpa. DBC had therefore concluded, based upon all their evidence base work at that time that the front section of the site should be allocated as a housing allocation.</p>

Due to potential changing housing numbers from central government at that time, that draft version of the plan was not consulted upon but instead DBC consulted on a range of housing numbers per annum. The final version of the Issues and Options consultation document therefore merely asked for feedback on a large number of green belt potential releases which included site BK03.

In our previous consultation responses to the Issues and Options consultation, we supported DBC proposals at that time for the possible allocation of the front section of the site, with biodiversity enhancement to the land at the rear. We made very clear in our submission that if higher housing numbers were required at any time, that we would also support a larger allocation including the BSG rear land. After all, the entire land had been identified by the Phase 1 and Phase 2 green belt studies to be part of the area which included the weakest of all sites on the edge of Berkhamsted.

Following analysis of all previous consultation feedback, DBC have been progressing towards the new draft plan on the basis that site BK03 as a whole was considered as a potential housing allocation. As stated previously, DBC were at one stage in late 2019 intending for the draft plan to be based around housing growth of 1,025 dpa. Given the very recent government response to the local housing need proposals in “changes to the current planning system” dated 16 December 2020 DBC will no doubt reconsider the level of growth planned for. If the numbers within this most recent government guidance were taken forward by DBC then the numbers would once again revert to this higher level.

The published draft plan version is currently based upon housing numbers of 922dpa. As stated above, the final housing numbers proposed to be delivered by DBC may end up higher due to the very recent government changes. We are also conscious of the fact that the final numbers could even end up being proposed as lower due to political factors. In our opinion, what is clear is that regardless of the final growth numbers, we support DBC that a) green belt release would be justified and necessary in Berkhamsted and b) the BSG land at Haslam Field, site BK03 is the weakest site in GB terms in Berkhamsted and would be the most appropriate release.

Numerous benefits will flow from the allocation of site BK03 and the relocation of the existing sports facilities to site Cy04 at Haresfoot, as set out throughout this response.

We elaborate on some of the key points as to why site BK 03 is the most suitable GB release regardless of the final housing target below:

### **It is supported by the comprehensive DBC Evidence Base**

DBC have undertaken an extremely thorough analysis of all potential sites as set out in their Site Selection Topic Paper and appendices. Their consultants AECOM have undertaken a rigorous phased assessment of 144 sites in their Site Assessment Study documents. 117 sites were included within the Phase 1 Assessment of which 38 were wholly unsuitable for allocation, carrying forward 79 sites for detailed phase 2 assessment. Following Phase 2, 33 sites were considered not suitable for allocation, and 46 sites were considered potentially suitable, of which 34 had major constraints and 12 had minor constraints.

Site BK03 was one of the limited sites with minor constraints. Having regard to this evidence and the three phase green belt study referred to below, DBC concluded that site BK03 is suitable for a housing allocation.

### **Appropriate Green Belt Release**

It is evident that DBC will be required to allocate significant additional land for housing, which will necessitate Green Belt releases. It is therefore appropriate for Green Belt releases to be made in Berkhamsted as the second largest settlement. The phase 1 Green Belt Study produced in 2013 confirms that site BK03 is part of a swathe of land that contributes least to green belt purposes.

The subsequent phase 2 Green Belt study then confirmed that site BK03 is part of the only area in Berkhamsted that was judged to have the “Weakest” category outcome. It is clear from the phase 2 green belt study that the BSG land in this area is the most suitable of any green belt releases in Berkhamsted.

The recent Phase 3 Green belt study raises no issues. With the recent planning approval for a high density retirement project on the immediately adjoining Hanbury’s allocation, the site will be in essence surrounded on three sides by residential development and with the substantial defensible boundary of the bypass at the rear.

### **Site is in a Sustainable Location**

During the adoption process for the current Core Strategy, various Green Belt sites in Berkhamsted were assessed, culminating in the release of the Hanburys site as a Local Allocation, in preference to other options. As the Hanburys site immediately adjoins Haslam Fields, it is considered that both sites are as sustainable as one another.

An appeal inspector on part of the Hanburys site adjoining has also very recently reiterated the locations sustainability credentials when granting planning permission.

The site is in an accessible location, in the existing built up area of Berkhamsted. It is within easy reach of services, and the High Street. It is considered that the site is a natural location for the expansion of Berkhamsted.

Also, within the current evidence base, DBC have published a sustainability appraisal report by TRL Ltd.

The SA concludes that overall, the Draft Local Plan performs well in relation to the SA objectives and that by allocating sites in the most sustainable edge of settlement locations will also help to reduce any adverse effects.

No significant effects were identified.

Additional sustainable transport measures can be delivered with this site and the BSG is committed to continuing to invest in local infrastructure projects that enhance sustainability such as the recent coach/car drop off facility off Kings Road.

### **Opportunity to provide open space and provide bio-diversity gain**

Within any detailed scheme there is ample opportunity for the provision of biodiversity improvements and the provision of public open space in an appropriate location to be agreed.

There are no technical constraints that would restrict the development of site BK03.

The School has previously had Transport Statements prepared by SK Transport Planning Limited which at that time confirmed that, in traffic and transport terms a 100 unit development (as being supported then by DBC) at the front section of Haslam Field was appropriate, deliverable and will have no adverse material impact on the surrounding highway network. It confirmed that the recently upgraded signalized junction at Kingshill Way/Shootersway will continue to have spare capacity after the development of both the land at Hanburys and at Haslam Field is implemented.

Since that time the majority of the adjoining Hanburys allocation has recently received planning permission for a retirement scheme and the other part has obtained permission for a small flatted scheme. The transport studies submitted with those applications were accepted by DBC/stakeholders on the basis that the traffic flows will be no worse than the previous allocation envisaged and with the retirement project the vast majority of movements would now be off peak, which is a major positive in highways terms.

In the current draft plan DBC have tested and concluded that higher growth can be accommodated. The Dacorum Local Plan Strategic Transport Modelling Report by AECOM together with the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport study shows how with a package of interventions, the total growth in Berkhamsted can be accommodated in transport terms. This growth includes an allocation of BK03 for 150 dwellings.

Given the current uncertainty over the final housing numbers and the fact that further detailed discussions will be needed with DBC anyway in due course, we have not yet commissioned an update of our site-specific highway measures. What is abundantly apparent though is that site BK03 has direct road frontage and is a small site in comparison to many others. There is no doubt that an appropriate package of direct and proportionate sustainable transport measures could be agreed and implemented if necessary for this site to go ahead as a phase 1 priority site.

A Tree Survey by Patrick Stileman Ltd dated August 2017 recommended the proposed access point as acceptable from an arboricultural perspective.

An ecological assessment was previously undertaken by Arbtech which confirmed that the Haslam Field front part of the site has negligible ecological value and that the rear parcel of land could (as then proposed), could be used for biodiversity enhancement where necessary. Once the draft plan has progressed past Reg 18, we propose obtaining updated ecological advice with a precise brief on what open space/biodiversity measures are appropriate on the entire BK03 site.

A Noise Assessment has not been undertaken to date as we wish matters to progress to the next detailed phase first. Noise will not be an issue as we envisage noise attenuation alongside the bypass at the rear as appropriate including the possibility of a narrow swathe/buffer of open land, similar to other nearby housing development. Such land at the rear can also be used for biodiversity gain.

### **Relocated and Enhanced Sports Provision**

To facilitate the development of the front part of the land for housing, the existing playing pitches will be relocated to a site adjacent to the Berkhamsted Pre-Prep School at the Haresfoot Campus site Cy04. The proposed site at the Haresfoot Campus is more than double the size, so an additional 4.16 hectares, in excess of 10 acres of area more. The move to Haresfoot Campus allows the potential to develop first class sports facilities which will in turn benefit the local community.

Very detailed expert EQA analysis has previously been undertaken and submitted to DBC which proves the many qualitative and quantitative benefits. Sports England were consulted and raised no objection.

Further updated reports will be produced as part of a future planning application process.

As well as improved sports facilities there are also benefits for the amenity of local residents near Haslam Field as the provision for car parking and coach travel will be taken away from the local highway, and into a much more self-contained environment.

### Community benefits/local infrastructure investment

The receipt that would flow from this project would be used to enhance sporting facilities directly at site Cy04 but will also result in wider education and community and infrastructure benefits throughout the local community as set out throughout this response.

The detailed Draft housing allocation for site BK03 is set out on pages 302/303 of the draft plan.

We support the draft allocation and the general points contained within the supporting text subject to the specific observations below.

We have commented upon the wider highway and infrastructure implications elsewhere in our response.

We would request flexibility in the wording to allow the possibility of a retirement housing element in due course as an option on a part of the site, subject to demand.

We accept the principle that any detailed scheme on site BK03 should provide for a through route for vehicles for the potential allocated site (Growth Area BK04) to the south-east of the site, unless another access route were pursued.

We note that the policy states that as part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, it should deliver a new wildlife site. This is too prescriptive and the BSG is open minded as to the precise uses on the open land and this will be subject to future detailed testing.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">IMAGE 1 AND 2</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5305
<b>Person ID</b>	1264532
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5341
<b>Person ID</b>	1264616
<b>Full Name</b>	Philip Daw
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK06 – I currently have views looking over the fields. The proposed development will ruin our view. Of greater significance, is further destruction of much needed green space. This has a detrimental impact on the environment in what is already a heavily populated and built-up town. We need to put more focus on protecting what limited green space is available, not recklessly building all over it and destroying habitats for wildlife, as if they were of no concern.</p> <p>Whilst I agree a second secondary school is required, the proposed location needs to allow children to walk/cycle to school safely. No proposals have been made to improve walking/cycling/public transport routes. In addition, improvements to roads or traffic flow.</p> <p>Site falls within area of Archaeological significance</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	There is no mention of the Bulbourne Cross development in this proposed plan – tthis needs to be taken into account.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5393
<b>Person ID</b>	1263101
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 - This is an inappropriate use of greenbelt. The footpath running pallel to the A41 on the north side of the A41 must not be destroyed. The proposal must protect all woodland is accepted.</p> <p>BK-02 - No issues. This must be prioritised as brownfield.</p> <p>BK03 - Tolerable loss of open space, but seems non sensical to lose space that is good for health.</p> <p>BK04 - This housing will be poor quality as so close to the A41.</p> <p>BK05 - Tolerable loss of land but still poor quality as close to A41.</p> <p>BK06 - Non acceptable use of greenbelt land. This will have a disproportionate impact on Berkhamsted &amp; Northchurch. This will significantly impact existing residents of Berkhamsted. Insuficient infrastructure exists to support this size of development.</p> <p>BK07 - This will be very poor quality housing as so close to the railway line. This will also impact nature and wildlife. It will significantly negatively impact canal users and residents who are trying to leave the urban area. The footpath on the canal here is the first point where your leave the town. If you build here it will make 'leaving the urban area' even harder.</p>

BK08 - Tolerable loss of land but again poor quality housing.  
BK09 - Tolerable loss of land. River must NOT be impacted.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5463

**Person ID** 1264636

**Full Name** Lynsey Bilsland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Sites Bk02 - 08 and Bk10 will have a significantly negative impact on the area. The over 800 houses proposed will put undue pressure on the infrastructure in and around Berkhamsted. With the development of Bearroc park (so far only phase I is open) the traffic along Shootersway has increased significantly and is dangerous. Only two roads - Kings and Durrants lead into town - as Cross Oak is single track at points and Darrs and Bell Lane are country lanes. The inhabitants of the proposed housing at these sites will likely drive into town and park, adding to traffic congestion and overwhelming current road infrastructure. The traffic in Berkhamsted centre is already over capacity. Proposed school developments in the plan are not within walking distance of these sites and again new inhabitants will need to drive to these schools. The junction at Shootersway/Kings road is already overloaded at rush hour, with tailbacks (and associated pollution)

extending back beyond shootersway lane and this is before Bearroc park phase 2 opens. Developing sites Bk02, Bk03, Bk04 and Bk10 will open directly onto Shootersway/Kings road and add significantly to congestion.

Proposed development of sports sites at the Haresfoot campus of Berkhamsted school to replace those at Haslam Fields (Bk03) is counterintuitive. The entrance to the Haresfoot Campus is directly after a roundabout leading onto the A41 and itself causes congestion and significant tailbacks every morning, on the A41 and local roads, already due to the limited car parking facilities and the number of parents/cars that queue to enter the site. This will only worsen by the development of sports facilities here.

At each of the sites Bk02 - 08 and 10, only a small number of houses will be built. It would make more sense to look for an alternative site where a reasonable number of houses can be built with appropriate infrastructure. As proposed these sites are not supported by transport, school or medical infrastructure and would have a negative impact on the town.

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

The Bulborne Cross site seems to be a reasonable alternative by offering a significant development size together with appropriate transport, school sports and medical infrastructure rather than cramming lots of houses into fields at the edges of Berkhamsted.

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS5483

**Person ID**

1264628

**Full Name**

sophie boden

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I have significant concerns with the proposals you set out for Berkhamsted. I will detail these below. Firstly I will talk about the personal impact.

You have included my house and my neighbours in the BFI plot. Are you trying to buy my house? Or do you think it is feasible for cars belonging to 90 dwellings to turn the pavement in front of my house into a through road for a housing development??? You will destroy my children. Currently the BFI is closed at the weekend and therefore the gates are locked. My children play in front of my house. Putting 90 dwellings behind my house will destroy this. The pollution would be horrific. The noise would be unimaginable.

Putting out this consultation at a pandemic is so unfair. I want to talk about this. Face to face. I want people to understand what they are doing here. You won't even get half the responses you should do, as anyone who does not have the technology will not be able to respond.

You need to reconsult properly.

Have you even considered the location? There are new builds across the road which have been on the market for over 6 months and none of them have sold. Why? Because it is the wrong location for a new build. The houses in front of the BFI sold because of their character and charm. The house on the corner by Kings road has not sold. This is not a central location.

The proposals for areas including the BFI, for the land south of Berkhamsted, for Hanburys, for the land south of Hanburys and Haslam playing fields would eradicate habitats and ecosystems that could not be recreated. You cannot destroy such significant amounts of green space in such a small area. The impact on the environment would be devastating. Developing one of these areas could perhaps be justified, this would allow the wildlife to continue on in the other locations, but all of them? Together? Just from an ecological point of view it is terrible.

As already stated, there are nowhere near enough facilities in this area. The closest school to BFI / Hanbury / Haslam is Greenway and is oversubscribed. Meaning that less students would get into a school they can safely walk to (without inhaling too many fumes) and therefore making their parents drive. This has not been thought through!

The traffic at this end of town is already high, building here will simply increase it!

There is no Dr's within walking distance (Dr's common having moved to Gossom) therefore again people will have to drive and clog up the town centre.

There are no shops within easy walking distance (try walking a buggy up the road and you will see you cannot do a full food shop and walk back to the top of Kings hill).

It is overbuilding in an area and not a sensible or well thought out plan.

Stop destroying our greenbelt!

The only site I have no objection is is the Jewson site.

I also find it very frustrating that you are putting all these sites on, making people choose which area you destroy.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5509
<b>Person ID</b>	1264647
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Burnell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5569
<b>Person ID</b>	1264491
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Wade
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5571
<b>Person ID</b>	1264651
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Beecroft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to these four proposed sites that will harm Northchurch directly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bk05 Blegberry Gardens in Berkhamsted (3.5ha)</li> <li>• BK06 East of Darrs Lane (22.73ha)</li> <li>• Bk08 Rossway Farm (12.29ha)</li> <li>• BK07 Lock Field (2.2ha)</li> </ul> <p>Specific points as follows:</p>

**BK06 East of Darrs Lane**

- There is therefore no extraordinary reason or need for Green Belt to be encroached and these plans should be stopped immediately
- This Green Belt land prevents the unrestricted sprawl of Berkhamsted into the village of Northchurch. If this land is developed on our village will be made obsolete.
- The site is located between two narrow country lanes and is unsuitable for development with restricted access.
- These fields can be viewed from across the valley within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Northchurch is unobtrusively nestled within the valley below it, but development would irreversibly change this vista to one of rooftops.
- The loss of this space will have a certain impact on the mental wellbeing of my family, and friends in my community. The 'space' is what attracted us to this semi-rural village life and the loss of biodiversity will be devastating.
- The site is located on a steep hill. The adjacent town of Berkhamsted is already over-developed for its topography, and the result is heavy run-off and steep side, narrow car-lined roads. Consequently, there is only one throughfare through Northchurch and Berkhamsted which is already highly congested. Keeping this Green Belt land green is highly important to the absorption of water above our village.

**BK07 Lock Field**

- This is completely unsuitable from a safety perspective. The road and canal bridge are extremely narrow and already a danger to local primary school children.
- There is therefore no extraordinary reason or need for Green Belt to be encroached and these plans should be stopped immediately
- It would constitute additional environmental damage to the chalk stream

**Bk08 Rossway Farm**

These are attractive fields that form a green barrier between developments and the A41 traffic. My family often walks through them and we see lots of wildlife including foxes and badgers which use this space as a corridor, hemmed in by the A41 to the south.

**Yes / No**

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5611
<b>Person ID</b>	1264681
<b>Full Name</b>	Laurence Mattingly
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I OBJECT TO THE PROPOSALS FOR BERKHAMSTED.</p> <p>I have a number of points to make about the both the consultation process and the proposals for Berkhamsted. I will make them all here rather than plough through this vast and opaque document.</p> <p><b>Consultation process</b></p> <p>The process has been inadequate in consulting the community directly affected by the proposals. There was minimal publicity of the plans and the information available is limited to a user-unfriendly document, placed inconspicuously on the Dacorum website. Once the document is discovered, the details of the exact proposals for Berkhamsted are not easy to find, being hidden away in the bottom half of chapter 25 of a 28 chapter document. Moreover, the proposals are fragmented to disguise the true extent of development (e.g four proposals for a site extending from the BFI site to Haslam Fields).</p> <p><b>Proposals</b></p> <p>The proposals to build a large number of houses in Berkhamsted seem to have no justification other than central government have dictated it. We are told that Berkhamsted will see significant growth but there is no evidence to substantiate this claim. It is also important re-appraise any thinking through the lens of a post-covid world, for example, the ability to 'work from home' means commuting into London will significantly reduce and accordingly people will look to settle in other parts of the country.</p> <p>The obvious implications arising from the proposals seems to have been ignored:-</p> <p>&gt; the strain placed existing on Infrastructure :-</p> <p>- schools - new schools are hinted at but no location for the necessarily large sites are offered. A true oversight in the plans.</p>

- sports facilities - no additional facilities are outlined. Indeed, building on Haslam Fields removes playing fields used by the wider community, not just Berkhamsted school.

- local food retailer - there is only one supermarket of any real size in Berkhamsted and it does not have the capacity to cater for a vastly enlarged population.

- parks and play facilities for children - again, there is limited capacity in the town.

> the hugely adverse effect upon local traffic. Traffic is heavy enough in Berkhamsted already with regular traffic queues in the High Street. The extent of development envisaged will compound this to beyond breaking point. Shooters Way, in particular, with vast development along its full length, will be unable to cope with the huge increase in use and result in serious traffic problems. Parking in the centre is also at full capacity with no sensible solution for expansion.

> the destruction of irreplaceable countryside; countryside that is rightly allocated as Green Belt and that is part of the Chilterns AONB. In these environmentally conscious times, surely this not justifiable. And the 'creation' of a country park (by destroying countryside) is a NOT a suitable mitigant.

> the disruption caused by the housing building work, both to the environment and to local traffic.

Taken together, the various sites proposed in Berkhamsted represent a level of building that is truly excessive (even the brownfield sites are greedily earmarked for high density housing). They will adversely affect the town of Berkhamsted and its community. To paraphrase Dacorum's *Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 - 2038)*, the proposals will not enhance nor even maintain the outstanding qualities of Berkhamsted – its community less vibrant and local, high quality countryside ravaged leaving it no longer a great place to live, work and enjoy.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5621

**Person ID** 1264688

**Full Name** Nick Head

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The sheer volume of additional homes is likely to lead to serious traffic congestion in the town, with a corresponding impact on air quality. I understand the need for additional homes but the scope for increasing road capacity in Berkhamsted is very limited - the roads are just going to clog up. I would support expansion more commensurate with the size of the existing town.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5644
<b>Person ID</b>	1264706
<b>Full Name</b>	Gilbert Connors
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I would like to state a complaint about the building of the houses next to the Grand Union Canal in Northchurch (BK07 Lock Field, Northchurch). There are many many reasons but there are five that come to my mind most prominently.

Firstly, you talk about the new development being sports facilities and other facilities to benefit the community, in actual fact it is just houses in this area, creating more carbon emissions on an already congested and polluted area. The area at the T-junction where New Road joins onto A4251 is one of the most polluted places in this area and will only get worse with these houses. This is bad for the environment and well-being in the local community.

However it is not just pollution that is going to be problematic with these new houses. The safety on New Road is already pushing the boundaries of what is allowable. The pavement is not even big enough for a mother with her buggy and toddler to walk down without being on the road or in single file. Considering most of the families in these new houses will have their children at Saint Mary's school, it is natural some of them will have twins. Therefore, they will have to wheel a double width pram down that pavement without being in the road, don't ask them to try because it is not possible. Continuing with the pavement some people living in this road are almost completely blind and use a white cane to get around and some are old and can't move well. This all means that these people are more at risk from the speeding cars, sometimes going up to 50mph in the 30mph zone. I have gathered this data with my dad with a home-made speed detector but I am sure it matches up with the actual data from other sources.

On the subject of cars, each new house would have an average of 2 cars, this means that (on an already congested road) there would be twice as many new cars as houses. Creating more pollution and traffic.

Penultimately, the wildlife that you would destroy is rare and protected. An example is the Kingfisher which is protected under Schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and there are 2 living in the section of land you want to destroy. I also feel that the open space in this area greatly contributes to my well-being and happiness and I ask you to preserve this for other young people like me.

Finally, the houses would back onto the railway. This railway is loud and has fast Pendolinos and large freight trains constantly moving along it. This means not many people would want to buy your new houses.

I would be thankful if you would reconsider your decision on building these houses.

Yours sincerely

Gilbert Connors

age 13

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5659
<b>Person ID</b>	1264232
<b>Full Name</b>	Lesley Wilkin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk01 specifically the area to the East towards Bourne End. This is currently green field space and I object to further development on green field sites especially as this will join Bourne End to Berkhamsted and completely change the nature of living in Bourne End or vicinity. I also feel that Berkhamsted is too small to maintain the infrastructure to support such a large development. It is already an overcrowded market town ( pre Covid). This large development will have a negative impact on the way of life in Berkhamsted which people have been attracted too for the reason that it is relatively small and not over developed. I think small developments on brown field sites in the town or on the very edge thereof would be much more appropriate. I don't think we should be driven by developer's preferences for green field space.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5671
<b>Person ID</b>	1264035
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Knowles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to site BK06. I am emailing my objection letter and also pasted it below:</p> <p>I would like to address the following points and raise your awareness of how this will affect my family and neighbouring residents.</p> <p>I live at the top of Darrs Lane, Northchurch and have resided in the village for nearly 10 years. We moved here to bring up our family in this beautiful semi-rural setting. We did not want to live in a town, but a village with the benefits of a lovely market town on our doorstep, but more importantly protected countryside with a wealth of flora and fauna for our children to grow up in. I am now fully embedded into the community and countryside and my whole family's physical and mental well-being is hugely reliant on the green space around us. I am a keen runner and 5 days a week run several miles a day through country lanes, fields, footpaths, woods, Ashridge and wherever I can find that is away from the roads. The hedgerows and wealth of countryside are home to a rich source of wildlife and out and about I regularly see many species of birds, Hare, Deer including Muntjac, squirrels, rabbits and much much more. I bring home news most days of somewhere idyllic that I have found or something rare that I have seen. I then spend spare family time exploring these beautiful surroundings with my husband and children, educating them about their home surroundings and the importance of outdoor space and fresh air for their health.</p> <p>I find it an absolute tragedy that your growth strategy proposes over 16000 new homes for Dacorum, with over 400 in Northchurch. The statistics show that this does not marry with expected population growth, and also is based on 2014 figures from the government mandate giving 1023 per annum. Whereas the latest 2018 figures are 497 per annum, therefore meaning your projected growth is double what is needed. It is also deceitful to propose such growth on past figures which have since been updated. Greenbelt by law must only be built on if necessary and these statistics you</p>

have put forward therefore mean the proposed growth is not necessary. There is also no information as to why you deem it necessary to develop our greenbelt so heavily? The value of the greenbelt land is not being considered for the physical and mental health of Dacorum residents.

Then there is the matter of roads, traffic, waste and pollution. We are already a stretched community as the popularity of the beauty of this area brings in a wealth of families and professionals to settle down. I wanted my children to be able to walk to school relatively safely and at the moment they can just about safely walk down Darrs lane to the pavement, although there is still the odd speeding driver or cars struggling to pass in the narrow lane. Darrs Lane can fall beautifully quiet at times which is why we chose this spot, but it also can act as a rat-run in rush hour. With an extra 400 houses in Northchurch, naturally that will add circa 800 extra cars to our already busy lanes and high street. With Tring an area of proposed growth too, Northchurch High Street will become clogged, gridlocked and dangerous. Tesco express already has insufficient parking so how will it cope? Shootersway along the top is already a route used by motorists to avoid the High Streets of Berkhamsted and Northchurch and there is no way it can cope with hundreds more cars. We have untold pot hole problems on the lanes and slowly the verges are getting destroyed. All these need attention before proposing more housing. And lets not forget the death of a 9 year old girl on Northchurch High Street nearly 3 years ago after she was hit by a van.

I chose to live in the beautiful village of Northchurch on the outskirts of Berkhamsted as that is the semi-rural setting that I wanted to bring my family up in. I fear we will become submerged into Berkhamsted and I am also shocked we have been referred to as "West Berkhamsted". This proposal is writing Northchurch out of existence which is a total tragedy and distressing for us residents who have chosen to settle here.

Finally I have attached a photo showing 2 important facts – firstly we received the Growth Strategy brochure only on Thursday 25th February –**4 days** before the deadline of the consultation on the 28th February. How are we supposed to have had enough time to respond and assist others to respond to the consultation who need help with postage, the internet, access to the information etc?

And secondly you have omitted my house from the map of Northchurch. There are a row of houses in the idyllic spot at the top of Darrs Lane and you have failed to add them to the area of Northchurch. This clearly mis-leads people into thinking the proposed field of housing here backs onto fields, when in fact it does not. It faces straight onto many houses who currently enjoy a view out over the fields into the woodland skirting down Bell Lane and Durrants Lane.

I would like to also add that the information I have tried to access over the last week since I have been made aware of this growth strategy by the community, is incredibly complicated and confusing. I have a degree and am perfectly proficient

on the internet but there is a lack of clear, concise, accessible information available to the public to be able to respond constructively and with good knowledge of the proposal.

Finally, we are in a pandemic and a 3rd lockdown. The entire population is distracted with untold physical and mental health problems with hundreds of thousands also shielding with no access to family, friends and community that they usually would be able to learn about this from.

It is therefore immoral to push a consultation through during such unprecedented times and urge you to stop the consultation. The statistics and figures need to be re-looked at, presented accurately and brought forward at a time when we are not in a national crisis.

Yours sincerely  
Alex Hammond Knowles

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	None. The statistics are already hugely flawed and housing proposal does not marry up to projected population growth.
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Dacorum Darrs Lane map.docx</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5712
<b>Person ID</b>	1262957
<b>Full Name</b>	Gregory Hukins
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposal of growth area BK06 in unsustainable. The statement itself raises so many areas of concern, such as Grim's Ditch and the recreational impact on the Chilterns beachwood SAC as to be impossible to develop. The addition of a park and a school which may or may not be completed are a red herring. Schools are governed by other areas such as catchment areas, in fact the school system was changed in Berkhamsted to encourage more children to attend Ashlyns College and changed the nature of the schools in the area. There are already two schools in the nearby vicinity of Durrants lane and Northchurch high street. How can a park provide the same levels of biodiversity as existing fields, ancient hedgerows and Beachwoods?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5734
<b>Person ID</b>	1264678
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom A
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5739
<b>Person ID</b>	1263239
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Farrer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The strategic plan treats Northchurch as contiguous with Berkhamsted. This does not represent the views of Northchurch people nor the village quality of our community.</p> <p>Looking at the map of the strategic plan, it is clear that the Green Belt land between the A41 bypass and the town of Berkhamsted is gradually to be filled in by housing. Remaining islands of green will undoubtedly be regarded as indefensible in future longterm planning. There are some absurdities. Haslam Fields off Shootersway is to be built on and a recreation ground will replace this lost recreation space on Green Belt land in Northchurch. Yet the plan regards this 'swap' as a laudable manifestation of leisure provision.</p> <p>Growth area BK07-Lockfield Northchurch.</p> <p>This is wholly unsuitable for dense housing as planned. It is bounded by the high speed railway to London and the canal to the south. The site would be incredibly noisy and Network Rail will insist on access for maintenance work for the tunnel and rerailling projects.</p> <p>This Trojan Horse proposition is clearly aimed at a wider designation of all land bounded by the canal and the railway through to Dudswell, which is a separate hamlet.</p> <p>The northwestern area of this segment is currently a Conservation Area. Local people are very worried that this would erode the nature of this ecologically significant area.</p>

Any housing on Lockfield would have access to an extremely narrow pinch point on New Rd. The road cannot be widened because of the canal bridge. There is no proper pavement on the northern carriageway and visibility is already very restricted. This is probably the least suitable site of all those listed.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS5779

Person ID 1144878

Full Name Mr Peter Moore

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No  
No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS5806
<b>Person ID</b>	494828
<b>Full Name</b>	P Marshall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 Access to this site onto Chesham Road will create a vast increase of daily journeys past the listed buildings. Construction traffic will have a negative impact in the short term also. Two existing schools Ashlyns and Thomas Coram will have a vast increase in noise pollution and potential for air pollution as well.</p> <p>Access via Swing Gate Lane is also problematic for the existing road structure and entry into Berkhamsted.</p> <p>BK02 New access would be imperative as exit through current entrance would lead to over capacity at the junction between Shootersway and Kings Road, the main entrance to Berkhamsted from the A41.</p> <p>BK03 and BK04 and BK10. All of these sites are adjoining and in total are mooted as providing 260 houses. Affordable housing should not be in the least favourable position next to the A41. Road access will be a prime planning consideration, in conjunction with BK02.</p> <p>BK06 Grims Ditch runs through this site so should be protected .</p> <p>BK07 Access to this site should mean this site is vetoed. A single car width bridge and resident on road parking and a primary school within 20 yards make it impossible to create a safe environment. There is already concern over air pollution levels in this area as evidenced in your plan.</p> <p>BK09 Density of housing provision on this site is a vital consideration so that the River Bulbourne is not affected. It has recently been reborn due to reduction of abstraction by agreement upstream.</p> <p>BK12 Taller buildings may be considered acceptable for this town centre site but delivery of 16 houses should be achieved without altering the centre of this historic area.</p> <p>BK13 Can this be redesignated for residential only as it is a safe flat accessible site?</p> <p>Applying to all developments across Dacorum I can see no mention of fresh water supply capacity, and sewerage capacity. Have works been done to suggest that the level of housing densities suggested in the plan are possible with these factors?</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5897
<b>Person ID</b>	1264702
<b>Full Name</b>	Megan Riddington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264683
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Megan Riddington
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Lockfield</b></p> <p>I have lived on Bridgewater Hill for 8 years, in a house that adjoins New Road, and have raised a young family here. I am therefore very familiar with the nuances of traffic flow etc on New Road, and the challenges navigating this road brings to family life.</p> <p>New Road is already hazardous and development of Lockfield will exacerbate these difficulties by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 increasing the amount traffic using the road</li> <li>2 introducing a blind junction at a pinch point on the road</li> </ol> <p>My concerns are:</p> <p><b>Narrowness of New Road</b></p> <p>New Road is a narrow road - larger vehicles cannot pass without extreme care, have no option but to overhang the pavement as they do, and often mount the pavement to do so without colliding, particularly on the stretch between Bridgewater Hill and the canal bridge. On this stretch, New Road frequently operates as a single track road. This is because on a daily basis vehicles park on the paved side of the road, due to i) people dropping and collecting their children</p>

from St Mary's School, ii) using the Scout Hut, iii) visiting the graveyard and iv) administering daily life (e.g. shopping deliveries, big garden supply deliveries, septic tank emptying lorries). As a consequence, vehicles stack up and sit idling both below and above the bridge whilst waiting their turn to cross. This is frequently to the extent that the queue extends past the entrance to Bridgewater Hill (particularly when Lockdown isn't in force and during the summer months when there are increased visitors to the Ashridge Estate).

### **Pollution**

The idling of vehicles contributes to the pollution in the area which is already recorded at problematic levels. As a mother of a child with moderate asthma whose health is negatively impacted by pollution, this is a significant concern to me.

### **Narrowness of New Road pavement**

The path down New Road is extremely narrow, right from the canal bridge up to the woods at the top. Many people, myself including, avoid walking this road whenever possible, because of the danger involved. People have to walk in single file down New Road to use the path in anything like safety - you cannot hold your child's hand. The pavement is too narrow for some standard size buggies, let alone if you needed a twin buggy, and walking a child and a buggy down it side-by-side would be impossible. I have personally seen people hit by the wing mirrors of passing cars and lorries.

At times cars also park on the pavement, meaning the pavement is totally blocked. Pedestrians are then having to walk into the road to continue their journey, putting themselves at further risk of being involved in a road traffic accident.

We have a community of people who need to use these paths, including those who have respiratory conditions, people who are blind, people with neurodevelopmental conditions (e.g ASD/ADHD), trainees with Learning Disability who attend for the work at Sunnyside Rural Trust (off the allotments along New Road). The development on Lockfield will increase the risk for all these already at risk groups, as well as the population as a whole.

There is no space to address this in a meaningful way.

### **Volume and speed of traffic**

Vehicles regularly speed when driving up and down New Road, putting other vehicles and pedestrians on the pavement at risk. Motorbikes travel here from >2 hours away to use the upper road to practice their slalom skills. My boys built a hand held speed camera and regularly recorded vehicles moving between 45-65mph in the 30mph zone as they descended into Northchurch. Other families have made and hung 'we live here signs' with pictures of kids, to try and discourage speeding. This is a longstanding issue of which the council is aware and has taken no proactive action on.

### **Cyclists**

New Road is a main route used by road cyclists up into the Ashridge Estate. These cyclists are already at risk because of the inconsiderate way the road is used by cars, and its general geography. From my house I heard the impact of a horrible collision between a road bike and a car on the stretch of road between Bridgewater Hill and the canal bridge only last year - the cyclist was badly injured but thankfully survived. More traffic will make these incidences more likely. There is no space for a cycle path to make this a safer passage for people using the road to build fitness and spend their leisure time.

### **Canal bridge**

The canal bridge is a pinch point on New Road. It is only wide enough for 1 vehicle to cross at a time. The current priority system to vehicles travelling uphill works reasonably well, but would not be effective if an additional junction on the uphill section to the Lockfield site was added in, along with all the traffic the houses would add.

The canal bridge is historic and warrants being preserved. It cannot simply be widened to allow for 2 streams of traffic.

### **Other concerns**

#### **Access to the Lockfield site**

I have real concerns about the access proposed onto New Road, from the point of view of people being harmed because of a blind-junction being created. I fear that vehicles will be coming down New Road on the wrong side of the road (because of parked cars on the left) and faster than they should (because this is already a problem), with the risk that they hit cars coming out of the Lockfield site the entrance of which will be obscured. I am also concerned that cars coming up the road will see the junction very late, risking exiting cars being blindsided. Other road users (e.g. cyclists) will be at even more risk. Children and families leaving Lockfield site on foot to go to school or scouts etc will be at extreme risk of harm. The death of Kasey-Lee in 2017 on the main Northchurch road is a reminder of how quickly a life is lost and their family thrown into an unimaginable future. Development off New Road cannot be allowed to progress in ways that will put the lives of our children in harm's way.

#### **Nature of the proposed houses**

If this volume of new houses are needed in this area (of which I am unconvinced), it is not the 4-5 bed, double garaged houses proposed. 2-3 bed starter homes for young families would be much more appropriate, so that young people growing up here have an affordable option that allows them to stay in adulthood and build their lives here.

I believe that Hertfordshire is being used to ameliorate the problems caused by London's dysfunctional housing market. I believe official figures actually show a decline in the population and think we should be making better use of sites that could be renovated to meet any housing need, rather than building on untouched land.

I ask that the council make a robust objection to the numbers of housing being requested of them and the justification given for them.

#### **Infrastructure**

As far as I am aware, there is no new money to improve the infrastructure of the area to cope with the increased traffic that will come with the building in Hemel, Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring. The scale of the development means that the roads between these conurbations are going to become further overloaded. I am concerned that Northchurch will be permanently clogged up with traffic - and therefore pollution - and that the road between Northchurch and Tring will be a rat run everytime the A41 is backed up. When this has happened previously it has brought the entire area to a 2-3 hour standstill and I foresee more of these incidences.

#### **Changing the character of the area**

We moved to Northchurch because we wanted to live in a semi-rural/rural location - where there is both proximity to nature and a village feel. Both of these factors that drew us to this location will be lost if the proposed building in Northchurch and the surrounding area goes ahead. We are not simply an extension of Berkhamsted (Northchurch was

here first) and nor do we want to be. We adjoin farmers fields and woodland, there are miles of hedgerows providing habit for wildlife. To suggest Northchurch is 'urban' is a misrepresentation of the area.

Building on the greenbelt is simply the wrong path to take. We have a duty to protect the environment, and particularly our green spaces, for our children and the generations to come. I work in children's mental health, and we have seen a 3.5x increase in our referral rate over the last year, with the children reaching us being very much more ill at the point that they are referred in. I believe access to greenspace is so important to preserving mental health and wellbeing in the population.

The views that people value over the surrounding countryside of Northchurch / Berkhamsted will be lost forever. Several vantage points will be disrupted by the development across Northchurch and Berkhamsted.

I personally walk the canal stretch between Northchurch and Dudswell with my dog, benefiting from the green space. I rarely walk in the other direction because it is built up and therefore has a different feel. Building along this stretch of canal bank will leave me feeling very sad, particularly for all the wildlife I know to be living in the fringes which will lose their home.

Overall, this overall development will breach the tranquility of the area which brought me in from Berkhamsted in the first place.

### **Wildlife**

There is a range of wildlife that use the Lockfield site, the nearby allotments and the hedgerows along New Road as a corridor up into Ashridge. Animals including deer already come to grief on the road near my house and this situation will only be worsened by the proposed development. Animals need to be able to safely transition between areas if they are to survive and thrive.

### **The disruption of the build process**

The process of building on Lockfield site will also be highly disruptive. The canal bridge will likely be damaged by the volume of large machinery that will come to and from the site. The angle of the turning into the proposed new site is likely to mean lorries cannot take the junction in one maneuver, and this will bring the road to a halt. Where lorries currently try to turn into this land area they use 3 or 5 point turns and bring traffic to a standstill for 15 minutes in doing so. These turning lorries are also a major problem mounting the pavement creating hazards to pedestrians.

### **Bell Lane**

The description of Bell Lane as a 'major thoroughfare' is absolute nonsense. It is an ancient sunken lane mostly avoided by traffic which couldn't be made suitable for anything (?other than a cycle lane) without vast changes and land-grabbing.

### **Fairness of the consultation**

This consultation process has not been a fair one. I only found out about the consultation about 2 weeks before the consultation closed and only then due to the actions of my local councillor Lara Pringle, not the actions of the council. Our household did not receive the brochure from Dacorum Borough Council summarising the proposed local plan - but we did receive marketing from the companies involved which was very misleading. This all made knowing where to find the local plan on the council website more difficult than it should have been. Once accessed, the consultation platform on the council website is also pretty hard to navigate - and I am educated to postdoctoral level.



I'm mindful that many residents in Northchurch, and in particular perhaps our older citizens, may not have electronic access at all, making the lack of a physical space where one can go and view these plans and speak to relevant officials particularly disadvantageous. A consultation should elevate the voices of all residents, and this one has not. Lockdown is a terrible time to conduct a consultation with many citizens isolated and shielding etc. The land connects us from one generation to the next and everyone must be facilitated to have their say.

It's my opinion that the consultation should not be going ahead during the lockdown period. Our opportunity to engage with this consultation has been massively impacted by the Lockdown situation. Firstly it impacted when we first heard that a consultation was actually taking place because, as a consequence of Lockdown, we are increasingly disconnected from the people and organisations around us. Secondly, because of the huge demand on our time as a consequence of Lockdown, it has compromised our opportunity to engage with the consultation in a meaningful way. We have not been able to attend most of the meetings which we would otherwise have.

My partner and I both work full time and have 2 children who are both being home-schooled - one primary school age, the other secondary age but with some learning needs meaning he is not an independent home learner just yet. This homeschooling takes all our time and energy - more than we have to give. We are trying to accommodate the educational and care needs of our kids within working days that now start at 6:30am and end around 10:30pm, and where the concept of a weekend is a thing of the past. The idea that we have been adequately consulted about the plan would be laughable if it wasn't about something so important. What is planned has the potential to change Northchurch and its surroundings forever, and create precedent for further infringements in the future. I find it hard to believe that anyone who is honest with themselves would call this consultation a fair process.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5903
<b>Person ID</b>	1264702
<b>Full Name</b>	Megan Riddington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1264683

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Megan Riddington
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Lock Field (BK07)</b></p> <p>I have lived on Bridgewater Hill for 8 years, in a house that adjoins New Road, and have raised a young family here. I am therefore very familiar with the nuances of traffic flow etc on New Road, and the challenges navigating this road brings to family life.</p> <p>New Road is already hazardous and development of Lockfield will exacerbate these difficulties by</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 increasing the amount traffic using the road</li> <li>2 introducing a blind junction at a pinch point on the road</li> </ol> <p>My concerns are:</p> <p><b>Narrowness of New Road</b></p> <p>New Road is a narrow road - larger vehicles cannot pass without extreme care, have no option but to overhang the pavement as they do, and often mount the pavement to do so without colliding, particularly on the stretch between Bridgewater Hill and the canal bridge. On this stretch, New Road frequently operates as a single track road. This is because on a daily basis vehicles park on the paved side of the road, due to i) people dropping and collecting their children from St Mary's School, ii) using the Scout Hut, iii) visiting the graveyard and iv) administering daily life (e.g. shopping deliveries, big garden supply deliveries, septic tank emptying lorries). As a consequence, vehicles stack up and sit idling both below and above the bridge whilst waiting their turn to cross. This is frequently to the extent that the queue extends past the entrance to Bridgewater Hill (particularly when Lockdown isn't in force and during the summer months when there are increased visitors to the Ashridge Estate).</p> <p><b>Pollution</b></p> <p>The idling of vehicles contributes to the pollution in the area which is already recorded at problematic levels. As a mother of a child with moderate asthma whose health is negatively impacted by pollution, this is a significant concern to me.</p> <p><b>Narrowness of New Road pavement</b></p> <p>The path down New Road is extremely narrow, right from the canal bridge up to the woods at the top. Many people, myself included, avoid walking this road whenever possible, because of the danger involved. People have to walk in single file down New Road to use the path in anything like safety - you cannot hold your child's hand. The pavement is too narrow for some standard size buggies, let alone if you needed a twin buggy, and walking a child and a buggy down it side-by-side would be impossible. I have personally seen people hit by the wing mirrors of passing cars and lorries.</p> <p>At times cars also park on the pavement, meaning the pavement is totally blocked. Pedestrians are then having to walk into the road to continue their journey, putting themselves at further risk of being involved in a road traffic accident.</p>

We have a community of people who need to use these paths, including those who have respiratory conditions, people who are blind, people with neurodevelopmental conditions (e.g ASD/ADHD), trainees with Learning Disability who attend for the work at Sunnyside Rural Trust (off the allotments along New Road). The development on Lockfield will increase the risk for all these already at risk groups, as well as the population as a whole.

There is no space to address this in a meaningful way.

### **Volume and speed of traffic**

Vehicles regularly speed when driving up and down New Road, putting other vehicles and pedestrians on the pavement at risk. Motorbikes travel here from >2 hours away to use the upper road to practice their slalom skills. My boys built a hand held speed camera and regularly recorded vehicles moving between 45-65mph in the 30mph zone as they descended into Northchurch. Other families have made and hung 'we live here signs' with pictures of kids, to try and discourage speeding. This is a longstanding issue of which the council is aware and has taken no proactive action on.

### **Cyclists**

New Road is a main route used by road cyclists up into the Ashridge Estate. These cyclists are already at risk because of the inconsiderate way the road is used by cars, and its general geography. From my house I heard the impact of a horrible collision between a road bike and a car on the stretch of road between Bridgewater Hill and the canal bridge only last year - the cyclist was badly injured but thankfully survived. More traffic will make these incidences more likely. There is no space for a cycle path to make this a safer passage for people using the road to build fitness and spend their leisure time.

### **Canal bridge**

The canal bridge is a pinch point on New Road. It is only wide enough for 1 vehicle to cross at a time. The current priority system to vehicles travelling uphill works reasonably well, but would not be effective if an additional junction on the uphill section to the Lockfield site was added in, along with all the traffic the houses would add.

The canal bridge is historic and warrants being preserved. It cannot simply be widened to allow for 2 streams of traffic.

### **Other concerns**

#### **Access to the Lockfield site**

I have real concerns about the access proposed onto New Road, from the point of view of people being harmed because of a blind-junction being created. I fear that vehicles will be coming down New Road on the wrong side of the road (because of parked cars on the left) and faster than they should (because this is already a problem), with the risk that they hit cars coming out of the Lockfield site the entrance of which will be obscured. I am also concerned that cars coming up the road will see the junction very late, risking exiting cars being blindsided. Other road users (e.g. cyclists) will be at even more risk. Children and families leaving Lockfield site on foot to go to school or scouts etc will be at extreme risk of harm. The death of Kasey-Lee in 2017 on the main Northchurch road is a reminder of how quickly a life is lost and their family thrown into an unimaginable future. Development off New Road cannot be allowed to progress in ways that will put the lives of our children in harm's way.

#### **Nature of the proposed houses**

If this volume of new houses are needed in this area (of which I am unconvinced), it is not the 4-5 bed, double garaged houses proposed. 2-3 bed starter homes for young families would be much more appropriate, so that young people growing up here have an affordable option that allows them to stay in adulthood and build their lives here.

I believe that Hertfordshire is being used to ameliorate the problems caused by London's dysfunctional housing market. I believe official figures actually show a decline in the population and think we should be making better use of sites that could be renovated to meet any housing need, rather than building on untouched land.

I ask that the council make a robust objection to the numbers of housing being requested of them and the justification given for them.

### **Infrastructure**

As far as I am aware, there is no new money to improve the infrastructure of the area to cope with the increased traffic that will come with the building in Hemel, Berkhamsted, Northchurch and Tring. The scale of the development means that the roads between these conurbations are going to become further overloaded. I am concerned that Northchurch will be permanently clogged up with traffic - and therefore pollution - and that the road between Northchurch and Tring will be a rat run everytime the A41 is backed up. When this has happened previously it has brought the entire area to a 2-3 hour standstill and I foresee more of these incidences.

### **Changing the character of the area**

We moved to Northchurch because we wanted to live in a semi-rural/rural location - where there is both proximity to nature and a village feel. Both of these factors that drew us to this location will be lost if the proposed building in Northchurch and the surrounding area goes ahead. We are not simply an extension of Berkhamsted (Northchurch was here first) and nor do we want to be. We adjoin farmers fields and woodland, there are miles of hedgerows providing habit for wildlife. To suggest Northchurch is 'urban' is a misrepresentation of the area.

Building on the greenbelt is simply the wrong path to take. We have a duty to protect the environment, and particularly our green spaces, for our children and the generations to come. I work in children's mental health, and we have seen a 3.5x increase in our referral rate over the last year, with the children reaching us being very much more ill at the point that they are referred in. I believe access to greenspace is so important to preserving mental health and wellbeing in the population.

The views that people value over the surrounding countryside of Northchurch / Berkhamsted will be lost forever. Several vantage points will be disrupted by the development across Northchurch and Berkhamsted.

I personally walk the canal stretch between Northchurch and Dudswell with my dog, benefiting from the green space. I rarely walk in the other direction because it is built up and therefore has a different feel. Building along this stretch of canal bank will leave me feeling very sad, particularly for all the wildlife I know to be living in the fringes which will lose their home.

Overall, this overall development will breach the tranquility of the area which brought me in from Berkhamsted in the first place.

### **Wildlife**

There is a range of wildlife that use the Lockfield site, the nearby allotments and the hedgerows along New Road as a corridor up into Ashridge. Animals including deer already come to grief on the road near my house and this situation will only be worsened by the proposed development. Animals need to be able to safely transition between areas if they are to survive and thrive.

### **The disruption of the build process**

The process of building on Lockfield site will also be highly disruptive. The canal bridge will likely be damaged by the volume of large machinery that will come to and from the site. The angle of the turning into the proposed new site is likely to mean lorries cannot take the junction in one maneuver, and this will bring the road to a halt. Where lorries currently try to turn into this land area they use 3 or 5 point turns and bring traffic to a standstill for 15 minutes in doing so. These turning lorries are also a major problem mounting the pavement creating hazards to pedestrians.

### **Bell Lane**

The description of Bell Lane as a 'major thoroughfare' is absolute nonsense. It is an ancient sunken lane mostly avoided by traffic which couldn't be made suitable for anything (?other than a cycle lane) without vast changes and land-grabbing.

### **Fairness of the consultation**

This consultation process has not been a fair one. I only found out about the consultation about 2 weeks before the consultation closed and only then due to the actions of my local councillor Lara Pringle, not the actions of the council. Our household did not receive the brochure from Dacorum Borough Council summarising the proposed local plan - but we did receive marketing from the companies involved which was very misleading. This all made knowing where to find the local plan on the council website more difficult than it should have been. Once accessed, the consultation platform on the council website is also pretty hard to navigate - and I am educated to postdoctoral level.

I'm mindful that many residents in Northchurch, and in particular perhaps our older citizens, may not have electronic access at all, making the lack of a physical space where one can go and view these plans and speak to relevant officials particularly disadvantageous. A consultation should elevate the voices of all residents, and this one has not. Lockdown is a terrible time to conduct a consultation with many citizens isolated and shielding etc. The land connects us from one generation to the next and everyone must be facilitated to have their say.

It's my opinion that the consultation should not be going ahead during the lockdown period. Our opportunity to engage with this consultation has been massively impacted by the Lockdown situation. Firstly it impacted when we first heard that a consultation was actually taking place because, as a consequence of Lockdown, we are increasingly disconnected from the people and organisations around us. Secondly, because of the huge demand on our time as a consequence of Lockdown, it has compromised our opportunity to engage with the consultation in a meaningful way. We have not been able to attend most of the meetings which we would otherwise have.

My partner and I both work full time and have 2 children who are both being home-schooled - one primary school age, the other secondary age but with some learning needs meaning he is not an independent home learner just yet. This homeschooling takes all our time and energy - more than we have to give. We are trying to accommodate the educational and care needs of our kids within working days that now start at 6:30am and end around 10:30pm, and where the concept of a weekend is a thing of the past. The idea that we have been adequately consulted about the plan would be laughable

if it wasn't about something so important. What is planned has the potential to change Northchurch and its surroundings forever, and create precedent for further infringements in the future. I find it hard to believe that anyone who is honest with themselves would call this consultation a fair process.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5911
<b>Person ID</b>	1263099
<b>Full Name</b>	Oliver Knowles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane</b></p> <p>I categorically object to the plan to build 200 homes on this site (Bk06). It is wholly illogical to use this site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Northchurch is a village completely separate to Berkhamsted. With all these proposed new developments including Bk06 our community is being erased from the map. Northchurch has a rich history and predates Berkhamsted, we want to keep our own identity and not be a part of a town.</li><li>2. The traffic situation in Northchurch is already out of control. Cars speed past St Mary's Primary School with little worry for the children who walk the tight pavements. We have been campaigning to make that part of the high street a 20MPH zone for years with no luck. The council has no interest in that, yet this proposal will add hundreds of more cars to our already congested roads. We had a young girl killed on the high street a few years back, more cars and that will happen</li></ol>

again. The parking situation at the bottom of Darrs Lane is ridiculous as it is. Cars are now parking on the blind corner all the way up the road as there are no double yellow lines. Its a death trap. I hate to think what hundreds of more cars will do to the already bad situation. Deaths most probably.

3. Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are very tight roads with historic hedgerows that must not be damaged. How on earth access to a school could be off the top of Darrs Lane is a mystery to me. There has been no thought process at all on how this would work. Darrs Lane is narrow and full of potholes as it is, nowhere on the proposal does it say Darrs Lane would be improved. Bell Lane is even worse than Darrs Lane, its a very narrow ancient road with a rich history and should not be damaged by this greed for more housing.

4. The field on Bk06 is not appropriate for housing. There is a huge sink hole in this field, what research has been undertaken to ensure more sink holes dont open up on this site?

5. What happened to the law stating we can only build on green belt land if it was absolutely necessary? In this case it certainly is not necessary to build houses on site Bk06. The data being used for the argument is out of date, population growth is not as is was according to the latest statistics. Why is out of date data from 2014 being used when there is more up to date statistics available? This feels like a scam.

6. The residents of Northchurch value our green belt land dearly. Its why we live here. We ARE NOT PART OF BERKHAMSTED. We appreciate what this land does for us mentally and physically.

I also believe this consultation has been handled appallingly. I only received the brochure on the 25th of February. This is outrageous. This feels like this is being pushed through during a pandemic whilst people are shielding and have other things on their minds. It feels you are hoping you will get as few objections as possible by pushing this through now, rather than waiting until after the pandemic when us residents can actually meet in person and discuss this properly. I am furious with the way this has been handled. I know many residents that were completely unaware of any of these proposals. This should be a completely transparent process but it feels like it's anything but.

I implore you to stop this consultation now and push the date forward so that residents can put forward proper objections once we are out of this pandemic.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5919
<b>Person ID</b>	1264752
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As previously mentioned, this is over development of Berkhamsted which the market town cannot tolerate.</p> <p>Access around the market town of Berkhamsted is circumscribed at all times by the impact of the canal and the railway. Berkhamsted is set in a valley. And as the plan says.: “there are few opportunities for new road capacity in the town”. As a town set in a valley with only one main crossing the county’s engineers comment the traffic lights already operate at over capacity. This results in residents choosing to avoid the main roads in the town centre or travelling to shop elsewhere.</p> <p>All the proposed sites are up hills along the top of the valley. Berkhamsted is a hilly place, so people will drive not walk into town so increasing traffic congestion along the A4251 and pollution. The existing road network cannot tolerate this increased burden of cars. I can see NO significant proposals for improvements to roads or traffic flow. All additional traffic created will feed onto Shootersway, Kings Road to town /station and various rat-runs ( Bridgewater Road) to avoid inevitable congestion.</p> <p>All the proposed sites infringe on the green belt of Berkhamsted and Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>My comments are as follows:</p> <p><b>Bk01 South Berkhamsted.</b> Green Belt. The’ Exceptional Circumstances’ justifying removal from Green Belt are not specified. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how will Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times be kept as a ‘secondary’ access.</p> <p><b>Bk02 BFI</b> Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.</p> <p><b>Bk03 Haslam Field.</b> Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to</p>



their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school. Even more important now that we keep green spaces for young people to use for exercise and to keep fit. (for health and well-being)

**Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch** Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy. The canal is a very important tourism asset within Berkhamsted and the Borough of Dacorum. Development should not be countenanced along this priceless asset. Once lost it is gone for ever as green space and an important wild life corridor.

**Bk09 Bank Mill Lane.** Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. It is on the flood plain. It is an irreplaceable asset to our local green space.

**Bk11 Jewson.** Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.

**Bk12 Civic Centre.** Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5927

**Person ID** 1261255

**Full Name** Sarah Lightfoot

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1261248

**Agent Full Name** Sarah  
LIGHTFOOT

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposed growth of 24% in dwellings and an enormous increase of 31% in the urban footprint will totally swamp the town of Berkhamsted and the Parish of Northchurch. The vast majority of the land designated in the plans is located within sensitive ridge top locations in Green Belt, at a distance of 3-4km from the town at the top of a steep hill – increasing high-carbon forms of travel since the suggestion that residents will cycle and walk up this hill (especially with shopping or children) is ludicrous.</p> <p>I was present when DBC vociferously supported their 2013 Core Strategy vision of <i>“maintaining the strong valley and linear character of the settlement”</i> and strongly asserted to the Planning Inspector that <i>“The open valley sides and ridge top locations are especially sensitive to new building and development in these locations will not be supported”</i>. They refused the developer's application to build on this land, giving detailed reasons why it was an unsuitable development.</p> <p>DBC has performed a volte-face and is now promoting the land for removal from Green Belt. Their suggestion that development can now be built <i>“in a way that takes account of sensitive views and landscape”</i> was previously dismissed by them as undeliverable. They have ignored national Planning Policy contained in the NPPF and statements by Ministers including the Prime Minister that Green Belt should not be developed except in ‘exceptional circumstances’.</p> <p>The arguments DBC employed earlier to reject the plans from developers to develop this same land as neither justifiable or sustainable have now been disregarded. Rather than repeating those arguments at length here, I refer you to the statements made by DBC themselves in rejecting these plans in the 2013 Core Strategy.</p> <p>I believe that the arguments made by DBC in favour of the 2013 vision remain sound and no justification or explanation has been given – or can be given - to overturn the strongly made arguments that DBC made to the Planning Inspector. The 2013 vision should be re-instated and this land should be removed from the plan.</p> <p>The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good and are itemised under each of the sites below, followed by BRAG's additional comments which I endorse.</p> <p>Bk01 - Land south of Berkhamsted</p> <p>Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strong countryside/Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>▪ Development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location.</li> <li>▪ Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built up area.</li> <li>▪ Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.</li> <li>▪ Important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.</li> <li>▪ This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.</li> <li>▪ Not well related to existing housing.</li> </ul>

- Visual impact on important gateway to town from A416 and A41.
- Proximity of A41 bypass.
- Potential impact on the setting of Ashlyn's Hall.

In addition BRAG has made the following objections which I endorse:

This land has been promoted many times before and the largest parcel within Bk01 has been robustly rejected by previous Planning Inspectors –“The present Green Belt boundary runs along the rear boundaries of the properties fronting Upper Hall Park which in my view forms a clearly defined, firm and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, the site contributes to one of the primary purposes of the Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment.”

Nothing has physically changed. Indeed, the Stage 3 Green Belt Review commissioned by DBC clearly supports the strong boundaries that exist now, while conclude that “strengthening” to the new boundaries would be required only if the land is released i.e. releasing the land from Green Belt would weaken the strong defensible boundaries that previous inspectors have referred to. Furthermore, the review’s Landscape Findings labels Bk01 as “Moderate-High” for both Susceptibility and Sensitive, but that summary includes the “moderate” label for the land to the furthest west of Bk01 which is physically detached from the larger parcels to the east where the majority of building would take place. On its own this land would be given a “High” rating.

Site Appraisals raise significant issues:

- Substantial loss of Green Belt land and major southward expansion of the town on the open upper valley sides up to the A41.
- The loss of productive farm land.
- Impact on the Green Gateway into the town – impact on transition area from urban to countryside
- The land is not well related to existing services and facilities in the town centre.
- Located at a distance from the town centre which would discourage walking and cycling – in addition the gradient between the town centre and the site may make walking and cycling difficult
- Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- Located near A41 – noise levels could affect health and wellbeing even with the proposed acoustic bunds in place
- Large-scale development will place significant pressure on local infrastructure, particularly the local highway network.
- The ability of these roads to accommodate additional traffic should be tested, particularly Swing Gate Lane and any potential to upgrade it. How can it be kept as a secondary access?
- Capacity of Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction and other local junctions will need to be confirmed, especially given cumulative impact of existing and other promoted development. Sustainability Site Appraisal acknowledges that the distance from key facilities and services and its valley ridge location would discourage movements by foot or cycle Site Appraisals all negative issues – mitigation relies on - *The proposal offers opportunity to create a new planned*

*neighbourhood expansion of the town with a range of associated local services and facilities. It is of a size to deliver larger-scale infrastructure and contribute to improving transport links through the creation of an east-west link road (connecting Swing Gate Lane with Chesham Road), although this will need to be tested. It also allows potential to secure a range of social, leisure and community facilities.*

BRAG gave evidence at the Core Strategy showing that the so called benefits are unlikely to materialise, are not sustainable or are simply required to facilitate the new development itself, giving no benefit to the wider community and indeed would pile extra stress on the already creaking infrastructure. In particular:

- Proposed east-west link is promoted as benefit to the wider community. However, at the Accessibility session of the Core Strategy Hearing the Inspector accepted the conclusions of all attendees (including DBC and Herts County Council Highways Department) that the 'link' could not work as promoted by the developer and was simply required to facilitate the proposed new development. As such it cannot be accepted as benefit for the community as a whole and is shocking that it appears as such in a DBC site appraisal. It is likely to generate rat runs – cutting out road system around Chesham Road (which is one-way for the majority) and Shootersway – leading to unintended consequence of massive congestion as cars are forced down Swing Gate Lane – which does not have the capacity – and then additional traffic on all the Hall Park estate roads as cars seek to avoid traffic jams with A4251
- Additional 2000 cars (c6,000 car movements per day) – contrary to local plan policies and creating increased greenhouse gas emissions.
- Parts of this ridge top location would be highly visible from AONB land and intrusive
- Commuter estate – lack of community cohesion – no contribution to vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'
- Suggestion of new primary school – rejected by DBC at Core Strategy.
- Affordable housing – cut off from town and all facilities – requirement for car – will not generate vision of 'inclusive community'
- Not appropriate siting for growing elderly population. An increasing elderly population will have more reliance on cars etc and the distance from town and all vital facilities will be a key factor in their integration into the community or isolation from it.
- Previous suggestions to improve traffic flow in Swing Gate Lane by banning parking totally unfeasible and detrimental to community.
- Additional dangers of steep roads in winter. In recent years, bad winters have become a regular occurrence and, in some cases, freezing conditions have lasted for several days. Most roads leading south out of the valley were not cleared or treated and buses either found them impassable or proceeded with great difficulty. Refuse collection had to be cancelled and four wheel drive vehicles had difficulty in coping. The inaccessibility of the hills caused many drivers to abandon their cars on the London Road, exacerbating travel problems. The weather-related accessibility problems for any developments on the valley ridge will require some form of snow clearance programme. This definitely has not happened in recent years mainly on the grounds of cost and once, we believe, when there was a national shortage of salt. We can find no evidence that this particular issue has been addressed.

- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport. ▪ Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and usage, for any purpose, remains low.
- Suggestion of 'bus loop' not viable solution as clearly demonstrated at Core Strategy Inspection. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement for 850 homes to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- Important issue – TRL states "The scale of development at this site is out of scale with employment opportunities in Berkhamsted and therefore it is likely that many of the new dwellings will be occupied by commuters to other towns/areas for work. Whilst the site is situated within 2km of the railway station there remains the likelihood that a high proportion will commute to work or make their journey to the station by private car."
- Berkhamsted railway station and commuter line to Euston is already at full capacity – pre-pandemic.
- Suggestion of local services and facilities shown not to be viable at last Core Strategy inquiry – BRAG has letters from commercial surveyors relating to local retail provision not being a sustainable option.
- Suggestion of local employment opportunities in 'local centre' or business units – generate more car journeys – not viable anyway.
- GP / health provision – town struggling to meet current demand. National shortage of GPs – unlikely that a new practice would be established on South Berkhamsted site – significant distance to current practices.
- Suggestion that "this increased number of residents in the town would make facilities and shops more viable" – they have already identified the difficulties in accessing the town and facilities – will either massively increase congestion and drive away business from the town – or will commute out and use other towns and facilities – in either case providing NO 'sustainable Prosperity' to Berkhamsted
- Impact on wildlife – reduction on wildlife corridor – forcing wildlife to cross A41 – TRL recognises loss or damage to habitats including Long Green wildlife site and Brickhill Green wildlife site
- Development of site threatens ancient woodland (Long Green), while environmental policies suggest this would be an ideal area to plant more trees and expand existing woodland rather than creating more pollution.
- Suggestions of managed woodland doubtful – who would have responsibility?
- Area of Archaeological significance affects part of the land.

- Site appraisal says the ‘Potential linkages with B-h2 could be explored’– would exacerbate all the problems and block wildlife corridor even more.

#### Bk02 British Film Institute

The local objective to “Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site” has clearly been dropped. Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense. Bk03 Haslam Playing Fields Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community.

#### Bk03 Haslam Field

This was gifted to the school and BRAG were told by the school that it was a legal condition that they could not develop the land – it was gifted to be used as sports fields. Presumably, the school have found legal way round these conditions, but clearly at the very least promoting the land goes directly against the spirit of the gift and the benefactors stated wishes. If it is surplus to the school’s current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car

- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

#### Bk04 Land Between Hanburys and A41

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.

▪ Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

BK05 Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)

Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site

- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- Very close to the A41. In addition BRAG makes the following objections
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road near to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.



▪ Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk06 East of Darrs Lane Land between Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darr's Lane (two sites)

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Strong countryside boundary.
- Impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB.
- Impact and visibility of development on valley sides.
- Poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.

In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Fails to meet Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided highly unlikely
- Suggestion that it is relatively close to shops at Northchurch risible – steep gradient and distance'
- Parking at Northchurch already insufficient – no capacity for additional cars from ridge top
- One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Suggestion of 'bus loop' therefore not viable solution. Berkhamsted bus routes have decreased in recent years. Would not meet requirement to reach employment, schooling etc in rush hour or have any significant impact on car journeys
- Site falls within area of Archaeological significance
- Adjacent to Chilterns AONB
- Same arguments on accessible housing – distance from facilities and services

- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

#### Bk07 Land at Lockfield, Northchurch

Core Strategy identified the following reasons against development on this site ▪ Site is insufficient on its own, but could be phased with other land. ▪ Some distance from the town centre.

- Next to the Chilterns AONB.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.
- The canal bridge on New Road is narrow and results in poor pedestrian access to local facilities.
- Visually prominent site.
- Proximity to railway line.
- Impact on setting of the canal. In addition BRAG makes the following objections
- Close to canal – undermines Berkhamsted Vision “protecting key historic and environmental assets such as the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne”
- Close to Northchurch AQMA
- Traffic congestion at junction of North Road with Northchurch High Street will be exacerbated
- Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge
- Parking difficulties and concerns for safety of children attending St Mary's School
- Noise from railway
- Distance from town centre services and vital facilities Bk08 Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)
- Some distance from the town centre.
- Important transition area between the town and open countryside.
- New building could set a precedent for further development of land to the A41 bypass.
- Site is too small to offer scope for additional town-wide leisure space.

- Very close to the A41.
- Fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision
- facilities and services not accessible
- Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is absurd
- Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services.
- Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- Site of archaeological significance
- Not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution. Additional traffic created by the site could add to existing problems in the AQMA at Northchurch
- No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill. With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within one mile of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13½% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. We accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Bk09 Land at Bank Mill Lane

Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons

- Encroachment of the urban area along the valley bottom and into adjoining open countryside.
- Distance from the town centre services and facilities, employment land and station.
- Impact on setting of the River Bulbourne.
- Reduction in the degree of separation between the town and Bourne End In addition BRAG makes the following objections

- Expansion of town to east – would significantly alter Gateway to Berkhamsted
- Located in Berkhamsted Conservation Area
- Impact on adjacent AONB
- Risk of flooding identified in assessment
- Distance from town centre – walking or cycling route to town adversely affected by any additional traffic to/from South Berkhamsted
- Suggestion of provision of local play space – edge of town not a practical site
- Adjacent site delivered NO affordable homes – suggestion that this site will deliver 20 affordable homes ....
- Suggestion of specialist elderly person’s accommodation on site – at a distance from the town centre facilities and services – residents won’t be walking and cycling to the town Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulborne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.

Bk10 Hanburys

Already adopted, but is an example of master planning failure. BRAG was invited to participate in planning the development with the owner’s representatives and the DBC planners. What is currently proposed bears no resemblance to the agreed Master Plan and has been changed without reverting to the local community.

Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site)

Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities’ needs and provides employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council’s objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.

Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street

Given Dacorum Council’s track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.

Bk13 Gossoms End / Billet Lane Lidl are understood to be seeking a developer purchaser to provide the foodstore and parking on a leaseback basis and build the residential element to its own account. Any element of affordable housing in the existing consent should be retained.

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

No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I agree with BRAG that the 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted by Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document. The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5935
<b>Person ID</b>	1264787
<b>Full Name</b>	Sam Markey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I recognise the popular need (and Government directive) to provide additional housing and broadly welcome what look like reasonable infill proposals. I am concerned that the access on New Road is already very poor for pedestrians (ie. the very narrow pavement) and wonder how the impact of a further 60 dwellings on site Bk07 will be mitigated in terms of traffic past St Mary's School.</p> <p>Several schemes seem to place significant burden on Shootersway, which risks becoming a heavily congested artery. The distance to the High Street and elevation means few people are likely to choose to walk into town. What plans are there to create new bus routes serving these new communities, allowing at least some journeys to taken on public transport? And what improvements to Shootersway to allow for heavier use?</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5945
<b>Person ID</b>	1264785
<b>Full Name</b>	Thomas Lloyd-Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Most of these are valley sides, or ridges where the wind is very strong. It looks like someone has come up with these locations without ever visiting. They are quite obviously not sustainable nor desirable.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5947
<b>Person ID</b>	1262737
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Cassels
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Your plans neatly parcel out the developments in lots of 60 to 200 odd house which looks acceptable and logical. When you add together the house in the Shootersway and Kinghill Way the total number is a massive increase in traffic in an are where during the morning commute and school run, massive congestion is already evident since Bearoc Park was developed. There is far too much development of Berkhamsted (24% increase in housing, or thereabouts) with the existing infrastructure and the proposed improvement to the infrastructure are grossly inadequate. These plans need reconsidered tom reduce the increase in housing and advance the improvements planned to the infrastructure. I oppose.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS5952
<b>Person ID</b>	1264790
<b>Full Name</b>	Claire McParland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	My comments concern the proposed Bulborune Cross development. I am very concerned about this proposed development. Being a resident of the Paddocks in Bourne end I can see that this will have a significant impact on traffic on the A41 junction which is our only access in and out of the development. This will also take away all the green belt land surrounding us and join us to Berkhamsted. No thought appears to have been given to the impact of Bourne End residents, particularly those in the Paddocks development whom will be most affected. The priority seems to be focused on Berkhamsted only. I wish to raise an objection to the proposed development and express my support for the green

belt areas and for the designated housing areas around south and west of berkhamsted as being the least impactful areas.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS5966

**Person ID** 484226

**Full Name** Mr Matthew Allen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Berkhamsted has a rich history and has seen an explosion of new developments and residents over the last 25 years. The town centre already suffers with extreme vehicle congestion with queues and associated pollution issues. Parking even with new arrangements is very limited, and the station car park is already full to capacity (accepting COVID). Major improvements will be required on multiple aspects including, doctors, healthcare, schooling, recreational facilities for young adults etc. The green belt needs to be respected and the special characteristics of the town preserved.

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

No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

Any potential undeveloped area appears to have been considered for future new builds. Nothing is left.



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6026
<b>Person ID</b>	1264822
<b>Full Name</b>	JULES GARNER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The area of greenbelt between the A41 was at one time considered crucial to protect the the health of Berkhamsted residents from any increased pollution the newly A41 would bring. This proposal not only ripes out those green lungs but also puts the health at risk of the new residents of the developments in between the A41 and existing Berkhamsted town.</p> <p>There is little oppourtunity for new road infrastructure as Berkhamsted sits in a valley, however the new sites appear to not take this into consideration, since most are served by narrow or single track roads.</p> <p>The councils key objective to provide at least 100% of their self-assessed housing need will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB which is at odds with their other objective to minimise and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS6036
<b>Person ID</b>	1264827
<b>Full Name</b>	Wai Tang
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I'm writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft local plan specifically draft local plan section 23.1.</p> <p>We do not support either the development of the land behind Upper Hall Park or the speculative Thakeham plans. Both are ill thought out and concentrate on profit without consideration on the impact on residents and the environment.</p> <p>Currently there is a lack on infrastructure and amenities (doctors, school places, shops etc) at this end of town and adding housing will only increase pressure.</p> <p>There are well documented traffic issues which again will be exacerbated by the proposed developments. In addition the existing roads such as Swing Gate Lane are already busy and ill suited to the additional traffic these developments would generate.</p> <p>Finally the fields act as an important soakaway for rain water. Even now when it rains heavily (this is a common occurrence) we have a lot of water running down the hill and pooling at the bottom of London Road causing huge puddles. If these fields are developed, it will make this run off worse and likely result in flooding.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6037
<b>Person ID</b>	1264827
<b>Full Name</b>	Wai Tang
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I'm writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft local plan specifically draft local plan section 23.1.</p> <p>We do not support either the development of the land behind Upper Hall Park or the speculative Thakeham plans. Both are ill thought out and concentrate on profit without consideration on the impact on residents and the environment.</p> <p>Currently there is a lack on infrastructure and amenities (doctors, school places, shops etc) at this end of town and adding housing will only increase pressure.</p> <p>There are well documented traffic issues which again will be exacerbated by the proposed developments. In addition the existing roads such as Swing Gate Lane are already busy and ill suited to the additional traffic these developments would generate.</p>

Finally the fields act as an important soakaway for rain water. Even now when it rains heavily (this is a common occurrence) we have a lot of water running down the hill and pooling at the bottom of London Road causing huge puddles. If these fields are developed, it will make this run off worse and likely result in flooding.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6042

**Person ID** 1264835

**Full Name** Mark Paterson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

We firmly reject the proposals for the Bulborne Cross development which represents marketing over substance.

The development is proposed smack on top of Green Belt land which is still supposedly safeguarded by this Government. The identity of Berkhamsted would be fundamentally altered by such a development which more or less would connect Berkhamsted to Hemel via Bourne End. I am surprised such a development is even entertained by Dacorum considering none of the previously proposed developments' flaws (green belt, roads, infrastructure etc) are addressed by the project.

Thanks for your consideration.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS6054
<b>Person ID</b>	1264812
<b>Full Name</b>	Gwyneth Davies
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Land south of Berkhamsted (Growth area Bk01).</p> <p>The proposal for around 850 dwellings on this site is inappropriate. It is green belt land which provides an important green corridor between the A41 and the town. This should be preserved for future generations, as although I appreciate the need to identify new sites for expansion, this site does not have the required connectivity or local infrastructure to support sustainable living in the 21st century. The land accessible via Swing Gate Lane / behind Upper Hall Park is at the top of a hill. Whilst I can appreciate that on a 2D map this location is fairly near to the centre of Berkhamsted (and even ignoring any consideration of the green belt land in relation to the health and well being of local residents), in reality it is at the top of a hill. The number of cyclists that navigate Swing Gate Lane currently is tiny, reflecting the steepness of the hill. It seems inconceivable that cycling up Swing Gate Lane to the proposed development land is a realistic proposition to anyone but the keenest of cyclists. Similarly, walking would be restricted to able children and adults, and excluding the elderly/anyone with a mobility impairment unless they go by car. It is highly likely that almost all travel from the proposed south Berkhamsted development would be by car - through a town that is already congested unless going on to the A41. Travel to the station would almost certainly be by car. The infrastructure within Berkhamsted will not cope with this - particularly on Swing Gate Lane, and on roads through central Berkamstead (e.g. towards station). This is both in relation to the size/steepness of road and road traffic, and also pedestrians (Swing Gate Lane houses an infant and junior school). There are clear safety implications, particularly in the winter months. The improvement that would need to be made to Swing Gate Lane seem impossible given existing housing. I am also concerned that infrastructure relating to sewerage around Swing Gate Lane/Hall Park will not cope with such a large new development at the top of the hill.</p> <p>I fully accept that there is a need to identify sites for expansion, but these sites need to be appropriate to promote and sustain healthy living for new residents as well as those already living in the town. The proposed development of the land south of Berkhamsted does not fit the bill. Working patterns and locations are changing. The Dacorum local plan needs to be re-thought with a post-pandemic mindset.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6064
<b>Person ID</b>	1144597
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Newell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We would like to register our strongest objection to the planned new housebuilding programme for Berkhamsted - in particular to the fact that most of this newbuild will be on the south side, between Shootersway and the A41 and on existing sites such as Haslams Field.</p> <p>The implications for such a programme as far as road traffic is concerned are very worrying. We live in Cross Oak Road, where already the heavy goods traffic is dangerous and excessive. This traffic is bound to increase if the planned building proceeds. By extension, the effects on traffic in the High Street and on the heavily overloaded traffic-light system will also be significant.</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure for so many new family houses will also have adverse implications for the existing system, such as health care and schooling provision.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6125
<b>Person ID</b>	1264797
<b>Full Name</b>	Robert Diehl
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The majority of the sites indentified in Berkhamsted are on valley sides and ridge-top Green Belt locations. These cannot be regarded as sustainable locations and will necessitate addtional use of cars by residents to access facilities.</p> <p>Sites Bk02, Bk03, Bk04, Bk05, Bk06, Bk08, Bk10 will all be accessed using Shootersway. This cause extreme congestion and air pollution along Shootersway, particularly with the junction with King's Road which already heavily congested at peak times.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6145
<b>Person ID</b>	1264690

<b>Full Name</b>	Terry Martin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Site BK02</p> <p>We strongly object to these plans for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a resident and owner of a property in Archive Mews, my house is sitting within the red boundary of your plans to build in the BFI (BK02) – Does this mean you are planning to knock my house down?</li> <li>• Furthermore, all 9 residents of Archive Mews co-own the communal land at the front of the BFI which also includes the area where the Grade II listed Granary is located. We have not given you permission to build on this land.</li> <li>• This development will rip the heart out of Archive Mews and will have a huge negative impact on the mental health and well-being of the 9 residents, not to mention the resale value of our property.</li> <li>• The Granary is of significant historic significance and should be left completely alone as well as its surroundings.</li> <li>• There is also no mention of the impact the development at the BFI will have on this historic Grade II listed Ernest Lindgren House.</li> <li>• 90 dwellings at the BFI could mean potentially 180+ cars driving right through our little Mews and will have a huge detrimental effect on the safety of the families currently residing in the 9 dwellings. This huge increase in traffic will cause long-term damage to the access route, for which the Archive Mews residents contribute payments – this is simply not fair.</li> <li>• Traffic Congestion and traffic light issues, especially along Shootersway and at the junction with Kingshill Way, is already an issue which DBC are well aware of.</li> <li>• I cannot see an ecological survey so I am unable to ascertain how much habitat this may destroy.</li> <li>• Many new developments are already built/pending completion in and around the Shooterway/Kingshill Way junction which will add to the congestion.</li> <li>• This proposed development would decrease the value of our 9 properties.</li> <li>• There are no amenities near here. The BFI is located at the top of a steep hill, away from the Town. The steep hill will discourage residents walking/cycling to and from town, resulting in a higher numbers of car journeys (as no public transport links) with an associated rise in the level of greenhouse gas emissions</li> </ul> <p>On a more general note, we also strongly object as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkhamsted has already met its target for new dwellings.</li> </ul>



- Berkhamsted Town has reached the limits of capacity. Local Medical & Social Services are already at breaking point and schools are oversubscribed.
- ONS projections based on 2018 data do not support the number of dwellings for Berkhamsted that are proposed in the plan.
- The current household build rate per annum in Berkhamsted is nearly twice that targeted, while the rest of Dacorum lags behind target
- The Town Centre already suffers from congestion and suspect air quality, viz data for Lower Kings Road shows the level of NO2 in some periods exceed the 40micrograms/cm3 limit, albeit that the annual record does not show exceedances.
- The absence of any commitment to preserve or improve local employment opportunities within or close to Berkhamsted. The Vision must include improved local provision and access to employment as a contribution to sustainability.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6146

**Person ID** 1264826

**Full Name** alanah cullen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposed local plan fails to take into account the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic and recently expanded permitted development rights, both of which are likely to result in much greater conversion of commercial space (especially office and retail) to residential use. The potential for such windfall provision of housing throughout Berkhamsted is likely to be much higher than that identified in the proposed plan. As a result, such a windfall many of the proposals for development on Green Belt and greenfield sites outside of Berkhamsted are likely to be unnecessary.</p> <p>In the light of recent events (Covid and Brexit) and trends in the retail sector, the government has announced a new approach to promotion of redevelopment and changes to the way our urban land is used, in particular the reconsideration of how much, and which existing retail, industrial and commercial land and premises can be more efficiently and sustainably used in a different way. The now-expanded permitted development rights allow commercial space to be converted to residential (as well as adding additional storeys on top) without need for planning permission This new opportunity appears to have been ignored in the preparation of the proposed plan.</p> <p>The current proposed plan would overwhelm the current infrastructure of our small market town effectively removing the character of the medieval town.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6153
<b>Person ID</b>	1264857
<b>Full Name</b>	Simon Scott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Growth Area BK06: East of Darrs Lane

Darrs Lane, particularly as it becomes a single lane, is not sufficient size to accommodate the traffic likely from a school, and the proposed housing development. The Developer will need to turn this into a two way road. The road is below the field height by about 1m and therefore will require significant civil works to retain the earth - this will require extensive drainage management also to avoid the properties directly down hill of the road widening not to be affected by surface water flooding. Further these houses restrict the ability for a double lane road to be built, so the developer will need to offer to buy the houses land to incorporate the two way road. This work will also take down the row of trees and hedges along Darrs Lane, and these will need replacing on the widened road edge. We trust that all these costs will be borne by the developer rather than the council.

Note that no pedestrian access should be provided to the school from Darrs Lane, double yellow lines will need to be painted from top to bottom of the road to prevent parents parking along it in order to drop kids off. This will turn a quiet road into the noise and chaos that you see outside all the schools in this area, including the increase safety risk, and likely parents parking over our drive entrances preventing us travelling from our houses.

The junction between Darrs Lane and the High Street is a busy junction during school time, and often we get gridlock with people trying to access the Tesco's car parking spaces blocking Darrs Lane, back onto the High Street. Any increase in traffic will require extensive works here, either a new four way traffic light system or roundabout.

The school will create noise levels that will travel down the hill; Wherever houses back onto the school playing fields noise baffles, or ideally mature trees, should be located along the perimeter to reduce this noise.

We would expect no school buildings to be positioned such that anyone could see into our gardens, and the noise baffles/trees sufficient height to prevent school children playing in the fields views of us in our gardens.

Any building work on this land will require extensive drainage works preventing the properties downhill from being flooded.

Our daughter has severe asthma, and we moved here to help her as the air quality is so good. Any building work must not impact on our daughter being able to enjoy being out in the garden; all dust must be reduced to prevent this.

There is a copse of woods that back the houses on Granville road and Darrs Lane corner, adjacent to the fields proposed to work on. This will require protection and assurance from the council that this will not be "accidentally" cut down by the developer. These mature trees provide earth retention, noise reduction and add to the natural aesthetics that homeowners in this area bought into.

In summary we object to this area becoming a school area or housing development; the costs to protect the properties downhill, junction modification works and the road widening mean that this should not be a cost effective site compared to the Bulbourne Cross proposal.

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6156
<b>Person ID</b>	1145998
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Pauline Hughes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6215
<b>Person ID</b>	1264859
<b>Full Name</b>	Darrell Braid

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK06 -Land East of Durrants Lane</p> <p>I preface my comments by saying that the whole proposal of this large scale building in a small histoic/ancient town of Berkhamsted constrained as it is in anarrow valley between hills witha ribbon town developemnt is sorely misguided .No matter what ameliorations and tinkering are done to roads and access /egress plans, such an increase in houses and thus people and cars in a bottleneck along the valley bottom through Berkhamsted will cause congestion ,pollution and a severe detrimental effect on everybody living here.</p> <p>This sort of mass development is misguided and taking place next to Ashridge AONB and the rural surroundings will impact it severly ,despite minor suggested considerations of ecology /visual impacts.</p> <p>Such amass housingplan for the area wouldbefar better plannedfor exampleby enlarging Milton Keynes newtown which was built for such a purpose and which has sufficient roads and infrastructure to cope and the congestion and time wasted in travelling from Milton Keynes would probablyequal the extra time sitting within Berkhamsted in traffic jams.</p> <p>Re Area BK06 - the vague suggestions to reduce "intervisibility as you refer to it are from the cursory reference to it totally insufficient. The impact which is visibile across the valley from Ashridg to the new mass area of hosing will be significant and severe. The impact on this AONB will be signicant both visuallyand by the pollution of every type from such an increase in housing proposed in Northchurch and Berhamsted.</p> <p>Similarly constructing a housing estate around Grimms Dyke and thinking a minimal buffer along it does not alter and degrade the context and historical setting of it is misguided. Wildlife - I know that in the cornfields of BK06 where I walk and admire the view across to Ashridge AONB there are colonies of precious Red Admiral butterflies and also foxes live there -( I see them every year ) no real consideration has been given it seems to wildlife .</p> <p>I would like to comment in more detail but find the scale of the maps and plans provided are too small general and there appears to be no way to enlarge them and to see the details of plans for particular roads access ,etc. This prevents residents beingable to make potentially more detailed and useful comments.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	No

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	You are doing quite enough damage without suggesting people do more !!!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6216
<b>Person ID</b>	1264872
<b>Full Name</b>	Ben Penalggon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>How can the plan propose to deliver 'a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' when wildlife corridors will be removed, and the air further polluted by increased traffic on the A41 from additional inhabitants? In addition, if the Thakeham/ Broxbourne proposal also proceeds this will result in a ribbon of urban development stretching from Northchurch to Kings Langley / M25. This goes against 'exceptional circumstances' for allowing development of green belt land.</p> <p>It is difficult to improve road links sufficiently for the increased weight of traffic in what is an old market town, without removing the already congested pedestrian areas.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS6275
<b>Person ID</b>	1264834
<b>Full Name</b>	Ilina Jha
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6319
<b>Person ID</b>	1264884
<b>Full Name</b>	Max Ansell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK06 East of Darrs Lane and BK 06 Shootersway and A41</p> <p>Including these sites as part of the strategy for the market town of Berkhamsted fails to recognise the separate nature of the community of Norhtchurch, a rural village characterised by its green fields and woodland, stunning views, and population older than the national average. We have our own parish councillor and a vibrant supportive community of 1,500 souls.</p> <p>Huge new housing developments on our precious green belt would change the nature of the village completely. We are a 40 minute walk from Berkhamsted centrewith the nearest train station, commercial centre and leisure services. The increase in housing would necessarily bring with it an increase in car usage and noise, pollution levels and congestion would go up significantly on our already congested roads. These areas have narrow steep one track lanes with room for one car and no pavements.</p> <p>I grew up here and love the quiet and peace it offers. These are crucial to my well being and mental health and the current pandemic and lockdown has helped me appreciate them even more.</p> <p>i urge Dacorum to review these plans and undertand the separate identity of our village.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	i cannot provide a red boundary map but propose the Egerton Rothsayschool site as the school is aiming to sell it and it woudl be in-filling
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6341
<b>Person ID</b>	1264629
<b>Full Name</b>	Claudia Selina
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Delivery Strategy as part of this consultation is incomplete, as it does not include plans for the proposed new houses between Bourne End and Berkhamsted, named Bullbourne Cross and outlined in <a href="https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision">https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision</a></p> <p>Considering this is a proposal, which is to be realised before 2038, it should have been included in the Berkhamsted Delivery Strategy.</p> <p>I formally object to the proposed plans due their incompleteness and lack of transparency how transport links, road network, schools and other amenities will be upgraded to enable proposed growth as outlined in this plan.</p> <p>I especially object to the proposal of secondary access from Swing Gate Lane, as the traffic capacity of this road is already exceeded at peak times with school pick ups and too narrow to accomodate additional traffic to accomodate the amount of traffic resulting from the amount of new dwellings proposed.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Bullbourne Cross proposals have been omitted from this Delivery Strategy and should have been included to clearly explain to residents the extent of proposed new housing establishments.</p> <p><a href="https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision">https://www.bulbournecross.co.uk/vision</a></p> <p>I object to the presented Delivery Plan, as it is incomplete with at least one proposal being omitted, namely Bullbourned Cross, and the delivery plan does not outline how especially transport problems will be overcome and the transport network upgraded to enable growth to the extent presented without negative impact on the existing community. The same critical comment applies to the upgrade of other infrastructure in Berkhamsted to enable accomodation of the additional dwellings and residents.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6356
<b>Person ID</b>	1264914
<b>Full Name</b>	Malcolm HULL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We attach below comments from one of our local members. White letter Hairstreaks are a Priority species, present in good numbers in hedgerows on several of these development areas. Care needs to be taken during development to avoid damaging the hedgerow habitat. Elm is susceptible to dutch elm disease and can often be removed due to "tidying up" operations when housing is built close by. Retaining existing regenerating elm suckers and planting with disease resistant elm are both good solutions which have worked well elsewhere</p> <p>In terms of specific lepidoptera species likely to be affected by the proposals, White-letter Hairstreak (WLH), there is a strong colony on Shootersway between Bell lane and Darrs Lane on the northern verge, I spent time looking for elm and WLH in the town in 2018 and there was a strong correlation between old lanes and elm and so WLHS.</p> <p>Alongside the southern verge of Shootersway is a strip of (diverse) ancient woodland that includes oaks. I have seen Purple Hairstreak further along the road in both directions so they are probably here too. I have not surveyed for other species, just ad hoc sightings.</p> <p>Most of the proposed housing areas are agricultural fields so the main value is in the hedges, copses and trees, especially where our sunken lanes are likely to be widened.</p> <p>There are a couple of large areas of scrub or grassland (a school playing field), but they have no public access currently. The scrub area is adjacent to the canal off Northchurch New Road at about the point I usually see good numbers of Brimstone, I don't doubt this is a good wildlife habitat, and has been identified as a significant wildlife corridor connecting the canal with Ashridge and Northchurch Common.</p> <p>I have not had access to any of the agricultural fields between Shootersway and the A41 bypass so cannot comment in detail, but the hedgerows i can see are of a good size not intensively managed.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6381
<b>Person ID</b>	1145844
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr and Mrs Melvyn Else

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	We strongly object to the Edgeworth House site being classed as Open Land. This is a private garden offering no public access or public ammenity. If it were to be developed for housing or other purposes the land would be opened up and would offer a greater public access than it does under its present classification. It is we believe contrary to several guidelines in the NPPF and latest Government White Paper on Housing to utilise Green Belt land for housing when sites such as Edgeworth House are available. The latter has extremely good public transport access, it is close enough to the town and a wide range of other facilities within walking and cycling distance as opposed to having to use a car for every journey.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6384
<b>Person ID</b>	494770
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Borton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Cedar Road awho is a cyclist and dog owner I am very familiar with the fields proposed for development to the south of the town between Thomas Coram school and the A41. There are many aspects of the propsal to construct 850 homes which I find objectionable.</p> <p>The levels of road noise from A41 are high and I find it implausible that even with heavy investment in noise barriers will be reduced sufficiently to make the area suitable for housing in which people can relax in their gardens or sleep with their windows open.</p> <p>The road access to the site is wholly inadequate. Swing Gate Lane is a residential street with a steep gradient and on street parking which often allows only single carriageway movement. Swing Gate Lane Primary School is at the bottom of the Lane. Not only will there be issues of safety for the children posed by the Lane becoming a main access point for 850 homes but there will be issues of air quality, noise and congestion. It is likely that congestion on Swing Gate Lane will result in drivers from the new development to drop down to the A4251/High Street using Upper Hall Park, Cedar Road Hall Park Road, Hall Park Hill and Hall Park Gate. The peace and safety of these residential streets will be disturbed.</p> <p>Winter access when snow prevents cars getting up the steep gradients for several days each year will also be an issue for those living in the new development. Living some distance from shops on the valley bottom will limit the ability of residents to access food and amenities. Even in good weather, being 2km from the town centre and up a steep hill will no doubt prevent elderly residents and mothers with young children from being able walk down to the town. No doubt many will use their cars adding to the congestion in town. Plans for bus transport are unconvincing.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6417
<b>Person ID</b>	1264750
<b>Full Name</b>	Neil Joyce
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6476
<b>Person ID</b>	1264949
<b>Full Name</b>	Evelyne Brocas
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK 06 Shootersway and A41 and BK06 East of Darrs Lane</p> <p>As I've stated above, these sites are in fact in the rural village of Northchurch and not part of Berkhamsted market Town but separate in identity and quite far away. I am one of many elderly residents who are the majority in the village. it is a quiet respectful place where we greet neighbours even when they are not acquaintances.</p> <p>these fields are green belt and at the very heart of our village and character. We love the views from both sides of the valley - building all these houses would destroy the village. we have narrow country lanes not suitable for children walking or traffic. The plans would bring so much noise and pollution and make it even harder to cross the roads. it does not fit</p>

in with Dacorum Climate change policy. Perhaps it would be a good idea to come and see the village or speak to our councilor who lives here and knows it to understand why the plans are unsuitable.

I moved her for retirement because it is in the Chiltern Hills and surrounded by lovely views of protected Green belt land. I need the peace and quiet here. I'm really worried and stressed about the plans. Don't destroy our lovely community and village.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6493

**Person ID** 1264951

**Full Name** Chris Perks

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The proposals for additional housebuilding in Berkhamsted are quite sickening, and suggest that they were prepared by people with no understanding of or care for the town and its current population.

Essentially, the proposal is to in-fill the few remaining green or open spaces within Berkhamsted, and to remove Berkhamsted's green lungs which run as a buffer along Shootersway next to the A41. The proposals also overload Northchurch (an entirely separate village with its own character) with new housing, even though the schools are already over-subscribed and it is generally impossible to park anywhere near the shops. Northchurch is lumped in with Berkhamsted, which would destroy its distinct nature and give us unbroken housing and development where there are currently large gaps.

The inevitable increase in traffic will be damaging to air quality, particularly as several primary schools are immediately adjacent to the main roads. Traffic congestion, which is already significant, will dramatically increase, and there is insufficient focus on practical means of persuading residents to travel without their cars.

Given Berkhamsted's location in a valley, along with the canal and the railway, there are few routes by which traffic can negotiate from one side of the valley to the other, or drive to and from the facilities in the town. The town's roads and parking are already over-stretched, as are its schools, dentists, doctors and nearest hospitals, and so to increase the number of houses (when driving is the only real transport option) is incredibly irresponsible and impractical - we will just end up with a larger town in which nobody wants to live.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6512

**Person ID** 1145686

**Full Name** Mrs Sarah Gray

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

This site was previously put forward for development and was finally rejected at the high court. The reasons for the previous rejection have not changed. The access roads to town are still narrow residential street. Still agricultural land etc. Still along way out of town so people wont walk in etc.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6516
<b>Person ID</b>	1264936
<b>Full Name</b>	Jane Cracknell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Please see previous comments about suitability of development of 850 new homes in South Berkhamsted. Objections - too much traffic, too big a development to keep the character of local area, destruction of open land which is a necessary green space and area for exercise and leisure.
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6531
<b>Person ID</b>	1264916
<b>Full Name</b>	Kathryn Spall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	All of the sites in Berkhamsted are either on the side of the valley or on the top of the ridges - Green Belt land in an designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. They are not suitable for housing of the amount and density that is proposed. The removal of all this open space will have an extremely detrimental impact on the locality and Berkhamsted as a whole.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6577
<b>Person ID</b>	1263462
<b>Full Name</b>	Bourne End
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Small in number developments are more likely to be compliant with policy to protect green field settings and sustainability. We are particularly concerned to limit the sprawl of town density dwellings.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6633
<b>Person ID</b>	1265007
<b>Full Name</b>	Duncan Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6670
<b>Person ID</b>	399096

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Natalie Glaysher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am responding to the above Consultation.</p> <p>Firstly, it would seem that the data used to underpin the plan is incorrect and that far too many new houses are, therefore, being targeted for Dacorum. The numbers are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough as calculated by the ONS. I, therefore, do not agree the Strategic Local Plan and housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>If the number of new homes were to go ahead as proposed then to build them all to the West of the town is disproportionate and will create even greater traffic problems in Shootersway, Kingshill Way, Kings Road and the surrounding areas. I personally have experienced traffic queuing back onto the A41 in the rush hour and queues back well beyond Cross Oak Road in the other direction.</p> <p>Your Sustainable Transport plan for Berkhamsted acknowledges the traffic issues already existing in Berkhamsted due to its being built in a Valley. The sustainable Transport Plan suggests that residents will be encouraged to walk or cycle to the High Street from the proposed areas earmarked for development. The walk in to town would take at least 30 minutes each way and cycling really isn't practicable given need to pedal back up the hills. So we can only expect people to take their cars down to the town causing further congestion in the town centre and pollution.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the infrastructure of the town will not support the proposed increase in housing. We will need more schools, GP Surgeries, local Shops etc. I note that Dacorum will 'support' these developments but will not ensure that they will happen.</p> <p>Finally, the current Green Belt should be preserved for wildlife and existing and future generations. With the increasing concerns about mental and physical wellbeing as well as the need to protect the natural environment it is more important than ever that we protect the Green Belt.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6733
<b>Person ID</b>	1264892
<b>Full Name</b>	Daniel Newman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We would also like to highlight the flaws with carrying out a consultation in national lockdown. As residents of Northchurch, we have received NO DIRECT INFORMATION from Dacorum council about this proposal and feel we have had no chance therefore to be fully informed.</p> <p>From looking at the proposed developments online, we are shocked and saddened that the green belt location sites in and around Northchurch have been chosen. Northchurch has already seen the huge development of Bearroc Park with no improvement to roads, facilities, or amenities. We have specific concerns over the Darrs Lane development particularly around access. The proposal talks about road improvements along Shooters Way and Kings Road (which is at the other end of town) but the surrounding streets such as Granville Road which is a main thoroughfare leading to this site is already impassable at several times during the day.</p> <p>We are also greatly concerned about the Lockfield site which again, in terms of road access, is not a good site. Although there is mention of improvements to the junction, the canal bridge is only fit for single flow of traffic and during busy periods this is already problematic. Parking along this part of New Road is dire because of the need for parents at the school and we fear this would exacerbate an existing issue about road safety and access.</p> <p>The lockfield site is also an area where nature can safely thrive along the banks of the canal and beyond. This site should continue to be protected for wildlife and the views beyond towards Ashridge.</p> <p>We have seen no mention of proposed amenities such as doctors and/or primary school places. The vague notion that a secondary school will be put on the site - with no mention of size, playing fields, community provision - these are all aspects of a consultation that should be addressed.</p> <p>We love living in Northchurch as it holds a community feel that we fear we are at jeopardy of losing.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	As an alternative, we would be happy to support the Bulbourne Cross development proposal. We both are physically active, enjoy sport and could see a real advantage to creating a site where sport and community provision are at the heart of the community. Access from the A41 would address our concerns for existing road infrastructure and the development of a country park and designated green spaces would make the development a positive place to live.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6755
<b>Person ID</b>	1265029
<b>Full Name</b>	Christian Armond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	All of these proposals and sites, on green belt or farming land, will significantly reduce natural/open spaces that are used by the local community for health and wellbeing purposes. There appears to be no consideration of additional sporting facilities to meet the demands of the additional housing being proposed which runs counter to the strategic vision to ensure health and wellbeing is maintained or improved in the town. There is already a shortage of sporting facilities, and more specifically football pitches for young people, within the town and this Local Plan for Berkhamsted does not address this current shortage and only exacerbates this problem.
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6792
<b>Person ID</b>	1265065
<b>Full Name</b>	J C
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch</b></p> <p>This site is not suitable for development, due to oneway bridge on New Road. There are considerable road traffic conjection issues in this area. Further houses in the area would make the air pollution problem the near by primary school even worse.</p> <p>The on-road parking of near by houses and the additional traffic the proposal would bring, would not be off-set by any of the suggested contributions to the local road network.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6827
<b>Person ID</b>	1265036
<b>Full Name</b>	Tom Burrows
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6846
<b>Person ID</b>	1265023
<b>Full Name</b>	Steven wright
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>East of Darrs Lane</b></p> <p>Darrs Lane is very narrow and a historically interesting route. It would be environmentally damaging to increase its width to allow access. The hedgerows on the boundary with Darrs Lane are probably of a considerable age and few examples remain; they should be conserved</p> <p>Consideration could be given to making Darrs Lane one way to mitigate the access difficulties which already present themselves.</p>

There is a view of this landscape from across the valley which will be lost if this development goes ahead.

Access to the housing is stated to be from Shootersway and to the school from Darrs Lane, but if they are internally connected it would not be possible to enforce this and there would inevitably be a tendency to use Darrs Lane for access to the housing. Darrs Lane is close to housing at its lower end and any significant increase in traffic should be prevented, perhaps by making it one-way (downhill).

### **Lock Field, Northchurch**

**Access** - The access to this site is poor and dangerous - there is only a single access road which opens onto New Road only a short distance from the narrow road bridge across the canal. New Road is used for access to the village centre and also the primary school by parents with young children using prams and pushchairs. At busy times in the morning and evening there are queues of traffic stretching back up New Road making egress from this site extremely difficult. Access for emergency vehicles at such times would also be impeded.

**Environmental** - being sited at the base of the hill this site will be very wet at times of heavy rainfall, which, as stated in the report, is expected to be more frequent as a result of climate changes in the future. In addition the water stored within and seeping from the underlying chalk replenishes the groundwater and the river Bulbourne which flows along the bottom of the valley. This river is a delicate environmental balance which supports local wildlife and nothing should be permitted to disturb this balance.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6868

**Person ID** 1265056

**Full Name** John Hitchcox

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>It's very clear that the current plans would add to already congested roads, increase pollution levels, put pressure on water supplies and wastewater systems and vastly increase surface run-off in an area already prone to flooding.</p> <p>The infrastructure needed is also not in place – where will all of these extra children go to secondary school? There is just one state secondary school in Berkhamsted, which is already at capacity. There is no provision for this in the plan.</p> <p>There also seems to be no consideration of how important green space is to existing residents and biodiversity in the area. Building on green areas removes the very reason people have chosen to live here.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6902
<b>Person ID</b>	1261827
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian Brener
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>This is an awful way of getting a response from ordinary citizens. The document is over long and unreadable. It is ridiculous and irresponsible that this is happening during such an unprecedented crisis for our country. I can't believe that this is legitimate.</p> <p>This proposal is very woolly</p> <p>I endorse the response from the CCG</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6937
<b>Person ID</b>	1263500
<b>Full Name</b>	Jessica Haigh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am absolutely shocked that <b>Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm</b> is even being considered as a development site, let alone for 200 houses. This whole area is within the greenbelt, a habitat to a multitude of wildlife, as well as woodland. Destroying and developing on this land will be detrimental to the environment and the beautiful wildlife that we have in Dacorum.</p> <p>12.29 hectares of land is also nowhere near large enough to accommodate 200 reasonable-sized houses, parking, roads, and public outdoor space. This number should be seriously reconsidered and reduced. It will be much better for current and future residents to have a reduced number of high-quality houses built, rather than 200 small new builds, with no parking or outdoor space.</p>

Additionally, this site is in very close proximity to the A41, meaning the houses will experience a lot of noise pollution, as well as poor air quality. There is a causal link between pollution and health, which would mean any occupant of a property built here, will be putting their health at risk. I would advise re-evaluating the many health risks of developing housing here, as well as the impact it has on the environment.

Finally, the road network here is very poor. Shootersway is already very busy and congested, and with all of the additional developments, it will be even more so. Additional and alternative roads and routes will need to be built and considered to accommodate this development, let alone the additional developments around Berkhamsted. The A41 is also a very busy road, with regular incidents and accidents. This whole area also has poor public transport links, which means it will be likely that all house owners here will own a minimum of 1 car, meaning at least an extra 200 cars will be on the road. Berkhamsted, Northchurch, and Tring do not have the infrastructure to support this.

I would also like to raise some questions about several of the other sites in question. **Growth area BK02 - British Film Institute** is home to the BFI archive and is a lovely place for local people to visit. If this site is being developed, where will this be moved to? This site is also difficult to get to, additional roads and infrastructure need to be considered and planned. Finally, being so close to the A41 may cause air pollution, as well as noise pollution. Please ensure this is thoroughly investigated before considering developing on this land.

**Growth Area BK07** is also a concern. These potential dwellings will be right next to the canal. not only will this disturb residents on the canal, but it could cause excess pollution within the area. Additionally, could the canal pose a flood risk to residents? Also, this development is very near the railway track, which will cause high levels of noise pollution. It may be better to have fewer houses within this area so that they are not directly next to the track.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS6939

Person ID 1265031

Full Name Melissa Hansraj

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lock Fields</p> <p>The entrance for this site, I presume would be off of New Road. This is already a very busy road, with high air pollution rates at St Mary's Primary School. The site is difficult to walk to due to the very narrow pavements. In fact at entrance to the site there is no pavement. The entrance is located just after the Historic Canal Bridge, which only allows single lane traffic to pass. This bridge is in need of repair and a substantial building site and increased heavy goods traffic will only accelerate the deterioration of this bridge. The entrance is also opposite the entrance to South Bank Road. This is a single track unmade private road, with no turning points. This results in all refuse trucks and delievery vans having to reverse in (by turning in New Road) or reversing into New Road! This will be incredibly dangerous with a new housing development entrance opposite. Many parents and children of St. Mary's Primary school walk past the South Bank Road entrance to get to school - this new entracnce to the development will put their safety at risk.</p> <p>The junction with the High Street is already very busy and the air quality is poor. A child was knocked down on this High Street not far from this junction and very sadly past away due to her injuries. Sending more vehicles through this junction and onto the High Street will only put more children at risk.</p> <p>There are already surface water issues in this area and a new development will make them worse. Water currently runs down New Road and erodes the entrance to BK07. Some of it runs into surface water drains and then into the canal. All of which continually silt up and are in need of maintenance. BK07 is low lying and has the potential to flood from the canal and from surface water run off.</p> <p>There is no foul drainage North of the canal bridge on New Road. All foul needs to be removed by tanker. This will create further congestion from heavy vehicles.</p> <p>There is currently only overhead electricity, this is known to disconnect frequently.</p> <p>The copper wiring creates slow internet speeds making it difficult to work from home. This then creates further car journeys as you need to travel to a place of work for internet.</p> <p>Northchurch village is semi-rural by nature, low density and has a strong relationship with the countryside. This will be lost if both BK07 and BK06 go ahead and the risk is the village will be lost forever being swallowed up into Berkahsmted.</p> <p>The development will cause destruction of outstanding views on both sides of Northchurch valley of our green fields and woods. Northchurch is a gateway into the Chiltern Hills an Area of Outsatnding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The development will result in a loss of valuable greenbelt and the destruction of our species rich hedgerows.</p> <p>This area is a wildlife corridor to the canal and Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Including over 80+ birds and butterflies, protected species and badgers.</p>

There is a reduced need for these homes. The government targets are lower but Dacorum targets have not decreased in line with these. The UK population has decreased by 1million since Brexit.

BK06 Darrs Lane

This housing development is at the top of a steep valley, with all the amenities at the base of the valley. Therefore people will use their cars to access these creating further pollution and congestion. Access for a new secondary school is very difficult being located at the top of a steep valley, on a single track road with no pavement. This is unsafe for pupils walking to school.

The steep sided valley are sensitive and potentially unstable.

The development threatens 800 year old historic and species rich hedgerows, encroachment on ancient woodland and loss of farmland.

There are too few green spaces and parks proposed with the draft plan. Berkhamsted and Northchurch already suffer from insufficient green spaces in proportion with the areas developed.

BK01

Chesham Road is a steep one-way road with narrow pavements. It is the main walking route to Ashlyns secondary school many children. It is dangerous to locate the entrance to BK01 off of Chesham road. As this will increase the traffic on this already gridlocked road (during school run) and will increase the pollution levels. There are also road safety concerns for the many children who use this route. Ideally this road should be turned into a pedestrian /cycle route only (during school run).

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS6958

**Person ID** 1265098

**Full Name** Clare Ickringill

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk01: The major number of additional houses are up an incredibly steep hill with limited road access. As someone who lives just a third of the way up the hill and one of many who use the train regularly to work in London I can confidently say that many people will be driving to the train station from these sites every day. Walking/cycling into town will be very limited due to the combination of distance and steep hill with environmental and congestion associated impacts. With no increase in the employment opportunities (save a small retail unit?!) in the whole of berkhamsted surely a huge proportion will be needing to travel to work elsewhere. As an aside the terrible train service cannot cope either!</p> <p>i am not convinced in any way that the corresponding infrastructure could be delivered to accomodate this increase in housing. The road solution seems impossible to deliver, and schools, doctor, dentist provisions all already stuffed full.</p> <p>i do not understand why this site has been discounted previously yet now seems acceptable when nothing has changed other than a dubious argument around targets.</p> <p>Additionally the loss of greenbelt and ancient woodland should be avoided. i am not convinced by the the target methodology at all and think this is completely unnecesary.</p> <p>i oppose the bulbourne cross development not included as part of this consultation but seemingly timed alongside it for the same reason as well as the urban sprawl.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS6973
<b>Person ID</b>	1265063
<b>Full Name</b>	Richard Scott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposals for Berkhamsted are inconsistent to the wider plan. Building on Green Belt land, in areas which the community use for health and fitness goes against the Councils objectives and national strategy. Whilst the proposal for Growth Area BK01 Land South of Berkhamsted suggest that the primary highway will be Chesham Road, clearly - given the location and number of house - Swing Gate Lane will be considered as the most direct route into town. With two schools on this road, and the likelihood of over 1,000 additional cars to be introduced to the town - the proposal raises serious safety risks and concerns which threats future generations of school children. I believe the number of dwellings will have an unsustainable impact on the town, pollution (noise and air particularly) and the environment which Council Leaders Campaigned to protect.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7001
<b>Person ID</b>	1265059
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Austin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The bk01 growth area separates the town of berkhamsted from the A41. Providing an obvious area for infill it is nevertheless green belt land designed to prevent urban sprawl. The proposal on the site has already led to further proposals in the fields to the south, linking berkhamsted to bourne end.</p> <p>it is obvious that by ignoring the purpose of the green belt that developers will seek to capitalise and develop further sites. Where will it end?</p> <p>we would also question to proposed access to the site via fieldway and the hall park area, a quite residential development on steep valley side roads. Traffic passing through these roads, or indeed swing gate lane will place pressure on those roads that no amount of walking routes will address given the sites distance from the market town centre.</p> <p>swing gate lane is a steep residential road with two schools and given the layout vehicle access to hundreds of new homes would be dangerous.</p> <p>these hills are impassable in winter and to suggest car access via these routes shows no consideration of real world practicality. Instead it focuses on the availability of a large infill site in meeting a need for housing as a means of development.</p> <p>a far greater concern would be the failing centre in Hemel, with both the Marlowe and old town suffering lack of footfall and uninspiring offering.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7014
<b>Person ID</b>	1265081
<b>Full Name</b>	Caitlin Neale
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes



- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I would like to include my specific opposition to any proposed build on BK07 Lockfield and BK06 land east of Darrs Lane

- BK07 Lockfield is a semi rural location within the village of Northchurch • I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The exit from this area is dangerous, there is a poor sight line, a blind spot south of the bridge, the bridge itself is single track and there are frequent incidents, near misses and accidents because of it, the road is narrow near the site and can be speedy as people accelerate away from the central village location. Exiting by car from this site would therefore be hazardous
- More so exiting as a pedestrian raises even more safety concerns as there is only one very narrow pavement across from the Lockfield site making it particularly difficult for children or people with disabilities to use safely.
- Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends. The proposed addition of another 120 cars would exacerbate this • And the level of pollution. Even in the pandemic high levels have been measured near the primary school of St Mary's
- New Road which is the road alongside Lockfield is semi rural. Animals such as deer and foxes are frequently seen on the road, even escaped horses
- Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal
- The Grand Union canal is bordered by a chalk stream in this area, chalk streams have international significance, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage its ecosystem
- Lockfield is in Green Belt, there are no exceptional reasons for boundaries to be reviewed, and irretrievable and unnecessary change must be prevented
- The view across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) is beautiful • Building density locally is currently 10 homes per hectare, the building proposal for Lockfield is 27+ homes per hectare
- There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this habitat
- Developing Lockfield would impact negatively on the quality of life, I greatly enjoy the semi rural location, taking walks along the rural and peaceful area along the canal
- The single track bridge would make access to Lockfield challenging for construction traffic and the potential for bridge damage would be high • The narrowness of road and pavement does not lend itself for any obvious cycle paths
- New Road has been identified as a problem for its congestion and pollution for some time. DBC recognises this but failed to find a solution over this time, and did not see through the link road between Tunnel Fields and New Road
- Ensuring developers stick with their agreement to bring enhancements promised is a concern - in New Road alone there is no link road and a ravaged ancient hedge from illegal access from new houses
- The amount of usable land at Lockfield is questioned, Railtrack uses this site currently and has access to the railway line, there may be pollutant issues as a result of their long term use of this site
- The portal of the railway tunnel impinges onto more land at Lockfield and there is no retaining fence

- There are no main drains north of the canal bridge, there is a gas hub on the edge of Lockfield, electricity is over ground and telephony is copper wired, this area is not urban in any sense
- All the above add to a cost for the developer
- NFWS identifies Lockfield as medium risk of flooding
- The hedge bordering Lockfield and New Road is productive; animal tracks, significant bird song and butterflies are in evidence
- The Glover report identifies that planning needs to consider those living nearby AONBs and their views. This is Northchurch's best feature, its view. Any building of BK07 and BK06 would adversely affect the beautiful view of the Chilterns and the semi rural idyll of Northchurch
- BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed, the selection of Darrs Lane in the planning proposal is as a result premature. Buffer zones have also not been considered to protect its ancient woodland

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
 comment

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7017

**Person ID** 1265058

**Full Name** Rick Ansell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** Many of the proposed sites would have a very dmaging visula effect on the town. The views across the town from Berkhamsted Common would be utterly destroyed. What are now pleasant arable fields and woods will become a mass of housing, completely destroying the rural charachter of Northchurch and Berkhamsted.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7023
<b>Person ID</b>	1265118
<b>Full Name</b>	Helen Beeley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK01 South Berkhamsted I strongly object to the proposed size of this development. 800 homes bringing likely 1600 additional cars to an area that the councils own sustainable transport study shows will not promote walking or cycling due to the increased steepness of the hill in this area. And so an inevitable catastrophic increase in the amount of car journeys on roads which will inevitably pass 2 schools - either by the Swing Gate Lane route (passing Swing Gate School & Thomas Coram School) or the new route proposed via Chesham road (affecting Thomas Coram again plus Ashlyns School), that are already congested during school times. It will start as unsustainable and only get worse.  Though new housing is inevitably required Dacorum need to rethink the numbers. The size of the proposals do not account for true requirements on transport and accessibility and availability to schools and healthcare provisions. All of which are congested/over subscribed and the new proposals do not adequately account for this.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7046
<b>Person ID</b>	1265114
<b>Full Name</b>	Kirsten McGregor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7056
<b>Person ID</b>	1265105
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Tay
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7090
<b>Person ID</b>	1263561
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexander Bhinder
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Too late to elaborate.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7101
<b>Person ID</b>	1265144
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Williams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these Unique hreen spaces.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7166
<b>Person ID</b>	1265120
<b>Full Name</b>	Edward Kudish
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Growth Area Bk01</p> <p>In simple terms, anyone who lives, or spends meaningful time in Berkhamsted, understands that the constraints of the town, due to both its historic nature and physical geography, means that it simply cannot support the level of development proposed.</p> <p>It is of such scale that it will fundamentally and forever alter the nature of the town.</p> <p>The requirement for housing in the Dacorum area clearly means that everyone location will have to make compromises and acknowledge that some development will happen across the borough, including Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Simply identifying sites that have the capacity for high density housing should surely not be the only measure by which they are considered appropriate. In this instance, allowing site Bk01 for consideration will tick the requisite housing supply numbers for a considerable period of time, but depressingly at the expense of almost every other measure of what makes a site appropriate for development. As such, it should not be considered for allocation within the Local Plan.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7168
<b>Person ID</b>	1265074
<b>Full Name</b>	Stephen Wilson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	A visual intrusion on the whole valley that it would overlook. Would almost certainly put a big strain on the already overused roads.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7180
<b>Person ID</b>	1262099
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Comments refer to BK01, BK02, BK03, BK05, & BK06 - Strongly object BK01 - Land south of Berkhamsted Core Strategy rejected this option for the following reasons <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Strong countryside/Green Belt boundary.</li> <li>2 The development would be highly visible from this prominent ridge-top location.</li> <li>3 Erosion of buffer between bypass and existing built-up area.</li> <li>4 Poor relationship to town-centre services and facilities, employment land and station.</li> <li>5 The important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged.</li> </ol>



- 6 This could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.
- 7 Not well related to existing housing. Visual impact on this important gateway to town from A416 and A41.
- 8 The proximity of A41 bypass.
- 9 The potential impact on the setting of Ashlyn's Hall.
- 0 In addition, this land has been promoted many times before and the largest parcel within Bk01 has been robustly rejected by previous Planning Inspectors –

BK02 – BFI site will cause a build up of traffic in and already over congested area.

Bk03 Haslam Playing Fields is an important sports field for the town. If it is not being used by Berkhamsted School it should be returned to the town to be used by all as a sports field not housing. It would also have a negative impact on the adjacent AONB and I'd be concerned for existing Tree Preservation Orders.

Bk05 Blegberry Gardens, and Bk08 Rossway Farm These sites are adjacent to each other and run between Shooters Way and the A41. Many residents enjoy walking the footpath that runs along the edge of these fields and the views across the Green Belt. These fields act as a corridor for wildlife between the houses on Shooters Way and the A41. Building on this would ruin it.

BK06 East of Darrs Lane - The proposed development is too large and will overwhelm this part of Northchurch.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7194
<b>Person ID</b>	1264617
<b>Full Name</b>	Victoria Latham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>BK03, BK04, BK05 and BK06:</b></p> <p>The proposed development will irreparably change local semi-rural and adjacent areas, and deny current residents to the East and South of Berkhamsted access to countryside within walking distance of their homes. Whilst there may be areas of open space constructed, unless these are linked to form a large area they will have very limited impact and will not replace the health and wellbeing benefits of the existing area. This is contrary to the strategic vision.</p> <p>The proposals do not make clear how Shootersway will be improved to handle the increased level of traffic and the potential environmental damage of water run-off, given increased hard cover standing.</p> <p>There is no mention of additional amenities such as local shops meaning residents will be reliant on a car journey into town, unless public transport is radically overhauled. Public transport in the area is infrequent and expensive. As CrossOak and Charles Street are already de facto one-way, in many parts, it is unclear how gridlock will be avoided and the roads kept safe for pedestrians, particularly the primary school children travelling to Greenway and Thomas More. This is contrary to the strategic vision.</p> <p>The developments adjacent to the A41 (<b>BK01, BK02, BK03, BK04, BK05, BK08</b>), particularly the narrow strip provided by <b>BK04, BK05 and BK08</b> provide a valuable buffer to air and noise pollution from the road and provide a wildlife corridor. The areas closest to the A41 should be preserved as green belt across the entire length of Berkhamsted as the developmental gain, in terms of the number of dwellings, would be low per mile of road, so the new residents would be quite intruded upon by the road noise and pollution and the town would lose the pollution sink it provides. With the closure of the crossings across the A41, it is essential that people can walk freely along the footpaths and fields of the Berkhamsted side of the A41.</p> <p><b>BK06 and BK08</b> need to include new local access to the A41 or via Northchurch, as Shootersway cannot sustain the traffic which will be generated by all the additional homes plus a new secondary school.</p> <p><b>BK07:</b> it is unclear how vehicle access at the New Road/ High Street junction in Northchurch could be enhanced, given the existing primary school and houses front directly onto the narrow pavement. There will already be increased pressure on this junction as the main route from that end of Berkhamsted to Ashridge National Trust.</p> <p><b>BK09</b> Bank Mill Lane area provides readily accessible access to countryside and an area of extreme beauty and recreation along the Grand Union canal and is one of the defining features of the town, beloved by local residents. Further development along this narrow strip would irrevocably damage the character of the area, which is contrary to the strategic vision. <b>This development should be abandoned entirely.</b></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7218
<b>Person ID</b>	1265129
<b>Full Name</b>	Karen Foxwell-Moss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposed sites are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The infrastructure can't be developed to support these proposed sites - it is already stretched with the existing housing/ population.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7251
<b>Person ID</b>	1265039
<b>Full Name</b>	Michael Lelieveld
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The collective sites for SW Berkhamsted along and in the vicinity of Shootersway and Kingshill Road (including BK02 to BK06, BK08 and BK10) propose to add in excess of 800 houses to this stretch and at a much higher density than exists in this area already. Doing so will completely overrun the area. Shootersway is already used as a rat run to bypass the High Street which causes significant congestion at Kingshill Way/Shootersway junction (despite this junction now having a smart traffic light system). This junction will become completely overloaded and log-jammed with the addition of over 800 houses on this route – especially when it has to additionally cope with vehicles entering from sites BK02, BK03, 04 and 10 (BFI, Haslam Fields and Hanburys x2). Traffic already hinders access to neighbouring streets such as Oxfield Close and Tower Close. It should be noted that drivers already speed along Shootersway and Kingshill Road in an attempt to 'beat the lights' and to get down Shootersway faster than the High Street. This will only become more prevalent with 800 houses added to this feeder.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7253
<b>Person ID</b>	1265154
<b>Full Name</b>	Beth Williams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	<p>Comments relate to Berkhamsted sites BK04, BK16 and BK18.</p> <p>This area of Berkhamsted has already been subject to significant development recently with the construction of Elizabeth II Avenue and Bearoc Park 2. There are several reasons why I object to further development as follows -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shootersway is an extremely busy road and congestion at the Kings Road junction and the A41 junction will become worse.</li> <li>- Drainage is poor on parts of Shootersway with surface flooding a regular occurrence and pedestrians being splashed or driven into the road.</li> <li>- There is no pavement along much of the south west side of Shootersway. On the north east side the pavement is very narrow along much of Shootersway. In short it is not a safe or practical pedestrian route and further dwellings on this route should be avoided.</li> <li>- Shootersway is not within practical walking distance to the town centre for anyone with small children, reduced mobility or shopping, especially on the uphill leg. I do not know anybody along Shootersway who travels to the railway station on foot as part of a journey to work. Development in this area will lead to significantly more car journeys which is at odds with sustainability aims and the climate emergency.</li> <li>- All three sites fall between Shootersway (high point) and the A41 (low point) but I see no mention of air quality considerations for residents of any new dwellings on these sites, given proximity to the A-road and the fact that they are geographically in the valley.</li> <li>- All sites include greenbelt land and I do not believe that building here meets the 'exceptional' test when there are other areas in the Borough outside of greenbelt.</li> <li>- The only open green space available within walking distance to the residents of this area of Berkhamsted is the footpaths across the farmland of these 3 sites. This includes the residents of the new developments at Elizabeth II Avenue and Bearoc 2. Removing this accessible greenbelt land would result in yet more car journeys as people seek open space for recreation.</li> <li>- I note the ecological implications of sites BK04 and BK16 being adjacent to a local wildlife site and the presence of TPO on both sites.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No</p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>

<b>ID</b>	EGS7254
<b>Person ID</b>	1264956
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Heard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7278
<b>Person ID</b>	1146109
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr J Elphinstone
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Provision for road access to the sites to the west must be included to reduce the levels of traffic using Shootesway and associated junctions.

The Bk03 proposal includes a provision for access to this site to the southeast (Bk04). This will add to traffic on Shootersway and should not be permitted, it is madness to encourage traffic in this direction when access could be provided via the BFI site direct onto Kingshill Way. This cannot be allowed to proceed on this basis, the scale of the combined provision will have a severe impact on the character of the adjacent neighbourhood as well as make the Shootersway/Kingshill junction even worse at peak times.

This site is highly visible from the footpaths crossing the open countryside to the east and whilst the A41 might constitute a new physical boundary for development in the minds of some, it will be extremely damaging to the rural character of the land to the south. Any development will have to be limited in height and position to prevent this. Far better to carry out a very limited development (if any) and retain the majority of the site as public open space - to make up for that which was never delivered in the ERS/Durrants Lane/Shootersway scheme failure. Far better to provide some SANG here than on Durrants Lane, it would likely be of far better quality and would benefit from the existing footpath network which has been well used by local residents recently.

Improvements/widening of Darrs Lane to permit safe traffic flow should be specifically required as a benefit from this site, and primary access onto Shootersway is not very town focussed. It would seem you want to send the traffic the long way round at the expense of the local environment. Connect developments onto Darrs Lane and Durrants Lane, not Shootersway. Provide the best possible pedestrian and vehicle links to existing community facilities to make it easier to walk to the shops than drive. Your proposals do not seem to help this. You are also clinging onto the idea that views across the valley are more important than new homes in an established neighbourhood and in walking distance of the shops. It just doesn't make sense to try to protect something of such dubious quality and that is only seen by a few, and which encourages car use when good quality SANG - say on Shootersway with links to the south of the A41 would be far better used than a bit between Bell Lane and Durrants Lane, and when you could be building a better neighbourhood. Put a SANG where it belongs - in a rural with established footpaths and easily accessed without a car and not on Durrants Lane!

Include provision for a contribution to the link road which is still awaited and which would do so much to alleviate traffic in Northchurch.

Parts of this site suffer from the same exposure as the Blegberry site and measures need to be taken to minimise the impact on the views from the footpaths to the south which have been much used of late. Consider providing a pedestrian bridge over the A41 to improve pedestrian access and recreate the footpath route lost when the bypass was built (A41 pedestrian crossing also now closed), and preserve the green and rural nature of the areas surrounding the footpath that bisects the site. Development of this site is likely to bring further windfall developments.

This site is largely made up of fill from the A41 construction and a lot of concrete and plastic has appeared as the land has been ploughed over the years. Issues arising from poor /uneven soil compaction will need to be addressed in construction.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7299
<b>Person ID</b>	358532
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Gillian Culham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>PE41 “Haslam Playing Fields” – Shooters Way.</p> <p>10 SA Objective – This site would certainly discourage walking for normal everyday use such as going shopping – with small children pushing prams – heavy shopping and at the other end of the spectrum – where walking such gradients are not conducive to health either.</p> <p>Policy SP20 BK07 P307 Lockfield Northchurch</p> <p>Will you be losing the current facilities of the special needs people and the allotments? I hope you can incorporate this in your new plan, of housing and the garden centre. Sound proofing of all properties in the area regarding the neatness of the rail line, no doubt would maybe (trees/hedging) be appreciated by all.</p>



Berkhamsted Homes P224 23.107 BK11 Billet Lane (Jewsons) SP20 P228.

This company – is a vital part of the community for the Berkhamsted area – needs keeping – As you are going to construct all these properties they are the perfect people to assist in this. I feel that this is the perfect site not far from the high street, within easy walking distance to the town/Northchurch to travel to Northbridge road (if it was to move). It is extremely difficult as it's up an extremely steep incline – because of the canal bridge. This area is okay if you have transport but not if otherwise (walking).

Map 39 – keep the front section for jewsons there would still be room for housing at the rear. There is still room at the side if jewsons in previous wood site.

Growth area BK12, P313 Civic Centre

Map 40

Where will the police station be located?

If you keep the front façade will it still be used by the council for current facilities?

Where will this all be placed?

This all needs to be located in the centre of town, visible to all, easy to find.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7313

**Person ID** 1265182

**Full Name** JAMES NODDER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The development encroaches too close to the A41, with all the pollution risks associated with this.</p> <p>It is now known that traffic pollution is a major contributor to adverse health risks. Also an area of separation from a major road with plants and shrubs helps to absorb a significant amount of the toxic fumes.</p> <p>The parts of the development furthest from the town centre will require transport into town. This would mean major road works and traffic management to make it viable without causing bad congestion on the current roads.</p> <p>The use of important green belt land is best avoided as it will never be reclaimable and could damage this AONB. It would be better to use brownfield site. This would keep development more central to the existing towncentre, thus encourage walking and reduce car use.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7314
<b>Person ID</b>	1265182
<b>Full Name</b>	JAMES NODDER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The development encroaches too close to the A41, with all the pollution risks associated with this.</p> <p>It is now known that traffic pollution is a major contributor to adverse health risks. Also an area of separation from a major road with plants and shrubs helps to absorb a significant amount of the toxic fumes.</p> <p>The parts of the development furthest from the town centre will require transport into town. This would mean major road works and traffic management to make it viable without causing bad congestion on the current roads.</p> <p>The use of important green belt land is best avoided as it will never be reclaimable and could damage this AONB. It would be better to use brownfield site. This would keep development more central to the existing towncentre, thus encourage walking and reduce car use.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used first before considering the destruction of greenfield areas.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7355
<b>Person ID</b>	1265354
<b>Full Name</b>	GEOFF FORBES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7357
<b>Person ID</b>	1265356
<b>Full Name</b>	RYAN COLLIER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7370
<b>Person ID</b>	1265364
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Cooley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to express that my family (2 adults, 3 children and a dog) DO NOT agree with the councils plan for housing in Dacorum and in particular in Northchurch where we live.</p> <p>We bought our property nearly 9 years ago, although both my husband and I have lived in Berkhamsted all our lives. We are not against change and are forward thinking people however the proposal to build 200 houses and a secondary school on the field between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane in Northchurch is literally preposterous. As are the plans to build hundreds of homes along Kingshill Way and Shootersway in Berkhamsted, as well as 90 houses on New Road in Northchurch. There are the obvious issues of the limited access around the Darrs Lane site - both lanes are narrow and Bell Lane is single track all the way from Westfield Road to Shootersway, and the fact that Kingshill Way/Shootersway from the A41 roundabout can barely cope with the volume of traffic it has now, let alone with potentially hundreds or maybe even thousands more cars from all the proposed housing along these roads. I cannot even begin to imagine how the council thinks a new secondary school could be built here. However, aside from all the infrastructure issues that I know have and will be debated at length I would like to add our own personal reasons to oppose this plan too.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7373
<b>Person ID</b>	1265364
<b>Full Name</b>	Louise Cooley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Our house is on Bell Lane and looks out on to the field between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane, that is the view we have from 3 of our bedrooms as well as our lounge and kitchen. We love that field, in fact we call it 'our field' as our children have grown up looking at the wildlife and crops growing in it, we use the footpath that runs up the side of the field daily too. This field and our view have had a massive positive impact on our mental health and well-being always but during the last year in particular. Having beautiful open, green space on our doorstep is the main reason we chose to buy our house in the first place, it really is something we appreciate every single day. To ruin this not just for us and all the local families here but also the wildlife, plants and trees would be a travesty. We see foxes, rabbits, deer, pheasants, red kites as well as many kinds of birds and butterflies regularly in this field. How would they and the local people cope with the disruption of a massive development, as well as the noise, pollution and loss of green open space that goes with that?</p> <p>We have chosen to live in an outstanding area, and to provide a safe and stunning environment for our children to grow up in. We do not want this ruined by massive housing developments. We have taught our children to respect outdoor open spaces, countryside and wildlife, which they do. What are we teaching them if we bulldoze all of this on their doorstep? It's certainly not respecting our environment in any way. The next generation are working towards reducing pollution not making it worse. How can we justify these developments to our children; all they will get from it is a less safe environment with more traffic on the roads on their walks to school, higher pollution damaging their health, loss of countryside and wildlife impacting negatively on their mental health and well-being. This is not fair and not right.</p>

In summary, this housing proposal, if it went ahead, would not enhance the local area but instead it would be a blight on our village of Northchurch that would lose its identity, beautiful fields, wildlife and be plagued by higher pollution levels, traffic and an infrastructure that could not cope. Furthermore I find it very difficult to believe the houses that would be built under these proposals would be affordable to the families that require housing, so would not provide a solution to the lack of housing anyway.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7374

**Person ID** 1265365

**Full Name** EILEEN BEAUMONT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

Owing to restricted communication due to corona virus interested parties cannot meet to discuss the Bulbourne Cross proposal. This is an essential democratic requirement.  
The proposed destruction of Green Belt land will effectively join Bourne End to Berkhamstead and destroy the ethos of our village community.

Traffic associated with this development would inevitably further congest London Road and the lanes around Bourne End. The latter are currently well-used by ramblers, cyclists, joggers, dog walkers and horse riders.

Our unspoilt village with its surrounding chalk meadows and canal paths is already a focus for more appropriate activities than those that stadia and sports fields would provide.

Furthermore, large-scale house building and associated soil and substrate disturbance (run off, compaction etc) would have adverse effects on the ground water at the bottom of the valley where there are important, unique environmental sites. The spring-fed lakes attract a range of currently protected fauna and as a professional zoologist I would suggest that designated housing areas around the south and west of Berkhamstead would have less impact on the environment and wildlife.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7440
<b>Person ID</b>	1265382
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH COLMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am a resident of Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7446
<b>Person ID</b>	1265385
<b>Full Name</b>	B-HIVE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>1 Introduction</p> <p>We wish to state our expression of interest in contributing to Dacorum Borough Council's aspirations for BK12 as a possible development site within the current draft Local Plan. We welcome the ambition to renew Berkhamsted Civic Centre and consider the potential for other social and community uses on the site to the rear of the High Street, on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The BK12 site is an outdated and underutilised public and community asset that needs investment to be transformed into a much-needed community facility at the heart of the town;</li> <li>• The site should continue to offer vital community services, taking account of pre-existing arrangements with tenants, and include the opportunity for affordable housing and / or working space in its development;</li> <li>• The site must deliver improved community facilities and economic and social benefit for the borough;</li> <li>• Redevelopment of the site and buildings, with a mix of community, commercial and residential usage, must be designed to deliver improved public amenity and operate as a vibrant and viable Community Asset;</li> <li>• Sustainable redevelopment taking account of the Government's commitments about UK's Net Zero emissions target in 2050;</li> </ul>

- The development must be in keeping with and enhance the historic centre of the town and reflect the needs of the Conservation area;
- The replacement Civic Centre facility must:
  - be available and accessible for a range of uses needed by local groups, businesses and residents alongside the delivery of vital community services;
  - be developed in keeping with the architectural historic characteristics of the town centre;
  - incorporate wider access links through the site and between the High Street and adjacent green space;
- be an improvement on its current capacity and flexibility of use, clearly demonstrating investment by the local authority to meet the needs of the local community.

#### 1 B-Hive – our track record of working in partnership

B-Hive is leading the development of a viable, community-led plan for the BK12 site in line with the points in 1. above. Our approach is based on co- operation with a range of local community, voluntary, business, youth and faith organisations, listed in Appendix 1. Their concerns about the current provision of community space in the town and priorities for the future inform our plan for the site and are contained in the following sections.

Our experience and approach to BK12 reflect our skills and expertise to reach local residents, community groups and businesses and transform their needs into a clear vision and actionable plan. In 2013, we presented to DBC the consensus plan for the town centre area around the Civic Centre of the 30 local groups and 1,000 people who contributed to our public consultation report. In 2015, the Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update cited the B- Hive report when identifying the deficit in community space in Berkhamsted. In the same year, B-Hive was commended for our work with Hertfordshire County Council Library Services to deliver an extensive community consultation. B-Hive's resulting New Library for Berkhamsted report fed directly into the design brief for the new High Street library facility.

We are committed to maintaining our open and collaborative approach with Dacorum Borough Council. Our concept and offer for BK12 are in sections 4. and 5. below.

#### 1 Local concerns and challenges

Berkhamsted lacks suitable, central, affordable, available community space to deliver community services, activities and offer support needed by local residents, businesses and organisations.

Housing development has been ongoing in Berkhamsted, Northchurch and surrounding villages since this issue was highlighted in the 2015 Dacorum Infrastructure Delivery Plan Update report, yet there has been no noticeable investment or improvement of community asset provision in the town by Dacorum Borough Council since then. Although local organisations work hard to address these shortcomings with, for example, the development of Open Door and additional facilities at the Hospice of St Francis, existing town centre provision is fragmented, dispersed, outdated and too often inaccessible, and the demand for centrally located multifunctional community space continues to grow.

This problem is set to be further exacerbated by the high level of new residential development proposed in the draft Local Plan. Potentially over 2,000 dwellings in and around the town could be added by 2038, placing huge further pressure on already inadequate community provision in the town. The 2020 C19 pandemic has exposed the pressing need for a central hub for community support, health and wellbeing services, local access to cultural and natural amenities, and the need to support local business and social enterprises.

The current main Civic Centre building has seen little investment over a long period and needs modernisation to meet the needs of our community. The interior is dated and in great need of refurbishment: the foyer is large, underutilised and unwelcoming; accessibility is restricted; the space is inflexible and not available for the range of services and activities needed; the bar and kitchen facilities are outdated and inadequate; the main hall lacks up-to-date technology and facilities. The building is unable to fulfil what the community needs, a ‘buzzing’ integrated community hub at the heart of the town.

#### 1 CIVIC CENTRAL – an opportunity

Further to the publication of the draft Local Plan, consulting with a wide range of local community organisations, B-Hive has developed CIVIC CENTRAL as our town’s shared vision to transform Berkhamsted’s Civic Centre into the prominent landmark and powerful asset our town needs. CIVIC CENTRAL will promote health and wellbeing, support business and social enterprise, foster cultural life and provide a living heritage hub in Berkhamsted town centre. It will be a source of pride and the focus for community life in our town.

B-Hive has conducted a January 2021 update survey of key local community organisations (see list in Appendix 1) to determine their specific needs for CIVIC CENTRAL. They have identified the following spaces they would want available for hire in an upgraded Centre. Redevelopment of the site, including improved design and configuration of the main and ancillary buildings, should accommodate these needs in multifunctional spaces, alongside the vital services and activities already on the site:

- a main hall / large venue to host events and performances
- space for community groups (cubs, parent and toddler groups, youth and senior organisations, special interest groups)
- a welcoming, informal space for community drop-in advice and support sessions, including a community wellbeing day centre
- exhibition space for art / heritage displays, including interactive / digital
- smaller spaces for meetings, advice sessions, rehearsal / recording or small performances / exercise or other classes
- a heritage hub to engage audiences in the town's rich past
- a kitchen for community / event catering / sale of drinks and food at a café / bar
- a voluntary sector resource centre / office
- start-up / workshop / shared office

## 1 Summary and next steps

To ensure the needs of the community are at the centre of any development plans, we are committed to collaboration with Dacorum Borough Council through the ongoing Local Plan consultation process, and the future development of a Master Plan for BK12 and ongoing delivery of the project.

Our initial concept plan for the BK12 site reflects the needs identified in our 2013 report and updated following our January '21 survey, with financial sustainability and community benefit of the site maximised through increased use of facilities and rental revenue. The plan is also fully aligned to Dacorum Borough Council's eight-point Local Plan objectives.

### Our offer

We look forward to sharing our initial concept plan for the BK12 site at an early meeting with DBC officers, including discussion of a range of development models / vehicles to ensure community representation and the potential for local fundraising contributions to the plans.

The need for improved community facilities in the town is long overdue, and we understand that the local engagement, planning and fundraising process can take time, so we would very much like to support DBC to take positive action early in the current Local Plan cycle.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7461
<b>Person ID</b>	1265418
<b>Full Name</b>	ROGER HOOD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p> <p>I want to add that Green Belt should be preserved at all costs—it's value to our human population has been evident in the last year. Once destroyed it is gone for ever.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7462
<b>Person ID</b>	1265420
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE HOOD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p> <p>I want to add that Green Belt should be preserved at all costs—it's value to our human population has been evident in the last year. Once destroyed it is gone for ever.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7463
<b>Person ID</b>	1153737

<b>Full Name</b>	TRICIA KENNEDY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7464
<b>Person ID</b>	489025
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sarah Rees
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i>  <i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7465
<b>Person ID</b>	1265421
<b>Full Name</b>	NIGEL REES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i>



*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS7466

Person ID 1265422

Full Name THOMAS REES

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

*Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.*

*The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.*

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7467
<b>Person ID</b>	1265423
<b>Full Name</b>	JACK REES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7468

<b>Person ID</b>	1154237
<b>Full Name</b>	Philippa Jones
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I wish to support BRAG's response to the DBC planning consultation.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7469
<b>Person ID</b>	1265425
<b>Full Name</b>	LYN PILBOROUGH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7470
<b>Person ID</b>	1143351
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Linda Cooper
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take tis email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emergency Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkahmsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full the consultation. To avoid repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7471
<b>Person ID</b>	1265427
<b>Full Name</b>	FELICITY BEAR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please accept this email as my formal response to the dacorum local plan 2020/2038 emerging strategy for growth consultation.</p> <p>The B.R.A.G. has responded comprehensively to the consultation. To avoid yet another repetition of their extensive points i request that you accept this as confirmation that I wish Dacorum b.c. To duplicate B.R.A.G.S. response in my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7472

<b>Person ID</b>	1265428
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW JACOBS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7473
<b>Person ID</b>	1265429
<b>Full Name</b>	VANESSA JACOBS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7479
<b>Person ID</b>	1261660
<b>Full Name</b>	Mx S. A. Ferrier
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to object to the proposal Bk06, land East of Darrs Lane.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The valley is very steep there and potentially unstable.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion at school run times.</li> <li>3. Parking if you put a new park there.</li> <li>4. Destruction of historic woodlands and loss of agricultural land</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7493
<b>Person ID</b>	1265558
<b>Full Name</b>	CLAIRE AND GORDON HEWITT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7496
<b>Person ID</b>	1265560
<b>Full Name</b>	MICHAEL AND ANNE ROBINSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7503
<b>Person ID</b>	1145702
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Lowe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Specifically I would like to add the following points re: Section (24) Proposals and Sites - Bk06 East of Darrs Lane: Land between Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darr's Lane</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 This area represents a strong countryside boundary and will have a significant impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB as well as visibility of development on valley sides.</li> <li>2 There is a poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, and the location fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers</li> <li>3 Already limited facilities and services are not easily accessible</li> <li>4 Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is not realistic, there will be a significant increase in traffic on an already very poor road infrastructure</li> <li>5 Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services - pedestrians (inc children) already walk on roads with no pavement to access Northchurch directly (e.g. Darrs Lane)</li> <li>6 Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders</li> <li>7 Site of archaeological significance</li> <li>8 Site was previously not recommended for removal from Green Belt</li> <li>9 Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road at a point opposite to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.</li> <li>0 No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car</li> <li>1 Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG's traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill.</li> <li>2 With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.</li> <li>3 Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within <b>one mile</b> of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT 'Sustainable Travel Towns' initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13.5% but again the steep gradients</li> </ol>

would not promote walking in this site. This location is 1.8 miles from the station and requires climbing steep hills - meaning any walking will be minuscule).

- 4 I accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7504
<b>Person ID</b>	1145702
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Andrew Lowe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>I have read the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) response to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7517
<b>Person ID</b>	1265573
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID WARREN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to express my profound disappointment and to object in the strongest possible terms to the Local Plan as promulgated by the Dacorum Borough Council. Not only are the plans for Hemel Hempstead disproportionately high in terms of numbers of houses proposed but it clearly shows that absolutely no account has been taken of the effect on the environment and the disruption to existing communities by the imposition of this travesty.</p> <p>With reference to the plan for Berkhamsted, the concentration of proposed development in the Shootersway area, namely the area between existing housing and leisure facilities and the A41 Berkhamsted Bypass will seriously degrade the amount of Green Belt land remaining in and around Berkhamsted. The increase in traffic caused by the development of Bearoc by Taylor Wimpey , which is already having a detrimental effect on the safety of inhabitants, will be multiplied several fold by the proposed development. In addition, further development will place an intolerable strain on schools, services and amenities such as medical practices and care for the aged.</p> <p>It is quite clear that the Dacorum Borough Council is being unduly influenced by the desires of developers rather than the concern of the people whom they are supposed to represent.,</p>

I look forward to your comments and a redraft of the Local Plan.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7518

**Person ID** 1265574

**Full Name** VANESSA LOWE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Specifically I would like to add the following points re: Section (24) Proposals and Sites - Bk06 East of Darrs Lane: Land between Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darr's Lane

- 1 This area represents a strong countryside boundary and will have a significant impact on landscape/Chilterns AONB as well as visibility of development on valley sides.
- 2 There is a poor relationship to town centre services and facilities, and the location fails to meet Dacorum or Berkhamsted Vision other than provide housing numbers
- 3 Already limited facilities and services are not easily accessible
- 4 Public transport cannot be used and provision for walking and cycling not viable – suggestions that residents would walk to and from the town on any pathway provided through Bearroc is not realistic, there will be a significant increase in traffic on an already very poor road infrastructure
- 5 Situated at ridge top location at a distance from employment, retail, health and community services - pedestrians (inc children) already walk on roads with no pavement to access Northchurch directly (e.g. Darrs Lane)

- 6 Negative impact on adjacent AONB and concern for existing Tree Preservation Orders
- 7 Site of archaeological significance
- 8 Site was previously not recommended for removal from Green Belt
- 9 Exits onto Shootersway an already overstretched road at a point opposite to the large new development – Bearroc [Taylor Wimpey]. One of the major concerns of the Council in granting permission for development at Bearroc was the traffic that would be generated. Any additional development in this area will exacerbate the problems of traffic congestion and air pollution.
- 0 No public transport within reach. Suggestions that this development would increase the viability of new public transport provision is unrealistic. Little likelihood of commercial viability for even a few services per day and majority of journeys would be made by car
- 1 Sustainable travel aspirations are unrealistic. Cycling is the least popular mode of travel and, during BRAG’s traffic surveys, it was very rare to see a cyclist, especially ascending the hill.
- 2 With long, very steep gradients, some of which are 1:11, cycling is accepted not to be a realistic alternative form of transport.
- 3 Walking is a popular mode of travel for those living within **one mile** of the town centre or the railway station, currently, 12% of commuters walk. In the DfT ‘Sustainable Travel Towns’ initiative, walking trips per person grew by some 13%. If applied to Berkhamsted, the numbers walking would increase to just 13.5% but again the steep gradients would not promote walking in this site. This location is 1.8 miles from the station and requires climbing steep hills - meaning any walking will be minuscule).
- 4 I accept that bus travel offers the best hope for reducing car use but many of the ideas put forward in the Strategy Document and supporting papers do appear over-optimistic. A large proportion of Berkhamsted residents already live within ten minutes of a bus stop and, generally, the services to the town centre and further afield are good but usage, for any purpose, remains low.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7519

**Person ID** 1265574

**Full Name** VANESSA LOWE

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>I have read the Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) response to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7522
<b>Person ID</b>	1265575
<b>Full Name</b>	STUART MCKAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.

Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.

Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7524

**Person ID** 1265577

**Full Name** MIRANDA MCKAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.

Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.



Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7529

**Person ID** 1265583

**Full Name** MELISSA MCKAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I wish to endorse everything that has been forwarded to you by BRAG and the ONE VOICE ALLIANCE in respect of opposition to the Dacorum Local Plan.

Had we not received regular updates from BRAG, and some fancy advertising from a developer, we would not be aware of the situation as THE COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED NOTHING THROUGH OUR LETTERBOX.

Please do not forget you are elected to serve the community and should take note of the views of those who PAY THE TAXES.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7530
<b>Person ID</b>	1265584
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROL OBRIEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7532
<b>Person ID</b>	1265586

<b>Full Name</b>	DEBORAH SHUKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7545
<b>Person ID</b>	1263320
<b>Full Name</b>	Susannah Crowther
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to raise my concerns over the proposal to build 2236 new houses in Berkhamsted - in particular the 1700 more around Shootersway, Kingshill Way &amp; Chesham Road.</p> <p>- The impact on the area of such an increase in housing numbers will put more pressure on Shootersway. In the 10 years we have lived near Shootersway, the road has got busier and busier. This has been exacerbated by the building of Bearroc Park. An additional 1700 house in the area will only put yet more pressure is already a very busy road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area has two Primary schools (Greenway &amp; Thomas More - which many families access either via the Crossways entrance to Greenway, or the alleyway - also accessible from Crossways and Shootersway.</li> <li>• In addition, many Ashlyns pupils (and Chesham Grammar School pupils getting the bus) walk along Shooterway, Kingshill Road and Chesham Road.</li> </ul> <p>The increase in traffic will affect safety, congestion, pollution etc.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a small market town which has developed over many years. The infrastructure is not set up to cope with such a large influx of people who would inhabit the 2236 proposed houses. The town centre has narrow streets and limited parking which will not be able to cope with increased traffic. There are not the facilities to cope either e.g. schooling, doctors etc).</p> <p>To confirm, I do not agree with the proposed development.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7567
<b>Person ID</b>	1265606
<b>Full Name</b>	Prof. Jonathan Morris
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Finally, the net result of the proposed strategy for growth will be to destroy the principles upon which planning has always operated in this region, and in the South East as whole – that is to use green belt restrictions in order to avoid the creation of contiguous developments that erode the distinctions between historic settlements. The plan itself threatens to take this further – while the alternative Thackenhams proposal that is being widely canvassed by the developer to the public, would effectively amalgamate Berkhamsted with Bourne End to the detriment of both.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7595
<b>Person ID</b>	1265618
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL WOODS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the ‘Wishing Tree field’</b> This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars to travel anywhere, using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.

### **BK07 — The development in Lock Field**

This piece of land between the railway and canal is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side.

Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.

Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set

back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children

travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

The proposals will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction where there is also limited scope for improvement.

### **BK08 — The development at Rossway Park**

This area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. The proposed development ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first

person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

The plan also makes no provision for the additional infrastructure and services such a development would require eg local GP and social services. There is not sufficient evidence of how new school places would be funded.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7629
<b>Person ID</b>	1265745
<b>Full Name</b>	Frances Garratt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>DACORUM EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH TARGETS</p> <p>Lock Field growth area Bk07</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on the Lock Field area of Northchurch.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 This is an unusual and rare site supporting numerous diverse species. Herons use it for their nesting site, I have seen a Merganser/Goosander, Wax Wings, there are 3 nesting sites for kingfishers and there have been sitings of otters along that stretch of canal.</li> <li>2 The traffic using New Road towards the A41 is extremely heavy especially in rush hours using the small bridge over the canal.</li> <li>3 Many children and parents use New Road to walk to and from school, Bridgewater school and St Marys. We need to make places safe for children and encourage them to walk to and from school.</li> <li>4 Northchurch is a small and settled village community. The residents would be subjected to an unnecessary and unwelcome increase it its population.</li> <li>5 Dacorum is already planning large developments to the East of Berkhamsted and huge developments in and around Hemel Hempstead and Great Gaddesden.</li> </ol> <p>East of Darrs Lane growth area reference Bk06</p>

I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on the East of Darrs lane site area at Northchurch.

- 1 This is a beautiful place and one of the last remaining unspoilt hill sides in the Bulbourne valley
- 2 To replace rich, fertile and ancient farmland which we desperately need as an Independent Nation would be a combination of extreme folly and vandalism.
- 3 I recently visited the new development Bearroc Park I was shocked: houses very close together, not one solar panel to be seen, poor planting of trees, one tiny piece of green (not room to kick a ball), lack of communal spaces and cars parked everywhere, making the streets unsafe for children. Prices of these houses are in no-way affordable.

All this “concreting” of our green spaces will lead to flooding. Being a sync are these developers trying to get these developments through before more stringent environmental building regulations and applied.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7654

**Person ID** 1265753

**Full Name** JANE CRESSWELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the ‘Wishing Tree field’



This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.

— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7663

**Person ID** 1250022

**Full Name** Mr Michael Ridley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<b>2 DBC appears to be prepared allow even more development than the NLP proposes</b> Some development sites have already been granted planning permission for more homes than proposed in the plan, and others sites are being actively pursued by developers even though the sites are not in the NLP. The Public deserve to know where homes will not get planning permission, in addition to the site allocations in the NLP. I refer specifically to plans by Thakenham Homes, SE of Berkhamsted, and land north of Gadebridge, where an archaeological impact assessment has recently been conducted.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7681
<b>Person ID</b>	1265010
<b>Full Name</b>	Kerry Arnold
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	While it is not included in the local plan, I wanted to comment on the Bourne End proposal from Thakeham. They include some good proposals regarding the sustainability of their development and sports facilities, however, I am fundamentally opposed to the development in the space which will irrevocably join Bourne End and Berkhamsted and ultimately, Berkhamsted to Hemel – and given the expansion of Hemel through to Redbourn, this would create one huge town. The unique market town of Berkhamsted would no longer exist and so much green space would be lost. This should not be allowed to happen.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7687
<b>Person ID</b>	1265757
<b>Full Name</b>	JENNIFER GAIL FREER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>• During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>• The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will not only permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty, but the high density of housing will impact on the overall mental health of old and young alike who will be denied access to green space and nature and impact on small wildlife. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> </ul>

- The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
- Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.
- —The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.
- Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7708
<b>Person ID</b>	1265764
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRIS BATTERSBY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am responding to the Local Plan Consultation 2021-2038.</p> <p>I am deeply unhappy about the scope of the housing development and the loss of Green Belt and farmland. There are far more houses planned than are needed and I am not in favour of supporting the movement of people out of the Borough into our area.</p> <p>I am not in favour of the proposals in Northchurch and Berkamsted with respect of sites BK05, BK06, BK07 and BK08 due to these considerations, safety issues and the loss of the views across and down the valley.</p> <p>The traffic congestion in New Road is already unacceptable and these proposals will make matters worse. Please remove all these sites from your housing development proposals, especially BK07 which is a death trap in the making. I have grave concerns for local children who already have difficulty walking down the narrow single pathway on New Road.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7726
<b>Person ID</b>	1265172
<b>Full Name</b>	Russell Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Swing gate lane site:</p> <p>A number of factors make the site unsuitable for a development of the size proposed. Although there are several proposed entry routes the simple fact is that people will use the closest and most direct route.</p>

This means that far too much traffic will pass down Swing gate lane which is too small and narrow to take this amount of traffic.

Furthermore, Swing gate lane has two schools on it and having this amount of traffic passing past or close to schools will increase the air pollution in these schools.

The proposed sites are at the top of a hill meaning that only very fit people will actually cycle or walk to the town centre from their homes. The change in elevation and distance will mean that most people drive even to the town centre and train station showing the unsuitable nature of this location.

So many new homes should not be built in an area of outstanding natural beauty.

New homes should be built on brownfield site or redeveloping unnecessary commercial premises rather than building on green belt sites. Building on green belts is not a sustainable solution.

There are far too many houses proposed and there is not enough additional infrastructure in the plan. There should be less houses and a better mix of non-housing included in any development.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7731

**Person ID** 1265776

**Full Name** Anne Oldfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Proposed development of the Lock Side site has previously been deemed unsuitable in previous consultations. Access to the site and its location are unsafe. The plan does not even refer to Northchurch as a village, but as part of West Berkhamsted which it isn't . I believe that preserving the boundaries and identity of Northchurch is important and has not been taken into consideration. The very large developments in Tring and Berkhamsted coupled with the development of 400 houses in Northchurch will cause gridlock on Northchurch High Street.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7739
<b>Person ID</b>	1265778
<b>Full Name</b>	Councillor Lara Pringle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on</p>

the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The value of this site to the sense of identity and mental and physical health of the population of Northchurch as well as its ecological significance has been overlooked.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7740
<b>Person ID</b>	1265778
<b>Full Name</b>	Councillor Lara Pringle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7741
<b>Person ID</b>	1265778
<b>Full Name</b>	Councillor Lara Pringle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7772
<b>Person ID</b>	1265891
<b>Full Name</b>	james arnold
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am also opposed to the Bulbourne Cross development in a space that will irrevocably join Bourne End and Berkhamsted and ultimately, Berkhamsted to Hemel – and given the expansion of Hemel through to Redbourn, this would create one huge town. The unique market town of Berkhamsted would no longer exist and so much green space would be lost. This should not be allowed to happen.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7784
<b>Person ID</b>	1265899
<b>Full Name</b>	Nick Clayton

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>WE have recently been sent a circular/leaflet by "Thakeham", the apparent developers for the new proposals , clearly trying to hoodwink the current population by whitewashing the scheme to make it appear that amazing benefits to the town &amp; area will be the result !! They outline the key salient points, as listed below &amp; I list my response accordingly under each :</p> <p>THE NEW HOMES WILL BE ZERO CARBON</p> <p>There are no carbon zero benefits from building 2236 new homes &amp; housing potentially 10000 people who all emit carbon from their everyday lives....there would be a massive carbon increase!!</p> <p>CREATING A GREEN ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>We already have a beautiful green environment, we live in an AONB. Building 2000 plus homes will ruin a huge tract of this !!</p> <p>REDUCING TRAFFIC IN BERKHAMSTED</p> <p>With the occupants of 2000 new homes , having at least one car if not 2 plus !! there will be no decrease in traffic but instead a huge INCREASE ....how is this helping the carbon footprint!!!</p> <p>NEW SPORTS CENTRE</p> <p>WE don't need a new one ! We already have a perfectly suitable Sports Centre &amp; an even more substantial facility in Hemel Hempstead, hardly more than 3 miles away !!</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS7804
<b>Person ID</b>	1148738
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian and Claire Field
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Many of these sites are wholly inappropriate. For example, in Berkhamsted the majority of the sites are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as suitable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7814
<b>Person ID</b>	1265812
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shelagh Reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to protest about the number of houses you are proposing to build in Northchurch and Berkhamsted. I think it is an outrage that you are even considering selling off large chunks of Green Belt for housing. I am strongly opposed to housing being built along the canal side near the canal bridge in New Road, the bridge is already a bottleneck and would cause more queueing traffic to get onto the main road in Northchurch not to mention adding to the already congested road into Berkhamsted, together with the additional pollution.</p> <p>I am also very much opposed to any further development between Darrs Lane and Durrants Road. Darrs Lane is already a busy road and 400 new homes would create increasing pollution as 400 new homes could mean 800 further cars, most family homes have 2 plus cars. Our local roads, especially Darrs Lane, are already in terrible condition, will the Council be able to keep up with repairs?</p> <p>It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment in Northchurch/Berkhamsted, our schools are overflowing and our roads are congested. I think the Council should think again before going ahead with these and the other 2,000 home projected to be built in this area in the coming years. Our villages ought to be protected from this kind of irresponsible planning and the greed of large building companies. The vast majority of these houses will be beyond the reach of first time buyers and people on lower incomes who will be forced to move away to obtain housing.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7817
<b>Person ID</b>	1265812
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shelagh Reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to protest about the number of houses you are proposing to build in Northchurch and Berkhamsted. I think it is an outrage that you are even considering selling off large chunks of Green Belt for housing. I am strongly opposed to housing being built along the canal side near the canal bridge in New Road, the bridge is already a bottleneck and would cause more queueing traffic to get onto the main road in Northchurch not to mention adding to the already congested road into Berkhamsted, together with the additional pollution.</p> <p>I am also very much opposed to any further development between Darrs Lane and Durrants Road. Darrs Lane is already a busy road and 400 new homes would create increasing pollution as 400 new homes could mean 800 further cars, most family homes have 2 plus cars. Our local roads, especially Darrs Lane, are already in terrible condition, will the Council be able to keep up with repairs?</p> <p>It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment in Northchurch/Berkhamsted, our schools are overflowing and our roads are congested. I think the Council should think again before going ahead with these and the other 2,000 home projected to be built in this area in the coming years. Our villages ought to be protected from this kind of irresponsible planning and the greed of large building companies. The vast majority of these houses will be beyond the reach of first time buyers and people on lower incomes who will be forced to move away to obtain housing.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7825
<b>Person ID</b>	1263121
<b>Full Name</b>	David Holgate
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Lock Field growth area Bk07</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on the Lock Field area of Northchurch.</p> <p>This is a secluded and safe site for wildlife living alongside the canal and railway line. Rare birds habit this area including Barn Owls, Red Kites and Kingfishers, together with the many species providing a food source for them.</p> <p>The traffic using New Road towards the A41 is extremely heavy at many times of the day and access to and from the proposed site would be extremely dangerous because of the proximity of the narrow (and historic) canal bridge.</p> <p>Many children walk to St Mary's school from the foot path opposite the proposed site, alongside the graveyard, and similarly many children from Northchurch walk in the opposite direction to Bridgewater school. There is a pinch point and congestion here, with many children, some, accompanied by parents, who often have push chairs or are carrying younger children. It would be exceptionally dangerous to add to the risk for these children by an additional traffic to and from the site. In addition to this when St. Mary's school is opening and closing many parents are dropping off or waiting to collect children, causing traffic congestion in New Road near the proposed site entrance which will increase considerably if the proposal is confirmed.</p> <p>Northchurch is a small and settled village community. The residents would be subjected to an unnecessary and unwelcome increase in its population.</p> <p>Dacorum is already planning large developments to the East of Berkhamsted and huge developments in and around Hemel Hempstead and Great Gaddesden. This is a rather stupid idea to replace a wildlife sanctuary with 60 new houses.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7827

<b>Person ID</b>	1263121
<b>Full Name</b>	David Holgate
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>East of Darrs Lane growth area reference Bk06</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to the proposal to build houses on the East of Darrs lane site area at Northchurch.</p> <p>This is a beautiful place and one of the last remaining unspoilt hill sides in the Bulbourne valley</p> <p>To replace rich, fertile and ancient farmland which we desperately need as an Independent Nation would be a combination of extreme folly and vandalism. There are still large ongoing developments on both sides of Durrants Lane to the West of Darrs lane. Developments of box shaped houses with no open spaces for recreation or relaxation. The persistent aggressive policy of Dacorum to pile more and more housing into Berkhamsted / Northchurch is fuelled by no more than greed and exploitation and should be vigorously resisted.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7841
<b>Person ID</b>	1265916
<b>Full Name</b>	Susan Edwards
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to the proposed local plan for Dacorum, which has been based on incorrect statistics. With regard to BK06, West Berkhamsted, although it is actually Northchurch, I realise that more houses need to be built in the area but too many houses, 200 of the wrong type are proposed and the only people that will benefit are the developers selling off the green belt. What we need in this area is good affordable social housing using brown-field sites, not using green belt land. There has been too much green belt land built on already in this area and the local roads cannot cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to The National Planning Policy Framework set out by the government in 2019, Chapter 13 Protecting Green Belt Land. It states that:</p> <p><b>133. The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.</b></p> <p><b>134. Green Belt serves five purposes:</b></p> <p><b>a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</b>  <b>b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</b>  <b>c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</b>  <b>d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and</b>  <b>e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</b></p> <p>Why is the National Planning Policy Framework being ignored? Surely it was put in place to protect the green belt? How much work has been undertaken to identify brown field sites that could be used in the area instead of green belt land?</p> <p>We should be protecting our green belt for future generations, not destroying it.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7848
<b>Person ID</b>	1145752
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lucy Cross
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	A number of the sites in Berkhamsted that have been included in the plan have also previously been considered for development and planning applications rejected by both Dacorum Borough Council and the Planning Inspector. As nothing has physically changed about these sites, the reasons the council itself gave for rejecting the application remain valid and these sites should not be built upon. Additionally, in relation to the land south of Berkhamsted (Bk01), the Planning Inspector commented "The present Green Belt boundary runs along the rear boundaries of the properties fronting Upper Hall Park which in my view forms a clearly defined, firm and defensible limit to the built-up area. In its present open and undeveloped condition, the site contributes to one of the primary purposes of Green Belt, namely preventing the outward spread of the urban area and safeguarding the adjoining countryside from encroachment." As this issue has already been considered and rejected, these sites should remain in the green belt and should not be considered for development.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7853
<b>Person ID</b>	1165136
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs J.D Battye
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Further to our previous submission of 15 February we request that you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's response under our name in respect of Section 24-Comments on sites BK01,BK02,BK03,BK04,BK05,BK06,BK07,BK08,BK09,BK10.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7854
<b>Person ID</b>	1265919
<b>Full Name</b>	Jeremy Stevens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7855
<b>Person ID</b>	1159332
<b>Full Name</b>	John Bell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my wife's and my names.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7856
<b>Person ID</b>	1265920
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sheila Mary Bell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my wife's and my names.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7857
<b>Person ID</b>	1154674
<b>Full Name</b>	David Burbidge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</i></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7858

<b>Person ID</b>	742812
<b>Full Name</b>	mr Kevin Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7859
<b>Person ID</b>	1265921
<b>Full Name</b>	Celia Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.  The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7860
<b>Person ID</b>	1265922
<b>Full Name</b>	Deborah Palmer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.



The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7880

**Person ID** 1265982

**Full Name** John Waller

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

I understand that you have to provide extra houses under the Governments plans, after all everybody needs somewhere to live.

I just ask that you take into consideration that the so called "BROADWATER" in Berkhamsted is the home of Berkhamsted Comrades FC. This land was paid for by subscription and benefactors after the "GREAT WAR" for football and cricket to be played on in perpetuity. In fact it is sacred land meant to honour the 182 men from Berkhamsted who never returned! Its the equivalent of a War Memorial.

My grandfather Ted Waller who was born in (address removed) in 1890, and was on the Committee of Berkhamsted football club and a Vice President of the Cricket Club and my father Francis Waller and my uncle Bob Waller, both Captains of the Cricket Club and who played football for Berkhamsted Town, both told me the same. They told me that there was a "covenant" on this land protecting it from ever being built on, why would they lie?  
 The people who want to sell the land just want to get their hands on the possible £10,000,000-00p sale price and distribute it amongst clubs that have NEVER played on this ground!  
 I have reported the "BSGCA" to the Charity Commssion.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7889

**Person ID** 1265985

**Full Name** PAUL ELLERAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also

increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7894

**Person ID** 1262291

**Full Name** Paula Farnham

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I want to comment on the third party development that has been proposed by.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sporting facilities While these look good on paper I do not wish to see sporting facilities moved from Berkhamsted town centre. This will mean more car journeys to reach what would be effectively an out of town facility.</li> <li>2. Development site This would create a near non stop ribbon of development from Nash Mills to Northchurch putting pressure on local services that is not sustainable.</li> <li>3. Schools While the plan proposes a new school this will be too far for most of Berkhamsted children to walk to it putting more traffic into the area.</li> <li>4. Green Belt This development should be seen in light of the Dacorum plan which in itself seems to over state the number of new houses required in Dacorum.  This requirement and a revised plan should be agreed before any additional development of this nature is agreed to.</li> </ol>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7903
<b>Person ID</b>	1265991
<b>Full Name</b>	NICHOLAS MORGAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it

forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7904

**Person ID** 1265991

**Full Name** NICHOLAS MORGAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road.

A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7905

**Person ID** 1265991

**Full Name** NICHOLAS MORGAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.  
—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.  
— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7937
<b>Person ID</b>	1265997
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSE SHERIDAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7938
<b>Person ID</b>	1265997
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSE SHERIDAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted



<b>ID</b>	EGS7939
<b>Person ID</b>	1265997
<b>Full Name</b>	ROSE SHERIDAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7947
<b>Person ID</b>	1265998
<b>Full Name</b>	BRYONY CLARK

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Regarding Northchurch (BK06, BK07 and BK08 = 460 proposed new homes):</p> <p>By effectively merging the village with nearby Berkhamsted, there is a serious threat of loss of identity for Northchurch - a significant, historic village pre-dating Berkhamsted and having its own Parish Council. Dacorum Council documents do not even acknowledge the existence of Northchurch by referring to the area as 'West Berkhamsted' or 'the West of Berkhamsted growth location' See appendix 1;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standard of new housing developments seen in this area (£600,000+ family/executive homes at Bearroc park) which can be supported by the local property market does not address the country's need for affordable homes;</li> <li>• With an estimated 700-1,000 new vehicles anticipated at the proposed new homes in Northchurch, we could expect much increased heavy traffic on our narrow country lanes. This will substantially increase pollution and road safety risks near St Mary's school and on our narrow pavements. I can speak to my experience of this - I have been knocked into by lorry wing-mirrors and I felt genuinely scared for our safety walking my sons to school - forced to walk single file along New Road with a pram and an excitable four year-old ahead of me. It's so noisy, I couldn't even make myself heard to verbally keep him safe. Adding a junction and the increased weight of traffic, will only exacerbate these issues. The pavements on both sides of the crossing into the school via the Churchyard on the High Street, is already too narrow to accommodate more than two families trying to cross at once. I frequently see children being jostled off the pavement into the edge of the road - it's only the collective vigilance of parents that keeps them safe</li> <li>• The single track bridge on New Road is already under pressure from high levels of traffic, including heavy goods vehicles, and the narrow pavements are a risk to children going to/from school. There is no significant provision of work in the local area and no indication in the plan of where the many new residents of Dacorum will work. As I understand it, there is no employment strategy;</li> <li>• For all but a very few, walking to Berkhamsted train station from Northchurch is too far (30mins). Cycling, for those who are able, is only possible on already busy roads (my partner used to cycle in London but the combination of speed, narrow roads and volume of traffic means he doesn't feel safe here), more traffic would only add to the difficulty. All this means more traffic. Additionally, the station car-park is already over-capacity, forcing commuters onto the side-roads.</li> <li>• The gradient of the valley side is so steep that both local journeys (Northchurch Tesco) and commutes would be difficult on foot or bicycle;</li> <li>• We will lose ancient beech woodland and hedgerows at the Darrs Lane site and the loss of Lock Field as an important wildlife corridor between the Grand Union Canal and Northchurch Common. The proposed developments would have</li> </ul>

a huge negative and irreversible impact on the biodiversity, pollinator corridors, chalk streams and the aquifer (we already have suspected sink holes in the Darrs Lane site) See appendix 1;  
 St Mary's, our one-form entry village school would be totally unable to cope with additional children. Furthermore, there is no scope for expansion on its small site. The school is already struggles for space. I sit on the Parent Forum, from this I believe that the school has a plan to utilise the playground on the corner of the High St / New Road to give older children sufficient space, this will be under threat if this junction becomes even busier, noisier and more polluted.  
 • The village infrastructure (one church, one school, one pub, one shop, one cafe, no doctors, no dentists - let alone the drainage and sewage facilities) would be unable to cope with a population increase in Northchurch of c. 900-1,200 people. There is already a problem with surface water during heavy rain that accumulates on the High Street.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS7970

**Person ID** 1266006

**Full Name** SUE ELLERAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.  
 — During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on

the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.  
 — The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7971
<b>Person ID</b>	1266006
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE ELLERAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7972
<b>Person ID</b>	1266006
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE ELLERAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7985
<b>Person ID</b>	1266012
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON EDWARDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field' This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the adjacent single track Bell Lane and Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers Limited footpaths and cyclists.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7986
<b>Person ID</b>	1266012
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON EDWARDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.</p> <p>— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to a walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.</p> <p>— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7987
<b>Person ID</b>	1266012
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON EDWARDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.</p> <p>— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion,  — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne  — reduced water pressure  — there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7995
<b>Person ID</b>	1266015
<b>Full Name</b>	SOPHIE WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	f) The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents. — During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this. The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7996
<b>Person ID</b>	1266015
<b>Full Name</b>	SOPHIE WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	g) The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge. Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of the bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS7997
<b>Person ID</b>	1266015
<b>Full Name</b>	SOPHIE WHITTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	h) BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41. The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location. — Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8013
<b>Person ID</b>	1266023
<b>Full Name</b>	CHARLOTTE BUSWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I write to voice my objection to proposal BK01. This development would increase traffic on roads that just do not have the capacity and would put thousands of additional vehicles down the narrow and already very congested Swing Gate Lane, increasing pollution along this route and risking the health and safety of children who attend Swing Gate and Thomas Coram Schools. Please re-consider.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8035

<b>Person ID</b>	1266034
<b>Full Name</b>	GRANT TUNMER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In relation to the specific developments, please see below:</p> <p><b>BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the ‘Wishing Tree field’</b></p> <p>This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p><b>BK07 — The development in Lock Field —</b> this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.</p> <p>Developing 60 houses here will lead to an additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.</p> <p>This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary’s Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely</p> <p><b>BK08 — The development at Rossway Park -</b> This area was envisaged as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of</p>

death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested during rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning a significant increase in traffic congestion which is already a burden. The new houses will have to be provided water and sewage disposal, with no plan for dealing with these.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8052

**Person ID** 1266040

**Full Name** DAVID BRADBURY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Regarding BK07, the development at Lock Field. The last scheme a developer presented at a public meeting some time ago showed this exact type of short-sighted, profit-led approach. A carefully presented scheme of 60 houses but no thought at all about how the single-lane bridge on New Road would be affected. They wanted the idea of the Springfield Rd link road to be resurrected without knowing that it has been declared 'an engineering impossibility' by Dacorum Council themselves - even if the budget existed. It's one example of how plans like this expose local residents to unscrupulous developers and are left to fight the battle on their own. The Local Plan appears full of such 'opportunity'.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8057
<b>Person ID</b>	1266043
<b>Full Name</b>	EMMA WHITAKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed housing developments in land between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane and Lock Field in Northchurch.</p> <p>Northchurch is a village and the proposed plans will alter this entirely, for reasons which I will go on to explain. Merging Northchurch with Berkhamsted and increasing the population of Northchurch hugely will impact on the landscape, demographic, wildlife and character of the village immensely. It is a village which borders an Area of Outstanding Natural beauty (AONB) and this is integral and should be preserved.</p> <p>The council has a legal duty to protect these areas and enhance this, yet want to exploit it for economic gain by selling the land to developers. The 2019 Glover Report (DEFRA) recommended the Chilterns AONB as England's next National Park. The plans contrast entirely to targets to conserve these areas and their immeasurable assets to local people and their wellbeing, wildlife and the climate emergency. In fact, the proposals make no comment on the climate emergency, the environmental impact of building hundreds of houses, and conserving these sites. Lock Field is an essential wildlife corridor from the Ashridge Estate, through the valley, through Northchurch. Walking through the local area I have witnessed this but you are sacrificing the wildlife and ecology in Northchurch. Mature, tall trees like those in the proposed lock field site absorb carbon and then when we fell these their carbon is released. The fact that you are doing this and make no mention of this in your plans angers and upsets me as we should be making every effort to offset the impacts of Climate Change.</p> <p>I have grown up here and have enjoyed walking outdoors alongside the sites where the housing is proposed. I have enjoyed these views which will now be scarred by housing. I am sure I am not the only one who has been made aware</p>

during the pandemic that much happiness and our wellbeing depends upon our surrounding natural landscape and by building on the green belt you are removing the beauty of the green belt on the doorstep of local residents. They may instead get into their cars and drive to sites such as Ashridge, increasing the congestion along New Road.

Traffic in the village is already an issue and the plans include no plans to improve and manage this. Around the Tesco in Northchurch this is evident from the number of cars parked on the residential roads surrounding because there is not enough designated parking here. This never used to be a problem until recent years when Tesco expanded, and the problem with only worsen when the population increases and parents after picking their children up from school all flock to the Tesco at the same time. This will be worsened by the proposal of the school off Darrs Lane. The plans put a lot of pressure on the already fragile roads leading down to Northchurch. Darrs Lane is congested, particularly at peak times (e.g. school commute) and cars driving on the banks in attempt to safely pass other cars 2 abreast has pushed the banks to erode. These are single carriage lanes, not adequate for hundreds more people to be using them daily with much wider cars than they are built for! Repeatedly work has been carried out to repair and widen the lane which is worn away at the side due to increased traffic. The issue is so blatant yet there are no plans to address this- only worsen it! The traffic along Shootersway is bad especially at rush hour and this will be worsened when the new residents relocate here. Moreover, New Road is narrow and there have been a number of accidents here, including recently. During rush hour/school pick up times, the road is congested with cars parked for the school pick up and there is an inevitable hold up as the road narrows over the ancient canal bridge. This area is not suitable for vast amounts of housing and increased traffic flow.

This leads on to the issue of pollution which will be exacerbated by an immense increase in the number of cars in the village. Pollution is already an issue in Northchurch with machinery/technology monitoring it in the centre of the village. Why there are proposals to massively increase pollution in the small village that is Northchurch seems incomprehensible. The health and wellbeing of locals is actively being sacrificed by the Council.

The plans do not cater for local demand which is for smaller houses. As someone in my early twenties, I hope that in the coming years I can afford to live locally near to my family when I first buy my home. The plans are for large executive houses that cater for families moving out of London and not for locals wanting to remain in the area. As someone in their early twenties and still living at home this issue is extremely apparent to me. As I will likely not be able to afford to live in the area, I will move away and my parents will likely wish to downsize. These plans do not cater for the demand for smaller houses, for people such as myself and my parents, as they wish to remain in the area but are not looking for family sized housing. Instead the plans are for large family homes which there is not a demand for amongst locals, and those who have lived here for many years and wish to remain will be forced out the area. There has not been a proven need for huge numbers of new homes in Dacorum, and the population is decreasing. Why we are sacrificing green belt land for this seems ridiculous, and the plans are irreversible. Once the landscape is destroyed, it will never be restored.

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

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	We should be building on brownfield sites not green belt land, and this extremely important for the environment and wildlife. There are a number of sites where housing could be focussed, such as the site where Lidl was proposed a number of years ago, Cow Roast and Northbridge Road. It is also likely that the pandemic and its negative effect on the 'high street' may see buildings which previously served as a commercial use available for conversion to housing development. This is where the focus on housing should lie.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8066
<b>Person ID</b>	1266047
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Willcox
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'</p> <p>This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.</p> <p>— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safety</p>



pass on the pavement meaning people having to a walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8071

**Person ID** 1266048

**Full Name** RACHEL MORGAN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

- The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.
- During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.
- The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

- The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
- Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.
- —The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.
- Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8091
<b>Person ID</b>	1266049
<b>Full Name</b>	Mike Plowman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8095
<b>Person ID</b>	1266054
<b>Full Name</b>	Phil Lewis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I'm concerned on many counts to the proposed local plan for Berkhamsted and Northchurch.</p> <p>Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are not fit for purpose for the additional traffic coming down into Northchurch. The hedgerows will be damaged and the single file could not take the increased traffic flow. Bell Lane has no passing places fit for purpose. The increase in traffic to the local Tesco in Northchurch will cause a car parking overflow on an already congested area.</p> <p>There are no cycle paths or other incentives schemes to encourage people out of their cars, no EV charging points, no pedestrian crossings and a lack of traffic management references to cope with the extra traffic.</p> <p>The plan is looking to build on an AONB which will merge Northchurch into Berkhamsted. There are vague references to landscaping, no reference to parks and green space just a field full of houses.</p>

There needs to be a far better scheme than this than just simply filling a field full of more houses with no connection to the existing surroundings and infrastructure.

There is no such place as west Berkhamsted referenced on the plans

I strongly object to the proposal and the lack of thought around the impact on the wider community and a plan just to fill a field with houses without a plan on how the existing area would cope.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8098

**Person ID** 1266057

**Full Name** Laura Cahillane

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

As a local Dacorum resident, currently living in Berkhamsted, I am writing to you to voice my objections to the proposed Local Plan.

Addressing the first, most obvious point: who will benefit?

If you consider the existing Bearroc Park development alone, as representative of what is proposed, houses in Phase One are worth from over £500,000 to over £1,000,000. While there is a definite need for housing in the borough, efforts should be concentrated on building affordable housing for local people. The majority of this development, clearly, is not. Local to Bearroc Park, is the village of Northchurch, which will get swallowed up and absorbed into the urban sprawl that will be Berkhamsted, by the proposed development. It will lose its unique character.

In terms of the impact of the infrastructure of Berkhamsted and Northchurch, while it may be assumed that many people in these new developments may have the means to educate their children privately, this cannot be relied on. How will the local schools manage with the influx of many more students? How many more doctors' surgeries will we need?

While the building works are in progress, traffic from the building sites will put yet more pressure on roads not designed for heavy building site vehicles. Potholes are also an issue which needs to be addressed in Berkhamsted. When new residents are settled into their homes, there will be considerably more cars on the narrow, local roads. In an area with a disproportionate number of 4x4s which contribute adversely to the morning traffic, this is not acceptable. Air pollution will become a major problem.

The reason many people with the means to live in London decide to live in places such as Berkhamsted, is to be close to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Why must you build in an area with a high percentage of AONB land? What efforts, if indeed any, have you made to find suitable brownfield land close by?

How will you mitigate the loss of the Green Belt? How can you justify it?

If this Development Plan for Dacorum goes through, there is no "Plan B". Or will you set up a "Town Reduction Plan" in 20 years' time, when politicians scabble desperately to attempt to undo some of the damage already done?

I'm sure you're all familiar with the term "Think globally, act locally". Not going through with this plan would be a huge commitment to this cause: to the local residents and to the local environment of which we are so proud.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8134
<b>Person ID</b>	1266082
<b>Full Name</b>	Paula Williamson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In addition I would like to raise my concerns about how this will effect my children - who currently attend Thomas Coram School. It seems like the South Berkhamsted site will completely surround the school and they will be subjected to noise, dust and pollution as they try to learn. They have already been impacted by Covid so it seems incredibly unfair to provide more interruptions to their schooling. Also, the plans include another primary school - but how will Ashlyns (the secondary school) cope with the influx of so many new students? This does not appear to have been thought about enough. I am also very concerned about so many houses being built on green belt land. We moved to Berkhamsted to be surrounded by fields because we felt this is key to the health of our children and ourselves. This needs to be reconsidered. I appreciate there needs to be new housing but the current proposals do not support the town, it's community or most importantly the children. Please reconsider these plans and give Dacorum some time to recover after the Covid pandemic.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8138
<b>Person ID</b>	1266084
<b>Full Name</b>	Martin Spence
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I confirm that I disagree with the local plan and housing numbers proposed.

Particularly i object to the to the noise and pollution, and considerable increase in danger to pedestrians and school children caused by an increase in traffic volume on Shootersway

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8163

**Person ID** 1266110

**Full Name** Val Britten

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I have lived [address removed] near St Mary's School for almost 50 years. Please see below my strong objections to the above proposals.

- 1 I have attended court as witness to two separate road accidents directly outside my house.
- 2 Two police cars came to a stop almost through my front door chasing a stolen car.
- 3 Several years ago a car did crash through into a house two doors away.

These incidents were the result of a very narrow road. Very fortunately at times when the school was closed. You see my point.

New Road is very narrow all the way through to Northchurch Common. There have been scores of crashes along this section of road ever since I have lived here. The traffic since lockdown alone is very heavy as it leads to the Common where the world and his wife go for walks.

Again this is a very narrow road for the amount of traffic it generates.

We also have a one way canal bridge just past the School. Since the one way system was installed there, the residents of Southbank Road face a nightmare trying to negotiate coming into New Road with the one way system as it is.

The narrow bridge itself would create havoc if heavy duty lorries were to use it in the building of said proposal.. and the traffic generated by a new estate would just be so much worse for the safety of the families walking children to school. It's bad now!

When the Chiltern estate was built several decades ago it was promised that a link road from Billet Lane to Bridgewater Road in Northchurch would take heavy traffic, and that New Road would become an access road only. Sadly a loophole was found that compromised that plan and the link road was never built.

The traffic on this road rocks the foundations of our row of terraced houses already and the width of pavement approaching the school will be even more unsafe for the children with all the extra traffic!

This proposal should NOT go through.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8171

**Person ID** 1264732

**Full Name** Paul METCALFE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We can appreciate the need for more housing and sense in using “marginal” land. However the topography of Northchurch and Berkhamsted, together with the restraining location of the By-pass A41 and limited access points, mean that all additional householders are directed/herded down to the A4251 ( Northchurch/Berkhamsted high street).</p> <p>We would want to see that alternative locations to the east of Berkhamsted be reviewed and evaluated. We would want to see that the amenity/environment of existing residents of Northchurch and Berkhamsted , especially those bordering the A4251 are not further reduced/adversely affected.</p> <p>As a minimum we would want to see evaluation of the A4251 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic calming</li> <li>- Evaluation of the use of road noise reducing surfaces.</li> <li>- Evaluation of the narrow access roads and junctions to many of the proposed sites but especially Darrs Lane and Lock Field.</li> </ul> <p>The developments to the West of Berkhamsted appear to benefit the commercial interests of Berkhamsted at the detriment of the environment of existing householders.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The developments to the West of Berkhamsted appear to benefit the commercial interests of Berkhamsted at the detriment of the environment of existing householders.</p> <p>We would also register our support for an evaluation of a single development to the east of Berkhamsted, opening an access to the A41 and presenting a more coherent option.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8173
<b>Person ID</b>	1266115
<b>Full Name</b>	Gillian Metcalfe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We can appreciate the need for more housing and sense in using “marginal” land. However the topography of Northchurch and Berkhamsted, together with the restraining location of the By-pass A41 and limited access points, mean that all additional householders are directed/herded down to the A4251 ( Northchurch/Berkhamsted high street).</p> <p>We would want to see that alternative locations to the east of Berkhamsted be reviewed and evaluated. We would want to see that the amenity/environment of existing residents of Northchurch and Berkhamsted , especially those bordering the A4251 are not further reduced/adversely affected.</p> <p>As a minimum we would want to see evaluation of the A4251 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Traffic calming</li> <li>- Evaluation of the use of road noise reducing surfaces.</li> <li>- Evaluation of the narrow access roads and junctions to many of the proposed sites but especially Darrs Lane and Lock Field.</li> </ul> <p>The developments to the West of Berkhamsted appear to benefit the commercial interests of Berkhamsted at the detriment of the environment of existing householders.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The developments to the West of Berkhamsted appear to benefit the commercial interests of Berkhamsted at the detriment of the environment of existing householders.</p> <p>We would also register our support for an evaluation of a single development to the east of Berkhamsted, opening an access to the A41 and presenting a more coherent option.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8185
<b>Person ID</b>	1266123
<b>Full Name</b>	Elizabeth Morris
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Separately, the Thackenham plan reflects poorly on Dacorum Council. It may be a 'cheaper' to have the developer actively and widely canvassing the public but it is not a transparent, fair one. This development seems to join up Berkhamsted and Bourne End for no better reason than greed.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8198
<b>Person ID</b>	1266147
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Fleet
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have followed the debate over potential developments in Berkhamsted with great dismay. So many people recognise as a country that we need to build more homes, yet so many concurrent decry the need for more housing in their own town.</p> <p>You will be aware that a number of local Councillors have sought to exploit this fear of any development for their own electoral advantage. This is disappointing but inevitable. Councillors and Officials need to take into account that a vocal minority has sought to whip up fear that every green space is to be covered in housing. As is so often the case, the majority who support development will likely remain silent on the matter.</p>

So my sole purpose of contributing to this consultation is to express my support for one development proposal over others. We can object to every development and then get one foisted upon us by a Council which should meet government guidelines for new homes. Or we can show our support for the best proposal.

It strikes me that in the near-term at least the Bulbourne Cross proposal can provide all of the additional homes that Berkhamsted needs as well as creating the sport-led legacy of a healthy, carbon zero lifestyle for future generations.

Clearly if you don't support any development for new families to come and live in Berkhamsted that's fair enough. For those who realise that more homes (and associated infrastructure) are needed and will be built in Berkhamsted, Bulbourne Cross looks like the best option on the table by far.

Impressive plan: new schools, wide diversity of housing, fantastic sports facilities (with loads of car parking), green spaces, cycle paths, e-bikes and new access to A41. Seems a much more favourable proposal than the disparate alternative developments along the Western edge of the town (which would cause greater disruption during construction and clog existing access routes once occupied).

The Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association has set out a detailed plan of the 24 acres to be gifted to them which would include a football stadium, clubhouse, indoor sports hall, practice pitches (4 or 5 I think) and a rugby pitch. This is surely a once in a generation opportunity for massive expansion of sports provision in Berkhamsted.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8199

**Person ID** 1261210

**Full Name** MALCOLM Elderfield

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wish to express my opposition to the Bulbourne Cross proposal by Thakeham/BSGCA.</p> <p>This proposal would be an outrageous grab of Greenbelt between Berkhamsted and Bourne End and would effectively join Berkhamsted with Hemel Hempstead. I would question the green and carbon neutral elements of this project. The sheer amount of soil and spoil that would need to be removed to create level football pitches far exceed the green merits supposedly shown elsewhere in the project.</p> <p>The project also seeks to pass on valuable town centre resource currently used by Berkhamsted football club directly to a property developer whose only aim is to maximise their profit for shareholders. Thakeham is dressing this project up so as to win public support but the bulk of their claims are already available to the public. We already have access to the fields alongside the canal between Berkhamsted and Bourne End which are already is a viable and thriving wildlife habitat.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this project being adopted up to the local plan level</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8233
<b>Person ID</b>	1207978
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Sexton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK01 – This is a massive area, is it really required? The road infrastructure would need significant improvement and archaeology would need to be preserved and used to the benefit of the general public.

BK03 – it seems a terrible shame to lose a playing field as our forefathers campaigned hard for the right to fresh air and recreation in towns.

BK04/05 – these proposals are taking away a lot of green space.

BK06 – We must protect woodland, archaeology and the National Trust lands. Public enjoyment of areas of natural beauty is essential for public well being and good mental health.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8235

**Person ID** 1207978

**Full Name** Alison Sexton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK02 – development makes sense if this area is no longer used but buildings must be in keeping with other local dwellings.

BK11 – this seems like a good idea to use the space constructively.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8241
<b>Person ID</b>	1266155
<b>Full Name</b>	Annabel Carroll
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p> <p>— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p> <p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p>

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8302

**Person ID** 1266173

**Full Name** Kate Nolan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

SAVE ONE TREE HILL, NORTHCHURCH

One Tree Hill is the name that my family and I have used for the proposed development site in Northchurch (or 'West Berkhamsted' as it is referred to in the planning document) for the 40 years that I have lived here. My children love the fields as much as I do and we enjoy looking out at them and watching how they change throughout the year.

I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed plans to build on this land.



I believe that these proposed developments in Northchurch, as well as obliterating our precious green spaces, which are so important to all of us for our mental and physical wellbeing, will also put extraordinary pressure on the local environment and residents in terms of traffic congestion and access to local services.

Northchurch is loved by all of us who live here for its beautiful views, its calm and quiet pace and its village feel and identity. I believe that these plans will unnecessarily obliterate this for all of the current residents. The plans have failed to even identify Northchurch as its own village.

I have only very recently become aware of these plans and am very surprised that today is the final day to respond, especially given that we are all still in a full national lockdown.

I would urge the council to delay these plans to allow for proper consideration and feedback from residents.

My personal feelings are that insufficient value has been put on this Green Belt land in terms of its impact on the mental and physical wellbeing of the existing residents of Northchurch. The number of houses proposed is not justified by the latest statistics and the needs of the local community should be put above the desire to make money out of destroying this beautiful and historic land.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8311

**Person ID** 1266175

**Full Name** Anna Foster

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK07 - I believe BK07 to be a huge safety concern as well, New Road is already quite tricky to navigate let alone with new housing built there. As someone who walks to the canal frequently it is already hazardous to cross the road there, especially with my small children (and of course the school is there too, so lots of families around) – more cars coming in and out of lock fields would only make this worse, and add to pollution. The chalk stream with international significance near this site is also a huge consideration, and any development here could threaten its existence. There just doesn't seem to be a reason to build on this greenbelt and it would have a huge effect on the local area – peaceful canal, bordering woods – I am sure that the railway is access from Lockfields too so not sure how this would work.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8312
<b>Person ID</b>	1266175
<b>Full Name</b>	Anna Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK06 – We live on Granville Road which backs on to proposed site BK06. The surrounding fields were a big reason of us buying this house and provides a green 'buffer' between us and shootersway and the a41. The site is deeply unsuitable for any access to come off Darrs Lane. Granville Road is already used as a rat run and we have witnessed several episodes of road rage due to the tight one way aspect of it. To add so many more cars to the area would be dreadful and a serious safety concern.</p> <p>We also believe the site to be of great archaeological importance, and a huge wildlife haven, with precious ancient woodland. Therefore I am surprised to hear that there has been no archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation</p>

assessment. Without this study having been done, how can you possibly propose to build there? It also seems like it would be a challenging site to build on – in terms of gradient, and in particular access. Darrs Lane is already very problematic, and I can only see that access could be improved by widening it, which would therefore presumably mean the ancient hedgerows and woodland to be bulldozed, which would be dreadful. In our garden we get huge species of birds and we have seen foxes, deer, owls etc in the field, which would all be displaced. The view across the valley to the site would also be hugely affected – as we drove home this afternoon from a walk in Ashridge with our young children, it saddened me to think that when they are grown – all they might see when coming down New Road, is houses on the other side of the valley. We also often walk up past the BK06 site and love the view down over the valley to the AONB, which would also be affected adversely. As much as I see the need for a new school, I am unclear how this would work on this site, mostly in terms of traffic / access. To have it accessible from Darrs Lane would be ridiculous.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8315
<b>Person ID</b>	1266175
<b>Full Name</b>	Anna Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41 – I certainly don't think that homes should be this close to the a41, and I believe the plan was always to leave this area 'green' as a green lung between the a41 and the town. This should not change.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8316
<b>Person ID</b>	1266175
<b>Full Name</b>	Anna Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK12 – I believe the Civic Centre to be a wholly underutilised building – it is unwelcoming, inaccessible and rather depressing to be honest. I have long thought that the town needs a new community focus – there is no community centre, nowhere for people to gather apart from within businesses, cafes etc. As such I wholeheartedly support B-Hive’s proposal for ‘Civic Central’ and would ask the council to work with them to make a new community solution for this town.
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8347

<b>Person ID</b>	1266200
<b>Full Name</b>	ROGER HANDS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bank Mill Lane Development site which straddles the Bulbourne is wholly in appropriate in terms of damage to the Bulbourne. No building work should be done on the natural flood plain and the river which is more natural here should be preserved in its current natural state with the flood plain intact.</p> <p>Billet Lane and Gossoms End development there is opportunity here to de-culvert the river. However comments above regarding not building on the flood plain also apply here. The development which was done at Stags Lane a few years ago de-culverted the river but left it in a deep steep sided channel which is very unnatural (but slightly better than being in a culvert). The planners and developers have a lack of understanding of the importance of the bank and riparian area of a river and the importance of connectivity to the flood plain. Connectivity along the river corridor is also of importance.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8363
<b>Person ID</b>	211117
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Heylin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bank Mill Lane Development site which straddles the Bulbourne is wholly in appropriate in terms of damage to the Bulbourne. No building work should be done on the natural flood plain and the river which is more natural here should be preserved in its current natural state with the flood plain intact.</p> <p>Billet Lane and Gossoms End development there is opportunity here to de-culvert the river. However comments above regarding not building on the flood plain also apply here. The development which was done at Stags Lane a few years ago de-culverted the river but left it in a deep steep sided channel which is very unnatural (but slightly better than being in a culvert). The planners and developers have a lack of understanding of the importance of the bank and riparian area of a river and the importance of connectivity to the flood plain. Connectivity along the river corridor is also of importance.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8376
<b>Person ID</b>	1266205
<b>Full Name</b>	DI HAMMOND
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bank Mill Lane Development site which straddles the Bulbourne is wholly inappropriate in terms of damage to the Bulbourne. No building work should be done on the natural flood plain and the river which is more natural here should be preserved in its current natural state with the flood plain intact.</p> <p>Billet Lane and Gossoms End development there is opportunity here to de-culvert the river. However comments above regarding not building on the flood plain also apply here. The development which was done at Stags Lane a few years ago de-culverted the river but left it in a deep steep sided channel which is very unnatural (but slightly better than being in a culvert). The planners and developers have a lack of understanding of the importance of the bank and riparian area of a river and the importance of connectivity to the flood plain. Connectivity along the river corridor is also of importance.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8393
<b>Person ID</b>	1266222
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul and Helen Stephens
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted.</p> <p>This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p>

— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'

This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.

— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.

— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne — reduced water pressure

— there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage

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



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8408
<b>Person ID</b>	1266234
<b>Full Name</b>	LUCY DUGDALE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In addition to the below I believe that should further housing development in Berkhamsted be agreed then it should be located to the east of Berkhamsted in line with the Bulbourne Cross proposals. I believe that the Bulbourne Cross proposals can deliver community benefits (sports facilities, schools, a direct link to a41, parkland and 40% affordable housing) which plans to the west do not.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8414
<b>Person ID</b>	1266234

<b>Full Name</b>	LUCY DUGDALE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>&gt; — The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>&gt; — During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>&gt; — The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; — The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p> <p>&gt; — Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>&gt; —The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p>

> — Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8428

**Person ID** 1264223

**Full Name** Elaine Mercer

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Although a resident of HP4 for 16 years I have struggled to find out the benefits of the new local plan or indeed anything about it. I have however been bombarded with communications from a Developer who wants to build over the farm at Bourne End. I have several points to raise about this:

1/. If a Developer who is from outside the area can manage to find addresses for residents - why can the people who collect a goodly amount of Council Tax from each and every address not manage this?

2/. The Developer's plans seem questionable to say the least. The number of houses and the Sports facilities, Primary School and local infrastructure are unlikely to fit comfortably onto the space earmarked. I am also concerned that they do not have a track record of delivering this scale of project. Their corporate website "Thakeham" (as opposed to the

glittery micro site Bulbournecross) shows only modest sized developments and there is no evidence of local infrastructure being provided.

3/. The Houses the developer is used to providing are £500,000 plus. We have no shortage of these in the Borough. They cannot be considered as contributing to " Social Housing" or homes for vital key workers.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8462

**Person ID** 1266290

**Full Name** ANDY JAMES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft local plan consultation specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I DO NOT support the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted as the development will replace ADEQUATE EXISTING countryside facilities and the considerable disruption will obliterate the existing countryside and wildlife and the diversity of a natural ecosystem. The Thakeham and BSGCA proposals are not consistent with a sustainable development that will protect our natural environment for future generations. Further, I refute Thakeham’s proposals because:</p> <p>Adequate sports facilities with existing space for increased numbers ALREADY EXIST in Berkhamsted. There is room to expand these even with additional housing</p> <p>A country park with green open space and allotments IS NOT required to replace existing countryside with cycling, running and walking pathways (towpath and footpaths) and there is already in Berkhamsted area sufficient exercise space. The allotment allocation proposed by Thakeham IS MINIMAL compared to the allotment offering already in existence; the allotment provision locally in existence is sufficient as there are vacant plots and a frequent turnover. These proposals also remove valuable and productive farmed land.</p> <p>Affordable housing for local people can be provided in existing developments. Currently, developers are permitted by Dacorum to reduce their affordable housing offerings. The amount of affordable housing can be increased in existing developments; there is NO NEED to have a NEW development with increased affordable housing.</p> <p>The traffic strain on existing roads will NOT BE REDUCED by a direct link to the A41. Traffic joining the A41 at the proposed location would, I feel, cause disruption to traffic flows on the A41 and as a result traffic would divert through existing residential streets – so the Thakeham proposal JUST DIVERTS TRAFFIC, it does not reduce it.</p> <p>A new primary school, if required, can be accommodated on existing sites local to Berkhamsted without the need to build a new housing development such as Bulbourne Cross.</p> <p>I REJECT the Thakeham and BSGCA’s proposals .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8472
<b>Person ID</b>	495878
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Anna Hanson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.</p> <p>Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8483
<b>Person ID</b>	1266302
<b>Full Name</b>	Gareth Garner
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The area of greenbelt between the A41 was at one time considered crucial to protect the the health of Berkhamsted residents from any increased pollution the newly A41 would bring. This proposal not only ripes out those green lungs but also puts the health at risk of the new residents of the developments in between the A41 and existing Berkhamsted town.</p> <p>There is little opportunity for new road infrastructure as Berkhamsted sits in a valley, however the new sites appear to not take this into consideration, since most are served by narrow or single track roads.</p> <p>The councils key objective to provide at least 100% of their self-assessed housing need will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB which is at odds with their other objective to minimise and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8508
<b>Person ID</b>	1266316
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Cattle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Ref: Proposed housing development at Bulbourne Cross</p> <p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the Local Plan Section 23.1 Berkhamsted delivery plan.</p> <p>I object to the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is designated as Green Belt and should not be built on</li> <li>• Building 1,100 new homes in this location will overload the amenities in Berkhamsted (particularly Medical, Parking, Shopping, Schools, Rail services)</li> <li>• There will be an increase in traffic into and through Berkhamsted making the high street (A41) more dangerous for pedestrians, particularly children going to and from</li> <li>• It will create continuous ribbon development all the way along the A41 from Watford to Northchurch. This will encourage future infill development and pave the way for a conurbation stretching from North London, through Watford and all the way to The Green Belt was intended to prevent this and preserve the countryside.</li> </ul> <p>I do hope that you and your colleagues at the Planning Department are able to find alternative sites. Perhaps further West or along the Markyate, Flamsted, Piccotts End corridor to the West of the M1.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8553
<b>Person ID</b>	211354
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Laura Sanderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum Planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit. The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good. BRAG. Have provided detailed comments on this which I fully support.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8554
<b>Person ID</b>	211354
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Laura Sanderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document. The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8579
<b>Person ID</b>	1266567
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE SMALES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8609
<b>Person ID</b>	1266590

<b>Full Name</b>	LYNN LIGHT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to object to the south Berkhamsted concept and the proposed overdevelopment of the green belt around Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Firstly, it concerns me that this process has continued during lock-down without meetings being easily accessible for the public or advertised to all.</p> <p>Secondly, and perhaps most importantly I think it is a crime to be developing green belt when climate change is such a concern and meant to be a government priority. Berkhamsted is in a valley and any future houses plus their one or two cars, will all end up adding to the congestion/ polluting the air on London Road/ High Street. Putting a link road up the side of Ashlyns School will not help traffic in the town as the only route is onto the valley floor if you're not leaving on the A41.</p> <p>I have a large concern with the proposed access road at the top of Swingate Lane. It is already a busy road with car parking on both sides for the current residents. There is a primary school at the top and bottom of that road which definitely does not need further traffic added to endanger all those travelling to school.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The new Bourne End proposition also suggested it should have an entrance at the top of Fieldway (currently a dead end) Building 2,000 plus homes and putting an access road here will change the lives of all the Hall Park residents who have deliberately bought houses in a quieter area of town. The Hall Park streets would become a rat run for these new developments.</p> <p>This new and additional proposal of the Bourne End houses and sports ground is also concerning for many reasons. Wiping out a village community and making Bourne End/ Berkhamsted/Northchurch become an extension of Hemel and a very different place to live. This company boasted of the green area they intended to build for sports- football pitches and a huge car park. No one would be able to walk to facilitates like they can currently in Berkhamsted and increase people's use of cars again. A football stadium should not be a priority for a small town like Berkhamsted and 400 car parking spaces is not green.</p>

New housing is obviously needed in this country- the correct type of housing. Starter homes, homes near where there are jobs. Homes where the current infrastructure can cope/ drainage systems/ safe roads and room for schools/ doctors/ dentists. Building in the valley of Berkhamsted does not offer solutions to any of these.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8612

**Person ID** 1148382

**Full Name** Anna Penning-Rowsell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment** Bk01 South of Berkhamsted - I am opposed to this development as I am concerned about:

- The huge sale of the proposal and impact on all aspects of local infrastructure
- Particularly concerned about the inadequate road infrastructure to access this huge development. Swing Gate lane is very narrow and has two primary school on it, so is not at all suitable as a major access route to a new development of 850 houses.
- building on green belt land which provides valuable recreation and a buffer to air and noise pollution from the A41
- The location of the development means most new residents would drive to access shops etc which will not support sustainability targets. Real meaningful investment in green transport options is vital if this is to be avoided. It is at the top of a steep hill so cycling is not realistic for most.

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8620
<b>Person ID</b>	1266595
<b>Full Name</b>	SHARON MACARTHUR-POWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>5/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the proposals and sites?</p> <p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p> <p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it</p>

forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8630
<b>Person ID</b>	1266604
<b>Full Name</b>	SEB BELOE

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>5/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the proposals and sites?</p> <p>— Northchurch is named after St Mary’s Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as ‘West Berkhamsted’. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.</p> <p>— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).</p> <p>—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary’s school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.</p> <p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on</p>

the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8642

**Person ID** 1266607

**Full Name** RACHEL POWELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8643
<b>Person ID</b>	1266607
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL POWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8644
<b>Person ID</b>	1266607
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL POWELL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8649
<b>Person ID</b>	1145882
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Jane Hughes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft local plan consultation specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I DO NOT support the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted as the development will replace ADEQUATE EXISTING countryside facilities and the considerable disruption will obliterate the existing countryside and wildlife and the diversity of a natural ecosystem. The Thakeham and BSGCA proposals are not consistent with a sustainable development that will protect our natural environment for future generations. Further, I refute Thakeham’s proposals because:</p> <p>Adequate sports facilities with existing space for increased numbers ALREADY EXIST in Berkhamsted. There is room to expand these even with additional housing</p> <p>A country park with green open space and allotments IS NOT required to replace existing countryside with cycling, running and walking pathways (towpath and footpaths) and there is already in Berkhamsted area sufficient exercise space. The allotment allocation proposed by Thakeham IS MINIMAL compared to the allotment offering already in existence; the allotment provision locally in existence is sufficient as there are vacant plots and a frequent turnover. Affordable housing for local people can be provided in existing developments. Currently, developers are permitted by Dacorum to reduce their affordable housing offerings. The amount of affordable housing can be increased in existing developments; there is NO NEED to have a NEW development with increased affordable housing.</p> <p>The traffic strain on existing roads will NOT BE REDUCED by a direct link to the A41. ANOTHER direct link to the A41 will increase traffic strain on different existing local roads – so the Thakeham proposal JUST DIVERTS TRAFFIC, it does not reduce it.</p> <p>A new primary school, if required, can be accommodated on existing sites local to Berkhamsted without the need to build a new housing development such as Bulbourne Cross.</p> <p>I REJECT the Thakeham and BSGCA’s proposals .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8654
<b>Person ID</b>	1266622
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Fisher
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Loss of the playing fields at Haslam is a significant issue as these are supposed to be used by local community groups as part of the Berkhamsted school charitable status. Providing new space at Haresfoot is not a suitable alternative as Haslam is walkable for many people, whereas Haresfoot, due to it's location near busy roads and aon the other side of the roundabout is not walkable so this will also result in increased traffic.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8684
<b>Person ID</b>	1266687
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Bruce and Jenny Finlayson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>WE OBJECT TO THE DACORUM LOCAL PLAN</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 We agree to the conclusion reached by the CPRE Hertfordshire of the effects of the Dacorum Local Plan on Dacorum and in particular on the Parish of Northchurch.</li> <li>1 We are concerned about the number of houses that are included in the Local Plan for the Parish of Northchurch. The plan has included them under a Berkhamsted numbering. Northchurch is a parish completely independent of Berkhamsted. Those within the parish boundary are BK-06, BK-O7 and BK-08 a total of 460 houses. The plan has taken no account of Bearoc Park phase 2 which is under construction, to provide 84 houses all within the Parish</li> </ol>

of Northchurch. Re BK-07 This area of a proposed 60 houses, probably 120 cars entering and exiting on to New Road near a single lane canal bridge which is already a bottle neck at times. New Road also carries significant traffic from the Chesham roundabout on the A41 along Shootersway down Durrants Lane, along the A4251 then up New Road and in the other direction probably coming from and getting onto the A41 connecting to and from the UK motorway system .On New Road is the only Infant and Primary School in Northchurch. BK-06 This area is proposed to have 200 houses. It has had sink holes, has some parts of Grimm`s Ditch and would put huge pressure on the adjacent lanes and roads. BK-08 This area between Shootersway and the A41 with 200 proposed houses would be subject to air and noise pollution. Having spent the 1970s and 1980s as members of the now closed Northchurch Action Group (NAG) to fight a proposed road of full motorway standard that would have devastated parts of Northchurch, it seems ironic that it is now proposing to build on an area that provides a lung for Northchurch.

1 We also to state that we fully support the Parish Council in objecting to the Dacorum Local Plan.

1 Finally we feel that many of the residents of Northchurch who will be affected by this proposal are not aware of the Plan. Due to lockdown any public noticeboards will probably not have been read and no communications have been posted to many residents, including us. We have just spoken to a resident of Darrs Lane, at 5.00pm today, and they have said that they received a brochure yesterday saying that they need to respond by this Sunday. We request that the period for consultation be extended.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8692

**Person ID** 1266704

**Full Name** Ms Dawn Foster

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	NO to the South Berkhamsted concept!! I am a resident in Little Gaddesden and object to these plans for green belt land.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8697
<b>Person ID</b>	1266706
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I strongly disagree with the Local Plan and the number of houses proposed for Berkhamsted which are well in excess of the number quoted by the ONS. The infrastructure cannot sustain such an increase in population and the ensuing traffic congestion and pollution would be most unwelcome.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8722
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As well as indicating where flood risk should be considered and managed for a development site, there are some instances where the development of sites can help manage existing flood risk. For example, these are Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields, Bk10: Hansburys and to the west of Berkhamsted which are at the top of a significant surface water flow that runs down into the Management of the flood risk should start as close to the source as possible and these sites offer than opportunity.</p> <p><b>Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted</b></p> <p><u>Adult Care Services</u>. Housing provision for older people is welcomed at this site, however HCC would like confirmation of the type of accommodation for older people which will be provided and assurances that a proportion of accommodation will be available for people with fully funded care (affordable rented) as per the South West Herts LHNA. There is also no mention of provision of appropriate housing for people with HCC are in support of the figures given at Part 1 Table 9 - 100% of socially rented housing to be accessible and 10% of all housing to be wheelchair user dwellings. As stated above, such provision for older people and people with disabilities should be close to public transport links, local amenities, shops and health care. HCC suggest that housing provision for older people should be located near to the new community hub and public open space, however we have concerns that no local amenities are planned for this site.</p> <p><u>Children's Services</u>. Provision for a new primary school (totalling 3ha) within the allocation is The primary school will serve pupils arising from within this development. However, the primary school should be shown as an education allocation</p>



on the inset map (Map 29), along with the accompanying proposals map and where possible, the build zone removed from the Green Belt, in line with the county council's comments under the section titled: 'Education.'

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints of the site. A corridor of suitable width/alignment for walking, cycling and public transport infrastructure will be required for the eastern most access point unless otherwise agreed.

High quality walking and cycling routes from the site to key destinations will be required of and on site, including significant consideration and understanding of the Rights of Way network within and surrounding the

With regard to the contribution towards off-site enhancements to the local road network, including but not limited to junction improvements along Chesham Road, A416/Shootersway and A4251/Berkhamsted High Street, HCC would expect the site to improve key routes and areas of significant impact along with contributions to mitigate the cumulative impact via settlement wide measures in Developer contributions will be needed to fund bus service improvements (likely a new route) for the site so that dwellings are within 400m of a stop and this site is connected with key destinations by sustainable modes.

### **Growth Area Bk02: British Film Institute**

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints/existing use of the This growth area is remote from existing bus services and even if considered together with other sites in Berkhamsted, is not likely to be able to contribute to improvements for an adequate period, nor produce patronage to make any such improvements viable long term.

This growth area, along with sites Bk03, Bk04 and Bk10 should have a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach, required through policy, to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability and potentially enable sustainable transport route options. HCC would not support an approach of these sites coming forward individually without an approach that enables permeability and connectivity along with clearly well thought out routes across the area (the county council does not see a need currently for private vehicle access between Bk02 and Bk03). It is considered that significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing

A sustainable route for walking and cycling could be explored as a route and could present better quality options than revising shooters way for Any route would need to be high quality, have priority at all possible conflict points, and provide connections to key destination within the town. This should be secured in policy if it is found to be required.

### **Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields**

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints/existing use of the This growth area is remote from existing bus services and even if considered together with other sites in Berkhamsted, is not likely to be able to contribute to improvements for an adequate period, nor produce patronage to make any such improvements viable long term.

This growth area, along with sites Bk02, Bk04 and Bk10 should have a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach, required through policy, to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability

and potentially enable sustainable transport route options. HCC would not support an approach of these sites coming forward individually without an approach that enables permeability and connectivity along with clearly well thought out routes across the area (the county council does not see a need currently for private vehicle access between Bk02 and Bk03). It is considered that significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing

A sustainable route for walking and cycling could be explored as a route and could present better quality options than revising shooters way for Any route would need to be high quality, have priority at all possible conflict points, and provide connections to key destination within the town. This should be secured in policy if it is found to be required.

No more than 300 dwellings or equivalent would be accessed from a single vehicle access point and wider walking and cycling connections will be required. Measures will also be required to maximise and protect the use of Dennys Lane for vulnerable road users.

#### **Growth Area Bk04: Land between Hanburys and A41**

Transport. An access strategy is required for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints/existing use of the This growth area is remote from existing bus services and even if considered together with other sites in Berkhamsted, is not likely to be able to contribute to improvements for an adequate period, nor produce patronage to make any such improvements viable long term.

This growth area, along with sites Bk02, Bk03 and Bk10 should have a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach, required through policy, to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability and potentially enable sustainable transport route options. HCC would not support an approach of these sites coming forward individually without an approach that enables permeability and connectivity along with clearly well thought out routes across the It is considered that significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing provision.

A sustainable route for walking and cycling could be explored as a route and could present better quality options than revising shooters way for cycling. Any route would need to be high quality, have priority at all possible conflict points, and provide connections to key destination within the town. This should be secured in policy if it is found to be

No more than 300 dwellings or equivalent would be accessed from a single vehicle access point and wider walking and cycling connections will be required. Measures will also be required to maximise and protect the use of Dennys Lane for vulnerable road users.

#### **Growth Area Bk05: Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)**

Transport. This growth area, along with site Bk08, has a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach secured through policy, notably for transport to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability and potentially enable sustainable transport route Significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing provision. Maximising and enhancing the Rights of Way routes and their connectivity will be sought, retaining all existing routes will be required.

A sustainable route for walking and cycling could be explored as a route and could present better quality options than revising shooters way for Any route would need to be high quality, have priority at all possible conflict points, and provide connections to key destination within the town. This should be secured in policy if it is found to be required.

This growth area, along with sites Bk06 and Bk08 are remote from existing bus services and are not large enough to contribute to adequate improvements individually. Some of East of Darrs Lane would be within 400m of bus stops on Granville Rd and Westfield Rd but services are limited. Significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing provision.

#### **Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane**

Children's Services. Provision for an additional primary school and a new secondary school within Berkhamsted is needed, although HCC has concerns that an allocation for a new secondary school as suggested within this growth area might not be deliverable, due to the site's existing topography, site access and highway constraints. A new secondary school should be 10.78ha in size and the additional 2fe primary school site should be 2.03ha.

Transport. An agreed access strategy is suggested for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints with connections through the site and identifying key access points for all mode Measures to protect the rural nature of local lanes will be required.

Where existing routes in the area support walking and cycling, these will need to be protected fully from potential impacts and maximised/enhanced. Bell Lane will not be supported for any private vehicle access points and exploration of maximising this route, aligned to both internal and settlement wide walking/cycling connections should be considered. Possible public transport route options through the site could support public transport

A sustainable route for walking and cycling could be explored as a route and could present better quality options than revising shooters way for Any route would need to be high quality, have priority at all possible conflict points, and provide connections to key destination within the town. This should be secured in policy if it is found to be required. This should also consider how Bell Lane and improved town centre for walking/cycling access via site Bk06 could be utilised.

This growth area, along with sites Bk05 and Bk08 are remote from existing bus services and are not large enough to contribute to adequate improvements individually. Some of East of Darrs Lane would be within 400m of bus stops on Granville Road and Westfield Road but services are limited.

#### **Growth Area Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch**

Transport. An agreed access strategy for this growth area should be sought with HCC, due to existing constraints, including the severance to walking/ cycling caused along New Road.

#### **Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)**

Transport. This growth area, along with site Bk05, has a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach secured through policy, notably for transport to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability and potentially enable sustainable transport route Significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing provision. Maximising and enhancing the Rights of Way routes and their connectivity will be sought, retaining all existing routes will be required.

An agreed access strategy is suggested for this site prior to submission due to the possible complexities and constraints with connections through the site and identifying key access points for all mode Enhancements and connections to the rights of way network (and fully retaining all existing routes) will be required.

This growth area, along with sites Bk05 and Bk06 are remote from existing bus services and are not large enough to contribute to adequate improvements individually. Some of East of Darrs Lane would be within 400m of bus stops on Granville Rd and Westfield Rd but services are limited.

#### **Growth Area Bk09: Bank Mill Lane**

Transport. An agreed access strategy is required for this site, prior to due to the possible complexities and constraints with connections through the site and identifying key access points for all mode types, including new access onto a primary route (LTP4, policy 5). Vehicle access to Bank Mill Lane is unlikely to be supported and deliverable. Opportunities for walking/cycling connections should also be maximised from the site, including to River Bulbourne towing paths.

This growth area, along with sites Bk11 and Bk13 are within 400m of bus stops on the High Street, London Road and A4251 with regular bus services Maximising these connections should be required within policy.

This growth area, along with site Bk05, also has a joint master planning/connectivity strategy approach secured through policy, notably for transport to enable the best possible design for all transport modes, maximise permeability and potentially enable sustainable transport route options. Significant walking/cycling measures will be required for Shooters Way including high quality crossing provision. Maximising and enhancing the Rights of Way routes and their connectivity will be sought, retaining all existing routes will be required.

#### **Growth Area Bk10: Hanburys**

Transport. Please see previous comments on joint approach of site in the A single site approach would not be supported when considering transport design.

#### **Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane**

Transport. This growth area, along with sites Bk09 and Bk13 are within 400m of bus stops on the High Street, London Road and A4251 with regular bus services available. Maximising these connections should be required within

A central location may support a highly sustainable approach, including low parking levels. Opportunity for a high-quality connection to the towpath via this site should also be secured. Access arrangements reflecting new use type will be required/reinstated.

#### **Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and land to the rear of High Street**

Transport. A central location may support a highly sustainable approach, including low/no parking There is a very good opportunity to connect the site to a sustainable corridor from the South West in a high-quality way to the town centre/high street, (Right of Way 09). Bus stops are within 200m of the growth area, with regular services available.

#### **Growth Area Bk13: Gossoms End/Billet Lane**

Transport. This growth area, along with sites Bk09 and Bk11 are within 400m of bus stops on the High Street, London Road and A4251 with regular bus services available. Maximising these connections should be required within policy.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8735
<b>Person ID</b>	1266750
<b>Full Name</b>	HELEN SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Other site specific concerns:</p> <p>BK11, BK13 Billet Lane (especially between the industrial estate and main junction) is already very busy and this lower section is already difficult for children to negotiate on the way to school at Bridgewater. There needs to be extra attention to how the different junctions work for pedestrians and cars.</p> <p>BK03 I am concerned about the loss of sporting facilities/playing fields at Haslam Fields - a site which is used regularly by local teams.</p> <p>Crossoak Road has large sections which are single lane, with no pavement. Given the proximity of housing, it will not be possible to expand this road, which will have increased traffic due to the new developments.</p> <p>Any new commuter residents on the border of Northchurch/Berkhamsted will have to drive to Berkhamsted station, adding to the already congested road and rail services.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the need for extra housing in Berkhamsted, the town cannot sustain the addition of so many new residents. I therefore reject the New Dacorum Plan in its current form.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8779
<b>Person ID</b>	1266779
<b>Full Name</b>	Anna Peters
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b><u>Area at the top of Swing Gate Lane</u></b></p> <p>An area of particular concern is at the top of Swing Gate Lane. The walk back from the town centre and station up steep hills makes it unrealistic to expect residents to walk or cycle into the town to reach amenities, as such the areas proposed for building would create more traffic congestion. How would an elderly person or single mum with 3 children carry heavy bags with necessary shopping up to their house??</p> <p>The towns infrastructure already struggles to cope with the amount of traffic and healthcare and dental services are over stretched. Swing Gate Lane is a quiet residential street and will become a main route into town from the A41 and top of Swing Gate Lane regardless of the direct access proposed to the A41. No plan has been proposed to keep Swing Gate Lane as a secondary route to the town centre, and no infrastructure has been suggested to make this happen. Public transport is very lacking in frequency in Berkhamsted and almost pointless at weekends so all this will lead to traffic congestion of unmanageable proportions, especially at school and commuter peak times and weekends.</p> <p>No direct employment opportunities that would suit the economic status required to purchase houses in the developer lead housing proposed exist or plan to be created in Berkhamsted. Plans would therefore add to more commuting traffic congestion and over-crowding at Berkhamsted station on weekdays.</p>

Development in this beautiful location would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location. It will impact on views both of and from Ashlyn's Hall, a grade II listed building.

The building in this location would lead to the erosion of the buffer between the A41 and existing built-up area impacting sound quality to all local residents.

On top of all the about, this would also lead to the loss of productive farmland which characterises the nature of the Berkhamsted borders, impacting negatively on the character of the town. The loss of important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged and this could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.

Myself and my family regularly exercise on the public rights of way around the fields at the top of Swing Gate Lane and turning the farmland there into an urban area would mean we would need to drive in order to enjoy exercise in a similar green and rural setting, where at present we can walk straight from home. This is also true no doubt for many residents of Berkhamsted and other parts of the greenbelt planned for destructive building. This again adds to further congestion in the town.

I am a childminder caring for young children on a daily basis and I cannot imagine the stress of parents having to drop off / collect children & me having to do collections from Swing Gate with the inevitable increase in traffic congestion that would come with this development. The roads would become unsafe for children not to mention the horrendous effects on their health from increased pollution. Not being able to use the nearby fields/ public paths at the top of swing gate would mean more use of my car/ less easily available exercise opportunities to offer the children in my care and I believe will have an overall negative effect on everyone's mental health.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8783

**Person ID** 1266784

**Full Name** SIOBHAN REDMOND

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>i am totally against building new housing up Bell Lane, not only has Berkhamsted limited infrastructure for new housing, no new schools, nurseries, doctors, chemist's, parking area being built to cope with the extra demand from these extra pressures.</p> <p>Also most of the new houses will be car drivers, who will be driving to school, work etc, what will this be doing to our environment, definitely not helping it.</p> <p>i have lived here for over 20 years and live Berkhamsted for the small town and great community it was, It already feels like our great town is over crowded when trying to walk on the pavements and this is when we have a pandemic.</p> <p>Please do not ruin our great town by turning it into a concrete jungle</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8786
<b>Person ID</b>	1266786
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRISTINA MORRIS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The main focus of my objection to the DLP concerns the environmental impact of building on Green Belt land in close proximity to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The DLP is not an environmentally intelligent answer to housing need.</p> <p>It would not be useful to reiterate the detailed objections made by the Chiltern Society and the Hertfordshire Campaign to Protect Rural England, I can only say that I support their respective impact assessments.</p> <p>I also support the detailed question by question responses submitted by Berkhamsted Town Council and Berkhamsted Citizens Association; two organisations which represent the largest number of Berkhamsted residents.</p> <p>The housing need algorithms are generally seen as faulty and outdated, particularly in the light of the inevitable Covid 19 economic fallout.</p> <p>SECTION 24 Berkhamsted Growth Area12 - proposed redevelopment of Berkhamsted Civic Centre and land to the rear of the High Street.</p> <p>The proposal to designate this awkward site for housing will introduce significant pressure on the 20 households on Clarence Road, the sole access to 'Area 12'.</p> <p>A more thoughtful, civically minded plan would include a 'green' corridor allowing access from the High Street to Victoria School.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8791
<b>Person ID</b>	1266787
<b>Full Name</b>	Caroline Millson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to place my objection to the plans to build thousands of homes on green land locally.</p> <p>I am not against building of new homes of the 2 and 3 bedroom size so that young people can afford first homes. However Berkhamsted constantly builds more and more homes of 5 and 6 bedroom status at high end prices and on green land and I object to this.</p> <p>I particularly object to building on northchurch common as it is an area of outstanding beauty and is used widely by all for exercise which this year has been more necessary than ever when people need to distance. I also object to the large development near Ashlyns which proposes to have its own access to the A41. The A41 is an incredibly dangerous dual carriageway and simply does not need abutted entrance/exit which will require sudden slowing and cause more accidents.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8831
<b>Person ID</b>	1158356
<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Blundel
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Planning Officer Chiltern Society
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK1 - South of Berkhamsted 850 homes - This is close to A41 for access, so will encourage increased car use.</p> <p>BK2 - BFI site 90 homes - The effect on the listed building and its setting needs to be addressed.</p>

BK3 - Haslam Fields 150 homes - These are playing fields and loss of sports facilities in town!

BK4 - Hanbury - A wildlife corridor recommended in guidance which would lead to open space at the rear was ignored when pp was granted recently for a complex of unsightly private flats for older residents. (Uplift in numbers 40 to 100+).

BK 6 - East of Darrs Lane 200 homes - This is possibly the worst of the sites. The 22ha parcel of land at the Northchurch end of Berkhamsted, would further erode any distinction between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. It would coalesce with the very low density of existing development along the western side of Darrs Lane, and that on the southern side of Shootersway (BK8). The site is steeply sloping so would be highly visible from the northern side of the valley. It abuts the boundary with the CAONB to the west and would therefore severely impinge on its appearance and character. Both Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are very narrow, steep rural lanes and cannot take any further traffic. Walking and cycling is not considered to be feasible due to the nature of the site. It is a considerable distance from the facilities of Northchurch and Berkhamsted and further traffic through Northchurch High Street will impact on the AQMA.

These are beside the existing Bearroc 1 and 2 sites, so a large chunk at the Northchurch side of town, a further coalescence with the very low density of existing development along the southern end of Darrs Lane, ie modest bungalows and detached houses.

BK7 - Lock Field Northchurch 60 homes - This narrow site is constrained by the main line railway, the canal and the River Bulbourne. This section of New Road is hazardous, sloping and very busy and the footpaths are narrow. This is not conducive for safe use by walkers or cyclists. Again, this would result in additional traffic on the already busy roads. Northchurch High Street has already been noted as an Air Quality Management Area and the added pollution from traffic would further diminish air quality. Any development here, assuming there are no flooding issues, would put severe pressure on traffic over the canal bridge and parking on both sides of the road creates a hazard. Climate change has increased the risk of flooding in numerous areas and as this is adjacent to the River Bulbourne and the canal, no development should be allowed.

BK8 - Rossway Farm 200 homes - With BK6 these areas provide a soft edge to the town which is what development on the southern side of Shootersway was supposed to be, this is alongside the A41. It looks like all these intentions are forgotten and this is poor urban design which will provide an abrupt edge to a market town set in open countryside.

The previously planned “green lung” between the A41 bypass and Berkhamsted is to be eroded by building all along the corridor, and the noise and pollution from the bypass will be a problem for the new build estates as well as loss of wildlife.

This is even further away from the town centre and further erodes the open countryside beyond the recognised urban area and was not previously included in the draft schedule of Site Appraisals, November 2017. Together with BK6, this will begin to coalesce Berkhamsted with Northchurch, clearly contrary to the aims of the Green Belt and put added pressure for possible future development joining with Blegberry (Bk5) for continuous development along the southern side of Shootersway.

BK9 - Bank Mill Lane 50 homes - This is a water meadow with the adjacent building density having exacerbated the problem and this should not be included at all. It also serves as a soft edge at the entrance to the historic market town. The River Bulbourne has already suffered from the proximity of the recent adjacent development which has substantially

reduced the wildlife corridor and any further development will severely affect this nationally important chalk stream. No development should be allowed.

BK10 - Hanbury - Already approved

BK11/BK13 - Billet Lane - Lidl pp granted some years ago and Jewsons site, ok if traffic issues onto Billet Lane and High Street controlled, only to same height of flats opposite, 3 storeys, and improvements to the canal side.

BK12 - Civic Centre - The Civic Centre is an important amenity and the Police station remnant is in there, with the increase in population proposed this is even more essential than now, as is the car park which should be retained.

The Plan proposes an additional 390 dwellings using Shootersway plus 176 recently developed at the junction with Durrants Lane known as Bearoc. Shootersway was a quiet road with houses on large plots forming a soft transition from the urban development to the rural land to the south. However, the cumulative effect of these sites will further erode the character, appearance and any wildlife present.

These, together with BK1 - South of Berkhamsted 850 homes, will fill in the gap between existing development and the A41 bypass. These areas provide a soft edge to the town which is what development on the southern side of Shootersway was supposed to be. It looks like all these intentions are forgotten and this is poor urban design as it will provide an abrupt edge to a market town set in open countryside.

The previously planned "green lung" between the A41 bypass and Berkhamsted is to be eroded by building completely along the corridor, and the noise and pollution from the bypass will be a problem for the new build estates as well as loss of wildlife. In addition, it will be detrimental to views to and from the wider rural landscape which lies within the CAONB, including light pollution which severely affects some mammals and birds.

Each site mentions the provision of a wildlife corridor and public access. However, this would be a narrow strip beyond the sites' boundaries immediately adjacent to the A41, a heavily trafficked road causing severe disturbance by virtue of noise, lighting and air pollution. One site, Hanbury has already been granted planning permission omitting public open space and access to the wildlife corridor, so a precedent has been set for the other sites.

In Dacorum's Consultation on Issues and Options for the new Local Plan in 2017, the Haslam Fields Site (BK3) was divided into housing on 3.8ha and biodiversity on 2.7ha. Some 80 -100 dwellings were proposed not 150 as now, and with a large area of public open space /walking field/wildlife area towards the rear. ie not a narrow wildlife corridor.

Despite this vast increase in dwellings, there is no public transport to this part of town and given the distance from the town centre and community facilities including health and education, and location on the ridge of a steeply sloping hill, is not conducive to walking or cycling. It is fatuous to think that people will forgo their cars if they live in this area if they want to visit the town or any meaningful public open space which the Local Plan will not provide. The Council itself has acknowledged that the location of these sites on the valley ridge would 'generally discourage movements by foot and cycle', Therefore, development on this scale on the southern edge of town is not sustainable and the proposals are deeply flawed.

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

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	No specific sites, but a review should be undertaken in the urban areas to identify any buildings no longer in business use for conversion to residential use.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8861
<b>Person ID</b>	1266803
<b>Full Name</b>	Jonathan Bridal
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I wish to register my objection for the proposed Thakeham/Bulbourne Cross development.</p> <p>I believe any new development should lead the way in sustainability and show clear commitment to reducing global warming. I don't see that the new proposed development goes anyway near leading the way in this.</p> <p>My children both attended Pooh Corner nursery which is located at the football club - this benefitted both the football club (financially) and the children (being able to use all the facilities. With the football club moving, the nursery would close, and with the increase in residents, there would not be anyway near enough pre-school facilities.</p> <p>During lockdown, the residents of Berkhamsted have been lucky to have green belt land to use for exercise, and the prospect of green belt land being taken away and housing built will affect the whole community negatively.</p>

My doctor's surgery (Manor Street) is always very busy and it can take a long time to get an appointment, I believe this is a problem across the area - a huge increase in population will only exacerbate the situation, and therefore have negative consequences for the health of the community.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8867

**Person ID** 1266811

**Full Name** Helen Bridal

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

I wish to register my opposition to the plans for the proposed Thakeham Bulbourne Cross development. My main objections are as follows:

- The past year of lockdown has proved how important green space is to us all. To destroy such a huge area of green belt land forever is completely at odds with the direction the world has moved in. People value the open spaces we have in this area – I have lost count of the number of people I've spoken to in the town who have said that having the countryside on our doorstep was their main salvation during lockdown. It's important to keep this green belt land as a recognition that nature and climate change concerns need to be at the top of the agenda, not to mention the knock-on effect of nature being a vital – and free – way to improve people's mental health.
- Climate change and sustainability concerns seem to be low on the agenda for this scheme, as highlighted by the CPRE Herts published concerns.

- Berkhamsted is in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty – this scheme will destroy the very thing that makes this area special by building on the countryside. The urban footprint of the proposed scheme threatens the historic character and setting of Berkhamsted.
- There is no benefit to the scheme creating a 'country park' when the green belt land could simply remain untouched and provide exactly the same wellbeing benefits.
- The council cannot be allowed to prioritise money-making schemes for large developers to the detriment of the people who already live here. The infrastructure is already at capacity and creating so many new houses will place far too much strain on roads, commuting routes, utilities and so on. The claim that the development will reduce impact on existing roads in Berkhamsted is flawed, as residents in the proposed scheme will naturally want to travel into the town to enjoy the high street and shop for groceries – but we simply do not have the capacity for this increase in numbers.
- There is absolutely no need to move the football club from Broadwater to out of town. Having community spaces like this at the heart of the town are precisely what makes the town special. We don't need to divert sports facilities to an out-of-town area (which isn't within walking distance, so will add to traffic pollution and congestion, and therefore paradoxically discourage exercise) – we just need to channel funds into improving the existing facilities.
- Furthermore, during weekdays, the football club currently operates as a nursery which both my children attended when younger. This dual use of a space in the heart of the town shows how local interests have collaborated to make the most efficient use of the space available. Losing the football club would also mean losing a nursery in the heart of town – one that not only provides local jobs but has also been invaluable to many working parents. I know from first-hand experience how important this was when I commuted to London and time was tight – it was a godsend to have my kids at a nursery close to the station, and many other parents will sorely feel the loss of something that makes the difference in making the work/family juggle a success versus it falling apart.
- There are not enough local jobs for the increase in population that this scheme will produce. Moreover, the changes to working life brought about by the pandemic mean that access to London transport links is now less important – house-building schemes should be diverted to areas which would benefit more from increased footfall and with better employment opportunities.
- Furthermore, the targets and housing estimates used as a baseline for this scheme are flawed and out of date.

By rejecting this scheme, it's a chance for DBC to make a positive step to acknowledge 21st-century issues of protecting nature and nurturing mental health, while also honouring the heritage of the area and the importance of allowing the countryside to simply remain as it has for hundreds of years. I urge DBC to support its existing residents by rejecting this scheme, while also acting on principle over profit and demonstrating that it can be a forward-thinking example for other councils to emulate in the future.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8886

**Person ID** 1266824

<b>Full Name</b>	Linda Ralphs
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted.</p> <p>This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p> <p>— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'</p> <p>This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.</p> <p>— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.</p> <p>— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children</p>



on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, reduced water pressure, increased pressure on the NHS services which are already inadequate.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8888

**Person ID** 1266826

**Full Name** Nigel Squire

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I would like to register my objection to the proposed development plans put forward by Thatcham on the site of Broadway Farm near Berkhamsted.

This is a valuable piece of Green Belt separating Bourne End from Berkhamsted. Green belt should be treasured and, following Government guidelines, should only subject to development under 'Exceptional' circumstances. The building

of houses is in no way exceptional. There is a huge amount of development occurring around all of the local towns and this proposal does not meet the Government requirement. Once the Green belt is gone it will not be recovered!

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8900

**Person ID** 1264506

**Full Name** Michael Burton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

This email is in opposition to the proposed South Berkhamsted development based on the unaccounted-for detrimental impacts it will have on the ecosystem and in particular the iconic bird of prey the Red Kite. Within the proposed building zone of BK-01 groups of Red Kites can be seen every summertime. Red Kites are an iconic British species that are classified as near-threatened with populations declining. They are at the top of the food chain within an ecosystem; hence a large and healthy population of red kites signifies a healthy fully functioning ecosystem. Red Kites only appear in groups within the breeding season, therefore indicating the ecological and species richness within this zone, as they have chosen this location to breed and subsequently raise their chicks. Personally, I have seen groups of birds up to 6 red kites, indicating that breeding pairs can successfully raise four chicks within this habitat. Red Kites lay a maximum of four eggs according to the RSPB, hence this further highlights the ecological richness of the flora and fauna and the environmental importance of this habitat to Red Kites, as there is enough prey to allow them to raise the maximum possible number of chicks biologically possible.

I do not believe that a proper ecological investigation with full scientific rigour has been undertaken to examine the number of Red Kites within the area, the biodiversity richness that this infers and most importantly the impact that the proposed development plans will have on these near-threatened species. Developers are required by law to at least offset the environmental impacts through targeted conservation action. However, numerous academic studies and simulations have shown that offsetting does not ensure species persistence and that it is better to avoid degrading the original habitats. Species need to be explicitly accounted for in offsets, rather than just vegetation or habitat alone. Vegetation-based metrics can give misguided impressions on how well biodiversity offsets achieve no net loss. Moreover, offset habitats require intensive monitoring and maintenance until they are fully established, this can take many years and be of great economic cost to the developer.

According to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Section 1(4) and (5), (as amended under Schedule 12(1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000), Section 18 and Schedule 1:

- Red Kites have a special level of legal protection at all times
- It is an offence to intentionally kill or injure them; take or damage their eggs, or damage or destroy their nests whilst they are being built or in use.
- During the breeding season, it is an offence to 'intentionally or recklessly' disturb adult or young kites at or near their nests. They are extremely sensitive to human activity at this time and any such disturbance could cause desertion of eggs or young.
- To attempt any of the above actions is an offence in itself, and is 'punishable in like manner as for the said offence'.
- Special penalties (fines of up to £5000 for each bird or egg involved and/or imprisonment for up to six months) could be imposed on a person convicted of any of these offences

It is inconceivable that the proposed developments would not infringe on these special protective laws for the preservation of Red Kites. Even if the proposed developments include 'green spaces' or the planting of trees etc this will not account for environmental destruction, ecological disturbance and substitute for the current richness of flora which inevitably has knock-on impacts all the way up the food chain. It is a massive oversimplification to equate the development of new green spaces as being of the same environmental and ecological importance as old established green spaces that have developed over many years.

Historically, conservation of Red Kites goes back to the reintroduction of 93 kite chicks to the Chiltern Hills between 1989 and 1994 after the entire population had been wiped out in the 19th century. Evidently, the conservationists at the time had identified the Chiltern Hills and surrounding areas such as Berkhamsted as a highly suitable area for Red Kites. It seems to be paradoxical then to be forgetting history and undoing the work of those conservations within the planned development zones.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8901
<b>Person ID</b>	398911
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Brown
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I just wish to inform you that I disagree with the Local Plan and in particular with the housing numbers proposed.</p> <p>I consider that the housing numbers proposed are excessive and unrealistically high in the light of local needs and potential for employment. For example, recent major developments to the west of the town ... eg Bearroc Park .. are already impacting the infrastructure such as roads and schools. Greatly increased traffic on Shootersway is now at an unacceptably dangerous level for pedestrians and cyclists; equally air and noise pollution significantly impacts adversely on local residents.</p> <p>I also believe that whatever plan is eventually adopted must specify exactly the order in which land should be released for development to provide a coherent development programme facilitating the provision of local infrastructure such as schools, shops and transport links and of course essential social housing. Developers should not be permitted to acquire develop land across the town on an ad hoc basis.</p>

For this reason I believe that the Bulbourne Cross proposals represent a logical and acceptable way to provide for the possibility of building additional homes and infrastructure for the town and should be fully considered by the planning authority.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8923

**Person ID** 1146039

**Full Name** Mr David Griffin

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment** I fully REJECT and do NOT support in any way the proposals by Thakeham and BSGCA at Bulbourne Cross. Destroying Green-Belt and other green areas then declaring that you are providing green space is complete nonsense. Building along greenbelt canal side and stating that those developments will enhance the enjoyment of walkers is beyond idiotic.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8925

**Person ID** 1266858

**Full Name** Caroline Brode

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation section 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>I <b>DO NOT</b> support this application which also includes the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the East of Berkhamsted for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The housing numbers in this Local Plan across Dacorum, and therefore Berkhamsted are excessive and wrong. They are well above the forecast housing need for the Borough as calculated by the ONS</li> <li>2) The impact on West berkhamsted is disproportionate, does not consider existing and recent major developments in the area (Bearroc park) and severely impacts infrastructure (rads / schools / Hospitals /etc) pollution, congestion, road safety, local ecology, health and well being of local residents.</li> <li>3) It wastes acres of farmland and beautiful countryside and damages the setting of the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</li> <li>4) The number of houses proposed in relation to the number of local jobs available will mean commuting will be worse</li> </ol> <p>I therefore call upon Dacorum Borough Council to</p> <p>HALT the Local Plan Consultation</p> <p>Re-draw the plan based on the recent housing densities achieved.</p> <p>DEMAND that housing targets are based on up-to-date estimates</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8927
<b>Person ID</b>	1266859

<b>Full Name</b>	Colin Lewis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth, 2020-38: Draft Plan for Berkhamsted</p> <p>I write to express my concern and opposition for the proposed developments in Berkhamsted. My reasons for doing so are threefold: the density and inappropriateness of the scale of the proposed expansion – especially the loss of green spaces; pressure on local services and infrastructure – suggested ‘improvement’ are inadequate in the extreme; adverse impact of the development on road safety and the environment.</p> <p>Looking at the scale, locations and density of proposed expansion in Berkhamsted, much of the development appears to be on greenbelt. This would markedly erode existing green spaces in and around the town and have an adverse impact on habitat and environment generally. Notwithstanding the proposed ‘news country park’ alongside the Bulboure Cross development, there will be a large net loss of ‘green lungs’. The loss of green spaces is compounded by additional health and safety hazards, discussed further below, and will lead to the degradation of the environment.</p> <p>The adverse impact of the proposed developments on road safety relates to conditions on the A41 and the centre of the town - along the A4251. The A41 is already one of the most dangerous trunk roads in the county, as highlighted by the frequency of accidents and fatalities. Traffic along the town centre bypass section already exceeds planned capacity. With major development planned at both ends – locations that are some distance from the railway station, road commuter traffic along the bypass will grow exponentially. Various sections of the plan indicate that the topography of the area discourages commuting by bicycle. Although the Bulbourne Cross development is described as having its own access to the A41, this hardly contributes to ‘safety enhancement’, let alone an infrastructure upgrade. The existing access point was planned and constructed to deal with limited movement to and from a small industrial estate, not a large housing development. Taken together, the developments will result in a sequence of closely bunched A41 access/egress points, each of which will generate high volumes of traffic at peak times, making an already dangerous section of the dual carriageway even more congested and hazardous as traffic bunches, slows and accelerates. The scale of housing</p>

developments clustered around the Tring access/egress junction points to a similar exponential and dangerous increase in traffic volumes.

Given distances from the town centre, planned large developments at each end of Berkhamsted, along with some smaller sites close to the centre, will generate a large increase in intra-town driving and commuting. The existing proposals appear to have given insubstantial thought to resolving these problems – both the mechanics of transit and related pollution. Hazards associated with the Bulboure Cross development, and nearby sites to the east and west of Swingate Lane, are especially acute, and likely to cause congestion and exceptional dangers for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers around the junction of London Road and Swingate Lane. The virtual lack of recognition of such dangers, as well as the growth in intra-urban traffic (given the location of the proposed sites) for shopping and leisure suggests a lack of awareness of existing traffic densities and travel patterns in and around the High Street. Such problems are hardly address in a meaningful manner in planning documents.

To conclude: the scale of development is out of keeping with the character of the town; no thought appears to have been given to providing an integrated intra-town transport system to cope with an exponential growth in local traffic, nor to health and safety problems that will result from an increase in traffic along the A41 around the town; the sum of the developments will result in a substantial loss of green space in and close to the town, with a resulting degradation of environment and amenities.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS8929

**Person ID** 1266861

**Full Name** Alison Kraff

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I have read the proposed housing development at Bourne End on the Southern edge . I appreciate the need for housing . However the scale of development is too large given the infrastructure . Berkhamsted High St is already very clogged with traffic.</p> <p>The development is filling in the green fields between Berkhamsted and Hemel . The two towns will be merged . I request the allocations are scaled back .</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8937
<b>Person ID</b>	1266874
<b>Full Name</b>	DENNIS CHRISTINE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to the proposed building of 150 dwellings on Haslam Playing Fields on the following grounds.</p> <p>Increased urbanisation in the green belt.</p> <p>Destruction of wildlife corridors and green spaces.</p> <p>Traffic congestion -There has already been such extensive development in Shooters way that the adjoining areas are struggling to cope with the increased traffic.</p> <p>Dennys Lane, Northchurch Lane, Johns Lane and Hog Lane are used as cut throughs and just cannot cope with any more traffic.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure for these extra dwellings.</p> <p>Increased air pollution</p> <p>We are continuously being made aware of climate change and the degradation of habitats. I do hope the council will take these wider issues into consideration</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8950
<b>Person ID</b>	1266884
<b>Full Name</b>	TOM & CLAIRE DOUGHERTY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>1 Direct effect on our property and family home on Darrs Lane</b></p> <p>Our family home on Darrs Lane sits directly next to the field where the proposed development will be. It will be majorly affected by the inevitable long building works and eventual homes / school sitting on that field. It seems there will be a road that is being planned that will sit right outside our garden. We moved to this areas 3 years ago to be in the countryside and specifically looked for houses near greenbelt land. Never once did we think that beautiful land we look at out every day would become a housing estate.</p> <p>Having a road outside of house as the main entrance and exit into either a school or housing estate will have a huge impact on the level of pollution generated. Pollution that will be felt by my young children mostly who are constantly playing in the garden next to the field.</p> <p>Because of the steep hill – any properties developed on this land will have a direct impact on the light into our property – specially a bedroom window that looks onto the field.</p> <p>Even now when the tractor uses the farm we can feel the earth shake in our garden, so cant imagine how the land will cope with massive building works and eventual road system. I am convinced this will cause land disruption and damage to my garden and potentially house.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment	
Included files	
Title	Berkhamsted
ID	EGS8976
Person ID	1266925
Full Name	Ms Sarah Edwards
Organisation Details	
Agent ID	
Agent Full Name	
Agent Organisation	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment	<p>Finally, I don't understand why the <b>Bulbourne Cross</b> development proposed by Thakeham has been rejected? Their proposal would appear to be <b>far more in line with your objective 2.14</b>. It offers a joined-up approach with <b>tangible benefits to the town</b> (such as improved sports facilities together with a significant number of affordable homes). Traffic from Bulbourne Cross and the adjoining BK01 development would have ready access to the A41 limiting traffic on residential roads; the site includes cycleways, walkways, access to bus routes, allotments and a new country park area. I would <b>support including this in the Berkhamsted Delivery Plan</b> as it seems a far more <b>sensible alternative to the piecemeal developments to the south</b> which offer little benefit to the town other than new housing.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8977
<b>Person ID</b>	1266926
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mark Finnie
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I object to the proposed development of new housing in Northchurch on Darrs Lane and New Road.</p> <p>The proposed development will greatly increase congestion on the roads in the area. The junctions where New Rd and Darrs Lane join the high st are already congested. Adding hundreds of new houses and thus cars will make it much worse. The current infrastructure of shops, schools, doctors etc will be put under increased pressure.</p> <p>The proposed developments will fundamentally change the character and feel of the area for the worse.</p> <p>The proposal to remove the name of Northchurch and call it West Berkhamsted is insulting to the residents of Northchurch and should be dropped.</p> <p>The Council should reconsider whether all of this additional housing is really necessary.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8987
<b>Person ID</b>	1266943

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Senem Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	We (Senem, Philip Waite and Adam Jordan) strongly oppose the proposed development based on loss of amenity in fields, destruction of sports fields, air quality in the town, sewage treatment centres overuse perhaps fouling of chalk stream, loss of employment space by building over Jewson's site and suggest to have really good look at all the brownfield sites.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8989
<b>Person ID</b>	1266944
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Philip Waite Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	We (Senem, Philip Waite and Adam Jordan) strongly oppose the proposed development based on loss of amenity in fields, destruction of sports fields, air quality in the town, sewage treatment centres overuse perhaps fouling of chalk stream, loss of employment space by building over Jewson's site and suggest to have really good look at all the brownfield sites.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS8991
<b>Person ID</b>	1266946
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Adam Jordan
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	We (Senem, Philip Waite and Adam Jordan) strongly oppose the proposed development based on loss of amenity in fields, destruction of sports fields, air quality in the town, sewage treatment centres overuse perhaps fouling of chalk stream, loss of employment space by building over Jewson's site and suggest to have really good look at all the brownfield sites.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9001
<b>Person ID</b>	1266975
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Norman Groves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>It is totally unacceptable that all vehicular access to the development is from Clarence Rd, which is a narrow cul-de-sac and effectively one way because of parking on both sides. However, that parking is very much needed as 20 households already live here, and it is already very often the case that we have to park at a considerable walk away, e.g. on Dr Commons Rd, or even Graemesdyke Rd, a 10 mins walk away. The road is always busy with shoppers, workers and dental patients vying to park, and delivery vehicles need to turn around or reverse out. The corner with Kings Rd is extremely busy and dangerous, as Kings Rd is the major route to the south.</p> <p>So if you add on all the new residents, visitors and delivery vehicles to the proposed 16 new dwellings (and especially if parking for the housing is falsely limited on the basis that this is a town centre site where people are expected not to need cars) the amenity and quality of life in Clarence Rd will be extremely prejudiced.</p> <p>The new multi-purpose Civic Centre will also need vehicular servicing from the rear, and thus via Clarence Rd, and this will greatly add to the very high volume of traffic, which ALL has to travel along Clarence Rd. Considerably more users will be introduced at the Centre, beyond even the present high volume of activity, and all vehicles will need to arrive/leave by the rear and Clarence Rd.</p> <p>Apart from having no development at all, the best way to reduce the extreme damage from all traffic entering and leaving the Depot site by Clarence Rd is to have a second access road via Prince Edward St, where the Council owns land already.</p>

It is important that the opportunity is taken to greatly increase pedestrian access in this part of the town centre, reducing the need for the narrow and dangerous pavements of Kings Rd to carry the volumes of footfall they presently do. There should be a direct 24/7 pedestrian link from the Depot site to the High St, as well as new links to the long footpath that exists between the Depot site and Victoria School. This will enable Clarence Rd residents and others from the west to reach the centre and east of the town much more safely and conveniently.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9002

**Person ID** 1266975

**Full Name** Mr Norman Groves

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The plan proposes around 16 dwellings on the site, apart from the Civic Centre and associated parking / servicing. This is a huge overdevelopment of a small and awkwardly shaped parcel of land. Apart from the traffic situation, this will result in poor quality housing units, as a spine road will be needed to get to the Civic Centre. It is likely that garden space will be severely limited or absent at these housing densities. There will be pressure to bring the building line right up to Butts Meadow, and this will be to the detriment of amenity and adversely affect the Conservation Area. Finally, there will be also be severe overlooking of the adjacent and sensitive primary school site.

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



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9003
<b>Person ID</b>	1266975
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Norman Groves
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	It is important that alternative accommodation is procured and transfer of activities undertaken for the existing main users of the site, including all the uses in the Civic Centre and those in the land at the rear, such as the Dacorum Heritage Trust.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9106
<b>Person ID</b>	1267074
<b>Full Name</b>	Joanne Howe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9118
<b>Person ID</b>	1145026
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Margaret Pillinger
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	1 The plan to put 150 houses on Haslam field will lead to gridlock - just imagine an extra 150 cars on Shootersway at rush hour!

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9140
<b>Person ID</b>	1267116
<b>Full Name</b>	Roger Bowley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am concerned and disapprove of one of the current proposals for new housing suggested for the area in Northchurch, Berkhamsted. If I have understood the proposals correctly, it is intended to erect a large number of houses in the angle between the Canal and New road, Northchurch. That would in my view be very inappropriate for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The traffic emanating from the site onto New Road would be substantial from such a large development.</li> <li>2) The traffic on New Road is already getting both more numerous and larger with more lorries. Even more traffic would cause greater danger to the St. Mary's School pupils and clog up the already congested junction beside the school and opposite broadly the George and Dragon. Further the Canal Bridge there is totally inadequate and would need extensive replacement.</li> <li>3) The site proposed is opposite the New Road Cemetery of St. Mary's Church. It is much used not only for new burials ( my wife is buried there) but also for visitors who are numerous and who park their cars in New Road outside the cemetery. The church would be unable to pay for any substantially altered parking arrangements in case that were mooted.</li> </ol>

4) I do not know what the drain and electricity (structure proposed for that area would involve but it seems to me that the site beside the railway and the canal would generate excessive problems, quite apart from the added burden on medical and school services.  
Please take these comments into your consideration of the plan.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9144

**Person ID** 1267121

**Full Name** Hilary Hartley

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

I have also looked at the proposed Bulboure Cross development from BSGCA and Thakeham and largely for the above reasons I'm even more against this proposal. Specifically:  
1 As per point 1 above this proposal erodes the green belt considerably more than the current draft plan and joins Berkhamsted and Bourne End up eroding the green belt around both settlements. It also leaves considerable space

around the development and the two existing settlements and sets a precedence which will make it hard to argue against developers in the future wanting to build on these remaining spaces.

- 2 As per point 2 above this site is even further way from the station with no transport solution proposed and will drive up traffic through the town centre.
- 3 The proposed sport facilities are on the far south west edge of the development and a long way from where most people live in Berkhamsted. In fact the facilities are not even in Berkhamsted but Borne End. As such unlike the current sports facilities virtually everyone will have to drive there to use them including dropping off and picking up children (which generating double the number journeys per child). All this will also drive up traffic through the town.
- 4 As per point 4 above as far as I can tell there are no plans to locate large food shops, doctors, dentists, pharmacists, churches, restaurants, bars, public buildings etc on or near this development. So to access these facilities virtually all trips will be by car.
- 5 As per point 5 above with no or poor public transport this could leave a significant minority isolated.
- 6 The school and sports facilities are located in an exposed position, close to the busy A41 and service station, in the direction of the prevailing wind and with virtually no protection from trees or embankments. As such will suffer substantial noise and air pollution.
- 7 There are high voltage power lines crossing the site with seemingly no plans to reroute them, leaving a set of very unsightly, and at times noisy, pylons and cables cutting straight through a residential area. With some also arguing high voltage cables close to residential property can be damaging to health.
- 8 The proposal puts forward the developments separate junction to the A41 as an advantage. I disagree. Currently the route between Bourne End's residential area and the A41 junction (along with the industrial estate) is blocked off. I presume this has been done for a reason. This proposal would open up this access via the new housing estate connecting the A41 to the equally busy London Road. This is likely to create a cut through (ie a "Rat Run") straight through the new residential area for cars, delivery vans and potentially even HGV's.

I would ask you to not include the Bulboure Cross development in your plan and amend your plan to reflect my first seven points.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9165

**Person ID** 211352

**Full Name** Mr Andrew Sanderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Do you have any specific comments on the Berkhamsted Proposals and Sites? YES</p> <p>The Civic Centre in Berkhamsted should remain as public facility and a separate consultation is being conducted about the citizens' vision for its future use. DBC cannot go on increasing the population while removing recreational, cultural and civic amenities. The quality of life will be diminished, health and well-being will decline, civic pride will be lost, and crime will increase. Localism is also important – to have facilities and accessible recreation in the locality makes a community worth living in. I attend many events in the Civic Centre.</p> <p>If that goes my quality of life will be much reduced.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum Planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit. The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good.</p> <p>BRAG. Have provided detailed comments on this which I fully support.</p> <p>The local objective to “Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site” has clearly been dropped. Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move.</p> <p>Site specific requirements are a nonsense.</p> <p>Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site) Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities' needs and provides employment.</p> <p>Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council's objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.</p> <p>Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street Given Dacorum Council's track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported</p>

by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9166

**Person ID** 211352

**Full Name** Mr Andrew Sanderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

NO The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document. The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9182
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am not happy with the local plan where 850 houses are planned behind Upper Hall Park. The roads around here will not be able to cope with the extra traffic. wing Gate Lane will become impossible
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9196
<b>Person ID</b>	1267193
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Keith Vanessa Gill & Harrison
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Firstly, the way the proposal was sent out at a time when the lockdown kicked in, and all hell was breaking loose stinks of a hidden agenda, the web site for information seems designed to misinform, and its being marketed as a boost to Berkhamsted's sporting? It's full of distraction, smoke and mirrors!</p> <p>It's clearly a commercial land grab without the consideration and environment impact assessments, trying to trick the local communities into thinking its benefitting them.</p> <p>Secondly, Berkhamsted's infrastructure can't handle an increase, never mind the substantial increase that's already from the Swingate Lane developments, the traffic along that route has increased significantly with no improvements, potholes are increasing exponentially along the route between there and the high street, and nothing has been done (what a surprise) so now we get into the high street itself, pre-lockdown the high street traffic was truly awful, with major tailbacks stretching in all directions, with a significant pollution impact to the surrounding area during these times, then there's the parking, yes we've got a new multi-storey, but the fact of life is people will seek out free parking around the high street, I used to live on Manor street and it's already a nightmare to park down there, people from this new development will exasperate this.</p> <p>Simply put, It just won't fit.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9240
<b>Person ID</b>	1264686
<b>Full Name</b>	Suzanne Doubleday
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9263
<b>Person ID</b>	1267329
<b>Full Name</b>	MARTIN DAVIES
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it

forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9264

**Person ID** 1267329

**Full Name** MARTIN DAVIES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road.

A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9265

**Person ID** 1267329

**Full Name** MARTIN DAVIES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9274
<b>Person ID</b>	1267330
<b>Full Name</b>	Kat Worth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p> <p>— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous</p>

to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of

—BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9338

**Person ID** 1267357

**Full Name** Michael O'Sullivan

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I support including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted for the following reasons :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Bulbourne Cross provides a once in a generation opportunity to build 24 acres of sports facilities for local residents :</li> <li>* It creates a new 30 acre country park, together with 50 acres of new green open space including allotments :</li> <li>* The proposal includes 40% affordable housing for local people :</li> <li>* Reduce the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41 :</li> <li>* Build a new Primary School and other educational and community facilities :</li> <li>* Overall, the proposals invest in the future of Berkhamsted, delivering community benefits when alternatives in the west do not do so</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9348
<b>Person ID</b>	1267365
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jont Cole
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9365
<b>Person ID</b>	1267367
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9366
<b>Person ID</b>	1267367
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9367
<b>Person ID</b>	1267367
<b>Full Name</b>	Sarah Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9379
<b>Person ID</b>	1267368
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Leighton-Murray

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9380
<b>Person ID</b>	1267368
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Leighton-Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9381
<b>Person ID</b>	1267368
<b>Full Name</b>	Peter Leighton-Murray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9393
<b>Person ID</b>	1267370
<b>Full Name</b>	Patricia Beloe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on</p>

the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS9394

**Person ID**

1267370

**Full Name**

Patricia Beloe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact

of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9395
<b>Person ID</b>	1267370
<b>Full Name</b>	Patricia Beloe
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9403
<b>Person ID</b>	1267391
<b>Full Name</b>	JAMES WOODS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted.</p> <p>This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.</p> <p>— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'</p> <p>This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.</p> <p>— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling</p>



buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne — reduced water pressure

— there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9418

**Person ID** 1267392

**Full Name** TANYA VERBEEK

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9441
<b>Person ID</b>	1267398
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra and James Donaldson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p>

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9443

**Person ID** 1267398

**Full Name** Alexandra and James Donaldson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9444
<b>Person ID</b>	1267398
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra and James Donaldson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS9453
<b>Person ID</b>	1267401
<b>Full Name</b>	JACKIE BELLAMY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>• During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>• The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> <li>• The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact</li> <li>• of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> <li>• Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</li> <li>• —The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</li> </ul>

- Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9481

**Person ID** 1267417

**Full Name** Wendy and Paul Goodridge

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9509

**Person ID** 399324

**Full Name** Ms Julie Hollway

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	As above, the visual impact of BK06 on the AONB (“intervisibility”) will be enormous - day and night! Developing alongside the A41 will take away a valuable buffer zone for the absorption of pollution generated by the road, and will subject residents of those developments to high levels of noise and potentially significant pollution levels. Infrastructure references also made above plus we have already seen with the building on Bearroc Park, Phase 1 is already adding significant traffic along Shootersway and to the dangerous corner into the top of Durrants Lane. Do people have to die in the accidents we see there for DBC to take action and address the traffic issue there? Phase 2 will only add more issues.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9512
<b>Person ID</b>	399324
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Julie Hollway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b><u>Specifically re area BK06: Green Belt protection should not be removed from the Wishing Tree field for a significant number of reasons:</u></b> A/ Independent consultants have repeatedly provided evidence that demonstrate the inappropriateness of DBC's proposal to remove this parcel from the Green Belt. Two independent assessments of Green Belt in the borough and beyond have been carried out over the past years. Each of these has made clear that the Bk06 parcel is strongly associated with the characteristics of the Green Belt and that as such the Green Belt protection remains warranted  <u>SKM Report (Green Belt Phase 1 Review):</u>



*"an independent and comprehensive Green Belt review", which included an assessment of the relative contribution played by a number of candidate parcels of land to the Green Belt. (Green Belt Review: Purposes Assessment (SKM), Part 1, p.6. Available at:*

*https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\_final-report-part1.pdf?sfvrsn=3babc89f\_0). That report concluded that the area including Bk06 (and indeed the other nearby parcels now put forward for removal from the Green Belt, including BK05 (Blegberry Gardens), and BK05 (Rossway Farm) is one of just four "key networks of parcels which preserve setting and special character" across the whole SW Herts area under consideration. The area is therefore assessed to make a "significant contribution" towards "preserving the setting and special character of historic towns".*

*The SKM Report also rightly concluded that:*

*"The Green Belt continues to perform an important role in checking the restricted expansion of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging by providing strategic gaps and preserving the special character of towns"; "A clear distinction is evident and has been maintained between land which is built-up and part of existing settlements and the adjacent surrounding countryside, and this is in large part a result of the success of the Green Belt designation"; "All strategic parcels in the Green Belt, at least in part, clearly perform a key role and need to be given maximum protection into the future". (Part 2, para. 9.1, p.69.)*

*Arup 1 Report (Green Belt Phase 1 Review):*

*The report noted that the area "predominantly retains an unspoilt, rural character" which is "particularly prominent in the wider Bulbourne Valley setting, highly visible from the AONB to the north". The report also commented on "visual prominence and degree of intervisibility with the opposite side of the valley (Ashridge Estate) creates increased visual sensitivity". The Ashridge Estate is (of course) a designated AONB and as such, visual sensitivity in related areas will be damaging to the AONB itself.*

*Arup also considered the "special qualities and characteristics of the AONB" to be evident on the parcel itself and the north-western parts of the area in particular (i.e. broadly coinciding with the 'Wishing Tree' field, by contrast with the field behind Westfield Road/alongside Durrants Lane to the eastern part of the site). This area related "strongly to the wider rural landscape". In particular, the report noted that "the parkland and landscape features at Woodcockhill are highly sensitive by virtue of their sense of time depth, intactness and historical continuity as well as the intricate landscape mosaic they create".*

*Arup concluded that while area BK-A12 (which included all of the area now referred to as Bk06 in the draft Local Plan) could be considered for partial amendment to the Green Belt designation, the only part of the area identified for such reconsideration is the area which is now a new playing field at the corner of Durrants Lane and Shootersway.*

*Crucially, the Report concludes that even the for modest sub-area proposed, "the Council may wish to consider the overall desirability of this recommendation, given the identified landscape sensitivities of the land surrounding the identified area. Aside from a number of small clusters of houses to the east, Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term".*

*The Local Plan fails to respect the conclusions of the Green Belt Phase 1 and 2 reports*

*B/ The site impacts on Chilterns AONB - as above views between the AONB and The Wishing Tree Field are "intervisible".*

- Considerations apply to the impact of many of the developments on the Chilterns AONB. DBC has a legal obligation to protect the AONB, and BK06 impacts on it, e.g. due to "intervisibility" from the AONB itself, eg from parts of Northchurch Common. The NPPF requires that "*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in [...] Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection*". Dacorum's own currently applicable Adopted Core Strategy states that: "*development will not be supported where it has an adverse impact on the sensitive open valley sides and ridge top locations*"

C/ The development will result in significant loss of amenity for local residents in and around Northchurch

- Developing the site will harm a public right of way used by Northchurch residents (alongside Bell Lane in the Wishing Tree field) while improving their mental wellbeing walking through a country field with spectacular views over AONB and will destroying its rural character.
- Exacerbate general loss of accessible open spaces between Northchurch and A41 - in addition to the sudden decision of DBC to close the footpath access across the A41 without any replacement in early 2020.
- The proposal suggests that the inclusion of a park with the parcel would "add" open space. It's already there !!!!! Any development would leave only a tiny portion . The proposed location of the park is also at odds with the character of the site - it is the Wishing Tree field which offers the best views across the valley to the Chilterns AONB

D/ The location is unsuitable for development

- Steep hills to town
- No-one will walk or Cycle... only use yet more cars
- SINK HOLES
- Pond with ducks and herons regularly visiting
- Ancient and established hedgerows
- Single track established soft verge lanes not suitable for additional traffic
- No pavements
- Grimms Ditch
- Only small Tesco supermarket locally
- No mains drainage/sewage, gas supply or copper piping for decent broadband supply (all crucial given increased and continued demand for working from home).

E/ Existing infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the proposed development

- We have already seen with the building on Bearroc Park, Phase 1 is already adding significant traffic along Shootersway and to the dangerous corner into the top of Durrants Lane. Do people have to die in the accidents we see there for DBC to take action and address the traffic issue there? Phase 2 will only add more issues. Including the 200 houses planned for Bk06, DBC plans to build 890 additional houses in the immediate area which will need to use these junctions .

F/ Nature

- The site is currently rich in nature - forming a habitat for bird life including bats, larks, kites and tawny owls. The pond regularly has ducks and herons visiting.
- Extensive development of the area to the north of the A41 (effectively a hard boundary for wild animals as well as local residents) will leave no space for wildlife to flourish

**Residents have every reason to be outraged and angered by the proposed Local Plan, which rides roughshod over legal protections for the Green Belt and the AONB, and will be hugely harmful for local quality of life. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that DBC has (wrongly) treated the current government's aspirations to increase the national housing stock as an injunction, and failed to take account of the very great weight that it is required, under national planning policy, to give to the protection of the Green Belt and the AONB, for the benefit of current residents of the borough and indeed future generations.**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9518
<b>Person ID</b>	1267424
<b>Full Name</b>	Laura Goss
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposed development between Durrants Lane across the Darrs Lane will add such and increase in traffic from these new houses that it will make living and driving in Northchurch a miserable proposition. These roads are already taking far too much traffic and are constantly full of potholes and dangerous conditions to not only drivers but pedestrians especially Darrs Lane where school children have to walk up with no footpath or street lighting. It is like

using a racetrack hoping you get to the top before you meet a car coming down. The 3 Lanes you are planning to use with the increased traffic are Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and Durrants Lane and are what they are called LANES not roads. They are too small in their design to cater for all this heavy flow of traffic that these extra houses will produce. Currently Phase 2 has not yet been completed and occupied therefore the impact of their vehicles is not yet known. There is already a pollution monitor placed outside Northchurch Parsh Office due to excess pollution so more traffic would lead to exceeding the recommended levels. This monitor is extremely important to test emission levels to safeguard our children using the local schools as many children do walk as parents find it is quicker than taking the car due to traffic. Durrants Lane/High Street traffic lights were put in place because on the increased traffic from Berrock Park but has only caused more queues with cars exhaust polluting the air as children and parents come out of the school gates.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9519

**Person ID** 1267424

**Full Name** Laura Goss

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** The proposed site in New Road, Northchurch is in such a dangerous position as far as traffic access. New road joining the A41 is very difficult to pull out and the proposed junction from this estate is right by a small canal bridge which is not strong enough to take the extra traffic that a new build would require.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9539
<b>Person ID</b>	398872
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jane Barrett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I also believe that whatever plan is eventually adopted must specify exactly the order in which land should be released for development to provide a coherent development programme facilitating the provision of local infrastructure such as schools, shops and transport links and of course essential social housing. Developers should not be permitted to acquire develop land across the town on an ad hoc basis.</p> <p>For this reason I believe that the Bulbourne Cross proposals represent a logical and acceptable way to provide for the possibility of building additional homes and infrastructure for the town and should be fully considered by the planning authority.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9566

<b>Person ID</b>	1264246
<b>Full Name</b>	Steve Burdekin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I know that the Thakeham/Bulbourne Cross is not part of the local plan but would like to register my opposition to this too. It may appear 'sustainable' but again, this is on virgin land where cars are a must and sporting and educational facilities are proposed literally metres away from the polluted A41. I also object to the Football Ground's proposed move to another town where people will have to drive 3 miles to – causing even more pollution.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9572
<b>Person ID</b>	1267442
<b>Full Name</b>	Teresa Adams
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I do not want to see anymore 4&amp;5 bed executive homes being built on Greenbelt land.</p> <p>Berkhamsted and Northchurch need homes built for local residents not homes to encourage more people re locating to the area.</p> <p>And to line the pockets of greedy developers.</p> <p>We need more 1,2&amp;3 bed affordable properties for young residents starting out and for older one's to down size to..freeing up the larger houses that are plentiful in the town and surrounding villages.</p> <p>My [AGE REMOVED] Mother lives in [ADDRESS REMOVED] (supported housing).Her flat is on [ADDRESS REMOVED].</p> <p>New Rd is treacherous enough for the elderly to cross with out adding more car users to it. Along with the additional fumes from more traffic idling at the junction.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9584
<b>Person ID</b>	1267450
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Ruth Taljaard
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I cannot navigate your website. It is not well designed. Please find my feedback below - which is submitted BEFORE the deadline.</p>

I understand that growth is inevitable, but it MUST be done WELL:

If you develop Lock Field, Northchurch then I have the following comments:

- You MUST also develop NEW ROAD. This pathway is already NOT SAFE. My children have to walk along it to go to their school (St Marys CofE) and I often get hit by van side mirrors as they pass. Imagine if that was a child!!!! The pathway needs to be widened, even at the cost of vehicles. Our children's safety is paramount!
- You MUST develop the bridge on New Road. It is a single track bridge over the canal. Yes it is beautiful to look at. But it is not SAFE, especially for our children. There is no safe way to cross the road from the path to the canal path. This bridge must be developed into something that is safe for our children to walk across and over. Especially as there is a school next to it.
- The canal path must be upgraded. It gets so muddy in the winter. It must be pathed or concreted in order to sustain the proposed increased foot-fall.
- I don't think that one road access to a residential area is wise. I think two ways in and out is safer.
- Cars already SPEED down New Road and the High Street - especially near the school and the Northchurch playing fields. What do you propose to do to keep cars and all this new traffic obeying the speed limit and keeping our children safe? Especially with the proposed new amount of vehicles to be using it.
- You MUST develop at least a footbridge (with cycle path) over the canal and river, across from Lock Field over to the Northchurch playing fields/Tesco. This will keep any children who then live in Lock Field safe, away from the roads, so they can visit the park/shops without having to use the VERY DANGEROUS New Road and High Street pathways.
- If children live on Lock Field - you must also develop the footpaths on the High Street as well. Children will want to access Tesco and the Northchurch Playing fields. People park cars on pathways, which are already un-safe, small as it is. There have been times I've had to push my babies in a pram IN THE ROAD due to cars being parked on the pavement! You MUST double-yellow-line all along those pathways!
- You are developing a 'green-belt' area. Firstly, by doing this you are making your 'rules' void. How do you expect anyone in Dacorum to respect you, believe what you say or take you seriously if you develop on a 'green-belt' area? Secondly, how do you plan to keep it 'green'? Are you asking the construction company to include minimum of 2 trees and 3 shrubs per home?
- Instead of building 60 tiny homes that are ugly and bad for the environment. What about building 40 homes that have larger gardens, more trees and shrubs and keep the area vaguely 'green'?
- Will the new houses be 'green' in the sense of - they will all have solar panels and other sources of renewable energy? It is a green-belt area.
- I'm no wild-life expert...but this is not an urban area (such as an old factory in a city being replaced with residential) - this is countryside. Many animals will live there. I myself have seen king fishers, ducks, herons, foxes, badgers, and much more wildlife along that stretch of the canal. You are killing their homes. Not only in the long run, but in the short term - while all the horrible machines are there digging and making noise. What are you doing to protect the wildlife that lives here? Are you planning on keeping a minimum 10 meter wildlife 'belt' between the canal and any potential housing? If this 'belt' is grass - will you plant more trees and shrubs to encourage wildlife to return after the bombardment of a building sight?



- You must add a footpath from Lock Field into Ashridge. So people can walk directly from Lock Field into Ashridge without having to use the foot path on New Road - again, this is too thin and not safe compared with the speed of traffic.
- Everywhere in Berkhamsted and Northchurch there are parking issues. Please can you design the new residential area to cope with the amount of vehicles. For example, plan houses to have ample driveways and garages for residents and guests. And double yellow the surrounding roads to STOP people from parking on footpaths. This is not safe for children. Again, if making safe footpaths means building 40 houses rather than 60 - then do it. Make this estate so that bin lorries and fire engines can EASILY drive everywhere (whilst keeping their bin collectors safe!)
- What about social responsibility? Is this new estate designed for middle and upper-class people? Or is it for everyone? Even working class? Are you mixing social housing between the large detached houses?
- How are you planning to future-proof this estate? Are you planning footpaths to be wide enough for two wheel chairs to pass each other safely? This would also be a safer width of path in case there is another pandemic and people have to keep 2 meters away from each other. Are you adding cycle paths? I think if you are serious about the environment then you should include cycle paths EVERYWHERE - even on New Road and the High Street. Even if cycling does not prove to be popular - you are future-proofing this space for things such as hovercrafts or the food-delivery-robots that you see even today in Milton Keynes. Everywhere footpath in Berkhamsted FAILS for safety. Lets make this new estate safe.
- Repair local roads after development. As seen on the new estates up Durrants Lane - the amount of construction traffic (and its pollution) has ruined the roads. Will you repair and redevelop the roads after this estate has been built?
- All of these new houses (both in Berkhamsted, Northchurch, Tring etc) will create a LOT more traffic on the road. How do you plan to future develop the T-junction next to St Marys School between New Road and the High Street? There is no safe crossing for children over New Road AT ALL! And it is next to a school!!!
- You MUST develop the infrastructure. How will you develop the Tesco shop parade and parking to deal with greater numbers? How will you develop local doctors and dentists to deal with greater numbers? Which hospitals are due to take on these greater numbers of people and how are you contributing to their development too?

To summarize; I know that growth is inevitable. But you MUST do it WELL and RESPONSIBLY, for the future of our area, our children and our wildlife.

I'm more than happy to talk to someone or detail my thoughts further. I'm happy to provide photographs of cars parked on pathways everywhere, videos of cars nearly hitting myself and my children walking to school etc etc.

If you build this Lock Field estate then do it WELL. Be innovators, be planet-protectors, be an inspiration to other areas who seek to grow too.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9591
<b>Person ID</b>	1267454
<b>Full Name</b>	Sharon Letherman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In particular I oppose the proposed builds on BK07 Lockfield and BK06 land east of Darrs Lane. Northchurch is a village and should be treated as one.</p> <p>New Road, off Locksite (BK07) is an extremely dangerous road, has fast moving traffic, and one small narrow pavement, making it hugely unsafe for pedestrians and cars that could be approaching from the Lockfield Site.</p> <p>An increase in traffic would lead to an increased level of pollution which is already very high outside St Mary's school. BK07 Lock Field also provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union cana. The destruction of this habitat must not be allowed.</p> <p>BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed.</p> <p>To sum up I oppose the scale of DBC's proposed development and calculation on which the need for housing is based. The increase in Urbanisation that this proposal would lead to, would have a very negative impact on this beautiful and very special area, and on the quality of life of those living in Berkhamsted and Northchurch.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9607
<b>Person ID</b>	1263214
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr R Pope
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, what impact will there be on traffic, road safety, environmental sensitivity if you <b>sixty</b> houses on Lock Field in Northchurch?</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9608
<b>Person ID</b>	1267455
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms C Wilby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finally, what impact will there be on traffic, road safety, environmental sensitivity if you <b>sixty</b> houses on Lock Field in Northchurch?</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9611
<b>Person ID</b>	1267456
<b>Full Name</b>	David Sidebottom
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lock field – the access to this site is just after the single passing hump back bridge, pulling in and out of this close will likely create an accident hotspot. In addition, there are regular accidents at the junction between new road and High Street ( I am aware of 2 in the last few months where New road has been closed as a result) this development would only make this situation worse. In addition the death of the young child on Northchurch High Street just a</li> </ul>

few years ago is a further example of how much pressure the local area is already under from a traffic point of view.

- There is no footpath on Darrs lane upwards of St Mary's avenue. My daughter would like to walk to visit her best friend who lives at the top of Darrs lane, but with single lane access, no footpath and the expected increased traffic due to the development, I fear this will not be possible. Pedestrian safety is paramount and any resident must be able to feel safe walking between 2 properties in Northchurch without fear for their life.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9626

**Person ID** 1151590

**Full Name** Lynda Clarke

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** (24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9640
<b>Person ID</b>	1151590
<b>Full Name</b>	Lynda Clarke
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9696
<b>Person ID</b>	1267474
<b>Full Name</b>	Fiona Porter-Hough
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The second proposed site, Lockfield, is on the opposite side of the High St here in the village. This area is accessible from a point near to a one way passing across a narrow bridge over the Grand Union Canal joining an already busy narrow road of 'New Road', a road which leads straight into the heart of Northchurch High Street, passing the front entrance of St Mary's Primary School and connecting at the busy T-junction where the two roads meet.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9727
<b>Person ID</b>	1267481
<b>Full Name</b>	Diana Holliday
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted.

This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.

— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'

This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9728

**Person ID** 1267481

**Full Name** Diana Holliday

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.

— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like



to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary’s Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9729

**Person ID** 1267481

**Full Name** Diana Holliday

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It

is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne — reduced water pressure — there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9732

**Person ID** 1145832

**Full Name** Clive and Judy Birch

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

We have also examined the information given on the Bulbourne Cross development proposal and we feel that, given that Berkhamsted is obliged to accommodate additional residential development, this option would be preferable, primarily

since it would not exacerbate the problem of infrastructure overload, and would have a lesser impact on traffic congestion in the town, result in no loss of urban green space and sites which provide employment within the existing town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9749

**Person ID** 1267511

**Full Name** Josephine Fairey

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Firstly, the entrance to the site is only yards from a narrow canal bridge, which as well as being a pinch point already with the present traffic, would be made much worse by first, construction vehicles, then extra cars from the 40 new homes. With 40 extra houses there would likely be 50 or 60 more vehicles using that bit of road.

Secondly, it is also within yards of a primary school, St Mary's Northchurch. The construction noise and extra pollution for the children playing outside is unacceptable. Many families who walk to the school use the narrow pavement and bridge at busy times as well and more traffic would be a danger to them.

There will also be extra pollution from more cars queuing to get out onto Northchurch High Street. A current problem already.

Thirdly, there is a precious wildlife corridor between Northchurch and Dudswell, along the Grand Union Canal which would at best be disturbed at worst destroyed.

New houses along the canal toward Berkhamsted have steadily encroached on the canal bank, and this planned estate will lose us yet another stretch of green.

I trust you will take note of my concerns and those of my fellow citizens in Northchurch and Dudswell.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9773
<b>Person ID</b>	1262601
<b>Full Name</b>	Anne Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	SEE PDF FOR ATTACHED IMAGES Tranquility of the Grand Union Canal by Lockfield site -and wildlife corridor which would be destroyed by BK07 build plan.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Anne Smith - Images.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9793
<b>Person ID</b>	1267544
<b>Full Name</b>	CATHERINE HAY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p> <p>— The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p> <p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9802
<b>Person ID</b>	1267551
<b>Full Name</b>	AMY TABRAHAM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	To confirm that I object to the South Berkhamsted Concept for all the reasons set out by the 'Say No to South Berkhamsted Concept' community group.  Please protect our countryside and the very reason we all love living within a rural community such as this.
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9803
<b>Person ID</b>	1267552
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr ANDREW SMITH

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are writing to you from a home that overlooks the field now earmarked as one potential site by Dacorum for Housing and a School, and we cannot state our opposition to this plan strongly enough. Personally I have been resident here since 1998. Equally we appreciate the role you are playing in collating these notes of opposition. Here is our take on the issues.</p> <p><b>Traffic and Road Safety</b></p> <p>It is worth noting that the age demographic at the top of the lane has changed and there are more children living here due to recent house sales. These children are walking up and down the lane as they head to school, whether that is St. Marys or Ashlyns or to catch the bus to go further afield.</p> <p>Our daughter is now at Ashlyns and as much as she usually walks to and from school, we typically drive her down the Lane and often pick her up at St. Marys Avenue because the final stretch through the uninhabited section is so hazardous. Many vehicles are over the weight limit, most speed through the wooded section for fear of getting stuck and this is due to the lack of passing spaces. My daughter is fearful of walking through this stretch and I'm sure other children (and their Parents) are equally as wary.</p> <p>My mother who used to provide after-school care for us when our Daughter was at St. Marys, had, on two occasions, reason to report incidents to Herts CC, based on the condition of the road and the recklessness of drivers using the lane.</p> <p>This immediately raises two concerns, the disruption caused by road-widening before any work can begin and then the impact of pedestrian safety if pavements are not provided up and down the Lane. Any road-widening will only encourage more traffic and the building will see more heavy vehicles on the Lane. Someone could get killed.</p> <p><b>Schools</b></p> <p>We are not convinced a new school is needed here but somewhere else in the Borough. Since our eldest daughter left Ashlyns and our youngest started, the school has gown in size but this seems to be because of a policy that now encourages an intake from outside of HP4. A significant number of pupils in our daughter's year travel from Bovingdon and Flaunden, and even out of County from Chesham. Surely this is an indication that the need to build a new school is not in Northchurch but somewhere near Bovingdon, a brown field site like the old airfield.</p>

A child walking from Northchurch to Ashlyns is environmentally more beneficial than Parents driving their children from Bovingdon.

### Local Services

As ever we are always concerned about the pressure on local services. A simple truth is, as a family we go to an NHS dentist in Tring because there is no capacity locally. Promises were made to improve local services, including affordable housing, when Bearoc was delivered, so far the developers have reneged on that commitment, so we should assume that what ever the plan is, the deliverables will be completely different.

And this is without considering whether we have enough GPs or school places for 5-10 year olds.

### Carbon Capture

Our last point is an environmental one, and the need to still ensure a clean air future for our children. Farmed fields are one of nature's most efficient ways of capturing carbon, and the fields that border Northchurch help our children grow with fewer pollutants and to nurture a natural ecosystem.

We have resisted speculating on the economic impact of Covid and Brexit and whether any decision that Dacorum takes should be deferred until we understand the availability of Brown Field sites on Northbridge Road, the A41 estate in Bourne End or anywhere across Hemel Hempstead.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS9818

Person ID 1267661

Full Name Mr Chris Hobson

Organisation Details

Agent ID



<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Question 5A</p> <p>I am aware of the attempt by Thakeham to include the Thakeham/Bulbourne Cross/ Berkhamsted project in the Dacorum Borough proposals and object strongly against these proposals and sites.</p> <p>I am completely against the destruction of the green belt between Bourne End and Berkhamsted. There is a public footpath from Sugar Lane to Swing Gate Lane including areas of woodland, thousands of trees, some ancient oaks and beech. There are also miles of mature indigenous hedgerows that supports native wildlife in abundance with existing habitats and complex eco systems in place.</p> <p>The proposed plans would destroy the existing green belt and footpath currently enjoyed by local people.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9847
<b>Person ID</b>	1267735
<b>Full Name</b>	ANDREW BRIDSON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Letter of Objection - Bulbourne Cross Development _Planning Consultation</b></p> <p>I write in relation to the proposed Bulbourne Cross Development and wish to strongly oppose this planning consultation for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The proposal is simply focused on the development of green belt land, which is neither sustainable and contradicts the developer’s own portfolio and intentions in providing more wildlife habitats and sustainable housing.</p> <p>2) This will result in both an unsustainable and huge increase in property, in the Berkhamsted area alone, when considering other developments, planning currently seeking approval and current planned developments. In total a circa 25% residential housing increase in Berkhamsted; which is neither supported or built on a founded and robust strategic solution for dealing with the pressure on investment with the existing schools, medical facilities, roads, infrastructure and public transportation.</p> <p>3) This development will require further and significant infrastructure capital growth schemes in relation to power, gas and water (ground water abstraction). In addition to the likely capital growth expansion of the Berkhamsted sewage treatment works; resulting in more final effluent being discharged into the Grand Union Canal. The sewage treatment works, in this area, are already and possibly running at full capacity as this was evident recently (some 4 to 5 years ago) when Thames Water received a record (£20mi) fine from the Environment Agency when they discharged untreated effluent into the Grand union canal at Tring sewage treatment works.</p> <p>4) The developers' ideas on providing carbon zero housing are flawed as the proposal provides no indication of how this will be achieved; either now or in the future. The developer has failed to consider the use of modern building techniques, such as passive house construction or explained how the construction and future energy needs will be met by the use of green energy sources alson such as solar, wind generation, and / or anaerobic digestion.</p> <p>3) The plans to relocate Berkhamsted Football Club to the lower side of the development are flawed and will actually result in a significant increase of carbon production and pollution, as supporters and sports facilities users alike will need to drive to the planned site. The new facilities are, at least, a 60 minute walk from the football clubs current location (next to the train station), to the denoted site adjacent to the A41. In addition, the illustrated sporting facilities and sports grounds are located roughly midway between Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted train station, therefore not easily reached by rail or public transport either.</p> <p>4) The sports facilities and planned school facilities are located in an area that will need a significant amount of “cut and fill” to the greenbelt land and surrounding area; due to the natural gradient of the existing landscape. Again, this will irrevocably change the landscape, will generate a huge amount of carbon emissions when being constructed and could generate roughly one million tonnes of excavated waste and landfill arisings.</p>

5) The developers proposal to achieve "a carbon zero lifestyle for the future" are only words and neither supported or backed up by any sort of feasibility proposal or factual evidence on how they will achieve this within their portfolio.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9854

**Person ID** 1267744

**Full Name** GARETH BELLAMY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

- The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.
- During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.
- The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9855
<b>Person ID</b>	1267744
<b>Full Name</b>	GARETH BELLAMY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> </ul>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9856
<b>Person ID</b>	1267744
<b>Full Name</b>	GARETH BELLAMY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</li> </ul> <p>The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>Since the beginning of the Covid pandemic the amount of people walking through Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9878
<b>Person ID</b>	1267757

<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I live in Berkhamsted with my wife and two school age children. My principle objections to the Dacorum Local Plan are based on the negative impact these proposals will have on schools, amenities and transport in the town.</p> <p>The 'plan', such as it is, proposes well over 1,000 new homes in Berkhamsted, an expansion which will presumably lead to a significant increase in working age people living in the town. However the local economy cannot currently provide sufficient employment for these additional working age adults, nor does the plan suggest how the local economy would be expanded. As a result, I would expect a surge in the numbers of people commuting from Berkhamsted railway station, putting additional pressure on an already extremely over subscribed service. Those who do not commute via train, will presumably commute to jobs outside of the borough by car, resulting in significant strain on local roads (not to mention the woefully inadequate bus network).</p> <p>The sites at Bk02: British Film Institute; Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields; Bk04 Land between Hanburys and A41; Bk05 Blegberry Gardens will together comprise 390 new homes. Access to the town (and railway station) from these sites is proposed via Kingshill Way, Cross Oak Road and Shootersway, with enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with the town centre and train station. Kingshill and Shootershill are already incredibly busy at peak times and lie along a walking route used by pupils at Ashlyns school. Cross Oak is single lane traffic for large sections with no pedestrian footpath. School children have to walk in the road for a hundred metres. How is it possible to increase the traffic flow along this road without a significant impact on road safety? It is physically impossible to widen the road given the proximity of housing along the route.</p> <p>In addition to traffic from the 390 homes mentioned above, the roundabout linking Kingshill Way and Chesham Road would need to cater for traffic from the 850 proposed homes from site Bk01. Clearly this would result in substantial congestion and road safety issues for local school children.</p>

In addition, I fail to see how 'enhanced pedestrian and cycle links' can be constructed? Where could these routes possibly be constructed without narrowing the roads? Clearly this has not been thought through and has been put into the plan as a vague afterthought.

The commutative effect will be to send the hundreds of vehicles along routes used by school children attending Ashlyns school with consequences for congestion, air pollution and road safety.

Traffic from the proposed 40 dwellings at Site Bk11 and the further 30 dwelling at Bk13 Billet Lane would have to pass through the already congested junction with the High Street or turn left and pass up Billet Lane and along Bridgewater Road, directly along the school route for Bridgewater School. This clearly presents another significant increase in traffic, pollution and road safety issues.

The hundreds of extra commuters using Berkhamsted railway station will put huge additional strain on an already overcrowded service. Trains are currently frequently overcrowded to the point where commuters often cannot board trains during rush hour. Given that most of the proposed new housing is on the edge of the town, will there be a commitment to increase parking at the station? Those living in new developments in Northchurch will have no option but to drive to the station. I cannot understand how the car park could accommodate such an increase in demand. The physical infrastructure at Berkhamsted station could not cope with the consequential rise in the number of commuters. The additional housing developments at Tring will place further strain on the public transport system, notably a rise in commuters using the services which pass through Berkhamsted station. This huge growth in numbers will make commuting from Berkhamsted completely unsustainable.

Although there are proposals for one additional primary school, there is no commitment to increase secondary school provision in the town. The proposal states that land will be provided for a secondary school, but there is absolutely no commitment or guarantee that one will be built. If no new secondary is constructed, the catchment area for Ashlyns would presumably shrink drastically, with the result that many families currently living to the north, east and west of the town would be forced to travel further afield to schools in Tring and Hemel. This in itself would put a further additional burden on local roads and transport infrastructure. The only alternative would be an expansion of Ashlyns, but given that it already caters for 1,400 pupils is such an expansion realistic?

The proposals lack any credibility. The access and transport proposals are woefully lacking in detail. Anyone with even the vaguest familiarity with the south side of Berkhamsted knows that the routes along Shooters Hill, Chesham Road, Cross Oak Road, and the residential streets in between, are extremely busy during peak hours. The proposals as outlined in the Berkhamsted plan will exacerbate these problems.

There appears to be no cohesion to the proposed developments, nor any appreciation of the impact and pressures they would have on the town.

In conclusion, the proposals would result in a huge strain on local roads, rail infrastructure, schools and local amenities. It is clear to me the proposals have not been thoroughly assessed for their impact on the town and should be rejected.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS9933

**Person ID** 1267778

**Full Name** REBECCA

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.

The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.

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



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9938
<b>Person ID</b>	1267780
<b>Full Name</b>	CHRISTOPHER BAKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please take this email as my formal response to the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation.</p> <p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9950

<b>Person ID</b>	1267787
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN AND SYLVIA BANKS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We strongly disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring. Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. Getting a doctor's appointment is almost impossible and the number of pupils in our school classes are too high. The teachers cannot cope with more children.</p> <p>It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum. This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9980
<b>Person ID</b>	1159323
<b>Full Name</b>	Charlotte Grange
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am also writing to express my opposition to the Thakeham Bulbourne Cross proposal. This would essentially connect Berkhamsted with Hemel Hempstead and would massively destroy the attractive canalside appeal of the local countryside. I don't believe that this development was mentioned in the New Local Plan, but it would hugely impact my local area and would again, ruin the appealing character of the open fields around the canal.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS9987
<b>Person ID</b>	1267848
<b>Full Name</b>	CALEB PRINGLE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— I object to the developments proposed for Northchurch because they deny the identity of Northchurch, referring to it as West Berkhamsted.  This denies the existence of the Northchurch community and the fact that Northchurch is a rural village. Although Northchurch is close to its larger neighbour Berkhamsted, it has a distinct identity that people value. The reality of

Northchurch has been denied and it seems that those who drew up the plans did so as a desk-top exercise, rather than as a result of surveying the village or consulting with Northchurch Parish Council or the residents.

— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field'

This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.

— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve.

— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having

recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.

— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely

— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.

— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne — reduced water pressure

— there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10012
<b>Person ID</b>	1267861
<b>Full Name</b>	FRANCESCA LAWRENCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I'm very concerned about the amount of Green Belt countryside which will be lost forever if the plan is allowed to go ahead. I do not believe that the developers should be allowed to trample all over the countryside just to make ridiculous amounts of money. The views from the AONB will be affected by development on some of the sites. My understanding is this is contrary to planning policy. For example if the field between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane, Northchurch, is developed this will be visible from the AONB on the other side of the valley, which will be harmed. All this loss of Green Belt countryside will be terribly harmful for wildlife. For example the field between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane is a nesting site for larks which are under threat. In summary I think the plan is stupid and very short sighted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10019

<b>Person ID</b>	1267862
<b>Full Name</b>	ALEX CHAPLIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10020
<b>Person ID</b>	1267862
<b>Full Name</b>	ALEX CHAPLIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10021
<b>Person ID</b>	1267862
<b>Full Name</b>	ALEX CHAPLIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact</p>

of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long-standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single-track bridge.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10022

**Person ID** 1267862

**Full Name** ALEX CHAPLIN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

**Yes / No**



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10056
<b>Person ID</b>	1155402
<b>Full Name</b>	Christopher Stafford
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10070

<b>Person ID</b>	1267996
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Christopher Vile
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The plans are incredible in scope, I'm worried for both my street and the wider implications for Berkhamsted.</p> <p>As a Swing Gate Lane resident in Berkhamsted I note one of the proposed sites uses my street as "secondary access" to a huge new estate at the top of Swing Gate Lane. The estate also has a new road, for "primary access" from Chesham road.</p> <p>This appears to create a link road between the primary and secondary access routes - and a potentially very busy "rat run" between London Road and Chesham road. I'm concerned that Swing gate lane is already very busy with two schools and poor parking facilities (at school time its at a stand still often) for the school rush, would not cope. I ask that Swing gate lane is NOT made the secondary access for the proposed estate. Or at least there is no direct link between the primary and secondary with lots of traffic calming etc.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10081
<b>Person ID</b>	1146079
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Vernon Garnham
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><u>Ref: Bulbourne Cross</u></p> <p>I write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Bulbourne Cross development by the Thakeham Group on the following grounds:</p> <p>This is effectively a 'new town' with only limited amenities proposed. Amenities that are included, such as the sports facilities seem to be aimed at replacing those in Berkhamsted, which are currently within walking distance of the whole town and ideally positioned. There would also be the further concern of what would happen to the land that the current facilities occupy. It would also be positioned too far from either Berkhamsted or Hemel Hempstead stations for walking commuters (who will return at some point), and would generate huge amounts of road traffic. The offer of a 'country park' which would replace agricultural countryside is akin to replacing an original with a fake.</p> <p>The proposal is the complete antithesis of the <b><i>'Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth'</i></b>. Whilst the current local plan certainly creates some challenging issues, it is essentially about the growth of the existing town with development reasonably spread across the whole area. By contrast the Thakeham proposal would effectively join Berkhamsted to not just Hemel Hempstead, but would create a continuous ribbon of development from central London and beyond, changing the character of South West Hertfordshire for ever.</p> <p>I urge and expect the planning committee to treat the Thakeham proposal with the cynicism and contempt it deserves.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10111
<b>Person ID</b>	1267350
<b>Full Name</b>	STEPHEN BANDY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I received the councils local plans through the door last week with a chance to respond only within a few days of receiving it and nothing received prior to that.</p> <p>I wish to object to the proposed building plan on the subject site, for the following reasons The local roads cannot support any further traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are single roads with few passing places and no pathways for people on foot.</li> <li>2. Granville road is in effect a single track road due to parked cars, the only passing spaces are peoples driveways and there are not many of them. There are already major issues with damage to cars when the road is gridlocked, with people avoiding the very busy high street.</li> <li>3. The local Tesco store has not enough parking now and cars park in Darrs Lane causing more traffic issues.</li> </ol> <p>Introduction of more cars in this area will make an already bad situation worse.</p> <p>The field behind Granville roads supports various wildlife, including Deer, foxes, pheasant, red kites etc. Our garden backs onto these open fields where we enjoy seeing them - we do not want look out on a housing estate or school!</p> <p>We moved here 30 years ago because we enjoyed village life and being next to the countryside. Your proposals would change all that and make it a very unpleasant place to live!</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10121
<b>Person ID</b>	1146091
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view.</p> <p>From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10122
<b>Person ID</b>	1146091
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Foster
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10150
<b>Person ID</b>	1268070
<b>Full Name</b>	ALLEN AND RITA GRIFFITHS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are responding to the Dacorum Local Planning as Northchurch Residents of many years. These plans we strongly object to, and no we have never received any literature from DBC, this was only found out through Facebook and Cllr Lara Pringle.</p> <p>Our reasons are:</p>

- Lack of infrastructure has not been considered, think this needs to come first. Doctors practices are overfull now making it difficult to get appointments even without the extra requirements there will be due to current building
- There will be too much traffic through the village and side roads, as it is now cars on many side roads are parking on pavements as most houses have more than one car
- Lockfield in New Road is certainly a bone of contention. The site has been considered and objected to a few times. The visibility of entrance to the proposed area is bad, road too narrow and you only have a footpath on one side. There are also vehicles parked on one side making it even more dangerous
- We certainly do not want to lose the green belt. If extra houses are built more green belt land is required not less and more recreation areas not less  
Keep the areas of natural beauty by building only an appropriate number of houses.
- Think that holding a consultation during lockdown is certainly inappropriate. Those that are not able to access the website have probably not seen the outcome of what is going on
- Access to green belt helps your physical health and mental wellbeing
- Dacorum should make more use of brownfield land for housing.
- Dacorum should meet these projections regardless of the harm that is caused to the green belt, climate change, sustainability biodiversity and public health.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS10158
<b>Person ID</b>	1268073
<b>Full Name</b>	KATE PAYNTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am emailing to express concerns about the proposed development behind Hall Park, part of the new single plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Impact to town infrastructure and services. I understand that there are plans to have some facilities on site but there will be increased traffic within the high street as a result of the increased dwellings and impact on the railway service. Is the town equipped to deal with the increased population?</li> <li>1 The impact this has on the town's identity since Berkhamsted will effectively merge into Bourne End.</li> <li>1 The impact on green space and footpaths which have become much loved by locals during lockdown.</li> <li>1 The impact of traffic congestion on Swing gate lane in particular which already becomes congested at school drop off and pick up times.</li> <li>1 The impact on safety of pupils walking to and from Thomas Coram school with additional traffic and route from A41.</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	



<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10160
<b>Person ID</b>	1268071
<b>Full Name</b>	LINDA SLIM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted. I understand that during the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging and to enjoy the views, which is good for people’s mental health.</p> <p>— The site on Lock Field, BK07, is a concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. I have concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p> <p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41. The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location. It is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10177
<b>Person ID</b>	1259999
<b>Full Name</b>	Paul Peters
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>An area of particular concern is at the top of Swing Gate Lane. This is an extremely challenging walk back from the town centre and station up steep hills, so it is unrealistic to expect residents to walk or cycle into the town to reach amenities, as such the areas proposed for building would create more traffic congestion.</p> <p>The towns infrastructure already struggles to cope with the amount of traffic and healthcare and dental services are over stretched. Swing Gate Lane is a quiet residential street and will become a main route into town from the A41 and top of Swing Gate Lane regardless of the direct access proposed to the A41. No plan has been proposed to keep Swing Gate Lane as a secondary route to the town centre, and no infrastructure has been suggested to make this happen. Public transport is woeful within Berkhamsted and non-existent at weekends so all this will lead to traffic congestion of unmanageable proportions, especially at school and commuter peak times and weekends.</p> <p>No direct employment opportunities that would suit the economic status required to purchase houses in the developer lead housing proposed exist or plan to be created in Berkhamsted. Plans would therefore add to more commuting traffic congestion and over-crowding at Berkhamsted station on weekdays.</p> <p>Development in this beautiful location would be highly visible from this prominent ridge top location. It will impact on views both of and from Ashlyn's Hall, a grade II listed building.</p> <p>The building in this location would lead to the erosion of the buffer between the A41 and existing built-up area impacting sound quality to all local residents.</p>

On top of all the about, this would also lead to the loss of productive farmland which characterises the nature of the Berkhamsted borders, impacting negatively on the character of the town. The loss of important transition area between the town and open countryside would be damaged and this could also set a precedent for further development of land southwards to the A41.

Myself and my family regularly exercise on the public rights of way around the fields at the top of Swing Gate Lane and turning the farmland there into an urban area would mean we would need to drive in order to enjoy exercise in a similar green and rural setting, where at present we can walk straight from home. This is also true no doubt for many residents of Berkhamsted and other parts of the greenbelt planned for destructive building. This again adds to further congestion in the town.

In summary I would like to see the Council, scrap the existing plan, rework it based on latest ONS data, with a focus on protecting green belt and developing brown field sites instead. This would create a more realistic and productive plan that would not strain resource in the local area, immeasurably impacting the character of the towns of Berkhamsted and Tring's green borders and gateways. This would also allow some time in the future a proper public consultation when all members of the community regardless of access and knowledge of technology to review, understand the plans and respond fairly.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10230

**Person ID** 1268167

**Full Name** CHRIS YOUDELL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10261
<b>Person ID</b>	1268211
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Chris Gray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One of the options I have seen which is trying to become part of the strategic plan is Bulbourne Cross, which just seems to join Berkhamsted to Bourne End, and thus to Hemel - which makes Berkhamsted in essence part of Hemel, destroying north the character of the town, and the fact that it is actually a separate town.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10268
<b>Person ID</b>	1268218
<b>Full Name</b>	FRANCES & DAVID STEPHENS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	I am particularly horrified that there are plans to build on Haslams Field which was given to Berkhamsted School for Girls by the late Sir Humphrey Haslam, Chairman of the School Governors. This was given as a Sports Field and should remain so - it was not intended to be for housing. Sir Humphrey lived in a magnificent property known as Cross Oak House which was demolished and now forms the Oakwood Estate. Enough is enough!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10273
<b>Person ID</b>	1268222
<b>Full Name</b>	GILL DOBBY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The land South of Berkhamsted is being suggested without anything like enough thought being given to the road access. It's proposing bringing all that additional traffic from to town to 850 houses via roads with 3 schools on them, and playing fields from a fourth that during school pickup and drop off time now are already ridiculously overrun with traffic. This already causes havoc and danger for the child pedestrians using the area as well as parents dropping and collecting. This situation will be extremely dangerous to children if the access roads to this new estate were to be from Chesham Road or Swing Gate Lane.</p> <p>If all these plans go ahead the amount of green space lost will be devastating to wildlife, the environment and the natural beauty of the area, changing Berkhamsted from the much loved small market town that it currently is.</p> <p>The plan to build 1000 houses per year is way way beyond the latest projections of 355 per year and it is beyond me that any member of our council can see any benefit in allowing these proposals to go ahead deviating our green spaces.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10282
<b>Person ID</b>	399324
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Julie Hollway
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I am specifically interested in this response to how the proposed Local Plan affects land between Bell Lane, Shootersway, Darrs Lane and Grenville Road: known as "The Wishing Tree Field" or BK06 (East of Darrs Lane).

The visual impact of BK06 on the AONB ("intervisibility") will be enormous - day and night! Developing alongside the A41 will take away a valuable buffer zone for the absorption of pollution generated by the road, and will subject residents of those developments to high levels of noise and potentially significant pollution levels. Infrastructure references also made above plus we have already seen with the building on Bearroc Park, Phase 1 is already adding significant traffic along Shootersway and to the dangerous corner into the top of Durrants Lane. Do people have to die in the accidents we see there for DBC to take action and address the traffic issue there? Phase 2 will only add more issues.

**Specifically re area BK06: Green Belt protection should not be removed from the Wishing Tree field for a significant number of reasons:**

A/ Independent consultants have repeatedly provided evidence that demonstrate the inappropriateness of DBC's proposal to remove this parcel from the Green Belt. Two independent assessments of Green Belt in the borough and beyond have been carried out over the past years. Each of these has made clear that the Bk06 parcel is strongly associated with the characteristics of the Green Belt and that as such the Green Belt protection remains warranted:

**SKM Report (Green Belt Phase 1 Review):**

*"an independent and comprehensive Green Belt review"*, which included an assessment of the relative contribution played by a number of candidate parcels of land to the Green Belt. (Green Belt Review: Purposes Assessment (SKM), Part 1, p.6. Available at:

[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\\_final-report-part1.pdf?sfvrsn=3babc89f\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review_final-report-part1.pdf?sfvrsn=3babc89f_0)).

That report concluded that the area including Bk06 (and indeed the other nearby parcels now put forward for removal from the Green Belt, including BK05 (Blegberry Gardens), and BK05 (Rossway Farm) is one of just four *"key networks of parcels which preserve setting and special character"* across the whole SW Herts area under consideration. The area is therefore assessed to make a *"significant contribution"* towards *"preserving the setting and special character of historic towns"*.

The SKM Report also rightly concluded that:

*"The Green Belt continues to perform an important role in checking the restricted expansion of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging by providing strategic gaps and preserving the special character of towns";*

*"A clear distinction is evident and has been maintained between land which is built-up and part of existing settlements and the adjacent surrounding countryside, and this is in large part a result of the success of the Green Belt designation";*

*"All strategic parcels in the Green Belt, at least in part, clearly perform a key role and need to be given maximum protection into the future".* (Part 2, para. 9.1, p.69.)

**Arup 1 Report (Green Belt Phase 1 Review):**

The report noted that the area *"predominantly retains an unspoilt, rural character"* which is *"particularly prominent in the wider Bulbourne Valley setting, highly visible from the AONB to the north"*. The report also commented on *"visual prominence and degree of intervisibility with the opposite side of the valley (Ashridge Estate) creates increased visual*

*sensitivity*". The Ashridge Estate is (of course) a designated AONB and as such, visual sensitivity in related areas will be damaging to the AONB itself.

Arup also considered the "*special qualities and characteristics of the AONB*" to be evident on the parcel itself and the north-western parts of the area in particular (i.e. broadly coinciding with the 'Wishing Tree' field, by contrast with the field behind Westfield Road/alongside Durrants Lane to the eastern part of the site). This area related "*strongly to the wider rural landscape*". In particular, the report noted that "*the parkland and landscape features at Woodcockhill are highly sensitive by virtue of their sense of time depth, intactness and historical continuity as well as the intricate landscape mosaic they create*".

Arup concluded that while area BK-A12 (which included all of the area now referred to as Bk06 in the draft Local Plan) could be considered for partial amendment to the Green Belt designation, the only part of the area identified for such reconsideration is the area which is now a new playing field at the corner of Durrants Lane and Shootersway.

Crucially, the Report concludes that even the for modest sub-area proposed, "*the Council may wish to consider the overall desirability of this recommendation, given the identified landscape sensitivities of the land surrounding the identified area. Aside from a number of small clusters of houses to the east, Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term*".

### **The Local Plan fails to respect the conclusions of the Green Belt Phase 1 and 2 reports**

B/ The site impacts on Chilterns AONB - as above views between the AONB and The Wishing Tree Field are "intervisible".

- Considerations apply to the impact of many of the developments on the Chilterns AONB. DBC has a legal obligation to protect the AONB, and BK06 impacts on it, e.g. due to "*intervisibility*" from the AONB itself, eg from parts of Northchurch Common. The NPPF requires that "*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in [...] Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection*". Dacorum's own currently applicable Adopted Core Strategy states that: "*development will not be supported where it has an adverse impact on the sensitive open valley sides and ridge top locations*"

C/ The development will result in significant loss of amenity for local residents in and around Northchurch

- Developing the site will harm a public right of way used by Northchurch residents (alongside Bell Lane in the Wishing Tree field) while improving their mental wellbeing walking through a country field with spectacular views over AONB and will destroying its rural character.
- Exacerbate general loss of accessible open spaces between Northchurch and A41 - in addition to the sudden decision of DBC to close the footpath access across the A41 without any replacement in early 2020.
- The proposal suggests that the inclusion of a park with the parcel would "add" open space. It's already there !!!!! Any development would leave only a tiny portion . The proposed location of the park is also at odds with the character of the site - it is the Wishing Tree field which offers the best views across the valley to the Chilterns AONB

D/ The location is unsuitable for development

- Steep hills to town



- No-one will walk or Cycle... only use yet more cars
- SINK HOLES
- Pond with ducks and herons regularly visiting
- Ancient and established hedgerows
- Single track established soft verge lanes not suitable for additional traffic
- No pavements
- Grimms Ditch
- Only small Tesco supermarket locally
- No mains drainage/sewage, gas supply or copper piping for decent broadband supply (all crucial given increased and continued demand for working from home).

E/ Existing infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the proposed development

- We have already seen with the building on Bearroc Park, Phase 1 is already adding significant traffic along Shootersway and to the dangerous corner into the top of Durrants Lane. Do people have to die in the accidents we see there for DBC to take action and address the traffic issue there? Phase 2 will only add more issues. Including the 200 houses planned for Bk06, DBC plans to build 890 additional houses in the immediate area which will need to use these junctions .

F/ Nature

- The site is currently rich in nature - forming a habitat for bird life including bats, larks, kites and tawny owls. The pond regularly has ducks and herons visiting.
- Extensive development of the area to the north of the A41 (effectively a hard boundary for wild animals as well as local residents) will leave no space for wildlife to flourish

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10294

**Person ID** 1268248

**Full Name** LIZ FLEMING

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing as a resident of Berkhamsted in response to the draft plan to build 830 houses along Shootersway. I object to the new housing development for the following reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of green field land and destruction of local ecology. There are ample brown field sites elsewhere in Dacorum.</li> <li>2. There is already a bottle neck of traffic along Shootersway to the A41 in the morning rush hour.</li> <li>3. There will be insufficient primary and secondary school places.</li> <li>4. Increase in air pollution with the extra volume of vehicles that this development will generate.</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	If further houses are actually needed then the East Berkhamsted development would reduce the strain on local roads if he had a direct link in from the A41.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10299
<b>Person ID</b>	1268255
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON BURDEKIN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I know that the Thakeham/Bulbourne Cross is not part of the local plan but would like to register my opposition to this too. It may appear 'sustainable' but again, this is on virgin land where cars are a must and sporting and educational facilities are proposed literally metres away from the polluted A41. I also object to the Football Ground's proposed move to another town where people will have to drive 3 miles to – causing even more pollution.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10312
<b>Person ID</b>	1268339
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Adam Craig
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Do you have any specific comments about any of the proposals and sites?</b></p> <p>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). Yet there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p>

There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

The site on Lock Field, BK07 causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10321

**Person ID** 1268350

**Full Name** Mrs Tamsyn Craig

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Do you have any specific comments about any of the proposals and sites?</b></p> <p>The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition). Yet there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.</p> <p>There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.</p> <p>The site on Lock Field, BK07 causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10335
<b>Person ID</b>	1268401

<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN WYATT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I wish to object to <b>POSSIBLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, IN LOCKFIELD NORTHCHURCH.</b></p> <p><b>General comments</b></p> <p>1) New Road (the B4506) at its Northchurch end is already subject to regular congestion because of the one-way section with waiting areas over and on both sides of the canal bridge. To add to this by providing access to a further 60-100 vehicles just above that point from any new development would appear unwise.</p> <p>2) Emergency access to the railway tunnels, should there be an accident therein, would be restricted by any new estate.</p> <p><b>Wildlife comments</b></p> <p>1) The existing wildlife corridor between the canal and railway lines from Northchurch Canal Bridge to Dudswell Canal Bridge and onwards into more open country would be blocked. Foxes (comment removed) are already known to use this and a Mammal Survey to determine what other mammals such as bats are present and/or utilising it for feeding, breeding or sleeping/hibernation or as a wildlife thoroughway should be investigated. Plant and Insect Surveys should also be undertaken. The micro-habitats which would be affected include canal bank, railway embankment, hedgerows, scrub, marsh, a few mature trees, fields and other open areas.</p> <p>2) The bird species present have been recorded for in excess of 20 years and include :-</p> <p><b>All Year (residents and regular visitors – some 81 species annually) :-</b></p> <p>Cormorant, Grey Heron, Little Egret, Mute Swan, Canada Goose, Mallard, Red Kite, Common Buzzard, Sparrowhawk, Common Kestrel, Peregrine, Coot, Moorhen, Red-legged Partridge, Northern Lapwing, Black-headed Gull, Herring Gull, Lesser Black-backed Gull, Little Owl, Tawny Owl, Woodpigeon, Stock Dove, Collared Dove, Kingfisher, Green Woodpecker, Great Spotted Woodpecker, Nuthatch, Pied Wagtail, Grey Wagtail, Skylark, Wren, Robin, Hedge Sparrow, Song Thrush, Blackbird, Mistle Thrush, Great Tit, Blue Tit, Coal Tit, Marsh Tit, Long-tailed Tit, Starling, Magpie, Jay, Jackdaw, Carrion Crow, Rook, Raven, House Sparrow, Chaffinch, Goldfinch, Greenfinch, Linnet, Bullfinch, Treecreeper, Yellowhammer and Reed Bunting (<b>57 species</b>).</p> <p><b>Summer Visitors</b></p>

Hobby, Common Tern, Cuckoo, Swift, Barn Swallow, House Martin, Sand Martin, Northern Wheatear, Reed Warbler, Sedge Warbler, Willow Warbler, Chiffchaff, Whitethroat and Lesser Whitethroat **(14 species)**.

**Winter Visitors**

Water Rail, Green Sandpiper, Fieldfare, Redwing, Waxwing, Lesser Redpoll, Goldcrest and Firecrest **(8 species)**,

**Passage Migrants**

Common Sandpiper and Meadow Pipit **(2 species)**.

In addition to the above, accidentals such as Great White Egret and Yellow-browed Warbler have also been recorded.

**13 of the above-mentioned birds are on the Red List of the Birds of Conservation Concern 4 (BoCC4) and 14 are on the Amber List**

3) A stronger case for the proposed area being developed as a local nature reserve rather than a housing estate could perhaps be made.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS10343

**Person ID**

1268418

**Full Name**

JOSEPHINE O'NEILL

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10344



<b>Person ID</b>	1268418
<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPHINE O'NEILL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10375
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK1 south of Berkhamsted 850 which is close to A41 for access, so much for the green lung area promised when the A41 bypass was built, I make this comment again below.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10376
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK2 BFI site 90 the effect on the listed building and its setting needs to be addressed.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS10377
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK3 Haslam Fields 150. These are playing fields and loss of sports facilities in town!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10384
<b>Person ID</b>	1059458
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Evans
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	<p>I wish to make my opposition to Thakeham Bulourne Cross proposal known.</p> <p>Thakeham placed a card through my letterbox encouraging residents to write to you. (I appreciate this proposal is not part of the local plan, nor should it ever be).</p> <p>I wish to make it clear that I believe their proposal to be inappropriate and built on false claims.</p> <p>As with any big proposals, there are claims of schools, parks, sports facilities ... we all know these are never delivered. Being placed in the later stages of any development they always fade away.</p> <p>Therefore, this proposal is really nothing more than the destruction of green open spaces that separate Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead. Merging the two into one big mess.</p> <p>It destroys the village of Bourne End (going against national policy that new developments should not dominate existing settlements)</p> <p>It will clearly increase traffic (the claim to the contrary is just bizarre. Despite attempts to prevent cars clogging up new builds, the reality is that 1 new house = <b>at least 2</b> new cars, so despite national policies to attempt to reduce climate change, this proposal is simply piling on the pollution, congestion and generally destroying the environment -- not a single mention of a solar panel anywhere, why? Because those would destroy the developers profits and that's what they really care about, not the area or it's inhabitants).</p> <p>The area already has numerous infrastructure issues such as water supply, traffic, pressure on the green belt, etc etc and this proposal would simply further exasperate all those issues. Dacorum has declared a climate emergency. This proposal is exactly the type of thing that contributes to the whole planet being in such a poor state.</p> <p>I urge you to dismiss this proposal and stick with the local plan.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10386
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK4 Hanbury A wildlife corridor recommended in guidance which would lead to open space at the rear was ignored when pp was granted recently for a complex of unsightly private flats for older residents. ( <u>Uplift in numbers 40 to 100+</u> ).
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10388
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK 6 is east of Darrs Lane 200, these are beside the existing Bearroc 1 and 2 sites, so a large chunk at the Northchurch side of town, a further coalescence with the very low density of existing development along the southern end of Darrs Lane, ie modest bungalows and detached houses.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10391
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK7 Lock Field Northchurch 60. The traffic along this section of New Road towards Ashridge is hazardous, sloping and very busy. Any development here assuming there are no flooding issues will open up the area of charity allotment area Sunnyside above for future development, traffic over the canal bridge and parking on both sides creates a hazard.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10392
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK8 Rossway Farm 200, and with BK6 these areas provide a soft edge to the town which is what development on the southern side of Shootersway was supposed to be, this is alongside the A41. It looks like all these intentions are forgotten and this is poor urban design which will provide an abrupt edge to a market town set in open countryside.</p> <p>The previously planned “green lung” between the A41 bypass and Berkhamsted is to be eroded by build all along the corridor, and the noise and pollution from the bypass will be a problem for the new build estates as well as loss of wildlife.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10393
<b>Person ID</b>	493957

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK9 Bank Mill Lane 50 This is a water meadow with the adjacent building density having exacerbated the problem and this should not be included at all.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10395
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK10 Hanbury already approved, against a lot of opposition.



<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10408
<b>Person ID</b>	493957
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK11/BK13 Billet Lane Lidl pp granted some years ago and Jewsons site, ok if traffic issues onto Billet Lane and High Street controlled, only to same height of flats opposite, 3 storeys, and improvements to the canal side.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10409
<b>Person ID</b>	493957

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Anne Galewski
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK12 Civic Centre the Civic Centre is an important amenity and the Police station remnant is in there, with the increase in population proposed this is even more essential than now, as is the car park which should be retained. The nearest alternative is the new multi storey, not easy for crossing roads and distance.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10437
<b>Person ID</b>	1262190
<b>Full Name</b>	Christine Hopcraft
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

My concerns regarding the suggested building of 60 dwellings on Lock Field adjacent to New Road in Northchurch.

Wildlife

The Lock Field site encompasses the wildlife corridor to the canal and nearby wildlife sites and sites of Special Scientific Interest including deer, badgers, at least 80 bird species including heron and kingfishers, butterflies and protected species. The impact on the wildlife and their habitat if planning is allowed will be significant.

Suggestion of 60 dwellings

The local plan for Berkhamsted quotes number of dwellings per site for a certain number of hectares, i.e Lock Field 60 dwellings on 2.2 ha. In 2009 when planning was considered and decided against for this site the Council estimated a capacity for 50 dwellings, this means an increase of 10 dwellings. In fact, other sites mentioned in the current Berkhamsted Strategy for Growth quote Bank Mill 50 dwellings on 3.9 ha, Hanburys 70 dwellings on 4.67 ha, Rossway 80 dwellings on 3.5 ha etc. Taking this into consideration the density for the Lock Field site is extremely high for a small site.

Sewage

As there is no mains drainage to properties north of the canal in Northchurch how will all the sewage and water from the Lock Field site be managed. All the other properties situated north of the canal have decent plots with their own septic tanks, there definitely is not the room for this facility on such a small site for so many dwellings.

Flood risk

Hand in hand with sewage goes drainage of excess water. During heavy storms and heavy rainfall, the water travels in rivers down New Road always on the righthand side going down and cascades into the track for the Lock Field site this has led to flooding of the area in the past, how will this be dealt with.

Pedestrian and Road Safety

The most compelling argument against allowing planning permission of 60 dwellings on Lock Fields must be Safety.

Regular users of New Road Northchurch will realise the seriousness of the impact another junction will have at that point of the road, the entrance and exit of the Lock Field site, which would be opposite to the narrow track Southbank Road and adjacent to the single-track narrow bridge, will be a hazard to all road users. Visibility exiting from the Lock Field site will be considerably restricted to the right because of the wall across the bridge and then the road drops away and veers to the right meaning vehicles cannot be seen also they have right of way over that single track bridge.

Because of the narrowness of Southbank Road and lack of parking facilities many vehicles regularly park in New Road on the opposite side of the road to where the Lock field exit and entrance would be. This means that any vehicles coming down New Road have to go on the opposite side of the road passing close by the entrance/exit to Lock field. During the day the line of cars parked can be quite significant because of school pick up and drop off, visits to the cemetery, excess vehicles from Southbank Road, also visitors who wish to go walking along the canal to enjoy the natural beauty of the area, this makes a severe hazard for vehicles coming down the hill as visibility of oncoming vehicles over the bridge is restricted and, on many occasions, causing a bottle neck and many frustrated drivers.

The footpath on the opposite side of New Road to Lock Field, past the cemetery and beyond, is extremely narrow and is only single track, making it dangerous for pedestrians, people in wheelchairs and especially mothers pushing prams or pushchairs, mothers with a toddler and also pushing a pushchair find it harrowing because of the narrowness. The excess traffic the road and pathways will have to endure and bearing in mind the speed of the traffic makes walking in this area very hazardous, bringing more traffic to the area by allowing building 60 dwellings on the Lock Field site is only asking for serious incidents to happen.

If 60 dwellings are allowed on the Lock Fields site this could mean at least 120 vehicles (2 per household is the norm now) which will have a serious impact on New Road.

The impact that construction traffic will have on this narrow road and single-track bridge is another issue. At the moment quite regularly heavy long lorries deliver to the railway site on Lock Field, these vehicles struggle to turn into the track which leads to the railway yard which, at times, holds up the traffic for a long time because the vehicles have to shunt backwards and forwards to get their vehicle round in just a small area. The weight of some of the larger vehicles could have a detrimental effect on the bridge.

I hope you will consider the above points when making any decisions.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10466
<b>Person ID</b>	1268450
<b>Full Name</b>	JOSEPH STOPPS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	DACORUM GREEN PARTY
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The plan already proposes over-expansion of Dacorum.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10495
<b>Person ID</b>	869129
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Ann Hetherington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	No

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Given the substantial shortfall in the evidence provided to justify the current housing supply target and housing strategy I do not propose there to be any other sites that should be included in the plan.</p> <p>Once the Council conduct a review of the evidence of 'housing need' and bring forward a Plan meeting the requirements of exceptional circumstances to build on the green belt then I would be prepared to consider other sites for development.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10515
<b>Person ID</b>	334492
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Sacha Hughes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Northchurch has been in existence for centuries. Adoption of this plan will effectively reduce Northchurch to a suburb of Berkhamsted and write it out of existence. In the proposal it is referred to as West Berkhamsted!</p> <p>Over 400 houses are earmarked to be built in Northchurch, of which 60 are to be added to Lock Field, which is only accessible from Berkhamsted/Northchurch over a single-track canal bridge on New Road. Current traffic over the bridge is already heavy, with traffic tailing back during normal rush hours towards Northchurch Common.</p> <p>The bridge itself is unlikely to be able to bear weight of the construction machinery required to build the houses, hence this traffic will need to be diverted through Ashridge and round the dangerous S bend at Woodside Cottage. To add to</p>

the already excessive traffic is inconceivable and certainly not in line with any green proposals, especially since there is no train station at Northchurch, hence commuters will need to drive to Berkhamsted station through already congested streets.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10550

**Person ID** 1268687

**Full Name** Ms Isabelle Robinson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.

Having grown up in the area, I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10551

**Person ID** 1268687

**Full Name** Ms Isabelle Robinson

**Organisation Details**



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10560
<b>Person ID</b>	1268702
<b>Full Name</b>	Kirstin Chaplin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>5/ Do you have any specific comments about any of the proposals and sites?</b> — <u>Northchurch</u> is named after St Mary's Church which is over one thousand years old. It has a distinct history. The community centres on two churches, a primary school, a small row of shops and a pub. Although we are a short distance from Berkhamsted, Northchurch has a distinct identity. People know each other by name and sight. There is a small community feel that people value

greatly. The people of Northchurch are concerned that the Borough does not appear to have any knowledge of this unique sense of identity and that it has simply referred to Northchurch as 'West Berkhamsted'. This has caused offence and distress to local people, who are concerned that this sense of community will be overwhelmed by being absorbed by Berkhamsted.

— The excessive development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street, which is the main route between the two settlements.

—There is a documented history of a high level of public concern about congestion, road safety and pollution in Northchurch already (see the motion of Herts County Council in 2018 following the Go20 petition).

—Yet it is recognised that there is almost no scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate this congestion due to the narrow, uneven and inconsistent provision of footpaths, along Northchurch High Street. Much of this is within a conservation area, with over-hanging Elizabethan buildings, such as the Alms houses.

—There is also a row of Victorian terraces along Northchurch High Street, many occupied by families with young children. These houses have doors opening straight onto the pavement, already heavy with buses and lorries. The increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in idling and traffic movements that would cause more congestion and pollution as well as a risk to road safety. This increased pollution will risk the long term health of families in these houses, as well as increase the road safety concerns.

—This increase in traffic volumes without mitigation will increase the risk to children travelling to and from school St Mary's school, and the elderly and disabled populations of Northchurch.

— The site between **Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06** — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

— The site on **Lock Field, BK07**, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact

of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long-standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single-track bridge.

— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

— Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10579

**Person ID** 1268716

**Full Name** MOHAN KAPOOR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The plan is proposing 2,200 new houses in Berkhamsted with hundreds of those in Northchurch being built on Green Belt land.  
 The two sites near us are BK06 (Darrs Lane to Bell Lane) and BK08 (between Shootersway and the A41)  
 Key objections:

All land on these two sites in in Green Belt. Green Belt is important to protect for the environment (habitats and wildlife), pollution control (acting as a natural barrier between urban and rural areas) and our wellbeing (access to nature is good for our health as proved throughout the pandemic).

Specifically the site between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane contains hedgerows at either side with an abundance of wildlife living in them or passing through. (Comment removed) bats and tawny owls are often seen or heard. Ancient trees line both sides of Bell Lane. The view over the valley from the top is stunning (this would disappear once hoses were there). Bell Lane provides a nice safe (cars rarely go up and down) single track country walk which many local people enjoy.

The site between Shootersway and the A41 is a mix of forest and fields, which acts as a natural noise and pollution barrier for Northchurch (the trees absorb the Carbon dioxide and Nitrogen Dioxide emissions from the heavy A41 traffic).

Development at both sites would lead to a significant increase in traffic and hence pollution. Already there is much congestion at Tesco Express (cars waiting for spaces and blocking Northchurch High Street) and Darrs Lane being a single track road is not fit for any further traffic. The answer is not to widen Darrs Lane as this would result in destruction of all the hedgerows. We need to recognise that this beautiful part of Northchurch is important to the village, and we need to keep as is for the sake of the environment, wildlife and human health.

2,200 houses across Berkhamsted is too many. We understand that the numbers are inflated and based on an outdated algorithm, and latest population numbers are showing a decrease rather than increase. It would be better to revise the plan to build only on brownfield sites with a realistic number of houses and present that to the government instead. Green Belt was assigned as such for good reasons and we should honour those and protect it for generations to come.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10584

**Person ID** 1268722

**Full Name** ALEX DEANE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Regarding Northchurch (BK06, BK07 and BK08 = 460 proposed new homes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The standard of new housing developments seen in this area (£600,000+ family/executive homes at Bearroc park) which can be supported by the local property market does not address the country's need for affordable homes;</li> <li>• By filling in gaps and merging the village with nearby Berkhamsted, there is a serious threat of loss of identity for Northchurch - a significant, historic village pre-dating Berkhamsted and having its own Parish Council. Dacorum Council documents already deny the existence of Northchurch by referring to the area as 'West Berkhamsted' or 'the West of Berkhamsted growth location' See <i>appendix 1</i>;</li> <li>• With an estimated 700-1,000 new vehicles anticipated at the proposed new homes in Northchurch, we could expect much increased heavy traffic on our narrow country lanes. This will substantially increase pollution and road safety risks near St Mary's school and on our narrow pavements;</li> <li>• The single track bridge on New Road is already under considerable pressure from high</li> <li>• levels of traffic and the narrow pavements are a risk to children going to/from school. Adding a junction and the increased weight of traffic, will only exacerbate these issues;</li> <li>• There is no significant provision of work in the local area and no indication in the plan of</li> <li>• where the many new residents of Dacorum will work. As I understand it, there is no employment strategy;</li> <li>• I have been a commuter based in Northchurch for 7 years and know from experience that Berkhamsted train station, for most residents, is too far to access daily by foot</li> <li>• (25-30 mins), particularly in adverse weather conditions. Cycling, for those who are able,</li> <li>• is only possible on busy roads and there is a lack of secure cycle facilities at the station;</li> <li>• The gradient of the valley side is so steep that both local journeys (Northchurch Tesco) and commutes would be difficult on foot or bicycle;</li> <li>• We face the loss of ancient beech woodland and hedgerows at the Darrs Lane site and the loss of Lock Field as an important wildlife corridor between the Grand Union Canal and Northchurch Common. The proposed developments would have a huge negative and irreversible impact on the biodiversity, pollinator corridors, chalk streams and the aquifer (we already have suspected sink holes in the Darrs Lane site) See <i>appendix 1</i>;</li> <li>• St Mary's, our one-form entry village school would be totally unable to cope with additional children. Furthermore, there is no scope for expansion on its small site;</li> <li>• The village infrastructure (one church, one school, one pub, one shop, one cafe, no doctors, no dentists - let alone the drainage and sewage facilities) would be unable to cope with a population increase in Northchurch of c. 900-1,200 people.</li> </ul>

**Appendix 1**

**An excerpt from The National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)**

The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green belts are their openness and their permanence.

Green Belt serves five purposes:

- 1 To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2 To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- 4 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - 1 To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and redundant land

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10592

**Person ID** 1268725

**Full Name** CHARLOTTE SMITH

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I would like to include my specific opposition to any proposed build on BK07 Lockfield and BK06 land east of Darrs Lane BK07 Lockfield is a semi rural location within the village of Northchurch. The proposals do not fall in line with your own policies for villages.

I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The exit from this area is dangerous, there is a poor sight line, a blind spot south of the bridge, the bridge itself is single track and there are frequent incidents, near misses and accidents because of it, the road (B4506) is narrow near the site and can be speedy as people accelerate away from the central village location. Exiting by car from this site would therefore be hazardous

Exiting as a pedestrian raises even more safety concerns as there is only one very narrow pavement across from the Lockfield site making it particularly difficult for children or people with disabilities to use safely.

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends. The proposed addition of another 120 cars would exacerbate this and the level of pollution. Even in the pandemic high levels have been measured near the primary school of St Mary's.

The single track bridge would make access to Lockfield challenging for construction traffic and the potential for bridge damage would be high, however construction traffic may find it difficult to access from the other direction as the road is particularly narrow past Lockfield.

The narrowness of road and pavement does not lend itself for any obvious cycle paths

New Road has been identified as a problem for its congestion and pollution for some time. DBC recognises this but has failed to find a solution. It did not see through the link road between Tunnel Fields and New Road and it is unlikely that another solution can be found as careful scrutiny will identify a number of challenges.

DBC should ensure developers stick with their agreement to bring enhancements promised, as there is evidence that developers ignore agreements, eg: in New Road alone there is no link road and a ravaged ancient hedge from illegal access from new houses.

New Road (B4506) runs alongside Lockfield is semi rural. Animals such as deer and foxes are frequently seen on the road, even escaped horses and there is an increased risk of animal deaths and accidents if the wildlife corridors are closed if Lockfield is built on.

Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal, this is a key reason for not building on Lockfield.

The Grand Union canal is bordered by a chalk stream in this area, chalk streams have international significance, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage its ecosystem

Lockfield is in Green Belt on the northern perimeter of the village of Northchurch, and as villages are to be to have their characters retained and there are no exceptional reasons for Green Belt boundaries to be reviewed, irretrievable and unnecessary change must be prevented and Lockfield must not be built on.

The view across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) is beautiful.

Building density locally is currently 10 homes per hectare, the building proposal for Lockfield is 27+ homes per hectare There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this habitat

Developing Lockfield would impact negatively on the quality of life, I greatly enjoy the semi rural location, taking walks along the rural and peaceful area along the canal

The amount of usable land at Lockfield is questioned, Railtrack uses this site currently and has access to the railway line, there may be pollutant issues as a result of their long term use of this site The portal of the railway tunnel impinges onto more land at Lockfield and there is no retaining fence.

There is no main drains north of the canal bridge, there is a gas hub on the edge of Lockfield, the location of the gas pieps is unclear, electricity is over ground and telephony is copper wired, this area is not urban in any sense. NFWS identifies Lockfield as a medium risk of flooding. All these factors would significantly complicate any development and increase costs.

The hedge bordering Lockfield and New Road is productive; animal tracks, significant bird song and butterflies are in evidence



The Glover report identifies that planning needs to consider those living nearby AONBs and their views. This is Northchurch's best feature, its view. Any building of BK07 and BK06 would adversely affect the beautiful view of the Chilterns and the semi rural idyll of Northchurch

BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed, the selection of Darrs Lane in the planning proposal is as a result premature and should be removed There is also no mention of buffer zones have also not been considered to protect its ancient woodland.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10599

**Person ID** 1268726

**Full Name** DR ADRIENNE GARNER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** I feel strongly that encroaching on Green Belt land for property development should not be considered.

As I said early I believe there is going to be a move away from living in the SE.

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10610
<b>Person ID</b>	369415
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introduction to Proposals and Sites</b></li> </ul> <p><i>“24.1 The work on allocations is still evolving and we have reflected as much detail as we possibly can at this stage in the Plan. In particular, we have not been able to include all forms of proposals that might emerge in the settlements. We set out our current understanding of allocations in more detail in this 'Proposals and Sites' section of the plan</i></p> <p><i>24.2 We are working towards incorporating a full list of allocations for the next stage of the Plan (Regulation 19). We will undertake this work in progressing discussions on individual development proposals with landowners and developers, our partners and other key stakeholders and through taking forward linked work on infrastructure requirements in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.”</i></p> <p>In other words, more sites could be added after close of consultation, and residents and concerned groups will not have had an opportunity to comment on these.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10612
<b>Person ID</b>	1268730
<b>Full Name</b>	PR AND C SMITTEN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I wish to register our objection to the proposed development. Our main objection is the single track bridge already being over used particularly at school times & the chaos often caused by the slightest thing - an extra wide vehicle or road accident not to mention the lethal left hand bend at the top of New Road and the regular accidents there. Any additional traffic obviously would increase these occurrences when everything comes to a standstill. Are there going to be more doctor surgeries and dentists to cope with the numbers?
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10627
<b>Person ID</b>	369415

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Dacorum EnvironmentalForum
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chair Dacorum Environmental Forum Waste Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK08 (and other sites in Berkhamsted.) Frequent reference is made to “increasing” or creating new or linking to various wildlife sites or wildlife corridors. These are not marked on the maps, and are difficult to locate.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10641
<b>Person ID</b>	1268735
<b>Full Name</b>	Marie-Clare Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Northchurch is currently surrounded by green space with single track roads leading up to Shooters way which have already become a lot busier due to the new estates along Shooters way. The erosion of habitat (Lockfield Site) alongside the canal is something which is not justified, we frequently see kites, kingfishers and various mammals using this land, once built on this, can never be replaced. This particular development is close to the canal and the River Bulborne – an endangered chalk stream and will cause further pollution within the water system. The building on the fields behind Granville Road and Chaucer close to where the locally known ‘wishing tree’ currently stands will completely erode not only an important habitat for mammals, birds and insects but destroy the essence of Northchurch as a village and rural location. The vista driving into Northchurch from Ashridge will be ruined.</p> <p>In addition, building on greenfield sites goes against everything that has been said about the importance of green space to our mental wellbeing. This has been particularly evident during the last 12 months during the covid epidemic. Visitors have flocked to our green spaces, Northchurch and Berkhamsted common and Ashridge monument to name but a few, are constantly over-run with people trying to access the green space, this will only get worse and more difficult to manage if we keep reducing our green space. Climate change is also very much on the agenda now and will increasingly be so in the future. How can building more houses on green belt, help to combat this?! We should be focussing on un-used buildings/brownfield space in the town centres such as the site next to Majestic in Berkhamsted that has been vacant for at least 3 years, not destroying the little green space we have left.</p> <p>I hope you take these concerns into consideration not only for the current residents of Northchurch but for future generations.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10694
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	It is important to note that the Core Strategy (endorsed by Councillors) rejected a number of sites in Berkhamsted giving detailed reasons for rejection – yet now Dacorum Planning are ignoring their own robust reasons and arguments for rejection simply on the basis that there is a target to hit. The reasons previously given by Dacorum Borough Council for rejection still hold good. BRAG. Have provided detailed comments on this which I fully support.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10696
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The local objective to “Support the British Film Institute to consolidate on their site” has clearly been dropped. Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10698
<b>Person ID</b>	1268745
<b>Full Name</b>	Rebecca Fennell
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Re Local Housing plan for Dacorum</p> <p>I have lived with this beautiful view for over twenty years now and STRONGLY disagree with the plan for the type and number of additional houses in Berkhamsted and Tring!</p> <p>I, like most people on this estate, bought our houses because of this very view and easy access to the stunning countryside which keeps us all fit, healthy and now sane.</p> <p>Although we accept the need for the provision of new properties, the plan is misconceived as a significant amount of green belt will be lost plus the fact that it will put a considerable strain on the current and future planned infrastructure. It appears that the volume of houses proposed in the Berkhamsted and Tring area is disproportionate to the number of new homes in the whole of Dacorum.</p> <p>This proposal needs revisiting in order to get the support of the local community.</p> <p>As it stands, it is simply unacceptable to us ALL.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">LocalPlan Photo 180321.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10699
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site) Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities' needs and provides employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council's objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10700
<b>Person ID</b>	1268744
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID FULLER



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>BK01</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for releasing Green Belt land for development in Berkhamsted has not been made and was rejected by Councillors in the previous Core Strategy. However this very large site results in the irreversible loss of over 33 hectares of our valuable green belt and the loss of the buffer between the town and the A41. Residents on the site would be subjected to considerable increased airborne and noise pollution from the A41.</li> <li>• The ridge top position of the site makes it highly visible from the surrounding hills.</li> <li>• The site is beyond the natural walking and cycling range from the existing services and facilities in the town centre (including the Railway Station) especially due to its position at the top of steep hills.</li> <li>• As the Local Plan does not include any new employment sites, inevitably most residents will have to commute to and from work and a significant number of those would have to do so via the station. This would massively increase traffic up and down Swing Gate Lane, a road with 2 infant/junior schools located upon it. If the east/west link to Chesham Road materialises it may mitigate against some of the increase in congestion around Swing Gate Lane and the Hall Park estate roads but would be of no benefit to the wider community and would contribute to the feeling that the site is semi-detached from Berkhamsted, therefore making no contribution to the vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'. The suggestion of a new community hub acknowledges that the site does not integrate with the town.</li> <li>• There are frequent sewage/waste water issues at the bottom of the Hall Park estate (by the A416), suggesting the current sewage system is already struggling to cope. There is no explanation in the plan as to how this would be mitigated.</li> <li>• Unless there is any new health provision on the site there would be pressure upon the existing GP's who are already at capacity.</li> <li>• 'As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' - this is disingenuous. It is not possible to deliver a net gain while removing a large area of Green Belt and the buffer (and wildlife corridor) with the A41.</li> </ul>

- 850 homes would probably result in around 2000 people and 1200 cars. It is unacceptable that the Council could impose that level of housing growth all in one area of the town without having clear plans to improve the existing infrastructure
- **For all the above reasons, I object to the use of this site.**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10701
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Haslam Field (BK03) is a sports ground owned by Berkhamsted School, which has been an important part of the Town since 1541. Haslam Field was gifted to the school and, at a meeting with the school's Headmaster around the time of the Core Strategy inquiry, BRAG was told by the school that it was a legal condition that they could not develop the land – it was gifted to be used as sports fields. Presumably, the school have found a legal way round these conditions, but clearly at the very least promoting the land goes directly against the spirit of the gift and the benefactors stated wishes, while BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. If the pitches are “surplus to requirements” to the school, they are clearly not to the community. It is very much needed by the community and should

be protected by any council that has the interests of its residents at heart. The policy on Haslam fields also draws another unpalatable comparison with Hemel Hempstead where the provision of open recreational space is huge by comparison. Its under-used too, while in Berkhamsted there is scarcely any provision at all.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10702
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street Given Dacorum Council's track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.</p> <p>The Civic Centre in Berkhamsted should remain as public facility and a separate consultation is being conducted about the citizens' vision for its future use. DCB cannot go on increasing the population while removing recreational, cultural and civic amenities. The quality of life will be diminished, health and well-being will decline, civic pride will be lost, and crime will increase. Localism is also important – to have facilities and accessible recreation in the locality makes a community worth living in. I attend many events in the Civic Centre. If that goes my quality of life will be much reduced.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10705
<b>Person ID</b>	1268744
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID FULLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I also object to Bk03, Bk04, Bk08 and do not support any proposal to increase the size of Berkhamsted by 25% or Tring by 50%,as I consider that to be totally out of proportion to their existing size and would totally change their historic character.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10706
<b>Person ID</b>	1268746

<b>Full Name</b>	DANIEL GARROD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 - I find it surprising that a proposed site of 850 dwellings which will totally transform the surrounding area has not received more publicity and investigation of proposed benefits.</p> <p>Developing this green belt land so close to Berkhamsted will have a huge detrimental affect on local residents who use this open land to go for walks, exercise, recreation etc</p> <p>This size of development will put huge strain on existing public transport systems (rail in particular) and dramatically alter the historical character of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>This site in particular appears to have been chosen to maximise developer profits rather than preserving green belt land or bio-diversity of the area.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10709
<b>Person ID</b>	1161079
<b>Full Name</b>	Melanie Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document. The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10716
<b>Person ID</b>	1145421
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shirley White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The Council also must protect the Green Belt and ensure the Green space between towns is protected. This particularly relates to the Thakeham development which plans to merge Berkhamsted with Bourne End. I particularly disagree with this development and think the marketing has been almost illegal by trying to persuade the town people that it would be beneficial because it's a green alternative and there would be more football pitches!!
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10727
<b>Person ID</b>	1145421
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Shirley White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10760
<b>Person ID</b>	1268755
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lesley Reynolds

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am particularly concerned with the proposed overdevelopment of Northchurch. Northchurch is a separate village and not West Berkhamsted as listed. The proposal is for a 50% population increase in the village.</p> <p>The development on the Durrants, Bell &amp; Darrs Lane site has access from single track lanes, ill equiped for the current traffic levels. To increase the road capacity established wildlife corridors and ancient hedgerows would have to be destroyed thereby destroying the eco system which takes hundreds of years to build. The proposed 200 homes and secondary school on this site would have put unsustainable pressure on the roads and the increased pollution would be another issue. The land is on a steep gradient and although it could be argued that residents could walk down to the local shops it is unlikely that many would walk back up with shopping, also school children with heavy bags would more likely be ferried too and from school in cars.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10761
<b>Person ID</b>	1268755
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Lesley Reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The site in New Road, where another 60 homes are proposed, is in another area of the village where access is already difficult. The road narrows to a single track at the canal bridge near the site and there are already residents of sheltered housing and pupils of St Mary's Primary school which have to cross New Road. The extra cars would not only have difficulty getting onto the road but at the junction with the A4251 congestion would be inevitable. There are already many hold ups here with tail backs to the bridge on New Road and cars idling outside the cottages between New Road and Tescos on the A4251. The pollution levels for the residents of the cottages would become intolerable.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	On the A4251 opposite Gossoms End Medical Centre there was a proposed site for a Lidl store which is not now going ahead. Surely this would be a better site being on the valley floor, brownfield rather than greenbelt and with direct access to the A4251
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10836
<b>Person ID</b>	1268791
<b>Full Name</b>	ELIZABETH FULLER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I also object to Bk03, Bk04, Bk08 and do not support any proposal to increase the size of Berkhamsted by 25% or Tring by 50%, as I consider that to be totally out of proportion to their existing size and would totally change their historic character.</li> </ul>
Yes / No	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10841
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At</p>

present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10845

**Person ID** 1145633

**Full Name** Mrs Suzanne Nixon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I would like to see more conversion of commercial space (office and retail) and less use of green field and greenbelt land.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10846
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am aware of the Bulbourne Cross proposals for developing land on the Bourne End side of Berkhamsted. I have reservations about this. While it does appear that the issue of sustainable development has been taken seriously with many positive features, once again we would be losing a large green space. The local plan shows potential expansion of Hemel Hempstead in the direction of Bourne End. The gap between the towns would be eroded. One day we might see a continuous ribbon of developed land where there are now green spaces. On this basis, I am opposed to the

Bulbourne Cross proposal. However, I would like Dacorum to take note of the positive aspects of the proposal relating to sustainability, amenities and green spaces provided.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10851

**Person ID** 1145633

**Full Name** Mrs Suzanne Nixon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

BK10

The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.

I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.

Regarding Berkhamsted,

Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS10852

**Person ID**

1145633

**Full Name**

Mrs Suzanne Nixon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

<p><b>Yes / No</b>  * <b>Yes</b>  * <b>No</b></p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b>  <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b>  <b>comment</b></p>	<p>BK09</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.</p> <p>Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10853
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>BK08</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building</p>



homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10854

**Person ID** 1145633

**Full Name** Mrs Suzanne Nixon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b></p>	<p>BK07</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.</p> <p>Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS10855</p>

<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>BK06</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.</p>

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10856
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	BK05 The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There

is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.

I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.

Regarding Berkhamsted,

Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10857
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>BK04</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.</p>

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10858

**Person ID** 1145633

**Full Name** Mrs Suzanne Nixon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

BK03

The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who

might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.

I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.

Regarding Berkhamsted,

Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.

Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.

Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10859
<b>Person ID</b>	1145633
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Suzanne Nixon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	



<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>BK02</p> <p>The scale of development proposed will forever alter the nature of relatively small towns like Berkhamsted and Tring. People like living in such places because they still retain something of their original nature as small market towns. There is a sense of community. They are not urban spaces. They are surrounded by green spaces that add greatly to the quality of life of residents. These are slowly being eroded. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 40 years and have seen many changes. Thus far the level of development, while substantial, has not been overwhelming, but there comes a point at which the town becomes too large and loses the very things that make it a pleasant place to live.. For future generations who might enjoy living here, I feel I must state that my heart sinks when reading Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth. Far too many new homes are proposed. Looking at the map of proposed sites around Berkhamsted, it appears that every available green space would be built on.</p> <p>I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO DEVELOPMENTS ON GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>Regarding Berkhamsted,</p> <p>Much of the proposed development is on the fringes of the town filling in green corridors vital to wildlife and greenfield sites that provide lungs and enhance quality of life here. A number of the proposed sites border the A41 bypass. At present, these green spaces provide a buffer between the traffic and nearby housing. I question the wisdom of building homes adjacent to a busy highway where air quality cannot be good. (Note the recent case in London where air pollution was officially named as the cause of a young child's death. She lived next to a very busy road with poor air quality). Noise pollution will also have an impact on these households.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is a Victorian town built in a valley with steep, narrow streets that are already at capacity with regard to traffic. Building on the outskirts of the town, will exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>Each household will have one or two cars. The stated intention is to provide cycle lanes, bus services and pedestrian pathways. This is admirable, but a young mother with two small children or an elderly person is more likely to jump into his/her car to access the distant town centre. This will create more pollution.</p>

Some roads in the town centre and in Northchurch already have very poor ratings for air quality. The roads leading to the sites off Shootersway and Swing Gate Lane will not be able to cope with the volume of traffic generated. Darrs Lane in Northchurch is a narrow, country lane, difficult to navigate even now if two cars meet. A large number of homes are proposed in the fields along the lane. Anyone living there would have to travel by car to reach the town centre or even Northchurch. None of these sites make sense.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10891

**Person ID** 1268687

**Full Name** Ms Isabelle Robinson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.

Having grown up in the area, I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road

for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10892

**Person ID** 1268687

**Full Name** Ms Isabelle Robinson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK06 Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10901
<b>Person ID</b>	1268814
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Emma Cotton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.

What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.

Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death. Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.

Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.

A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self- assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10902

**Person ID** 1268814

**Full Name** Ms Emma Cotton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10908
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Growth Area BK02: British Film Institute.</b>  This is a site to be built directly on to the heavily congested Shootersway / Kingshill Way junction. The junction will require radical upgrading to ensure the safety of pedestrian and residents as well as through traffic. This junction is crossed by

many secondary school pupils that walk to and from school. Maintaining a safe and healthy environment at this location will be challenging if not impossible.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10909

**Person ID** 333678

**Full Name** Mr David Simons

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

This development will involve felling many trees which will negatively impact on natural ecosystems. Development of this site cannot be utilised without exacerbating congestion on Shootersway. Currently at commuter times, despite the alterations to traffic lights at Junction of Kings Road and Shootersway, the traffic backs up to the new development at Bearoc Park (access also on Shootersway). It will also increase traffic significantly on Cross Oak road that is already unable to cope with current levels of traffic because parts of it are single track and large parts do not have pavement and yet it is a route which many secondary school pupils walk along to go to secondary school. The increased construction traffic and general car traffic once the houses are built will be a hazard for pedestrians and impact negatively on the environment. It must be recognised that Haslam Playing Fields were gifted to the Girls school as playing fields. Existing playing fields should be preserved for essential green field sites for the health of everyone.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10910
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The same arguments apply to both BK03 and BK04. Access to BK04 would have to gained via the Haslam Playing Fields development of the very narrow Denny's Lane
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10911
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10912
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Shootersway is yet again the primary highway access but no mention is made of the impact on Darrs Lane and Bell Lane. Both lanes are narrow single lane roads incapable of large volumes of traffic. This development would be on greenbelt land. The Draft Plan states that it will deliver a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on site to offset potential effects of damage to the Chilterns Beechwoods. The Draft Plan does not explain how?

The High Street at Northchurch is highly congested with many accidents, one fatal, occurring due to speed and intensity of traffic. Air pollution is a factor in this location - the existing residents in Northchurch would suffer acutely from any further traffic in this locality. This site should be kept as a buffer zone to the surrounding countryside, maintaining the definition between Berkhamsted and Northchurch.

Darrs Lane is extremely dangerous for walkers/cyclists. There are currently no footpaths on these roads, so they are very unsafe. These lanes would need to be made two way for traffic but reduced to a 20mph limit. There is no pedestrian / cycle links from this location to the High Street / Shootersway and therefore this would need to be addressed.

Despite this site being on the periphery of the town centre there are no open spaces within walking distance. This site would need to provide a proper open park for recreation. The open space provided as part of the Bearoc park is small and undermanaged. It is not suitable for football as the grass is not managed and there are no football nets despite being formed as football pitches.

Grims Ditch runs through this area and is an important Archaeological Site and would need to be properly surveyed and protected.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS10913

**Person ID** 333678

**Full Name** Mr David Simons

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This development will create a traffic problem where New Road crosses the canal. It is already a dangerous crossing where people want to get onto the canal, the bridge is a dangerous cycling area, and it is a main pedestrian route to the school.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10914
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The same concerns as BK04 and BK05 apply at this location. Around 200 new dwellings would need to have access again via Shootersway. The number of houses planned needs to be reduced to ensure noise and pollution from the A41 do not adversely affect residents.</p> <p>Development at this location needs to sympathetic with urgent need for a new access junction to the A41.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10915
<b>Person ID</b>	333678
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr David Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Yet more development along Shootersway with no plans to invest in roads and footpaths causing more traffic congestion and pollution. The concerns relating to BK4, 5, and 8 are equally applicable here.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10919

<b>Person ID</b>	1268851
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Humphrey Gillott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Proposed New Development between Durrants Lane and Darrs Lane; also between Shootersway and the A41 (towards the western end of your map).</b></p> <p>Has consideration been given to the impact this development will have on the volume of traffic using Shootersway? Will Bell Lane and Darrs Lane be widened to allow two-way traffic, or will these two lanes be left as they are? Either way, has the impact on the amount of traffic at the crossroads of Bell Lane and Westfield Road/Granville Road been considered? In Granville Road there is parking on both sides of the road, rendering the road a single lane for traffic in both directions. It would be futile, when driving, to proceed across the cross-road into the lower part of Bell Lane, as it is a one-way street, part of the way, coming up the hill from Northchurch High Street and it would not be appropriate to turn left from the lower part of Bell Lane into Alma Road.</p> <p>Is it expected that the traffic will use Shootersway?</p> <p>Has the impact of both traffic and custom on the shops at the bottom of Darrs Lane in Northchurch been considered and has the need for extra parking been thought through?</p> <p>Where will the water for the houses come from; if from the Water Tower just off the east end of Shootersway / Tower Close, has it been considered as to whether there will be sufficient pressure and what impact will it have on the houses already supplied by the Water Tower on both sides of Shootersway? One resident, in a house just off Shootersway, whom my wife and I know, commented, after the houses at the top of Durrants Lane had been built, that their water pressure had fallen.</p> <p>Will a condition of the contract for these new houses be the improvement of the surface of Shootersway, particularly immediately outside the new housing estate as you approach Durrants Lane from the direction of the Water Tower? The condition of it, at the moment, is very poor and I am very surprised that it was not made a condition of awarding the contract(s) for that housing, if that was not the case.</p> <p>Whether or not this is made a condition, the road drastically needs attention. The area of tarmac on the left-hand side facing west, needs to be widened, and the surface generally improved.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10920
<b>Person ID</b>	1268851
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Humphrey Gillott
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Bulbourne Cross</b></p> <p>I have received in the post a card suggesting that a site at Bulbourne Cross, east of Berkhamsted, should be developed, to include 1,100 of the 2,200 houses, which are proposed to be built in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>No map was provided on the card, which I have been encouraged to sign and send to you, so I do not know exactly where that will be, so I will not be sending it.</p> <p>From your own map of Berkhamsted, I see that development is proposed in what I think may be near to the area that is mentioned under this heading. I expect it is probably (looking at your map) at the bottom right between the right-hand end of your brown arrow of the A41 and the A4251 to Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>It would be particularly good for Dacorum to consider this suggestion, if development in this area has not actually been thought about yet, thereby relieving the pressure of houses being built, particularly in the areas I mention on my first page.</p>
Yes / No * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10945
<b>Person ID</b>	1268880
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jo-anne Tunmer
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>My children attend St Mary's school in Northchurch and I am concerned about the increased traffic and the associated risk to my children's safety with the increase in traffic volumes. The over zealous development in Tring and Berkhamsted will result in an enormous increase in traffic congestion, particularly in Northchurch High Street - the main route between the two settlements.</p> <p>There is already documented evidence of high levels of public concern about congestion and road safety in Northchurch - Go20 petition - however there is little scope for any meaningful improvements to mitigate congestion due to narrow and uneven footpaths along the High Street in Northchurch, much of which is a conservation area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the increase in traffic volume is likely to cause an increase in pollution as well as road safety. This is of particular concern to the residents living along the High Street and the children of St Mary's school.</p> <p>— The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>

— The site on **Lock Field, BK07**, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS10962
<b>Person ID</b>	1268886
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Jayson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11069
<b>Person ID</b>	1268914
<b>Full Name</b>	EDITH HARKINS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The Bullbourne Cross Development is too large for Bourne End. There have already been many houses added by the Industrial Site, at Buttons and in London Road,
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11100
<b>Person ID</b>	1268935
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Evelyn & Brian Hodgson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Northchurch New Road site.</p> <p>This site entrance is immediately opposite the entrance to the cemetery on New Road. A new housing estate entrance here opposite the cemetery gates will cause the loss of essential parking for the hearse and mourners many of whom tend to be elderly and not very mobile.</p> <p>There is a single lane bridge just to one side of the entrance and a recently expanded primary school on the Northchurch side. There have always been access difficulties for parents picking up very young children at peak times. A new housing estate would no doubt increase traffic to this area.</p> <p>It is noted on that there is currently an AQMA monitor in Northchurch due to the very high levels of nitrous oxide from traffic. Another housing development in this area has the potential to increase levels of pollution which are already worryingly high. The school have stopped using the playground which is at the junction of New Road with the High Street due to high pollution levels and further traffic congestion from the New Rd side could have an effect on their facilities for outdoor play even further.</p> <p>The school was changed in use from the three tier system which had children from nursery age up to year 4, and now they have children up to year 6 so they need all the outdoor play areas.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to the canal so there could be environmental pollution issue from run off into the canal. The River Bulbourne is also very close by. The Bulbourne has only recently begun to flow, having been dried up for several years. I note that developments must be a minimum 10m from the brink of a water body. This section of the canal is particularly tranquil and must be preserved. An ecological survey should be undertaken to preserve the divergent wildlife and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the issue of the provision of affordable housing on this site is a contentious one. House prices in this area currently average £710,064.00. If a person has a 10% deposit this would leave £639,578 to fund with a mortgage. At an average lender maximum of 4.5 times annual income a person would have to earn £142,128 pa to raise this type of sum. A newly qualified teacher now earns £30,000, so this is way beyond their capabilities, as I am sure it is also the case for nurses, prison officers and policemen to name but a few of our essential key workers for our communities.</p> <p>An increase in traffic would also have a bearing on the use of the A41. The junctions onto and off this bypass are notoriously dangerous, having sharp bends and only a two lane causeway. There are already traffic hold ups at rush hour times and accidents occur frequently on this stretch of road.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11101
<b>Person ID</b>	1268935
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Evelyn & Brian Hodgson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bourne End</p> <p>I would oppose the building of further dwellings adjacent to Bourne End on the basis that this is green belt land which is intended to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into each other.</p> <p>If Bourne End is permitted to merge into Berkhamsted it will affect the special historic character of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>It would also increase the traffic onto the A41. The junctions at Bourne End and Berkhamsted are particularly dangerous, having sharp bends and insufficient passing space. There are frequent accidents .</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11122
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK01</b> Land south of Berkhamsted The sheer scale of development will generate traffic congestion and a burden on public amenities</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11123
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK03</b> Haslam Fields This land is needed for sports facilities; and is in any case prone to flooding – which, anecdotally, is why it was donated to Berkhamsted School for Girls in the first place</li> </ul>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11124
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK06</b> East of Darrs Lane &amp; <b>BK08</b> Rossway Farm The sheer scale of development will generate traffic congestion and a burden on public amenities</li> </ul>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11125
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK11</b> Billet Lane (Jewson site) This land should be retained for light industrial use. There is too much land being lost which can provide employment use within the urban envelope of market towns</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11126
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK13</b> Billet Lane (Lidl site) should be retained as mixed retail/affordable housing</li> </ul>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11127
<b>Person ID</b>	1268953
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Susan Johnson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>BK12</b> Civic Centre Its façade should be retained and the building behind developed solely for community purposes. It houses the only public theatre space in Berkhamsted, and administrative offices for many charities; not to mention the Town Council, the Museum Store and the Police Station. There is also need for parking for all these uses, which makes housing a difficult addition. There is simply not room.</li> </ul>
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11181
<b>Person ID</b>	1264551
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Somervail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk06 East of Darrs Lane - this development is too far from the station; it is too large and will overwhelm Berkhamsted; it will create excessive traffic on the sunken lanes of Bell Lane &amp; Darrs Lane and destroy their ancient hedgerows which are important wildlife corridors. The extra traffic will lead to even worse pollution on Northchurch High street which is already a pollution hotspot.</p> <p>It was rejected for development in Dacorum's own Emerging Core Strategy which stated: "Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term"</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paras 133-147: importance of green belt to prevent urban sprawl and the need to use brownfield sites first.</p> <p>Dacorum Emerging Core Strategy 2017: importance of green belt round Northchurch.</p> <p>Dacorum Heritage Trust study in 2010: importance of ancient hedgerows and 10m border as wildlife corridors.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11182
<b>Person ID</b>	1264551
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Somervail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk07 Lockfield - this site is part of an important wildlife corridor between Northchurch Common and the green areas around the Grand Union Canal. It also forms part of the views which preserve the rural setting of Northchurch. This site will also increase traffic over the already busy and narrow canal bridge, past St Mary's Primary school and into the existing pollution hotspot of Northchurch High Street. This will also reduce road safety on New Road were there have been many incidents of speeding and wing mirrors hitting pedestrians.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paras 133-147: importance of green belt to prevent urban sprawl and the need to use brownfield sites first.</p> <p>Dacorum Emerging Core Strategy 2017: importance of green belt round Northchurch.</p> <p>Dacorum Heritage Trust study in 2010: importance of ancient hedgerows and 10m border as wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Dacorum 2017 Conservation Area Appraisal page 52: with regard to the Lock Field, the appraisal states that views from Northchurch to the north towards the river and canal "form part of the character and significance of the conservation area".</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11183
<b>Person ID</b>	1264551
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Somervail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk08 Rossway farm is too far from the station and will encroach on the Chilterns AONB. The extra distance will inevitably result in more car use and worse pollution in Northchurch High Street.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework 2019 paras 133-147: importance of green belt to prevent urban sprawl and the need to use brownfield sites first.</p> <p>Dacorum Emerging Core Strategy 2017: importance of green belt round Northchurch.</p> <p>Dacorum Heritage Trust study in 2010: importance of ancient hedgerows and 10m border as wildlife corridors.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS11184
<b>Person ID</b>	1264551
<b>Full Name</b>	Mark Somervail
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK13 Gossoms End: This site was previously earmarked for a supermarket which will no longer be built so the site could incorporate higher density higher rise housing similar to nearby blocks of flats. This site is within walking distance of Berkhamsted town centre and railway station which will avoid creating an increase in traffic.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11192
<b>Person ID</b>	1268980
<b>Full Name</b>	Ian and Pamela Gamble
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

We would like to re-iterate our concerns around the Shootersway road sites and those in Southern Berkhamsted with regard to biodiversity:

All the areas picked for housing on the southern edge of Berkhamsted are rich in biodiversity and so you cannot possibly say that your plans will enhance species/biodiversity richness. Biodiversity will plummet if you action these plans. Let me explain please:-

The areas that have been proposed for housing along the southern boundary of Berkhamsted were historically part of two large estates, namely the Haresfoot and Ashlyns Estates, which were owned by the Smith and Dorien families. One feature of the several plots of land highlighted namely, Hanburys, Haslam Fields and BFI sites, is the veteran Pedunculate Oaks *Quercus robur* many of which are several hundred years old. These trees can be found in the old hedgerows hereabouts and line the southern edge of the Shootersway road.

Some of the trees show dead timber in their crowns which is natural and doesn't mean the trees have disease. It is these trees that are most biodiverse with the dead timber holding a wealth of invertebrates. These trees are a treasured possession and should be saved at all costs. The general hedgerows are also very rich in this area holding a wide variety of shrubs and trees. The Purple Emperor butterfly has been recorded twice recently in this area. This is a Nationally Scarce 'B' species. The Purple Hairstreak, another local butterfly, is present on the oaks in the area. Two species of moth that are categorised as 'Vulnerable' in Hertfordshire, the Pretty Chalk Carpet and the Alder Moth have been recorded here and two threatened Hertfordshire moth species the White Satin and Brindled Beauty are frequent.

In 2007 the UK Biodiversity Action Plan put together a list of 71 species that were nationally common and widespread but were rapidly declining, for monitoring. Of the 71 species, 61 occur in Hertfordshire. Of the 61 Hertfordshire species, 24 occur within your proposed building area.

Three other moths are worth a mention here: The Mocha, a Nationally scarce 'B' species, has been recorded here and of the four modern Hertfordshire records, two come from south Berkhamsted. This is a rare moth which is found in southern Britain. It is extremely local in the Chilterns where its food plant is Field Maple.

Another local species of South West Britain and a rare species in Hertfordshire with only a dozen records, the Square Spot moth has been recorded within your building area and it is interesting to note that a second was seen close to the building area being found in Hockeridge Wood. This species' larval food plant is oak and other trees. The last interesting species found in this area was the Hemp Agrimony Plume moth with only 20 or so Hertfordshire records.

You must also realise that planting new trees after the removal of old trees is, in one sense, futile. The new trees will have little biodiversity and the amount of photosynthesis they can achieve will be minute compared to a mature tree. The world has serious problems which require immediate action but we see local government and national government paying lip service to climate change and biodiversity. This can be seen with your plans to remove the green belt and in the national government's desire to push through HS2 destroying many important habitats in the Chilterns. Britain is the least biodiverse nation in Europe and unfortunately, if we don't put nature first and give it greater protection our own human survival will be put at risk! An ancient woodland by its name takes hundreds of years to develop and cannot be recreated even in a hundred years, we simply don't have that long.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11216
<b>Person ID</b>	1144644
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Kerr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>We <b>support</b> including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulbourne Cross provides a once in a generation opportunity to build 24 acres of sports facilities for local residents;</li> <li>• It creates a new 30 acre country park, together with 50 acres of new green open space including allotments;</li> <li>• The proposals include 40% affordable housing for local people;</li> <li>• It will reduce the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41;</li> <li>• Build a new Primary School and other education and community facilities;</li> <li>• Overall, the proposal invests in the future of Berkhamsted, delivering community benefits when alternatives to the west do not do so.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11217
<b>Person ID</b>	1144710
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Isabella Kerr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11218
<b>Person ID</b>	1144644
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Kerr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11219
<b>Person ID</b>	1144710
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Isabella Kerr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are writing as residents of Berkhamsted in response to the draft Local Plan consultation, specifically Draft Local Plan Section 23.1 – Berkhamsted Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The proposal to build 240 houses on Haslam fields and the BFI site would place much greater traffic demands on Kings Road and specifically on the junction between Kingshill Way, Shootersway and Kings Road. The junction is already unsafe because of the lack of a separate filter lane for traffic turning right at the top of Kings Road. Further, there is no scope to enlarge Kings Road to cope with a major increase in traffic: the footpaths in this part of Kings Road for pedestrians are already inadequate (or non-existent). The issues here include safety for pedestrians and drivers which would be considerably reduced by the resulting increase in traffic at this junction and along Kings Road; the pollution caused by the increased traffic – already at a standstill at many points in the day; the attractiveness of the town centre which would be reduced by the sheer difficulty in accessing it.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>We <b>support</b> including the proposals from Thakeham and the BSGCA for an allocation to the east of Berkhamsted for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bulbourne Cross provides a once in a generation opportunity to build 24 acres of sports facilities for local residents;</li> <li>• It creates a new 30 acre country park, together with 50 acres of new green open space including allotments;</li> </ul>



- The proposals include 40% affordable housing for local people;
- It will reduce the traffic strain on existing roads through a direct link to the A41;
- Build a new Primary School and other education and community facilities;
- Overall, the proposal invests in the future of Berkhamsted, delivering community benefits when alternatives to the west do not do so.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11272

**Person ID** 221884

**Full Name** Ms Eliza Hermann

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment**  
 I oppose the inclusion of all the proposed Green Belt development sites to the south and west of Berkhamsted. These are sites BK01, BK02, BK03, BK04, BK05, BK06 and BK08. All of these sites are not only in the Green Belt but they are in unsustainable locations at the edge of the built up area and at the top of the steep hills surrounding the town. They are too far from the town centre and its services to be accessible by cycling or walking. If developed they will increase car usage and pollution in and around Berkhamsted including Northchurch, and they will add to the existing congestion, deficiencies and constraints acknowledged by the Council at paras. 23.102 and 23.119.

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

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS11274
<b>Person ID</b>	221884
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eliza Hermann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I also oppose the inclusion of Green Belt sites BK06 and BK07 in particular, at Northchurch, because if developed they will impact negatively on the setting of the Chilterns AONB and run counter to the air pollution mitigation needed in the Northchurch AQMA. In addition, site BK07 at Lock Field has been repeatedly proposed for development in past Plan consultations and repeatedly rejected as a suitable development site because of it's inaccessibility at the one lane bridge over the Grand Union Canal. BK07 is also an important wildlife site and is an integral part of the green setting of the canal and its towpath which are important for recreational use.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11275
<b>Person ID</b>	221884
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Eliza Hermann
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	I also oppose the inclusion of Green Belt site BK09 at Bank Mill for development. The site is in the Green Belt adjacent to the Grand Union Canal and the River Bulbourne and is prone to flooding. I note that the Council acknowledges this flood risk by stating (page 309) that the part of the site most likely to flood would be reserved as "public open space", which is ironic since flooded land is by definition not accessible to the public in any useful way. BK09 is also far from the centre of town and unlikely to be easily accessible by cycling or walking because of this distance, which means this site, like the proposed sites to the south and west of Berkhamsted, would result in increased car traffic, congestion and pollution. Further, site BK09 if developed would amount to "ribbon development" along the canal and the river towards Bourne End, ribbon development being exactly what the planning process seeks to prevent.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11313
<b>Person ID</b>	1269000
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Tracey Franklin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>As Berkhamsted is a valley and as such is limited in the ability to create new road infrastructure, these sites will need to use the narrow and over used roads into the town and as such will have an impact on the health of both the existing residents of the town and the new residents due to a massive increase in carbon emissions.</p> <p>The development using the green space will mean a reduction in areas that are able to assist in addressing air pollution and have the ability to capture airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.</p> <p>As pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity, 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the council states a key objective is 'minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land the impact on the Chilterns AONB', it is very clear that in their hasty mission to provide at least 100% of their self assessed housing needs (which is based on outdated information), they are not taking into account the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and how greatly this will impact and harm the Green Belt and AONB.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11315
<b>Person ID</b>	1269000
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Tracey Franklin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The first point of call is for Brownfield sites to be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all of these spaces, should Green Belt EVEN be considered. Developers are consistently only looking for the greatest financial return and do not even take into consideration the impact their greedy view, has on the environment and the actual residents themselves. The council SHOULD be defending these natural resources at all costs for their residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11338
<b>Person ID</b>	1269007
<b>Full Name</b>	Betty Maton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I object to the proposed development on Green Belt land at Bulbourne Cross on the grounds that it contradicts a Government commitment to fighting climate change and the dramatic reduction of biodiversity around the world, including the massive loss of pollinating insects vital for our food supply. Dacorum Borough Council declared a climate emergency and made a commitment to taking measures to combat it. The UN has recently brought out a report entitled 'Making Peace with Nature',prioritising the restoration of habitats for the benefit of humanity as well as wildlife. Building on 850

hectares of Green Belt deprives people over wide area of the benefits of green spaces, as well as destroying wildlife habitats.

The new development would put more pressure on the infrastructure of the surrounding area, and entail higher water use in an area already under water stress.

It would significantly increase traffic in the area. Residents of the 1,100 new houses would drive to use shops and facilities in Berkhamsted, and residents of Berkhamsted and surrounding villages would drive to the sports facilities, if they are popular. A new slip road to the bypass is not a solution to heavy traffic overall.

Biodiversity is not quickly restored and any newly-created ecosystem would be qualitatively different, it is more valuable to maintain the rich variety of life that has already been established.

There are alternatives to using Green Belt land, which should be maintained for the benefit of the thousands of people living in Dacorum, as well as wildlife which depends on it.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11396

**Person ID** 1269021

**Full Name** RUPERT SELDON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

**Yes / No** Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Further exploration of brownfield opportunities.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11401
<b>Person ID</b>	1262227
<b>Full Name</b>	James White
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposed development of this site would fundamentally change the nature of the town in many ways. The loss of productive and sustainable farm land, so much in need at the moment with the move towards locally-produced food and reducing reliance on imports, would be criminal, and the destruction of woodland and wildlife habitats seems to fly in the face of the council's sustainability targets. These green areas have become a lifeline for many over the past year and no amount of "green corridors" and "wildlife strips" would make up for the loss. Not only that but the development itself would put huge pressure on the existing road infrastructure (Swing Gate Lane, primarily) that is simply not capable of handling the extra traffic this development would entail. Plus, the impact on wastewater handling, and particularly surface run-off down the valley sides, much of which is currently mitigated by the farmland, would be substantial and would lead to increased flooding along the valley floor unless significant upgrade work is carried out across the whole area.</p> <p>Bk02-Bk10</p> <p>All of these sites (in common with Bk01) are accessed via roads which do not have the capacity to support the level of traffic these developments imply. Indeed, during the winter months it is sometimes impossible to access some of these sites due to snow and ice making the roads impassible, making emergency vehicle access extremely difficult. Whilst it is easy to say that these access roads would be gritted to prevent these issues occurring, I know to my cost that even</p>

though Swing Gate Lane is meant to be gritted for precisely these reasons, it is still more than possible to be forced to abandon your vehicle due to heavy snow.

Further development of the valley sides and ridgeline should be avoided until the infrastructure to support the development is in place and proven effective.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11402

**Person ID** 1262227

**Full Name** James White

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

Whilst I am aware that the Thakeham/BSGCA proposal for land east of Bk01 is not currently part of the Plan I would strongly urge the council to reject it. The proposal effectively links Berkhamsted with Bourne End which would lead, in a short space of time not doubt, to the merging of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead, the very thing that Green Belt



land was designed to prevent. In addition, the much-vaunted access from the A41 would do little reduce traffic from the estate accessing services within Berkhamsted, unless the idea is to encourage residents to use services in other locations, which again flies in the face of the council's sustainable development goals.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11407

**Person ID** 1269022

**Full Name** JENNI WHITE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Bk01- South of Berkhamsted

The proposed development of this site would fundamentally change the nature of the town in many ways. The loss of productive and sustainable farm land, so much in need at the moment with the move towards locally-produced food and reducing reliance on imports, would be criminal, and the destruction of woodland and wildlife habitats seems to fly in the face of the council's sustainability targets. These green areas have become a lifeline for many over the past year and no amount of "green corridors" and "wildlife strips" would make up for the loss. Not only that but the development itself would put huge pressure on the existing road infrastructure (Swing Gate Lane, primarily) that is simply not capable of handling the extra traffic this development would entail. Plus, the impact on wastewater handling, and particularly surface run-off down the valley sides, much of which is currently mitigated by the farmland, would be substantial and would lead to increased flooding along the valley floor unless significant upgrade work is carried out across the whole area.

Bk02-Bk10

All of these sites (in common with Bk01) are accessed via roads which do not have the capacity to support the level of traffic these developments imply. Indeed, during the winter months it is sometimes impossible to access some of these

sites due to snow and ice making the roads impassible, making emergency vehicle access extremely difficult. Whilst it is easy to say that these access roads would be gritted to prevent these issues occurring, I know to my cost that even though Swing Gate Lane is meant to be gritted for precisely these reasons, it is still more than possible to be forced to abandon your vehicle due to heavy snow.

Further development of the valley sides and ridgeline should be avoided until the infrastructure to support the development is in place and proven effective.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11408

**Person ID** 1269022

**Full Name** JENNI WHITE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Bulbourne Cross</p> <p>Whilst I am aware that the Thakeham/BSGCA proposal for land east of Bk01 is not currently part of the Plan I would strongly urge the council to reject it. The proposal effectively links Berkhamsted with Bourne End which would lead, in a short space of time not doubt, to the merging of Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead, the very thing that Green Belt land was designed to prevent. In addition, the much-vaunted access from the A41 would do little reduce traffic from the estate accessing services within Berkhamsted, unless the idea is to encourage residents to use services in other locations, which again flies in the face of the council's sustainable development goals.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11412
<b>Person ID</b>	1269023
<b>Full Name</b>	DOUG DUNN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.</p> <p>There are significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.</p> <p>Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.</p>

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11413

**Person ID** 1269023

**Full Name** DOUG DUNN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK06 Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11417
<b>Person ID</b>	1269025
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN MAWER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	This must be resisted by Dacorum. I have specific concerns listed below, but the whole sales approach to this leaves the local community concerned.

- 1 It will cause convergence between Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted. This is something the council has resisted over some time.
- 2 The flyer does not show what the presentation shows. The proposal that the area between Bourne End Lane and Sugar Lane is for pitches. This is a hill well above Bourne End Lane. It would require considerable cutting and with floodlights it would be intrusive.
- 3 The plans are unrealistic, and modification will result in increasing the joining up. This is particularly because the school is unsustainable in the current position. Even from the new housing parents will drive. It will be moved more to the centre with housing moved therefor more towards Bourne End.
- 4 Likewise, the sports facilities which are remote from Berkhamsted. All users will drive.
- 5 The stadium will require considerable parking facilities.
- 6 There is an attraction to the idea of removing through traffic from Bourne End but given the proposed route to the A41 and the sub-standard state of the junction it is highly unlikely to remove it and more likely it would cause and increase. I am not sure how it will reduce traffic in the town centre.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11451

**Person ID** 1264362

**Full Name** Juliet Miller

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** Yes, already explained in Question 4.

The strategy for Berkhamsted and Tring relies too heavily on developing expensive two storey dwellings rather than more affordable higher storey properties on brownfield sites.

The reliance on speculative developers to carry out this work will do nothing to ensure the affordability of housing, the plan does not protect against the risk that property prices will be artificially inflated by developers banking land, and/or building properties which are unaffordable to people who work locally.

This plan will create housing but will destroy great swathes of countryside. Properties will not be affordable to people working locally and the developments will draw in new commuter residents. The plan will not solve the housing shortage experienced by local residents and workers.

The number of dwellings proposed exceeds that which is sustainable for the combined capacity of the market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring. The infrastructure of these two areas is interlined and interconnected. In terms of transport, their High Roads are linked by the main routes between the towns and the main arteries into the towns. They both also rely on the A41, the same train line and shopping facilities. There is no local hospital between the two towns. The two towns share the same bus routes. The delivery strategy takes no account of the combined pressure on the infrastructure which would be created by the combination of the proposed large house building projects in both Berkhamsted and Tring.

The main Berkhamsted developments are at the edge of town. As Berkhamsted is in a valley, most residents in those developments will need to use private passenger vehicles to travel into town and in order to connect with public transport hubs. The proposals in these locations are for family homes and retirement properties. It is not practical or realistic to expect families or elderly residents to travel by foot or bicycle from these developments. Furthermore, the routes into town and to the railway station from the proposed sites are through narrow residential roads with on-street parking. The proposed sites will cause immense congestion on those roads, increasing pollution and hazards to pedestrians.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS11531
<b>Person ID</b>	1144732
<b>Full Name</b>	MR john reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11532
<b>Person ID</b>	1144732
<b>Full Name</b>	MR john reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	



**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The following comments apply to the sites at Northchurch -- 1.Durrants Lane /Bell Lane / Darrs Lane and 2. New Road.

The first seic and the inherent increase in pollution.

The New Road Development --

- 1 With 60 houses being built it will mean at least 120 cars being added to an already busy road and undoubtedly the existing very small bridges will be unable to meet these additional requirements -- especially where the road narrows to one lane. This is already a very difficult area for pedestrians to
- 2 New Road is the access road for St Mary's Primary School and a large sheltered housing accommodation for the elderly.
- 3 It is already difficult to access the A4251 from New Road particularly at the time of school arrivals and departures with a significant build up of traff

t of comments apply to both sites -

- 1 Has anyone actually visited either site to review the increase in traffic that will have to use the A4251 and the impact on air quality which is already a major issue in that area.
- 2 The destruction of the environment and the impact on local wildlife and flora and fauna will be
- 3 With a proposed increase of 260 dwellings how will local roads cope without major reconstruction of those roads.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11533
<b>Person ID</b>	1144732
<b>Full Name</b>	MR john reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The following comments apply to the sites at Northchurch -- 1.Durrants Lane /Bell Lane / Darrs Lane and 2. New Road.</p> <p>The first set of comments apply to both sites -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Has anyone actually visited either site to review the increase in traffic that will have to use the A4251 and the impact on air quality which is already a major issue in that area.</li> <li>2 The destruction of the environment and the impact on local wildlife and flora and fauna will be</li> <li>3 With a proposed increase of 260 dwellings how will local roads cope without major reconstruction of those roads.</li> </ol> <p>The Durrants Lane / Bell Lane / Darrs Lane Development</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 This is an area of Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which it is proposed should be destroyed. The impact on the well being of local residents will be immense.</li> <li>2 The practicalities of developing this site do not appear to have been considered. Neither Bell Lane nor Darrs Lane have more than a single track and how cars / school busses etc will use these roads is beyond comprehension.</li> </ol> <p>c.The proposal takes no account of the gradient that that this land has. It will be fine to walk down to the local shops but it is difficult to imagine how many people will be walking back up to their home.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 200 houses will bring in another 400 cars to an area that is already heavy with traffic</li> </ol>

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11534
<b>Person ID</b>	1144732
<b>Full Name</b>	MR john reynolds
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	Why not use the brownfield site on A4251 where the proposed Lidl store was to be built.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11539

<b>Person ID</b>	1269120
<b>Full Name</b>	JANE VELLACOTT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 - I strongly object to any buidling proposal on the Lockfield site which occupies a green belt site and is located on the northern fringes of the village of Northchurch.</p> <p>DBC could not have found a more inappropriate site:.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Building BK07 would make New Road even more dangerous; there are regular incidents including accidents and road kill. The intended exit from Lockfield would be far from safe, the road is narrow here, on a hill which traffic speeds down, there is a poor sight line to the bridge, which is single track and with a blind spot on the other side. There is only one narrow pavement, not suitable for push chairs or wheelchairs and which would require people to cross from the Lockfield site. There is no space for the proposed cycle path. The hedge bordering Lockfield on New Road is an exteremly productive one with evidence of an ambundenet wildlife.</li> <li>1 Northchurch is a village and has not been afforded even the recognition of this in the DBC local plan. It predates Berkhamsted, has one of the oldest churches and alm houses in Hertfordhire. It is not a ribbon development of Berkhamsted, and has a very separate identity. It is semi rural, has stunning views over the Chiltern Hills (AONB) and is the gateway to Northchurch Common and Ashridge National Trust Woodland</li> <li>1 Congestion builds up very easily on New Road, not only at busy times but if there is any activity such as when the cesspits are being emptied, there is no mains drainage north of the canal bridge; cars and lorries can commonly be queuing up past the turning to Bridgewater Hill.</li> </ol>

- 1 Pollution levels have been measured as high outside the primary school, potential for another 120 cars and deliveries associated with the proposed 60 houses would make this worse
  
- 1 The location of Lockfield is rural with the canal on one side, fields another, railway and allotments on the third side and low density housing on its fourth side; it can not in any way be described as urban. Wild animals can be frequently seen on the road.
  
- 1 Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The Grand Union canal is bordered by an unique chalk stream which any additional builds or changes in the road could irreversibly damage its ecosystem. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this habitat.
  
- 1 Building density locally is currently 10 homes per hectare, the building proposal for Lockfield is 27+ homes per hectare
  
- 1 The view from the houses on New Road and Bridgewater Hill enjoy some of the finest in the area, looking over to the Chiltern Hills (AONB). We also enjoy every sunset throughout the year. The proposed building on Lockfield would destroy this view and the quality of life of those people who currently enjoy such a The views over Northchurch are its key characterisctic and should not be impacted. DBC should protect this village and the views as it said it would (and as inidicated in the Glover report)..
  
- 1 DBC's ability to ensure developers stick with their agreement to bring enhancements promised is a concern - in New Road alone there is no link road and a ravaged ancient hedge from illegal access from new houses
  
- 1 In previous plannig appraisals DBC has highlighted a number of cons regarding building on the Lockfield site, these remain: "the site is insufficient on itts own, but could be phased with other land"; this would just extend the ribbon development along to Dudswell and the available land at times is very narrow between canal and railway, in fact the Lockfield site is very narrow in places. Lockfield is "some distance from the town" and next to the Chiltern AONB - it still is. "The site is too small for additional town wide leisure space"," it is a visually prominent site" - it still is!. And"it would impact on the canal setting" - it certainly would. It also remains very dangerous.

In summary I challenge the scale of DBC's proposed development and calculation on which the need for housing is based. I believe the land at BK06 has been considered prematurely as the needed assessments have not been completed

and above all I object strongly to the proposed build on BK07 Lockfield because of its wildlife corridors, chalk stream, village character and above all the many safety concerns.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11540

**Person ID** 1269120

**Full Name** JANE VELLACOTT

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed, the inclusion of Darrs Lane in the planning proposal seems premature as well as inappropriate for many of the reasons stated above.

In summary I challenge the scale of DBC's proposed development and calculation on which the need for housing is based. I believe the land at BK06 has been considered prematurely as the needed assessments have not been completed and above all I object strongly to the proposed build on BK07 Lockfield because of its wildlife corridors, chalk stream, village character and above all the many safety concerns.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11569
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, contains 'Long Green' LWS (which is also Common Land).</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Largely agricultural land with boundary trees and hedgerows. Sandpit Green to the south is part of 'Sandpit Green &amp; Long Green' Common Land.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present; and reptiles in rough vegetation</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p>

Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low – High if LWS trees affected. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

Yes, LWS. Ecological Appraisal and/or LWS \quality survey may be required.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11570

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk02: British Film Institute</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Previously developed land. Mature hedgerows border the site and nearby</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Limited due to nature of site. Buffer hedgerows. Create / enhance green corridors to the south of the site. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Consider measures to achieve net gain</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p> <p>Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p> <p>None. Ecological Appraisal may be required. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11571
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333

<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Across the road from Ecosite 'Cross Oak Meadow &amp; Wood (Shootersway), Berkhamsted', on the western side</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land; sports field and paddock? Divided by hedgerow and bound by trees / hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present; and reptiles in rough vegetation.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain trees and hedgerows. Provide green corridor along south-western edge to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the NaturalEngland Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low as considered unlikely to have any significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11572
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11573
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333

<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11574
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b></p>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Yes, adjacent to Ecosite 'The Rookery', the southern part of which is in the Ancient Woodland Inventory</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Undeveloped land. Agricultural fields bordered by trees / hedgerows. Cut. Scattered trees / copse in western field.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Bats known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Retain trees and hedgerows. Provide green corridors to adjacent habitats and to the south. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p> <p>Low as considered unlikely to have any significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p> <p>None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<p><b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No</p>	
<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b></p>	
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS11575</p>

<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> Yes, south- east part is Ecosite 'Land north of Grand Union Canal</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> The western end is across the canal from south- eastern end of an Ecosite known as 'River Bulbourne Meadow (upper) Northchurch – Dudswell'</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Largely undeveloped land. Some hardstanding at north-western end, and track</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Bats and Badgers known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain trees and hedgerows. Provide a green corridor to adjacent habitats, especially along the canal. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low as considered unlikely any significant habitats present. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p>

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS11576

**Person ID**

1207333

**Full Name**

Growth Team

**Organisation Details**

Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

Yes, south- eastern end is Ecosite 'Cross Oak Meadow & Wood (Shootersway), Berkhamsted.

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

Yes, adjacent to 'Meadow S.W. of Shootersway Road' LWS; and Ecosite 'Shootersway Green'

**Other features**

Undeveloped land with agricultural fields, woodland at north-western end, hedgerows and scattered trees.

**Protected species**

Bats and badgers are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.

### **Opportunities**

Retain trees and hedgerows. Provide a green corridor to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof

### **Ecological sensitivity**

Low as considered unlikely any significant habitats present. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

### **Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11577

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**



Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11578
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk04: Land between Hanburys and A41</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land. Agricultural field, cut. Boundary hedgerows, some mature.</p>

**Protected species**

Badgers known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Provide green corridor to adjacent habitats and to the south. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the NaturalEngland Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low as considered unlikely to have any significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11579

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk05: Blegberry Gardens</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b></p> <p>Yes, adjacent to 'Meadow S.W. of Shootersway Road' LWS.</p> <p><b>Other features</b></p> <p>Undeveloped land. Field, cut. Bordered by trees / hedgerows and woodland *LWS).</p> <p><b>Protected species</b></p> <p>Badgers known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b></p> <p>Provide green corridor to adjacent habitats, LWS, and to the south. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p> <p>Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b></p> <p>Low as considered unlikely to have any significant habitats. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b></p> <p>None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11580
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk09: Bank Mill Lane</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> Within 16m of 'Grand Union Canal, River Bulbourne' Ecosite</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Undeveloped land, grazed. Hedgerow divides two fields, boundary trees / hedgerows.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Potential otter habitat. Bats are known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees and roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present; and reptiles in rough vegetation.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Retain trees and hedgerows.</p>

Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi- natural habitats

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low – medium if trees affected. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11581

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** Growth Area Bk10: Hanburys

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

No

**Other features**

Field with pond; and two large residential properties with large gardens. Mature trees.

**Protected species**

Badgers known to be in the area. There may be potential for nesting birds in trees; and roosting bats in mature trees if suitable roosting features are present.

**Opportunities**

Retain trees and hedgerows. Provide green corridor to adjacent habitats. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates. If whole site or a significant area is lost to development, consider measurable biodiversity offsetting to mitigate for loss of semi-natural habitats

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Offsetting will be expected and should be informed by an appropriate metric. We advise using the Natural England Biodiversity Metric 2.0 or subsequent versions thereof.

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low – medium if trees affected. Avoid light spill on adjacent trees / woody habitats.

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None apparent. Ecological Appraisal may be required to determine ecological interest and impacts of any development

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment****Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11582

**Person ID** 1207333

<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site)</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land. Boundary trees. Close to canal at northern edge.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> Unlikely although there may be potential for roosting bats in mature trees and buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Retain trees. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> Consider measures to achieve net gain</p> <p><b>Ecological sensitivity</b> Low. Avoid light spill on adjacent habitats.</p> <p><b>Fundamental ecological constraint</b> None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11583
<b>Person ID</b>	1207333
<b>Full Name</b>	Growth Team
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Growth team Hertfordshire County Council
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street</b></p> <p><b>Recognised ecology sites within Site</b> No</p> <p><b>Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site</b> No</p> <p><b>Other features</b> Previously developed land.</p> <p><b>Protected species</b> There may be potential for roosting bats in buildings if suitable roosting features are present.</p> <p><b>Opportunities</b> Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates.</p> <p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b></p>



Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None. Preliminary Roost Assessment may be required.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS11584

**Person ID**

1207333

**Full Name**

Growth Team

**Organisation Details**

Growth team  
Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

**Growth Area Bk13: Gossoms End / Billet Lane**

**Recognised ecology sites within Site**

No

**Recognised sites adjacent/ close to site**

No

**Other features**

Previously developed land Units, hardstanding, vehicles

**Protected species**

Unlikely

**Opportunities**

Limited. Consider Biodiversity Net Gain measures such as native-species planting / wildflower sowing and habitat boxes for bats, birds, hedgehogs and invertebrates

**Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

Consider measures to achieve net gain

**Ecological sensitivity**

Low

**Fundamental ecological constraint**

None.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11586

**Person ID** 1269146

**Full Name** MAXWELL CLIFTON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.

Having grown up in the area, I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11587
<b>Person ID</b>	1269146
<b>Full Name</b>	MAXWELL CLIFTON
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK06 Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11603
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>BK2 – BFI site:</b> 90 homes / <b>BK3 - Haslam Fields:</b> 150 homes / <b>BK4 - land between Hanbury and A41:</b> 70 homes / <b>BK5 - Blegberry Gardens:</b> 80 homes. This makes an additional 390 dwellings using Shootersway plus 176 recently developed at the junction with Durrants Lane known as Bearoc plus the already approved BK10 - Hanbury (This permission increased numbers from 40 to 100+ and was for 4/5 storey elderly persons flats instead of the family houses, omitting the public open space and improved wildlife, clearly flying in the face of the approved Development Guidance which shows that the Council considers these detailed plans for sites as merely a very rough approximation of what they will finally allow on sites! The proposals for wildlife enhancement and provision of public open space was completely ignored in the rush for more dwellings. This doesn't bode well for the actual development of future sites.</p> <p>These, together with <b>BK1 – South of Berkhamsted</b> - 850 homes, will further fill the gap between existing development and the A41 bypass.</p> <p>Shootersway was a quiet road with houses on large plots forming a soft transition from the urban development to the rural land to the south. The previously planned “green lung” between the A41 bypass and Berkhamsted is to be eroded by building completely along the corridor representing poor urban design with an abrupt edge to this market town set in open countryside. It will be detrimental to views to and from the wider rural landscape which lies within the CAONB, including noise and light pollution which severely affects some mammals and birds. Each site mentions the provision of a wildlife corridor and public access. However, this would be reduced to a narrow strip beyond the sites' boundaries immediately adjacent to the A41, a heavily trafficked road causing severe disturbance by virtue of noise, lighting and air pollution. It looks like all the ‘green’ intentions are forgotten with a catastrophic effect on wildlife totally contrary to the Council's biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>Despite this vast increase in dwellings, there is no public transport to this part of town and given the distance from the town centre and community facilities including health and education and location on the ridge of a steeply sloping hill, is not conducive to walking or cycling. It is fatuous to think that people will forgo their cars if they live in this area if they want to visit the town or any meaningful public open space which the Local Plan will not provide. The Council itself has acknowledged that the location of these sites on the valley ridge would 'generally discourage movements by foot and</p>

cycle'. Therefore, development on this scale on the southern edge of town is not sustainable and the proposals are deeply flawed.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS11604

Person ID 1269148

Full Name SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

**BK2 – BFI site:** 90 homes / **BK3 - Haslam Fields:** 150 homes / **BK4 - land between Hanbury and A41:** 70 homes / **BK5 - Blegberry Gardens:** 80 homes. This makes an additional 390 dwellings using Shootersway plus 176 recently developed at the junction with Durrants Lane known as Bearoc plus the already approved BK10 - Hanbury (This permission increased numbers from 40 to 100+ and was for 4/5 storey elderly persons flats instead of the family houses, omitting the public open space and improved wildlife, clearly flying in the face of the approved Development Guidance which shows that the Council considers these detailed plans for sites as merely a very rough approximation of what they will finally allow on sites! The proposals for wildlife enhancement and provision of public open space was completely ignored in the rush for more dwellings. This doesn't bode well for the actual development of future sites.

These, together with **BK1 – South of Berkhamsted** - 850 homes, will further fill the gap between existing development and the A41 bypass.

In Dacorum's Consultation on Issues and Options for the new Local Plan in 2017, the **Haslam Fields Site (BK3)** was divided into housing on 3.8ha and biodiversity on 2.7ha. Some 80 -100 dwellings were proposed with a large area of public open space /walking field/wildlife area towards the rear. This Plan proposes 150 dwellings and a narrow wildlife corridor, another indication of how the Council disregards appropriate scale of development and provision for wildlife.

Despite this vast increase in dwellings, there is no public transport to this part of town and given the distance from the town centre and community facilities including health and education and location on the ridge of a steeply sloping hill, is not conducive to walking or cycling. It is fatuous to think that people will forgo their cars if they live in this area if they want to visit the town or any meaningful public open space which the Local Plan will not provide. The Council itself has acknowledged that the location of these sites on the valley ridge would 'generally discourage movements by foot and cycle'. Therefore, development on this scale on the southern edge of town is not sustainable and the proposals are deeply flawed.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11606
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK2 – BFI site:</b> 90 homes / <b>BK3 - Haslam Fields:</b> 150 homes / <b>BK4 - land between Hanbury and A41:</b> 70 homes / <b>BK5 - Blegberry Gardens:</b> 80 homes. This makes an additional 390 dwellings using Shootersway plus 176 recently

developed at the junction with Durrants Lane known as Bearoc plus the already approved BK10 - Hanbury (This permission increased numbers from 40 to 100+ and was for 4/5 storey elderly persons flats instead of the family houses, omitting the public open space and improved wildlife, clearly flying in the face of the approved Development Guidance which shows that the Council considers these detailed plans for sites as merely a very rough approximation of what they will finally allow on sites! The proposals for wildlife enhancement and provision of public open space was completely ignored in the rush for more dwellings. This doesn't bode well for the actual development of future sites.

These, together with **BK1 – South of Berkhamsted** - 850 homes, will further fill the gap between existing development and the A41 bypass.

BK2 – British Film Institute site. This site contains listed buildings in an open setting. The provision of 90 dwellings will seriously affect the setting of the main buildings, and will be disrespectful to the adjacent cemetery which warrants a quiet and landscaped setting. With the vast increase in population in the area, there will undoubtedly be a need for addition land for the cemetery which the BFI site could provide.

Despite this vast increase in dwellings, there is no public transport to this part of town and given the distance from the town centre and community facilities including health and education and location on the ridge of a steeply sloping hill, is not conducive to walking or cycling. It is fatuous to think that people will forgo their cars if they live in this area if they want to visit the town or any meaningful public open space which the Local Plan will not provide. The Council itself has acknowledged that the location of these sites on the valley ridge would 'generally discourage movements by foot and cycle'. Therefore, development on this scale on the southern edge of town is not sustainable and the proposals are deeply flawed.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11607
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK8 - Rossway Farm</b> 200 homes. This site was not included in the draft schedule of Site Appraisals, November 2017 and for good reason. It should not be considered now. It is in open countryside in the Green Belt abutting the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is on the ridge of the valley a considerable distance from the town centre and facilities with no easy access. It is clearly unsustainable and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify its development. It further erodes the open countryside beyond the recognised urban area and together with BK6, will begin to coalesce Berkhamsted with Northchurch, clearly contrary to the aims of the Green Belt. Its location on Shootersway will put added pressure for possible future development joining with Blegberry (Bk5) for continuous development along the southern side of Shootersway.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11608
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK 6 - East of Darrs Lane</b> 200 homes - This 22ha parcel of land at the Northchurch end of Berkhamsted, would further erode any distinction between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. It would coalesce with the very low density of existing development along the western side of Darrs Lane, and that on the southern side of Shootersway (BK8). The site is steeply sloping so would be highly visible from the northern side of the valley and the CAONB. It abuts the boundary with the CAONB to the west and would therefore severely impinge on its appearance and character. Both Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are very narrow, steep rural lanes and cannot take any further traffic. Walking and cycling is not considered to be feasible due to the nature of the site. It is a considerable distance from the facilities of both Northchurch and Berkhamsted and further traffic through Northchurch High Street will impact on the AQMA.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11609
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK7 - Lock Field Northchurch</b> 60 homes - This narrow site is constrained by the main line railway, the canal and the River Bulbourne. This section of New Road is hazardous, sloping and very busy with narrow footpaths. This is not conducive for safe use by walkers or cyclists. Again, this would result in additional traffic on the already busy roads with a poor junction at the High Street. Northchurch High Street has already been noted as an Area of Air Quality Management

and the added pollution from traffic would further diminish air quality. Any development here, assuming there are no flooding issues, would put severe pressure on traffic over the canal bridge and parking on both sides of the road creates a hazard. Climate change has increased the risk of flooding in numerous areas and as this is adjacent to the River Bulbourne and the canal, no development should be allowed.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11610
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK9 - Bank Mill Lane</b> 50 homes - This is a water meadow with the adjacent new building having exacerbated the problem and this should not be included at all. It also serves as a soft edge at the entrance to the historic market town. The River Bulbourne has already suffered from the proximity of the recent adjacent development which has substantially reduced the wildlife corridor and any further development will severely affect this nationally important chalk stream. Given the increased propensity for flooding due to climate change and increased development, there should be NO development on this flood plain.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11611
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK11 - Billet Lane/Jewsons</b> 40 homes and <b>BK13 Gossoms End/Billet Lane</b> 30 homes. These sites should be developed in conjunction with each other when the opportunity could be taken to expose and improve the River Bulbourne, a valuable chalk stream.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11612
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>BK11 - Billet Lane/Jewsons</b> 40 homes and <b>BK13 Gossoms End/Billet Lane</b> 30 homes. These sites should be developed in conjunction with each other when the opportunity could be taken to expose and improve the River Bulbourne, a valuable chalk stream.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11640
<b>Person ID</b>	1269148
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON AND ANNA BARNARD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	In light of the effects of the pandemic, an urgent review should be undertaken in the urban areas to identify any buildings no longer in retail or business use which could be suitable for rebuilding or conversion to residential use.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11651
<b>Person ID</b>	1269150
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Helena Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The majority of the proposed building sites in Berkhamsted are adjacent to the A41 - a very busy and main highway with significant amount of daily traffic. This will have detrimental effects on the both existing and new residents of Berkhamsted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The areas of greenbelt next to the A41 are the "green lungs" that help protect the towns from the increased level of pollution resulting from such a major highways. Removing these areas, as the plan proposes, will impact the health of many residents.</li> <li>• Building houses next to the A41 would surely impact the health of new residents in those developments and therefore increasing pressure on the West Hertfordshire health network of GPs and</li> </ul> <p>Brownfield sites or under-utilised urban areas should be used for development before the removal of any green belt areas.</p> <p>The council should be looking to save our greenbelt areas not development them.</p>
<b>Yes / No * Yes</b>	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11652
<b>Person ID</b>	1269150
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Helena Parr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>Brownfield sites or under-utilised urban areas should be used for development before the removal of any green belt areas. For example, the Lidl site in Berkhamsted that is still unused since it was proposed in 2014, could be re-generated into a number of dwellings together with an additional green space for residents.</p> <p>The sites used should encourage walking, discourage car use and should also have zero emissions.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11697
<b>Person ID</b>	1146103

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Simon Toon
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>need to be revised.</p> <p>I also object on the basis that these proposals are not in line with the following Local Plan Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserving and protecting the environment: The majority of these developments have been planned for Green Belt land, which would be lost forever, along with numerous plant and animal species currently living</li> <li>• Promoting and facilitating sustainable transport and connectivity: Since the majority of and the largest developments are proposed for areas that are realistically only accessible by car, transport links are not It will also make congestion in and around Northchurch and Berkhamsted worse. We live in Northchurch and currently drive up to Shootersway to reach the A41, as the High Street is frequently already congested. Almost all these developments are expected to use Shootersway as their primary access road, which will make the road congested too and will result in us having to find alternative routes and increase our journey time. This will also impact on our wellbeing as residents and will be worse for the environment.</li> </ul> <p>Both Berkhamsted and Northchurch have a historic core along their most important transport routes so that there is no scope to widen the roads to allow for cycle lanes and the proposed pavement enhancements. That's why these developments are not compatible with this objective.</p>



- Supporting community health, wellbeing and cohesion: Increasing traffic and pollution in Berkhamsted and Nortchurch, building on the green belt, destroying the village character of Northchurch and wonderful nature that surrounds the village and with that opportunities to enjoy nature and the outdoors, will worsen all of these things for
- Enabling the delivery of infrastructure: The proposed infrastructure improvements are There is no mention of improving the local road network (which is not always possible anyhow), more parking spaces in Berkhamsted, doctor's surgeries to support the developments.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11698

**Person ID** 1146103

**Full Name** Mr Simon Toon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

More specifically:

Bk01: I object to this proposal because there is insufficient access from this site to Berkhamsted town centre and this site contravenes all the objectives mentioned above. Chesham Road is partly a one-way street, providing access only FROM the High Street and only halfway down FROM the development. It also leads past Ashlyns secondary school. As

a parent of children at the school I know that it is a single-track road at school drop-off and collection times resulting in traffic queues in both directions. Part access TO the High Street would be via Hilltop Road, which is residential and has several traffic-calming islands - it does not have the potential to take a potential additional 1700 cars and neither is it meant to.

Swing Gate Lane on the other side has similar issues. It is a fairly narrow road, has cars parked on it from existing houses and leads past two primary schools with the same issues as above. It is simply not capable of taking the amount of traffic this site would bring.

Bk06: I object to this site as it contravenes all the objectives I mentioned above. This large number of houses would destroy the village character of Northchurch instead of preserving this historic and attractive village (the proposal is wrong to state that this is an urban development - most of the land is behind Granville Road, which is part of Northchurch village).

It would also destroy a large amount of green belt irrevocably, which completely goes against the objective of preserving the environment. Opportunities for walking, enjoying nature, the views of the green hills surrounding us would be lost. All of these things would have a detrimental impact on the wellbeing and the health of Northchurch residents, which also contradicts an objective of the Plan.

Again, the Plan completely fails to take into account the local road infrastructure and fails on the transport objective. Primary access is supposed to be from Shootersway, however it unrealistic to assume that people would take this route when trying to access the railway station or the

town's amenities. Also given all the existing new developments and the ones in the Local Plan that are supposed to use Shootersway as their primary route, Shootersway, which is a 30mph residential road, will be congested with the amount of traffic generated from all these sites and people will try to use other roads, such as Darrs Lane and Bell Lane.

Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are called 'lane' for a reason: they are rural lanes, very narrow and single track in some areas. On Darrs Lane, cars driving up the hill frequently have to reverse halfway down the hill to give way to a car coming from the top, which they couldn't see due to bends in the road. Bell Lane doesn't actually provide access to the High Street, cars will have to either go left on Granville Road, which is single track thanks to the cars parked there or right on Westfield Road, which is also fairly parked up by residents and cannot sustain so much additional traffic. Both these roads are completely unsuitable for the amount of traffic the new development plus a school would bring.

Both Darrs Lane and Bell Lane also lack pavements for the parts further up the hill so it is not realistic to expect people to walk. Cycling is only for the fittest, as both are steep hills. This does not align with the environmental objective of the Plan either. The families with small children and older people who are expected to move into these new houses would definitely drive.

Widening these lanes, which is not specifically mentioned in the Plan, would result in ancient hedgerows and the habitats of numerous species to be lost, which goes against the environmental objective.

Bk07: I object to this proposed site again. As residents we objected when it was first proposed and the circumstances have not changed. This site is completely unsuitable as the primary access road, New Road, cannot take the additional traffic of potentially 120 cars, which goes against the sustainable transport objective. New Road is a fairly narrow rural road (cars frequently drive on the pavement to avoid oncoming cars). It has a pavement only on one side, the opposite side of the proposed site. The pavement is only wide enough for one person to walk on, badly maintained and therefore dangerous. The proposed SP-B10 (Spatial Package Berkhamsted 10) which I had to google to find, as it is not linked to in the Plan, explains how the pavements will be improved up to the location of the new development, but nothing that would reduce the congestion of cars (and the knock-on effect to buses). Cars approach from Ashridge with considerable speed. Cars going towards Ashridge speed up after the bridge. There have been 4 accidents on that stretch of New Road in the past 4 months. Existing residents have been struck by passing cars when walking down the pavement and many do not walk their children to school down that road as they deem it too dangerous.

The bridge across the canal is single-track, historic and cannot be widened, which not only cannot sustain the additional traffic from the proposed site but is also the reason New Road frequently turns into a single track with bad visibility when cars park there near the bridge. Congestion queues can go back into Ashridge. The extra pollution and the increased danger from the vastly increased traffic would result in loss of quality of life for us residents and contravenes the environmental and wellbeing objectives.

Residents of the proposed site would go into Berkhamsted or Tring via the High Street and this would take them past St. Mary's primary school. Thanks to existing housing around the school and parking issues, adding up to 120 cars from the site would increase road dangers and pollution for residents, children and parents.

While cycling should be encouraged it is only possible along the canal, as Northchurch High Street is too narrow and cannot be widened for cycle lanes. A cyclist on the narrow High Street will hold up traffic behind him, which increases pollution and danger for road users and residents along the road. Therefore cycle lanes along the main transport route

are not a realistic proposal – indeed no such provision is included in the Berkhamsted and Tring Transport Strategy (Apr 2020)

[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/berkhamsted-and-tring-sustainable-transport-study.pdf?sfvrsn=42ce0c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/berkhamsted-and-tring-sustainable-transport-study.pdf?sfvrsn=42ce0c9e_4) .

Furthermore, this site proposal does not comply with the objective to preserve the environment. Local scientists have found the site is home to numerous animal and plant species, which would all lose their habitat.

Lastly, this side of the canal and this part of Northchurch village is very rural and quiet. We have deer and badgers going through our gardens. Adding a further 60 houses would impact badly on this part of the village and change the character of it. As residents, our quality of life and also our health and wellbeing would be impacted adversely by the change in our neighbourhood, as well as the increase in traffic caused by it.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11699

**Person ID** 1146103

**Full Name** Mr Simon Toon

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk13: I approve of this site because it has been derelict and unused for years. We were promised a Lidl but it was never built. This side of town could do with a supermarket, especially a budget one, as the next Aldi/Lidl is a 20-minute drive away and many people could walk to this one instead of driving to Waitrose or Tesco, which would have a positive impact on pollution.  This would indeed align with some Plan objectives.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11706
<b>Person ID</b>	1269219
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE SOUTO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted  The plan is for 850 dwellings which is a huge number. Access is proposed via Swing Gate Lane and Chesham Road which are not big roads and cannot possibly be expected to take this amount of traffic. Traffic around Ashlyns School is already problematic and this will make it so much worse. It will lead to an increase in air pollution especially along roads where children are walking to school.  The site is right next to the A41 and residents would be able to hear the traffic constantly. Also this natural buffer between the town and the A41 would be lost.  I understand the need for growth, but 850 dwellings is massive. Could the proposal not be reduced to say 200 dwellings which would have a much lesser impact on the area?

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11707
<b>Person ID</b>	1269219
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE SOUTO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area BK06: east of Darrs Lane This comprises 2 sites one to the South of Westfield Road, which seems like a natural extension of this estate. The land up the hill to the east of Darrs Lane is a huge piece of land on a hill. I would be concerned that the drainage currently provided by this land would be removed which would increase flood risk to the valley. Surely a compromise could be struck where just one part of this land was taken forward? Drainage in my road Valley Road is already very poor, and when there is a lot of rain, the drains already block and we have issues with water coming back up from the drains on the ground floor.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11708
<b>Person ID</b>	1269219
<b>Full Name</b>	CAROLINE SOUTO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm The proposal is for 200 dwellings and again this is right next to the busy A41. I would also be concerned about the increased traffic that this would bring to Shootersway. This road is already very busy especially at peak times with the traffic queuing right back to the Cross Oak and Denny's Lane roundabout. Again the road is used by children walking to school and the development would bring increased air pollution.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11778
<b>Person ID</b>	1269235
<b>Full Name</b>	Miss Eleanor Smith
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.</p> <p>Having grown up on New Road, Northchurch, I have significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.</p> <p>Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.</p> <p>Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further and could be tantamount to murder.</p> <p>In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.</p> <p>Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.</p> <p>The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. I love nothing more than coming home and opening my curtains in the morning to these views. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.</p>



Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

BK06

Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11817

**Person ID** 1205265

**Full Name** Mr Paul McCann

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID** 1123925

**Agent Full Name** Mr  
Les  
West

**Agent Organisation** Director  
Les West Planning

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Site Allocation Bk07

**General Comments**

CALA Homes supports the proposed site allocation Bk07 at Lockfields for around 60 dwellings.

CALA, and its predecessor Banner Homes, have been promoting Lockfields as a site for housing for many years. Lockfields, together with the adjacent former Sea Cadets' site is an ideal location for a modest expansion of Northchurch being situated within close proximity to a primary school and easy walking distance to local shops. Although the site is currently in the Green Belt it has been shown in the study undertaken by Arup on behalf of the Council that the site makes no contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and should be classed as brownfield land in recognition of its historic ad hoc use as a storage site for railway maintenance works as well as a site for a meeting and storage hut for the Sea Cadets.

Also, the site has been identified by the Council in the past as a potential housing site in earlier draft local plans.

Development of this site for housing will provide a number of significant benefits to the local community as follows:-

- Beneficial use of semi-derelict site
- Creation of publicly accessible canal side walkway and open space
- Provision of a housing development with a range of housing types including 40% affordable accommodation
- Delivering homes designed to be sympathetic to the local vernacular style
- Funding local transport improvements

All of the site-specific requirements listed on pages 307 and 308 can be addressed in the planning application for the proposed development in a satisfactory manner. CALA has provided the Council with all of its background reports apart from the advice on flood risk which is attached to these representations.

CALA agrees with the Council's estimated capacity of the site being able to deliver around 60 dwellings and has prepared an initial site layout plan to demonstrate how this might be achieved.

### **Urban Design**

CALA agrees that a public open space will be incorporated into the proposals which will be easily accessible to the wider community.

### **Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport**

General comments

If necessary and subject to a detailed assessment CALA is willing to make contributions to new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links as well as to off-site enhancements to the local road network.

In 2017/2018 discussions took place between CALA and Northchurch Parish Council on a package of transport measures that the Parish Council were seeking in connection with development of this site. All the suggestions made by the Parish Council at that time were appraised and agreed by CALA, where possible.

The measures currently envisaged by CALA, which are shown on a plan submitted to the Borough Council with a Transport Scoping Study (TSS) prepared by transport consultants WSP in 2018, largely reflect the proposals previously put forward by the Parish Council. The Study also showed that the development of the site would not be detrimental to existing residents. This Study has been previously forwarded to the Borough Council.

Detailed comments for each bullet point are set out below :-

Access to be provided via New Road (B4506)

This is agreed and is shown on CALA's draft masterplan for the site.

Contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station, including off-site provision.

CALA's comment on this bullet point is by reference to details for Footway and bus improvements for the site in the Berkhamsted and Tring Transport Strategy 2020 prepared for the Borough Council by AECOM, ref. SP-B10 Spatial Package Berkhamsted 10 - New Road as part of its evidence base for the draft Local Plan, page 112.

It is noted that the proposed 'works' largely align with those set out in WSP's TSS and shown on their drawing 70036486 SK001 included with the TSS referred to above. The only point of difference is the proposed inclusion of raised tables for the informal crossing points in 'Bi91.g'. This change will need to be reviewed during the design stage as there are implications for some of the proposed parking spaces opposite the school.

The level of financial contributions to wider improvements will require justification through the Transport Assessment accompanying any future planning application. Therefore, this bullet point should be amended to add "if necessary".

Contribute towards off-site enhancements to the local road network, including but not limited to junction improvements along New Road (B4506) and High Street (A4251).

As it is not envisaged that there will be any significant impact of additional traffic on the wider network, CALA sees no justification for contributions for off-site enhancements to the road network other than the works to the junction of New Road and the High Street shown on the drawing in the Transport Scoping Study.

Therefore, CALA would like to see "if necessary as a result of detailed assessment" added to the end of this bullet point.

### **Environmental Health**

Noise and Vibration Impacts have been considered by an acoustic and vibration consultant who concluded that despite the proximity of the railway line there will no issues arising from vibration as levels well below the threshold for concerns. Mitigation will be able to deal with noise emanating from the railway through careful design measures in order to satisfy the appropriate environmental standards for residential use.

It is not anticipated that light pollution will be a particular issue for this development. However, in order to allay the Council's concerns, CALA will seek an expert's opinion and this will accompany any future planning application.

### **Landscape**

Banner Homes commissioned a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment a number of years ago which concluded that the combination of topography and landcover (built form, woodland and tree belts) at both the local (Site) scale and in the wider landscape provided a strong sense of enclosure to the Site and curtailed most significant views from the wider landscape.

CALA has also commissioned a heritage assessment report which concluded that the proposed development of this site would not adversely affect the heritage value of the canal. Development would not impact on the ability to appreciate the canal or its architecture through its proximity, by dominating roof lines or by distracting attention away from the canal.

Indeed, the provision of a new walkway along the canal bank which was accessible to the wider public would be seen as an enhancement.

The detailed design of the proposed development will take account of the relationship of the site to the views of the AONB as well as immediate negative infrastructural elements such as the railway. Sensitive planting and screening will be used to mitigate any potentially negative effects. New riparian planting and screening will be dealt with through a comprehensive Landscape Masterplan for the site.

### **Biodiversity**

Advice from ecological consultants has confirmed that there is little ecological value on the site. There is, however, considerable opportunity for achieving a net gain in bio-diversity as part of the proposals for residential development.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

A proposal for the treatment and management of surface water resulting from the proposed new development will form part of the planning application submission. Investigation by flood risk experts has shown that there is no risk from flooding on this site and that the site is in Flood Zone 1. Unlike the rest of the information referred to above, this information has not yet been shared with the Council. A copy of the consultant's response is attached below, Appendix 1.

Please find attached detailed flood risk data received from the Environment Agency for the development site at Lockfield in Northchurch.

The data includes flood maps and corresponding modelled flood levels for various Annual Exceedance Probabilities (AEP) at a number of modelled floodplain nodes.

The flood maps shows flood extents for the 1 in 1000 (0.1%) and 1 in 100 (1%) plus all climate change probabilities to be confined within the banks of the Canal. The flood extents associated with these probabilities would be representative of Flood Zones 2 and 3.

Comparison of the corresponding flood level associated with these probabilities with site levels along the boundary appears to confirm that flood flows would not affect the site based on the indicative topographical information below, extracted from Dacorum Council's SFRA, which shows site levels along the boundary to be approximately 118m AOD, whilst maximum predicted flood levels from the flood risk data are indicated to be well below this level at 113.41m AOD.

With flood extents for the 1 in 1000 and 1 in 100 (1%) plus all climate change probabilities shown to be confined within the banks of the Canal and with maximum predicted flood levels shown to be well below site levels along the boundary with the canal, we would deem the site to be located entirely in Flood Zone 1 and not at risk of fluvial flooding with no further level of assessment or modelling required to confirm this apart from a topographical survey to confirm boundary levels along the canal are consistent with the indicative topographical information from Dacorum Council's SFRA.

Please note that a Flood Risk Assessment would still be required for a planning application as sites larger than 1 Hectare are required to be accompanied by a flood risk assessment although a report would generally focus on a solution for the management of surface water runoff to ensure development does not increase surface water flood risk.

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">ORG - CALA Homes - Agent Les West - Les West Planning response Dacorum Local Plan 2020-2038 210224_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11936
<b>Person ID</b>	1150963
<b>Full Name</b>	SUE TAYLOR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><u><a href="#">Lock Field New Road Northchurch</a></u></p> <p>This location has previously been rejected for inclusion on the local plan, I believe that the proposed housing density is far too high, out of keeping with the local housing densities and densities that should be expected on the outskirts of a town.</p> <p>This site also contains an important wildlife corridor connecting the Grand Union canal with habitats on New Road and into Ashridge. I have observed, Kingfishers, Bullfinches and House Sparrows sheltering in the canalside vegetation. All are sharply declining species and listed under section 41 of NERC Act 2006.</p> <p>The Canal makes a natural <u>visual landscape boundary</u> to the town at this point, with only scattered houses beyond, building here would breach that visual boundary.</p> <p>New Road is already a dangerous road for pedestrians, road safety concerns would also have to be met.</p> <p>If any housing is allowed on this site it should be in keeping with the local area, it must allow retention of the wildlife corridor especially the canal side scrub and hedgerow habitats.</p>

The houses should also provide for local families with housing needs for example the elderly or those needing affordable housing.

Other issues including access for the maintenance of the railway. Drainage and sewage would need addressing I understand there is no mains sewer in New Road above the canal.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11937

**Person ID** 1150963

**Full Name** SUE TAYLOR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Fields between Darrs Lane and Durrants Lane

These fields are very visible from the other side of the valley within the AONB, easily picked out from New Road Berkhamsted across the castle (see supporting photo) and from near Norcott Hill.

The fields contain the town and emphasise the rural character of this area. Building on them would diminish the AONB and the character of the existing settlements.

There are three large circular depressions in the Darrs to Bell Lane field, it is possible they are sink holes and this should be investigated prior to any building consents being granted (see supporting photo)

Skylarks (another Section 41 species in NERC 2006) are heard each spring in the field adjacent to Bell Lane and Bell Lane itself is an important Wildlife corridor enhanced by its proximity to Woodcock Hill with its woodland and grasslands. If any land must be designated for housing then the field off Durrants lane to Bell Lane is the most sustainable with good access via Durrants lane to other areas of the town. But only **IF** measures are taken to protect the exiting copse and hedgerows and if the proposed open space is implemented.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files** [Supporting Photos Sue Taylor EGS11937.docx](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11941

**Person ID** 1150963

**Full Name** SUE TAYLOR

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Shootersway is an ancient highway originally stretching from Tring to Boxmoor and situated largely on the ridgeline between two valleys. It has always been the southernmost road along the Berkhamsted valley, its mature hedgerows and trees along the ridgeline marking the edge of the town with glimpses of the open countryside beyond.

If you travel along the A41 it is significant that only scattered housing can be seen within this valley, giving a rural feel to this area in keeping with the AONB. Being visually separate from the town emphasises that the Road was intended to bypass the town not be integrated with it. Should housing be allowed up to the bypass boundary this will be a massive visual intrusion into a rural valley. It will also damage or sever important green corridors along the valley.

When the bypass was built these fields were to be retained as a buffer to residents from noise and pollution. With the ever-growing traffic on the a41 as Tring and Aylesbury expand the buffer they create remains important.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11942

**Person ID** 1269348

**Full Name** BERKHAMSTED FOOTBALL CLUB

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

We write in response to section 23.1 the Berkhamsted delivery part of the Dacorum draft local plan.

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Executive summary**

- 1 Dacorum Borough Council should lobby for a lower housing figure for Dacorum and preserve more of the Green Belt.
- 2 The new housing figures for Berkhamsted should be a lower proportion of Dacorum's total.
- 3 The draft local plan is superior to the Thakeham/BSGCA proposal.



- 4 **There is no case for taking away existing sports facilities like Broadwater football ground and replacing it with housing. We have a 3,700 strong petition on that point, and attach 83 pages of relevant comments made by petitioners.**
- 5 Why it is **not** necessary to put housing on Broadwater to obtain additional sports facilities.
- 6 Artificial football pitches and Berkhamsted.
- 7 Youth football pitches and Berkhamsted.

#### 1 **Dacorum's housing figures**

The number of new houses assumed in the draft plan should be revised downwards to reflect:

##### **-population trends**

1.3 million people have left the UK in the last year;  
Brexit, and the new points- based immigration system;  
Excess deaths through covid.

##### **-Covid and work patterns**

Covid may have permanently altered behaviour with regards to online working and shopping. Destroying green belt makes less sense if former shops and offices as a result become available for housing.

There will be a cut in commuting to London, in which case again Dacorum does not need the level of housing assumed in the current target.

##### **-housing policy**

the current government is altering the housing target algorithm;  
the possibility of different governments in future years.

#### 1 **New housing numbers for Berkhamsted should be a lower proportion of Dacorum's total.**

The covid related long term fall in commuting will have a bigger effect on Berkhamsted than Hemel or Tring, so its share of housing in Dacorum should now be reduced. Berkhamsted really is a commuter town and has grown around a town centre station, even having to make its station car park multi-story. In contrast, the other two big settlements of Hemel and Tring have remote stations.

#### 1 **The draft local plan is superior to the Thakeham/BSGCA proposal.**

Those that care about the environment do not want 200 acres of Green Belt land to be lost for ever and permanently turned into a Thakeham housing estate. to be virtually joined for ever. Erosion of the green belt and the coalescence of the three distinct communities of Berkhamsted, Bourne End and Hemel, does not fit with the local plan's current policy of housing provision by smaller builds around existing settlements.

There are sound planning reasons to keep separate the two settlements of Berkhamsted and Bourne End. Reality is the separation will **not** be maintained by the insertion of a strip of a mere couple of hundred yards of sports pitches. Thakeham's claims cannot be taken seriously that sports *are located in order to maintain green space between Berkhamsted and Bourne End, so the two settlements retain their individual identities and a permanent green gap can be retained in perpetuity.*

Thakeham have chosen the wrong organisation to receive the pitches. Giving them to the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association Limited (BSGCA) will not keep them green in perpetuity. That is the mistake the Berko inhabitants made in 1924. Remember the BSGCA now want housing on the Broadwater football pitch.

A particular feature of the Thakeham proposal is that it is inflexible to housing demand. Either the whole Bulbourne Cross development takes place or none of it. As they claim to be infrastructure led, Thakeham need to get all (not just part) of their Bulbourne Cross estate built to pay for the infrastructure.

The current draft local plan for housing is more sensible and flexible, by not having lots of eggs in one basket. Not all of the sites identified in the south and west of Berkhamsted need to become housing. The housing tap can be turned on or off according to population needs, if housing demand is cut, as discussed above.

That is just part of why the Thakeham/BSGCA scheme is not in the draft Dacorum Plan. The planning experts and elected councillors of Dacorum produced a plan for extra housing in the south and west of the town-not towards Bourne End. The developers shotgun wedding with the BSGCA ought not to make Dacorum change its mind.

Keeping countryside is important. Land to the west of Berkhamsted on the northern side of the main road is countryside. It is not green behaviour to try and turn into a country theme park Thakeham style.

According to the Electoral Commission's website Thakeham Homes Ltd made cash donations totalling £445,700 to the Conservative Party between May 2017 and May 2020. We hope that will not influence the Conservative Party run Dacorum Council.

- 1 There is no case for taking away existing sports facilities like Broadwater football ground and replacing it with housing. We attach a 3,700 strong petition on that point, with relevant comments made by petitioners.**

You may be puzzled as to why Broadwater comes up in as an issue in the draft local plan, when it is not shown as a housing site and nor is it a coloured as a housing site in Thakeham's leaflet. Either plan would allow Berkhamsted to meet its target housing numbers, **without** building on Broadwater.

The only connection is the Broadwater stadium freeholder, the BSGCA, wants to cash in on the potential housing value of the land. The BSGCA say this is to fund the construction of sports buildings at Bourne End on the land that Thakeham may donate (as well as terrace it, put in drainage, a road and 400 car park spaces). Berkhamsted Lawn Tennis & Squash Rackets Club reveals that the BSGCA will also have a legacy fund with the rest of any Broadwater sale proceeds.

If additional housing means Berkhamsted requires more sports facilities, the new facilities should be in Berkhamsted, not next door to McDonalds, Bourne End, Hemel HP2. It should be **extra** facilities, not the destruction of the existing ones.

As the saying goes, if it is not broke do not fix it. Broadwater is a much loved well used facility in the town centre, where football has been played for over 100 years, with accompanying community social facilities. It works because it is in the right location. Broadwater and the whole area between the canal and railway should remain the green lungs of Berkhamsted town centre, zoned for leisure and amenity use.

As explained below, under current law, to get planning permission to build on Broadwater relevant criteria have to be satisfied.

Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. From a transport and pollution perspective putting sports facilities 3 miles away from the town centre is an environmental disaster and having children playing next to the A41 does not sound healthy either.

Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless:

- 1 **a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or**
- 2 **b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or**
- 3 **c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use.**

Dealing with each in turn:

- 1 The existence of our club operating at pitch capacity shows this condition is clearly not applicable. The official report rates the Broadwater pitch quality as good and under our club's management it is used as **six** Berkhamsted football teams' home ground (three adult and three youth). If Berkhamsted gets a larger population, then more spectators will turn up at the existing town centre location thereby meeting a growing leisure need.

- 1 Whatever quantity or quality of sports facilities are configured within the sports bit of Thakeham's Bulbourne Cross proposal, they will not meet this condition because **Bourne End is not a suitable location** to replace a Berkhamsted town centre facility. Bourne End is inferior to Broadwater for Berkhamsted people, whatever mode of transport they use.

Many supporters walk to Broadwater and have a drink before and/or after the game. The Bourne End facilities would be 3.5 miles away by road from Broadwater. That is not walking distance. Drivers will not be able to drink alcohol if they use their cars. The proposed 400 space car park at Bourne End shows it is only accessible by car. All buses that come to Berko stop within walking distance of Broadwater. Hardly any buses go to Bourne End. Berko station is literally behind the goal at Broadwater. Rail travellers will find that the nearest station to Bourne End is Boxmoor (not Berkhamsted), both stations being several miles away from Thakeham's proposed new sports facility. Thakeham/BSGCA witter on about cycling. In the real world, cycle stands lie empty on matchdays as people arrive at out of town football grounds by car. The environmental and traffic congestion caused by extra people using cars to get to and from Bourne End instead of walking or using bus or rail routes to enjoy town centre football at Broadwater is considerable.

Bogus attempts are being made by BSGCA to claim that there is better **quality** because the non-league stadium will be built to step 2 football standard, and Broadwater is only big enough for step 3. The town of Berkhamsted will never be big enough to support step 2 football. Step 2 is officially elite football. Elite means players earn their living from football. There are only 43 step 2 teams in the whole of England. Two are in this corner of Hertfordshire, being at St Albans City and at Hemel Hempstead North (Vauxhall Road). To suggest there could be a third in Hemel Hempstead South (at Bourne End) is ridiculous. Our Saturday teams play at steps 4 and 7. We do have ambitions for their promotion to step 3 and step 6. We have realistic plans and funds to do that at Broadwater by adding an extra stand. The BSGCA are not doing us a favour by kicking us out of town to a step 2 standard facility. There is no point in rattling around in a new shiny ground in Bourne End if money will run out within a few years, because the club has lost its town centre fan base and secondary income. Developments need to be financially sustainable.

With regard to **quantity** we believe that the number of people getting their recreation through watching our football matches, will fall if the club is kicked out of Berkhamsted to Bourne End. The Thakeham/BSGCA plan adds a full -sized artificial football pitch/training area and additional youth football pitches with dressing rooms. It should be noted that these facilities can be put in Bourne End without having to sell Broadwater-see 5 below. Furthermore, there are plenty of other proposals for additional artificial pitches-see section 6, leading us to question the need for one in Bourne End. The youth pitches, if they come under the control of the BSGCA, will not be for the children who need them-see section 7.

- 1 The alternative sports are a single team rugby club (potentially moving from near Tring to very near an existing rugby club at Chaulden -Camelot), and gymnastics (potentially being moved from Ashlyns School in Berkhamsted out of town to Bourne End-a less suitable location on transport grounds like football).

- 1 **Why it is not necessary to put housing on Broadwater to obtain additional sports facilities.**

Both the draft local housing plan and the Thakeham alternative allow Berkhamsted to meet its target housing numbers, **without** building on Broadwater.

The vast amount of extra housing for Berkhamsted will come with S106 money from the developers, which can be spent on sports facilities. We note that a few years back, the last major development in Berkhamsted (Bearroc) provided several youth football pitches in Durrants Lane. They lie unused, even though they are closer for residents than Bourne End will be.

S106 contributions plus sports club money, relevant sporting body and Sport England grants, and taxpayer money should be sufficient to fund facilities without any need to destroy the existing facilities at Broadwater.

It may be counterproductive for those developing additional sporting facilities to have any proceeds from the sale of Broadwater. Grant giving bodies are charities that work on the additionality principle. They fund organisations and projects that would not go ahead without their grants, because of a lack of finance. Having £10m+ from the sale of Broadwater will be a handicap in attracting grants.

There really is no need for the BSGCA to sell Broadwater for housing to finance the Thakeham sporting facilities. This is because all that will need financing is buildings. That is because Thakeham will allegedly donate all of the potential sports land at Bourne End as well as terrace it, put in drainage, a road and 400 car park spaces.

The most expensive bit to build is the floodlit non-league stadium- which of course is not needed at Bourne End if Berkhamsted FC stay at Broadwater.

An artificial pitch for the community is the next most expensive bit. A few years ago, Berkhamsted Raiders thought they could get grants and afford one without selling Broadwater. We know that, because they unsuccessfully tried to put one in place of the natural grass at Broadwater! At Bourne End it is even more affordable, as a day-time user would be right next door in the shape of Thakeham's proposed new school. See section 6 on whether such a pitch is really needed.

The big space eater at Bourne End is 6 youth football pitches. Some are the same size as two unused youth football pitches in Durrants Lane in Berkhamsted. Looking at Thakeham's proposal, the school next door could share dressing rooms for youth/school pitches, saving community costs and making even less need to sell Broadwater. Many of the younger age groups do not need dressing rooms anyway.

We explain in section 7, why we believe that there is no shortage of youth football pitches in Berkhamsted. Even if there is a case for them in Bourne End next door to McDonalds, Bourne End, Hemel Hempstead HP2, they ought to be used by Hemel teams. That means they should not be donated to BSGCA, who under their constitution, would have to give preference to Berkhamsted inhabitants, instead of the Bourne End and Hemel youth that are more local to the site.

### **1 Artificial football pitches and Berkhamsted.**

We do not believe the claims that the Thakeham plan is necessary to add a second full size artificial pitch allegedly for Berkhamsted on top of the one that Berkhamsted Raiders share with Ashlyns School. It is one of four extra for Dacorum, as described in the May 2020 Dacorum Local Facility Plan. That report was based on the statement in The Knight Kavanagh & Page April 2019 report at page 48 that there are no formal plans in place to create additional 3G provision in Dacorum, which was seriously misleading.

Consider the following:

- Hemel Hempstead FC have since that report, installed such a full-sized pitch at Vauxhall Road.
- The hockey club at the Cow Roast have since got planning permission for a floodlit pitch that can take football training.
- There are plans outside Dacorum, in another county for **two** more full size artificial pitches within two miles of Berkhamsted. The grant funding conditions will inevitably include community access. If instead of sticking rigidly to council and county boundaries in writing reports, KK&P would have known that.
- Berkhamsted Collegiate School had already stated on the public record, that they want a full size 3G pitch and that they are going to build pitches in Berkhamsted south of the A41. The council's role should be to refuse planning permission unless community use is included. Such s106 agreements are the normal quid pro quo for straining infrastructure and leisure resources by expanding the local population through extra housing. We recommend that Berkhamsted Collegiate School is only allowed to sell Haslam's Field for housing if it funds from the proceeds, a replacement facility south of the A41, that as well as private sector school use includes a floodlit artificial football pitch with good community use availability.
- Watford Ladies have also identified a site in Dacorum.
- We were also approached by a school in Hemel to support their plans for an artificial pitch.
- Thakeham/BSGCA now plan one at Bourne End-is it necessary given the above?

It is anybody's guess in what order the extra artificial pitch facilities will be constructed, and whether some will fall by the wayside when they realise that the glut will leave them uneconomic to operate.

### 1 Youth football pitches and Berkhamsted.

Dacorum Council relies on a defective playing pitch strategy informed by KK&P and a related poorly composed local football facilities plan.

They grossly overstate the number of football pitches required, with a ridiculous assumption that each pitch can only be used as a home ground by **two** teams, without becoming a poor quality pitch. The official report rates the Broadwater pitch quality as good and under our club's management it is used as **six** Berkhamsted football teams' home ground (three adult and three youth).

Lazy thinking has been that as girls football expands, lots more youth football pitches are needed. The expected growth in girls football can be met by the existing stock of pitches being used on Saturdays, rather than adding to the Sunday peak period problem, and expensive additional youth pitches and facilities.

Using 2011 census figures for overall populations (as we do not have youth population figures) and KK&P youth pitch numbers of 111 it is easily seen that the existing stock of community use pitches are in the wrong place.

**Area**

**Population**

%

**Pitches if allocated on population.**

**Existing pitches**

**Per KK&P**

**Over/(under)**

**supply**

**Hemel**

94,932

74

83

53

**(30)**

**Berkhamsted**

20,641

16

18

46

**28**

**Tring**

11,929

9

10

12

**2**

**Total**

127,502

100

111

111

0

Even without Thakeham, Berkhamsted Raiders (who have someone on the board of the BSGCA) are adding 9 more youth pitches to their empire for season 2021-2.

Dacorum's challenge should be to find space for youth pitches for Hemel youngsters as part of its plans. The tie up with the BSGCA is why Thakeham will not provide pitches for Hemel youngsters. The BSGCA are obliged by their constitution to put Berkhamsted inhabitants first.

If the Thakeham/BSGCA plan goes through, it will create the farcical situation of Berko parents driving miles to Bourne End with their footballing children to a BSGCA owned site, damaging the environment and the travel time each way is a waste of precious family time on Sundays.

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS11961

**Person ID**

1269350

**Full Name**

Jan Dent Safer Gravel Path Action Group

**Organisation Details**

SECRETARY  
Safer Gravel Path Action Group

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11963
<b>Person ID</b>	1269351
<b>Full Name</b>	STUART MACALISTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>As a resident of Berkhamstead I am writing to express that I am NOT in support of the local plan, with specific reference to the suggested growth around Berkhamstead. The plan is a simplistic sprawl of housing estates with no detail nor suggestions about how the towns infrastructure will cope or be upgraded.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed developments to the West and South of the town, (BK06 , BK08 in particular ) clearly exclude any new/ additional link to the A41, and this appears to be extremely problematic and will lead to excessive traffic on what are already over used, narrow residential roads.</p> <p>The planning department also do not appear to be exercising any decent of appropriate quality standards when it comes to current housing developments, to safeguard the character and quality of the town. Recent developments at Townsend Gate (in the east ) and the Taylor Wimpey developments off Shooter Way, are dumbed down, bog-standard, characterless</p>

and pastiche designs, cramming as many units onto the site as possible with a derisory amount of landscaping or quality of architectural design. I speak as a practicing architect.

The lack of imagination, design quality and authenticity is undermining the architectural quality and heritage of the town - one of the key attractors for people to live and work here.

By contrast, the alternative proposals by Thakeham, BSGCA, appear to be much better considered and with significant benefits over those in the council's draft local plan. This alternative plan would get my full support in principle, as it clearly acknowledges and proposed the appropriate level of infrastructure provision which must come with housing developments of this size. The council's own draft proposal has no positive upsides whatsoever.

I would obviously like assurances that the proposed benefits from Thakeham must be delivered as part of that development and not be diluted or lost over time.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS11988

**Person ID** 333667

**Full Name** Mrs Patricia Simons

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Growth Area BK01:Land South of Berkhamsted  
850 homes are proposed for this site. New homes on this site would be on the edge of the town and there are no new routes for new roads to relieve traffic congestion. The existing roads are not capable of handling the existing traffic. No explanation has been provided as to how the town's road and transport system will be able to cope with the resultant journeys that will be generated. Many of these homes will be large family houses which will not be affordable on local wages.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11989
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The plan suggests 90 more homes to be built by this congested junction. The traffic lights here already take some drivers by surprise as there is an absence of a filter system to turn right from Kingshill way into Shootersway. The safety of pedestrians at this tricky crossing must be paramount in planning as secondary school pupils walk to and from school and deserve a safe and healthy environment.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11990

<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	This land was gifted to Berkhamsted Girls School to be used as sports playing fields. Not for the development of 150 homes. Green field sites are important resources for health. Development on this land will involve felling trees which will negatively impact on natural ecosystems. Development here will exacerbate the existing congestion on Shootersway. Traffic flow is already increasing as the new development at Bearoc Park is completed with access also onto Shootersway. Cross Oak road is unable to cope with current levels of traffic because parts of it are single track and parts do not have any pavement. The increased traffic, if the proposed 150 homes were to be built, would be hazardous for pedestrians and have a negative impact on the environment.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11992
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The Draft Plan proposes 70 homes to be built on this site. Access to would have to be gained via the Haslam Playing Fields development and off the very narrow Denny's Lane, increasing traffic onto Shootersway if these homes were to be built. No plans to improve the infrastructure of existing roads and pavements are included. No plans to recognise the difficulties of building on this steep topography with drainage and sewage
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11993
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposals suggest 80 homes to be built on this site. No plans exist to improve Shootersway to be able to handle the increased traffic these families would generate. Shootersway is a residential road and should not be used as a highway, especially HGVs, accessing the A41. The site would be extremely noisy as it is directly adjacent to A41 and in a valley, and air pollution from the A41 would have to be monitored to ascertain if it would be acceptable for residents. The sewage may have to be pumped up hill as in some existing developments in this position with resulting problems for residents
Yes / No * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11994
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>200 homes are proposed for this site of Green belt land. Shootersway is yet again the road access but no mention is made of the impact on Darrs Lane and Bell Lane. There are no footpaths on these roads, so they are extremely dangerous for walkers and cyclists. Both these Lanes would have to be widened to accommodate two-way traffic and reduced to a 20mph limit. There is no pedestrian / cycle links from this location to the High Street / Shootersway and provision would have to be made for the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Grims Ditch runs through this area and is an important Archaeological Site and would need to be properly surveyed and protected.</p> <p>The High Street at Northchurch is highly congested with many accidents, one fatal, occurring due to speed and intensity of traffic. Air pollution is a factor in this location - the existing residents in Northchurch would suffer acutely from any further traffic in this locality. This site should be kept as a buffer zone to the surrounding countryside, maintaining the definition between Berkhamsted and Northchurch.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11995
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	60 homes are proposed for this site. The canal and river Bulbourne are amenities for the town. No culverts over the river Bulbourne should be permitted because they affect the eco system of the river water. Land at the side of the river and canal should be preserved for future generations to provide additional green recreational space which is sparse in the town. Development will create a traffic problem where New Road crosses the canal. It is already a dangerous crossing where people want to get onto the canal, the bridge is a dangerous cycling area, and it is a main pedestrian route to the school.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11996
<b>Person ID</b>	333667

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	200 homes are proposed for this site. This development would add more traffic along Shooterway and to the overcrowded dense network of residential roads in Berkhamsted. On the periphery of the town, this site would need to provide a substantial open park for recreation. We have the experience of promises unfulfilled as the open space provided as part of the Bearoc Park is small and undermanaged, unsuitable for football. The grass is too long and there are no football nets despite being proposed planned football pitches. Development on this site would result in the loss of many trees and harm to the environment.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS11998
<b>Person ID</b>	333667
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Patricia Simons
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	50 homes are proposed for this site adjacent to a recent addition of Town Gate Development. The canal and river Bulbourne are amenities for the town. No culverts over the river Bulbourne should be permitted because they affect the eco system of the river water. Land at the side of the river and canal should be preserved for future generations to provide additional green recreational space which is sparse in the town.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12041
<b>Person ID</b>	1269361
<b>Full Name</b>	Dr Freya Rumball
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.</p> <p>There are significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.</p> <p>Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.</p>

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12042

**Person ID** 1269361

**Full Name** Dr Freya Rumball

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK06 Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12053
<b>Person ID</b>	1269362
<b>Full Name</b>	Angela Redmond
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am a Berkhamsted resident living beside Durrants Lane in Berkhamsted. I have watched the Thakeham proposal video and would like to make the following points: I agree that the town needs an overhaul of it's sporting facilities but do not think we need more housing in the town.

I have never had a problem accessing the A41 on either Berkhamsted junctions so don't see why we need another one, except if the sports facility is granted permission to be built.

The map of the plan is not that clear and I cannot see where, and what size the Northchurch village area will be or where the lake is that's on the plan. Neither of these are clear to me. Also you should have put road names on the plan too which would have made the plan clearer.

Will the school and sports centre be built before the housing? There are so many new houses in the town and 900 more I don't think is necessary.

Why does Berkhamsted need another primary school? There are 4 in the immediate vicinity, Westfield, St Mary's, St Thomas More and Greenway and three others in the town, Bridgewater, Victoria and Swingate. The town needs another secondary school instead as there is only Ashlyns School currently for secondary pupils to apply for, which is always over subscribed.

Thanks for reading this,

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12059

**Person ID** 1264202

**Full Name** Philippa Wosiek

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Areas proposed in Northchurch (namely BK06, BK07 and BK08), which seems to be renamed as West Berkhamsted - first and foremost we are a village in our own right and have no desire to be included within Berkhamsted. Northchurch is an older settlement and should continue to have its own identity not become part of the market town or indeed an satellite to either Berkhamsted or indeed Tring (if housing development is allowed from the west of Tring towards Northchurch).

Canal Fields - access via New Road which uses a narrow old bridge over the Grand Union Canal, let alone the increased traffic, noise, light and air pollution outside a primary school and existing housing. The Tjunction with A4251 is a particularly

dangerous crossing even with the traffic lights towards The George and Dragon Pub. New Road towards the Ashridge estate is already becoming an accident hot spot.

Wildlife along the Canal will become a rarity - I have often seen Kingfishers in the New Road area towards Dudswell and indeed towards Berkhamsted.

The fields between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane provide much needed green space - the topography of the land does not lend itself to easy house building; nor as the Lanes stand at the moment to be able to cope with the increased levels of traffic - residents' cars let alone delivery vans and other services.

We residents of Northchurch will lose these much needed green spaces and walking routes.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12065

**Person ID** 1269370

**Full Name** KATIE PARTRIDGE & JIM BARNARD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12112
<b>Person ID</b>	1269407
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Pratt
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Please refer to Agent Letter for information on the alternative site – Land At Dudswell
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Martin Pratt - Agent Al Morrow - Phillips Planning - 24.2.21 Letter to Dacorum land at Dudswell_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12128
<b>Person ID</b>	1165624
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Else
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Mr Richard Butler, Associate C/O Bidwells

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>My client is the owner of Edgeworth House and the associated private garden to the rear of the property (“the site”), which equates to approximately 1.6ha in size. Edgeworth House is a Grade II* Listed building and the site comprises associated ancillary buildings which are also located adjacent to the High Street along the site’s southern boundary. The site has a very good frontage onto the High Street with three existing access points. A section of the River Bulbourne crosses through the site and the northern boundary abuts the Grand Union Canal. There is no public access to the site and historically there has never been public access to the site. The site is fully enclosed with hedges and fences on all sides.</p> <p>To the west of the site are existing 2-storey residential properties of Bulbourne Close and Valley Road where the River Bulbourne is culverted under the road. Opposite the site frontage along the High Street to the south are 2-storey residential properties and to the east of the site are 3-storey apartment blocks of Turner Court and a builders’ merchants further to the north on the Sarthe Business Park.</p> <p>My client made previous representations (objection) to the Council in respect of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) that was adopted in July 2017.</p> <p>In summary, the site is identified as an Open Land designation on the Policies Map of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth. My client strongly objects to the identification of the site as an Open Land designation in the Emerging Strategy for Growth for reasons set out further below. My client requests that the Council remove the Open Land designation from the site as part of the continued preparation of emerging Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) beyond this consultation. The site can contribute towards the Borough’s housing needs through a windfall housing site; the Open Land designation must therefore be omitted.</p> <p>My client considers the Council is not sufficiently following the NPPF, in particularly paragraph 68 which encourages strategic policy-making authorities to identify small and medium sized sites that can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, including the identification of land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing on sites no larger than one hectare; and supporting the development of windfall sites, giving weight to the benefits</p>

of using suitable sites within existing settlement for homes. Edgeworth House would be a suitable housing site in this regard.

The Edgeworth House site is also well served by public transport again a priority in the NPPF, in particularly chapter 9 which seeks to promote sustainable transport and paragraph 108 which seeks to ensure appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be taken up, in assessing sites that may be allocated for development.

#### Review of Council's Previous Assessment Work

The Policies Map for the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011 did not previously identify the site as an Open Land designation.

Following adoption of the Core Strategy by the Council in 2013, the site was identified as an Open Land designation in the Site Allocations DPD which was adopted in 2017.

As part of the Council's initial preparation of the Site Allocations DPD, a total of 25 sites were considered for a new Open Land designation within the Borough as part of the Site Allocations Background Issues Paper (June 2015) (SABIP). Edgeworth House represented the only site of 5 considered in Berkhamsted that was progressed towards an Open Land designation.

It was clear from the level of dismissed sites that the criteria required to justify an Open Land designation was high. As noted in the SABIP, the criteria included a size threshold of 1ha; the consideration of proposed uses of the site; and built form.

Edgeworth House is referenced in a number of documents forming the evidence base for the Core Strategy and associated Site Allocations DPD documents. There is a marked inconsistency in how the Local Authority has considered the site and various conclusions drawn relating to Edgeworth House. These are documented below:

- 2006 – Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) documents notes the site as appropriate for circa 11 dwellings under site BW/9.
- 2008 – Open Space Study notes that the opportunity could be taken to include part of the Edgeworth House site closest to the canal as open land



- 2013 – the adopted Core Strategy defines Open Land as areas greater than 1ha. The Edgeworth House Garden closest to the canal measures only 5700sqm. The other land in the gardens of Edgeworth House was added to achieve the 1ha
- 2014 – The Site Allocations Background Issues Paper considers the site and makes the following comments, “*The green space here forms the back garden of the dwelling and **not appropriate to allocate as Open Land**. Site also affected by watercourse and floodplains, meaning scope for development may be restricted. 1.6 ha.*” This conclusion would note that the site should not be allocated as Open
- 2015 – The Site Allocations Background Issues Paper, notes the following comments in relation to the site, “*The green space here forms the back garden of the dwelling and extends 1.6Ha. Site affected by watercourse and floodplains, but land contributes to urban form, would extend the existing green/ corridor/ Open land associated with the canal and enhances the character of the*

*listed building.*” The previous comments from the 2014 study are simply dismissed with very limited explanation other than, an error was made. My client also considers the Council was in breach of its obligations throughout the earlier phases of the above procedure of putting the site forward as Open Land since at no point did they advise the owners of Edgeworth House of their intentions or proposals. Furthermore, contrary to what the Council has said there appeared little or no real support for designating Edgeworth House as Open Land in 2017 outside the Council. The garden at Edgeworth House appears to be the only private garden land in Berkhamsted classified this way.

The previous work undertaken by the Council identifies clear inconsistency in the comments noted across the assessments and highlights the lack of justification for the continued designation of Open Land and lack of real technical input into the assessment.

The assessments provide a reasonable identification of the positive elements of the site; the open nature at the northern edge close to a water environment of high habitat value; the absence of built form and the presence of trees that contribute to the urban environment. However, the assertion in the assessments is that the Open Land allocation will form an extension the wider designation; provide a buffer between residential and employment uses; and enhance the setting of the Listed Building are all false. The designation of Open Land makes no change to these matters. The habitat of the canal green corridor will not be extended and is already there in situ.

The protection of habitat; setting of the Listed building and protection of any TPO (Tree Protection Orders) trees can be maintained through normal planning control. Furthermore, the exclusion of garden land from the definition of previously developed land in the NPPF reinforces this position; protection from unsuitable development, and focus to maintain important landscape features is ensured.

In summary to the previous assessment work undertaken by the Council, there have not been any substantial reasons given to how the Open Land designation of the site at Edgeworth House shall contribute to the provision of genuine Open Land within Berkhamsted.

### Emerging Strategy for Growth

The Policies Map of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the site at Edgeworth House as an Open Land designation.

The Open Land designation in the Policies Map is supported by Policy DM38 'Open Land' in the Emerging Strategy for Growth which seeks to protect designated Open Land that forms part of the urban structure of the towns and larger villages. Furthermore, new development within designated Open Land will only be acceptable if it is for sports, recreation of other community or social uses and satisfies a number of conditions as set out under the policy.

Underneath Policy DM38 on page 132 of the Emerging Strategy for Growth, the relevant evidence and supporting guidance that has helped support the Council's justification of the policy simply states: 'Policies Map'. The Policies Map is not evidence or justification – it is part of the outcome of the assessment work and itself is justified by the evidence.

The Emerging Strategy for Growth is accompanied with a number of other evidence base documents and topic papers in order to inform the draft policies as set out in the Emerging Strategy for Growth.

The evidence base document Review of Green Space Strategy 2011-2016 (dated January 2011) sets out the Council's vision and plan to deliver improved public spaces within the Borough. The Strategy recommends that all formal and informal recreation space is designated as Open Land including open

space, allotments and school sites. The Strategy makes no reference to any recommendations to designate private gardens as Open Land and provides no specific reference or justification towards the designation of Edgeworth House as Open Land.

It is also noted that the Emerging Strategy for Growth is accompanied by an Open Space Study Assessment Report & Standards Paper (both dated July 2019) and topic paper Open Space, Sport and Leisure (dated November 2020). Again, neither of these documents provides specific reference or justification towards the designation of Edgeworth House as Open Land.

We note that the Emerging Strategy for Growth is also supported by an Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report (dated November 2020). The report states that *“policies aimed at protecting open spaces and limiting development in the countryside and on open land (‘DM38 – open land’, ‘DM63 - Open Space Provision’, ‘SP28 - Delivering Growth in the Countryside’) should help to preserve the natural environment and biodiversity. This could lead to indirect positive effects on soils.”*

In respect of Edgeworth House, the site is private land and not used for agricultural purposes, therefore the designation of Open Land will have no positive effects on soils. The Emerging Strategy for Growth already identifies suitable policies for the preservation of the natural environment and biodiversity. The designation of Open Land at Edgeworth House is therefore not reasonably justified.

The Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report also states: *“Significant positive effects have been identified in relation to this objective for the policies under the ‘Environment and Biodiversity’ theme, with “DM38 – Open Land’ protecting open land from residential development and requiring that any development on open land must not adversely affect character or environment of the setting.”*

Furthermore, the Appendices of Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report states: *“DM38 would protect open land from residential development and require that any development on open land must not adversely affect character or environment of the setting.” (page D-32).”*

The Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report simply asserts that there would be significant positive effects with protecting Open Land from residential development, without any clear justification or reasoning.

In summary, my client strongly objects to the continued identification of the site as an Open Land designation in the Policies Map of the Emerging Strategy for Growth. We object to Policy DM38 on the basis that there is a clear lack of evidence in the Emerging Strategy for Growth to support the justification of the policy and the associated designation of Edgeworth House in the Policies Map. My client requests that the Council remove the Open Land designation from the site as part of the continued preparation of emerging Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) beyond this consultation.

My client notes that chapter 11 of the NPPF encourages planning policies to make effective use of land, in particularly paragraph 118 which promotes development of under-utilised land, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained. Further, paragraph 137 states that, before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, it should be demonstrated that all other reasonable

options for meeting identified need for development have been examined fully. Whilst it may be necessary for Green Belt land to come forward for development due to housing need pressures, sites such as Edgeworth House should be considered as a priority as this approach is consistent with the NPPF. Our client considers that Edgeworth House as a site for housing has not been fully assessed by the Council as a priority ahead of Green Belt sites released for housing.

Furthermore, retention of an Open Land designation and not permitting controlled development on the Edgeworth House site will actually detract from available Open Space in Berkhamsted. Such a policy would see the area remain hidden behind hedges and fences with the benefit restricted only to the owners of

Edgeworth House. Permitting development could open up a significant part of the site to a much wider public, increasing access to the River Bulbourne and actually increasing the amount of true Open Space in Berkhamsted.

#### Housing Land Supply & Windfall Development

As noted above, due to the use of the incorrect LHN Standard Methodology for establishing the minimum housing need, the Emerging Strategy for Growth will already fail to deliver the level of housing required in the area.

However, in addition to this shortfall of some 1,819 homes, the development strategy also builds in insufficient flexibility and contingency on the housing land supply side for the Local Plan to be considered robust. Currently, the Emerging Strategy for Growth includes just a 2% buffer in housing land supply (303 homes – paragraph 7.128). This level of contingency is wholly insufficient, both in percentage terms and as an absolute number.

It is common for Local Plans to build in at least a 10% contingency on the housing land supply side to allow for unexcepted delays in the delivery of sites, changes in site capacity, under delivery of windfall, etc. In some cases, the buffer is 20%. The need for such a buffer depends on the risk associated with the overall strategy, the particular nature of the sites proposed for allocation – with larger, more complex sites justifying the need for a larger buffer in supply, and the step change in delivery being sought, which in Dacorum is significant given the current adopted Local Plan (Core Strategy) target of 430 and recent delivery rates averaging around 544 homes over the last three years. This suggests the need for a buffer nearer to 20%.

The implication of a 10% buffer on top of the minimum housing need of 18,414 is that the Dacorum Local Plan should plan for the delivery of 20,255 homes. A 20% buffer would mean the Local Plan planning for 22,097 homes. These figures

suggest that the planned housing supply in the Local Plan is between 3,355 and 5,197 homes below where it needs in order for it to be robust.

This is a significant shortfall which can only be rectified by additional sites being identified across the Borough for housing allocations in the Local Plan. This includes ensuring that sites that could come forward for housing through windfall development, such as my client's site at Edgeworth House, is not restricted by any unjustified designations such as the Open Land designation of Edgeworth House as discussed further above in this representation.

The second part of the housing land supply equation is the need to ensure that supply is not backloaded and that on adoption, the Council will be able to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of deliverable housing land is in place. This means that any additional sites need to be capable of delivery early in the plan period, suggesting the need for deliverable small to medium sized sites to be identified, including those such as my client's site at Edgeworth House which can contribute towards windfall development, as opposed to large, strategic sites with long lead in times and significant infrastructure requirements.

Policy SP20 'Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted' of the Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the delivery of at least 2,236 dwellings in Berkhamsted over the plan period, including 143 dwellings of known commitments and 1,876 dwellings of Local Plan Strategic Allocations. The estimated number of dwellings to be delivered from windfall sites is 217 dwellings for Berkhamsted.

We consider that the estimation of the number of dwellings to be delivered in Berkhamsted is unrealistic on the basis that the urban area is already physically constrained to achieve this target. Furthermore, unjustified designations that could prevent windfall development coming forward, such as the Open Land designation of Edgeworth House, would further hinder the Council from achieving its required windfall targets. Windfalls are a finite but diminishing resource so should not be ignored when they arise.

The Edgeworth House site without the Open Land classification could also assist the Council in other areas where it has targets to meet as well as its obligations in the NPPF. Housing development for older people will be encouraged in the NPPF on sites close to good public transport, local amenities, health services and town and district local centres. Few other sites in the area can satisfy all the above in the way that is achieved by the Edgeworth House site. The Edgeworth site offers almost endless limits in terms of its potential in future plans. The site could well be large enough to assist with the primary school requirements of the area or contributing towards the community health care requirements of the area as alternatives to its contribution to housing. With the identification of Green Belt land to meet the areas growth requirements, whilst this might be necessary, sites such as Edgeworth House should be considered and fully assessed

by the Council as a site for housing as a priority and ahead of Green Belt sites being released for housing as this would be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.

For reasons set out above in this letter, my client strongly objects to the identification of the site at Edgeworth House and associated surrounding land as an Open Land designation in the Emerging Strategy for Growth. It is requested that the Council remove the Open Land designation from the site as part of the continued preparation of emerging Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) beyond the current consultation of the Emerging Strategy for Growth.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12158

**Person ID** 1269444

**Full Name** Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

We would like noted that, should the proposed volume of new housing be passed, we are aware of at least one other proposal which we believe to be a more effective option for Berkhamsted and Northchurch – namely the proposals by BSGCA [Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association] and Thakeham. This alternative proposal offers a unique opportunity to provide the houses needed (including the proportion of affordable housing) while also creating simultaneously a healthy, carbon zero lifestyle fit for the 21st century along with the necessary infrastructure and broader community facilities.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12166
<b>Person ID</b>	1269444
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. Note - A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12167
<b>Person ID</b>	1269444
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Ms Jim & Katie Barnard & Partridge
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41. The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location. Following the death of (name removed), who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12188
<b>Person ID</b>	399285
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr John Roberts
<b>Organisation Details</b>	



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Consideration of the proposed Bulbourne Cross development by Thakeham should be considered - BUT this still does not resolve the water supply levels.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12220
<b>Person ID</b>	1249858
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Jillian Luff
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>LOCK FIELD SITE UNACCEPTABLE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The B4506 has become a rat-run over last 20 years as traffic has hugely increased</li> <li>• There have been multiple accidents as road descends towards Northchurch</li> <li>• The location of Lock Field at the foot of this descent with a blind spot beyond, a narrow bridge and a primary school is asking for further trouble.</li> </ul>

- If developed another wildlife corridor is lost forever

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12233

**Person ID** 1149618

**Full Name** Mr John Brabner

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

1 There is no consideration given in the Plan to the proposed development known as Bulbourne Cross.

1 While this may have appeared post the formation of the Dacorum Plan, Bulbourne Cross presents considerable merit worthy of further examination and inclusion in the Plan, for many reasons - not the least of which is the more suitable access both along the valley floor, and to a proposed new junction on the A41 bypass.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12301
<b>Person ID</b>	1269488
<b>Full Name</b>	SAMANTHA SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am particularly against BK-01 the land south of Berkhamsted – 1000 houses will increase of pollution positioned next to 2 schools, increase traffic and increase an already congested town.</p> <p>This proposed site is used by many local residents for walking and fresh air including my family.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12302
<b>Person ID</b>	1269488
<b>Full Name</b>	SAMANTHA SMITH
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposed number of homes suggests the needs for a new development outside of a town with its own infrastructure instead of adding to an already overcrowded town.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12333
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	There are brownfield areas for the Council to build on, like the proposed Lidl site, like the vast amount of parking for private businesses in Berkhamsted High Street, behind their offices in the High Street, and like the large amount of land in Northbridge Road where there have previously been business which are now closed down!
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12349
<b>Person ID</b>	1269490
<b>Full Name</b>	MIKE WHIT
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The proposal to build homes in Lock Field, New Road in Northchurch is massively flawed. This is a narrow road which already takes way too much traffic from Berkhamsted/Dunstable/Luton and there has already been a number of accidents on the road, very recently. We walk up New Road as a family and you can see deer grazing on the ground above New Road. The deer won't be there anymore when the council build loads of new houses with the associated noise and traffic. New Road does not have adequate pavements already, where families walk with prams and pushchairs to the school in New Road, and to Bridgewater School. The visibility of the road turning out of Lockfield is a huge problem, and the narrowing of the road over the ancient canal bridge. This is an area completely unsuitable for housing, and you are threatening the personal safety of the families who walk to and from St Mary's and Bridgewater School, and the safety of the elderly people who use buses' in the area to get into Berkhamsted. This is a beautiful semi rural area, leading very close by to the rural area of Ashridge, yet DBC want to change this area massively and make it more dangerous by building a load of houses in a completely unsuitable area. Lock Field is an essential wildlife corridor from the Ashridge Estate, through the valley, through Northchurch. With our family we have seen Kingfishers on the canal there, and other wildlife in our garden have included jays, woodpeckers, rare waxwings and many lovely beautiful British birds. You are threatening the very existence of the wonderful wildlife in Northchurch.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12353
<b>Person ID</b>	1269489
<b>Full Name</b>	STEVE HILL
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that I wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>I would like to add the following...</p> <p>With regard to Bk01 the land between Hall Park and the A41 is in the Green Belt to provide a natural buffer, sound insulation and wildlife corridor - and the underpasses built into the A41 provide this.</p> <p>Bk01 is an area of special biodiversity which must be protected. There are breeding skylarks and yellowhammers in the arable fields, pasture and hedge margins. There are very healthy populations in this area which need protecting as threatened farmland birds. In particular, yellowhammers are on the BoCC4 red list (Birds of Conservation Concern).</p> <p>In particular, Bk01 highlights the way in which the agreed 2013 Core strategy has been disregarded without any rationale. The BRAG group has responded in full regarding the environmental unsuitability of this location on the ridgetop and the lack of practical connectivity with the town centre which will simply overload congestion in the town as very few families with young children will walk up such a steep hill with push chairs. An evidence-based carbon reduction plan is also</p>

required to meet the national climate obligations of net zero by 2050. Increasing traffic movements along the linear, narrow valley floor to the ridge top is ridiculous and will increase carbon emissions substantially, not reduce them.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12392

**Person ID** 1164091

**Full Name** R.J. Hollis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The Shootersway proposal is at the worst place for water supply and dealing with sewage. It is the highest location so needs the most water pump pressure and the sewage has to travel through all of the current service to the treatment plant. Further it is remote from the town centre and schools, the hills will deter walking or cycling so just further increase car traffic/congestion on Shootersway and Darrs lane.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12393
<b>Person ID</b>	1164091
<b>Full Name</b>	R.J. Hollis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposal in Northchurch on New road just after the canal bridge will increase traffic problems at the bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12394
<b>Person ID</b>	1164091
<b>Full Name</b>	R.J. Hollis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposal for converting the Jewsons industrial area to housing is completely the wrong idea. We need more job opportunities not less, also part of this area floods regularly in the winter due to Bulbourne overflows.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12395
<b>Person ID</b>	1164091
<b>Full Name</b>	R.J. Hollis
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The redevelopment of the Civic Centre site is problematic due to access via Clarence Road which is very busy at present; and surely we need the hall. The plan just refers to "community services" which could be anything.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12411
<b>Person ID</b>	1269501
<b>Full Name</b>	Robin McMorran
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted - Map 29</b></p> <p>concerning the Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 - 2038) in the Dacorum Local Plan, there is a lot to take in and a lot to dislike.</p> <p>Some parts are worse than others - I'll highlight just a couple of areas for comment.</p> <p><b>Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 - 2038)</b>  <a href="https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/part-4-local-plan-emerging-strategy-for-growth-2020-2038-pages-298-to-359.pdf">https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/part-4-local-plan-emerging-strategy-for-growth-2020-2038-pages-298-to-359.pdf</a>  [see attached image]</p> <p>Consider the image above. The farmland at the top of Swing Gate Lane was until recently being farmed. Standing on Swing Gate Lane, there is a scenic view over the field to Ashlyns Hall, the historic home of Augustus Smith and William Longman, beautifully framed by an ancient cedar of Lebanon tree. It is a historically significant view, embedded in the local heritage. Berkhamsted's great country houses have almost all gone - Highfield, Haresfoot, Berkhamsted Place - only Ashlyns remains, and this view of the 18th-century mansion across open countryside is a piece of vanishing heritage. It should be treasured and preserved - plonking an estate of mediocre carbon-copy Wimpey houses on this field would be a desecration of England's heritage assets and this irreplaceable view would be lost forever.</p> <p>I note how the document states that "<i>Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities: [...] the setting of and views from Ashlyns Hall Grade II* listed building</i>" - right on same page as the proposal to concrete over the field and destroy this landscape with a dreary housing estate. Did Dacorum councillors have no sense of irony when they wrote that? Utterly insane.</p> <p>Anyway, I <u>object</u> to development in the area discussed above as it fails to take account of historic landscape sensitivities.</p>

It is argued that new housing has to be built to cope with a growing population. Perhaps this is an unfortunate reality, but covering lovely rural areas with housing is a lazy solution, and will only serve to make the council even more unpopular. Contrast this with some other aspects of the plan, such as:

Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site)

Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street

These schemes at least show a creative approach to making use of land within the existing urban area, and have less impact on the natural environment. Berkhamsted and other towns are peppered with empty patches of land wasted on office car parking, empty second homes and brownfield sites. These parcels of land should be considered in more detail.

The other problem is the English obsession with living in little detached houses with a patch of land. If there is a housing crisis, then such developments are an extravagance, and planning should focus on providing more tenement flat developments with a lower geographical footprint. This may not address all the requirements, but I think Dacorum should rethink most of this plan and leave the scenic countryside alone.

Finally - can we please stop the baloney about "affordable" housing? Any property that is ever described as such is only ever "affordable" to someone earning £100K or more. Unless you are going to sell properties for £120K, none of this is "affordable" to mere mortals.

I object to the Dacorum Local Plan in its current form.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

[Local Plan response EGS12411.png](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS12412

**Person ID**

1269501

**Full Name**

Robin McMorran

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site) Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street  These schemes at least show a creative approach to making use of land within the existing urban area, and have less impact on the natural environment. Berkhamsted and other towns are peppered with empty patches of land wasted on office car parking, empty second homes and brownfield sites. These parcels of land should be considered in more detail.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12413
<b>Person ID</b>	1269501
<b>Full Name</b>	Robin McMorran
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site) Growth Area Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street  These schemes at least show a creative approach to making use of land within the existing urban area, and have less impact on the natural environment. Berkhamsted and other towns are peppered with empty patches of land wasted on office car parking, empty second homes and brownfield sites. These parcels of land should be considered in more detail.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12416
<b>Person ID</b>	1269503
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jan Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Para 19.6 Release of Green Belt land may be required in 'Exceptional circumstances', However, bearing in mind the quantity of dwellings has been erroneously arrived at, once these are re-calculated, the exceptional circumstances reduce.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12420

<b>Person ID</b>	1269503
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Jan Wosiek
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>3: The developments in Northchurch identified as BK06 &amp; BK08 additionally are proposed for Green Belt land (See para 1). Access to Berkhamsted Town from these developments appears to be via Bell Lane and Durrants Lane. Darrs Lane isn't mentioned but it would be naive to believe it would not be used.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Bell Lane is a single track road running between Shootersway and Granville/Westfield roads.</li> <li>2 Durrants Lane is a 2 way road between Shootersway and High Street via a roundabout with a primary school just after.</li> <li>3 Darrs Lane is a single track lane between Shootersway and High Street.</li> </ol> <p>All of the above are steep hills and unsuitable for the increase in road traffic the proposed developments will incur.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Shootersway is already congested during peak times. These developments will only exacerbate the situation.</li> </ol> <p>4: Northchurch already occasionally suffers from pollution, the increase in road traffic as detailed in 2 &amp; 3 above will only exacerbate the situation putting residents at risk from increased associated diseases.</p> <p>5: The junction of Darrs Lane / High Street / High Street South becomes very congested at times as people drive to shop at Tesco's in Northchurch. This results in traffic backing up along the A4251 in both directions and restricts access / egress to residents on the Park Estate.</p> <p>It would again be naive to believe that residents from the new developments wouldn't travel and shop at this Tesco's hence adding to the congestion.</p> <p>6: The developments in Berkhamsted and Tring will generate a large increase in traffic on the A4251, Northchurch being a conservation area cannot accommodate any congestion relief schemes hence the increase in traffic will just increase the pollution in the area.</p> <p>7: Is DBC seriously considering the Lock Field site BK07, which according to the environment agency is an area at MEDIUM risk of flooding?</p> <p>8: Access to this site (BK07) will be via New Road and ultimately disseminating either through Ashridge or up to High Street (A4251) and adding to the congestion / pollution detailed in paras 5&amp;6 above. Additionally, when heading towards</p>

High Street, cars egressing from the site would have to cross oncoming traffic and almost immediately cross a narrow canal bridge. An accident spot, waiting to happen.

9: There will be approx 2200 and 1500 dwellings constructed in Tring and Berkhamsted within an approximate 3.5 mile radius of Northchurch.

Nowhere within this suite of documents is there mention of the overall environmental impact either as an assessment or statement providing any detail as to how this level of development will affect the current locality or its residents.

10: Finally; It is apparent from some of these proposals, the greenfield incursions proposed in this plan have been selected via a desk top exercise, from plans and maps rather than site inspections.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS12485

**Person ID**

1269523

**Full Name**

RORY LUMSDON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

I am concerned at the loss of hedgerows and trees - all impacted if these wetlands were built upon. Our own land is highly governed by conservationists - we are not permitted to build so much as a new garden shed, yet the proposal suggests that yards away another 60 houses could be built. How does the council explain this?

Bank Mill Lane has only a handful of cottages - several listed buildings - and already there are traffic issues with cars overflowing from the Old Mill pub. There have been several near collisions on a road that is only wide enough for one

car to drive down - and really should be a dead end as it heads towards Bulbeggars Lane. How will this road and indeed the bridge to Bank Mill sustain more cars and people? There is no footpath, and yet the majority of the road is National Speed Limit - despite regular use by pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. It is only a matter of time before a serious injury or death occurs.

Investment funds are being allocated to Hemel Hempstead for transport and amenity requirements associated with expansion of the town. Equivalent financial and infrastructure support is not being given to Berkhamsted and Tring.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12494

**Person ID** 1269524

**Full Name** DAVID ATKINSON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

The proposed site in Northchurch, Darrs Lane, will completely change the entire feel of the village. Northchurch is a village very separate to Berkhamsted and this development will merge the two places together, having a detrimental effect on the environment and community.

In Northchurch and Berkhamsted we are close to the A41, particularly at the top of Darrs Lane and rely on the green spaces to act as a buffer from the already very busy road.



As a young family we enjoy country walks, cycling and exercising in our nearest green spaces and the proposal to develop the Green Belt land around the houses at the top of Darrs Lane, would completely change the landscape and we would be very concerned about the increased level of traffic. Darrs Lane is a small country lane and would be ill prepared for the proposed development, it is already struggling to cope with current usage and would not sustain the increase in use.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12520

**Person ID** 1207806

**Full Name** Mr Chris Graebe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK07, Lock Field Northchurch:

This site borders the Grand Union Canal, and is an important open area viewed by the large number of walkers on the towpath. Its isolation by the canal on one side and the railway on the other has made it an important haven for wildlife, and bird watchers are often to be seen viewing northwards over the water between the lock and Dudswell. This is a particularly sensitive site, an important and very welcome open view rising to the ridge on the horizon beyond, the first such view after passing the stream of housing and industry along the path from Berkhamsted.

Accepting it as a development site would open up to the expanded ribbon development further along the (presently empty) canal bank. There has to be a limit to northwest expansion, and New Road, which is the present limit of housing development over the tunnel, should remain that limit.

The Lock Field site is valuable as it stands, the number of houses proposed is small, but the damage they would do is immense.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12521

**Person ID** 1207806

**Full Name** Mr Chris Graebe

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK09 Bank Mill Lane

This site by the river Bulbourne is an exceptional area of open water flow through beautiful landscape. The river is at the heart of Berkhamsted, and development of this flowery pasture area at its banks - and further extending the relentless creep of housing towards Hemel - would be a huge loss of green space for the community, and for the wildlife.

The damage done by building a small number of houses on this flood plain site would be disproportionately large.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS12537

Person ID 1269456

Full Name Mr & Ms R & C R & Wilby

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

Finally, what impact will there be on traffic, road safety, environmental sensitivity if you **sixty** houses on Lock Field in Northchurch?

Please accept this as our response to the consultation process. I trust you will submit our views to the appropriate body and consider them going forward.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12555
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk02</b> BFI Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12556
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb

<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk03</b> Haslam Field. Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12557
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch</b> Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy. The canal is a very important tourism asset within Berkhamsted and the Borough of Dacorum. Development should not be countenanced along this priceless asset. Once lost it is gone for ever as green space and an important wild life corridor.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12558
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk09 Bank Mill Lane.</b> Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. It is on the flood plain. It is an irreplaceable asset to our local green space.
Yes / No * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12559
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk11</b> Jewson. Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12560
<b>Person ID</b>	1269544

<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Lindy Foster Weinreb
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Chairman Berkhamstead Citizens Association
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk12</b> Civic Centre. Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12572
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk03: Should remain as sports pitches; moving the facilities further away to Haresfoot adds considerably to traffic and is much less sustainable.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12573
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12574
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk05: A hillside site facing downhill and away from Berkhamsted. Not a suitable extension to the town as walking and cycling prohibited by topography. Noise from A41.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12575
<b>Person ID</b>	1261562
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Symington
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12581
<b>Person ID</b>	1269559
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jessica Giolda
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.</p> <p>There are significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.</p>

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12582

<b>Person ID</b>	1269559
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jessica Giolda
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK06 Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12593
<b>Person ID</b>	1269561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Martin & Tracey Martin & Tracey Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> </ul>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12594
<b>Person ID</b>	1269561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Martin & Tracey Martin & Tracey Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12595
<b>Person ID</b>	1269561
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs Martin & Tracey Martin & Tracey Read
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</li> </ul>

—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

- Following the death of (name removed) , who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12614

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**



56352

Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted

The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on network infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing->

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12615

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 67968 Bk02: British Film Institute  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.  We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposed development and the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.  Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS12616
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>56354</p> <p>Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposed development and the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a</p>

strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

The proposed development is located within 15m of a Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station.

Given the nature of the function of the pumping station and the close proximity of the proposed development to the pumping station we consider that habitable rooms should be at least 15m away from the pumping station assets as highlighted as best practice in Sewers for Adoption (7th edition)'. The amenity of those that will occupy new development must be a consideration as set out in the National planning Policy Framework (NPPF) therefore we object to the application. In the event that the Local Planning Authority consider that they will grant planning permission for the development, we would suggest the following informative is attached to the planning permission: "The proposed development is located within 15m of a Thames Water Sewage Pumping Station and this is contrary to best practice set out in Sewers for Adoption (7th edition). Future occupiers of the development should be made aware that they could periodically experience adverse amenity impacts from the pumping station.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12617

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 67970 Bk04: Land between Hanburys and A41  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.  We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposed development and the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.  Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12618
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>56358</p> <p>Bk05:</p> <p>Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.</p>

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12619

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
 Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**  
**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**  
 56356

Bk06: East of Darrs Lane

The level of information contained in this document does not allow Thames Water to make a detailed assessment of the impact the proposed housing provision will have on the wastewater infrastructure. To enable us to provide more specific comments on the site proposals we require an indication of the scale of development regarding the maximum capacity of the proposed secondary school together with the anticipated timing of development.

We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site and the profile of the surrounding area. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12620

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>56357</p> <p>Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p> <p>There is a rising main crossing site. We will need to understand any potential impact ahead of development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12621
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>67971</p> <p>Bk08:</p> <p>Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)</p> <p>The scale of development/s is likely to require upgrades to the wastewater network. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to agree a housing and infrastructure phasing plan. The plan should determine the magnitude of spare capacity currently available within the network and what phasing may be required to ensure development does not outpace delivery of essential network upgrades to accommodate future development/s. Failure to liaise with Thames Water will increase the risk of planning conditions being sought at the application stage to control the phasing of development in order to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of development. The developer can request information on network infrastructure by visiting the Thames Water website <a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development</a>.</p> <p>We would like to take the opportunity to highlight the potential of SUDs development indicated by the proposal for the addition of public open space within the site and the profile of the surrounding area. In any case, in accordance with the Building Act 2000 clause H3.3. Positive connection to a public surface water will only be consented when it can be demonstrated that the hierarchy of disposal methods have been examined and proven to be impracticable. The disposal hierarchy being; 1st Soakaways; 2nd Watercourses; 3rd Sewer.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12622
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>56359</p> <p>Bk09: Bank Mill Lane</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development individually. However, considering the general upcoming growth within this particular location, further and comprehensive details will be required regarding the connection point/s and the discharge type, in order to assess more effectively the impact of this development as part of a development cluster.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach</p>

before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12623

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**  
42624  
Bk10:  
Hanburys

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12624

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
 Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**  
**Site ID**  
**Site Name**  
**Water Comments**  
**Waste Comments**  
**Additional Comments**  
 67972

Bk11: Billet Lane (Jewson site)

On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email [Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk) tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ On the information available to date we do not envisage concerns regarding wastewater treatment capacity in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email [Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk) tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities

Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ

Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12625

**Person ID** 1207604

**Full Name** Thames Water Planning Policy

**Organisation Details** C/O Savills  
Thames Water Planning Policy

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Site ID</b> <b>Site Name</b> <b>Water Comments</b> <b>Waste Comments</b> <b>Additional Comments</b> 42614 Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street  On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater network or wastewater treatment infrastructure capability in relation to this site/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12626
<b>Person ID</b>	1207604
<b>Full Name</b>	Thames Water Planning Policy
<b>Organisation Details</b>	C/O Savills Thames Water Planning Policy

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Site ID</b></p> <p><b>Site Name</b></p> <p><b>Water Comments</b></p> <p><b>Waste Comments</b></p> <p><b>Additional Comments</b></p> <p>67973</p> <p>Bk13:</p> <p>Gossoms End / Billet Lane</p> <p>On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding wastewater networks in relation to this development/s. It is recommended that the Developer and the Local Planning Authority liaise with Thames Water at the earliest opportunity to advise of the developments phasing. Please contact Thames Water Development Planning, either by email <a href="mailto:Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk">Devcon.team@thameswater.co.uk</a> tel: 02035779998 or in writing Thames Water Utilities Ltd, Maple Lodge STW, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, Hertfordshire, WD3 9SQ</p> <p>There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.</p> <p><a href="https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes">https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes</a>.</p> <p>Thames Water recognises this catchment is subject to high infiltration flows during certain groundwater conditions. The developer should liaise with the LLFA to agree an appropriate sustainable SW strategy following the sequential approach before considering connection to the public sewer network. In the longer-term Thames Water, along with other partners, are working on a strategy to reduce groundwater entering the sewer network</p>



Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12671
<b>Person ID</b>	1269581
<b>Full Name</b>	Vistry Homes
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Vistry Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	979742
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Love
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Senior Planning Associate BIDWELLS
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><b>Site Selection of Housing Allocations</b></p> <p>Our client has interest in land at Land off Pea Lane, Northchurch, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire (“the site”), which our client continues to promote as a potential residential allocation in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020- 2038).</p> <p>Representations have been made by our client (under the name of Linden Homes, now part of Vistry Group, following a merger in January 2020) to previous stages of the preparation of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) including the Issues &amp; Options consultation and Call for Sites held in 2017.</p>

We have set out in this letter the context of our client's representation to the Emerging Strategy for Growth consultation. Vistry Homes Ltd object to the Emerging Strategy for Growth of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) as currently drafted for reasons set out below in this letter. Our client has significant concerns with the approach to establishing the housing requirement in the Local Plan and the implication for housing land supply.

Our client also has significant concerns relating to the lack of site assessment as part of the Council's site assessment for housing allocations and we object to the Council's conclusion that the site is considered unsuitable for further consideration for proposed residential allocation, based on the Council's justification that the site is located wholly within the AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).

As set out in the introduction, my client has an interest in the land at Land off Pea Lane, Northchurch, Berkhamsted, which we consider represents an achievable, suitable and deliverable site for residential allocation in the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038).

The Policies Map of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the site as Green Belt designation and AONB designation.

My client strongly objects to the continued identification of the site as Green Belt designation and AONB designation in the Emerging Strategy for Growth.

My client requests that the Council remove the Green Belt designation and AONB designation from the site and instead identifies the site as a housing allocation, helping to meet the shortfall in land supply identified above.

The Council's consultants AECOM have undertaken an assessment of 144 sites provided by the Council. The assessment narrows this down to 46 sites which were considered to be potentially suitable for development, albeit with some constraints.

The site is identified in the evidence background document 'Site Selection: Appendix A, Summary of Site Selection' (November 2020) as site ref. 19 'Land off Pea Lane' under the table of "*sites considered to be unsuitable for further consideration*" in Berkhamsted (greenfield/rural sites) at page A9 of the document. The justification in the table states that the site is located wholly within the AONB.

We object to the justification that the site is considered unsuitable for further consideration because the site is located wholly within the AONB.

The Council's Sustainability Appraisal (Page 33, Table 5.3) sets out that the rationale behind this approach is that the Council places great weight on the importance of the AONB and will first look to allocation sites outside the AONB. It concludes that the evidence currently suggests sufficient non-AONB sites are available and therefore the option of allocating land in the AONB has been rejected.

Whilst the need to protect the AONB in line with national policy is understood, this approach does not allow for a proper assessment of the sustainability of sites, the quality of the AONB across the Borough and the impact that particular development proposals would have on the AONB.

There is nothing in national policy that sets out that development in the AONB should be avoided. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF sets out that:

*Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.... The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited.*

The NPPF therefore seeks to conserve and enhance the landscape in AONBs and ensure any development in them is 'limited'- it does not prevent development. For the Dacorum Local Plan to be justified, the Council will need to ensure that the impact of any potential developments on the AONB is properly assessed rather than ruling out any development.

In the case of our client's site, the site itself makes a limited contribution to the overall value of the quality of the landscape. Proposed development of the site would seek to improve the edge treatment to the west of Berkhamsted with new buffer planting and public open space. This would lead to an enhancement to the quality of the surrounding AONB, in line with national policy.

Particularly in the context of the Council needing to find additional sites for over 5,000 new homes, it will be key that the Council do further assessment work to look at the potential of AONB sites to form part of the final development strategy for the emerging Local Plan.

Overall, it is considered that the site has a low sensitivity value, is a logical extension to the built edge of Berkhamsted and there would be no landscape or visual constraints to the proposed development of the site. Proposed development of the site would be viewed in the context of the existing settlement edge and reinforced with additional landscaping.

Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. We consider that the site, taken in isolation, does not meet these five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the table below.

### **NPPF, paragraph 134 – five purposes of the Green Belt**

#### **Assessment of the site**

a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up area;

Proposed development of the site would not result in unrestricted sprawl of the existing built-up area of Berkhamsted. The site is visually and physically contained, relates well to the existing urban area and would form a logical extension to the built form between Berkhamsted and the A41.

b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

Proposed development of the site will not facilitate the merging of Berkhamsted with neighbouring settlements including any nearby hamlets or the town of Tring location much further north. There is no physical, visual or perceived relationship of the site with neighbouring settlements and proposed development would cause no physical, visual or perceived coalescence with other settlements.

c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

Proposed development of the site would assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site is visually and physically contained, relates well to the existing urban area and would form a logical extension to the built form between Berkhamsted and the A41. The site's landscape sensitivity is low and the proposed development would have a low to almost negligible impact on the wider surrounding area. Proposed development of the site would be viewed in the context of the existing settlement edge and reinforced with additional landscaping.

d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

Proposed development of the site would preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. The site and wider area have no visual or character relationship with the historic core of Northchurch or Berkhamsted located much further to the east of the site. There are no heritage constraints to the development of the site.

e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Proposed development would provide market and affordable housing which would assist in bringing a wide range of economic and social benefits to the local area, including support to local business through additional patronage; delivery of homes in a sustainable location within walking and cycling distance to local amenities and good public transport; and delivery of housing against a backdrop of housing need.

In summary to the table above, the site is exceptionally well contained and comprises defined boundaries that would be further enhanced through the development proposals and would be made permanent. Proposed development of the site would cause no visual, physical or perceived coalescence with neighbouring settlements and would assist in safeguarding the countryside of encroachment, ensuring that the openness of surrounding Green Belt land is maintained. It can be concluded that the site does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt and therefore justifies its removal from the Green Belt.

The site is located wholly within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore the lowest risk of flooding (less than 1 in 1,000 probability of river flooding). Proposed development of the site would be able to provide a suitable drainage strategy that would not increase flooding elsewhere.

There would be no constraints to the proposed development of the site in terms of water, wastewater or other utilities.

We also consider that there would not be any environmental health or minerals constraints to proposed development of the site.

There are no ecological constraints to development of the site and the proposed development of the site would be able to provide on-site ecological mitigation.

We consider that proposed development of the site would have limited to no impact on any heritage assets, most of which are Listed Buildings located in the centre of Northchurch.

The site is located in close proximity to public transport options including local bus services and Berkhamsted railway station.

Safe access to the site can be achieved to the existing highway network with sufficient visibility and the surrounding junctions within the town has sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional traffic generated.

As part of any sustainability appraisal, the site would score highly and be a strong contender for proposed allocation in the emerging Local Plan.

Our client's site at represents an achievable, suitable and deliverable site for residential allocation in the emerging Dacorum Local Plan, particularly in light of the need to identify additional housing land to meet the minimum housing need in the area, we consider the Local Plan should be amended to remove the site from the Green Belt and allocate it for residential development.

As already noted, it is considered that the site could accommodate approximately 50-100 dwellings along with public open space. Masterplanning for the site can be prepared in order to show details of proposed layout and design to identify how residential development of the site can be delivered.

Our client is also supportive of the additional growth to the west of Berkhamsted including housing allocation 'Growth Area Bk06: East of Darr's Lane' in Policy SP20 – 'Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted' as identified in the Emerging Strategy for Growth and associated Policies Map. This housing allocation will help facilitate our client's site and the land in between the site and Darr's Lane to come forward for additional housing growth.

The proposed development of my client's site would be supported by a planning application which would be accompanied by a detailed package of technical information to demonstrate that the proposed development will not result in any significant harm to matters of acknowledged importance, such as highway safety, flooding, ecology, arboriculture, heritage, archaeology or landscape and visual amenity.

Residential allocation of our client's site will meet the existing and future housing requirements for Dacorum Borough, boosting the supply of housing and contributing to a deliverable supply of housing land. The site is controlled by our client who is a developer, and not a promoter, and can be developed within the forthcoming five-year period, which will contribute significantly towards maintaining a rolling 5-year supply of suitable housing sites throughout the plan period of the Dacorum Local Plan once adopted.

### **Conclusion**

Our client objects to the Emerging Strategy for Growth of the Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) as currently drafted for reasons set out in this representation. Our client has significant concerns with the draft Local Plan, specifically the approach to addressing housing need and housing land supply.

Our client also has significant concerns relating to the lack of site assessment work by the Council as part of its site assessment for housing allocations and we object to the Council's conclusion that the site is considered unsuitable for further consideration for proposed residential allocation, based on the Council's justification that the site is located wholly within the AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty).

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12676
<b>Person ID</b>	1145844

<b>Full Name</b>	Dr and Mrs Melvyn Else
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	979742
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Love
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Senior Planning Associate BIDWELLS
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>My client notes that chapter 11 of the NPPF encourages planning policies to make effective use of land, in particularly paragraph 118 which promotes development of under-utilised land, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained. Further, paragraph 137 states that, before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, it should be demonstrated that all other reasonable options for meeting identified need for development have been examined fully. Whilst it may be necessary for Green Belt land to come forward for development due to housing need pressures, sites such as Edgeworth House should be considered as a priority as this approach is consistent with the NPPF. Our client considers that Edgeworth House as a site for housing has not been fully assessed by the Council as a priority ahead of Green Belt sites released for housing.</p> <p>Furthermore, retention of an Open Land designation and not permitting controlled development on the Edgeworth House site will actually detract from available Open Space in Berkhamsted. Such a policy would see the area remain hidden behind hedges and fences with the benefit restricted only to the owners of Edgeworth House. Permitting development could open up a significant part of the site to a much wider public, increasing access to the River Bulbourne and actually increasing the amount of true Open Space in Berkhamsted.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12679
<b>Person ID</b>	1145844

<b>Full Name</b>	Dr and Mrs Melvyn Else
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	979742
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Robert Love
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Senior Planning Associate BIDWELLS
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><u>Housing Land Supply &amp; Windfall Development</u></p> <p>As noted above, due to the use of the incorrect LHN Standard Methodology for establishing the minimum housing need, the Emerging Strategy for Growth will already fail to deliver the level of housing required in the area.</p> <p>However, in addition to this shortfall of some 1,819 homes, the development strategy also builds in insufficient flexibility and contingency on the housing land supply side for the Local Plan to be considered robust. Currently, the Emerging Strategy for Growth includes just a 2% buffer in housing land supply (303 homes – paragraph 7.128). This level of contingency is wholly insufficient, both in percentage terms and as an absolute number.</p> <p>It is common for Local Plans to build in at least a 10% contingency on the housing land supply side to allow for unexcepted delays in the delivery of sites, changes in site capacity, under delivery of windfall, etc. In some cases, the buffer is 20%. The need for such a buffer depends on the risk associated with the overall strategy, the particular nature of the sites proposed for allocation – with larger, more complex sites justifying the need for a larger buffer in supply, and the step change in delivery being sought, which in Dacorum is significant given the current adopted Local Plan (Core Strategy) target of 430 and recent delivery rates averaging around 544 homes over the last three years. This suggests the need for a buffer nearer to 20%.</p> <p>The implication of a 10% buffer on top of the minimum housing need of 18,414 is that the Dacorum Local Plan should plan for the delivery of 20,255 homes. A 20% buffer would mean the Local Plan planning for 22,097 homes. These figures suggest that the planned housing supply in the Local Plan is between 3,355 and 5,197 homes below where it needs in order for it to be robust.</p>

This is a significant shortfall which can only be rectified by additional sites being identified across the Borough for housing allocations in the Local Plan. This includes ensuring that sites that could come forward for housing through windfall development, such as my client's site at Edgeworth House, is not restricted by any unjustified designations such as the Open Land designation of Edgeworth House as discussed further above in this representation.

The second part of the housing land supply equation is the need to ensure that supply is not backloaded and that on adoption, the Council will be able to demonstrate a deliverable five-year supply of deliverable housing land is in place. This means that any additional sites need to be capable of delivery early in the plan period, suggesting the need for deliverable small to medium sized sites to be identified, including those such as my client's site at Edgeworth House which can contribute towards windfall development, as opposed to large, strategic sites with long lead in times and significant infrastructure requirements.

Policy SP20 'Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted' of the Emerging Strategy for Growth identifies the delivery of at least 2,236 dwellings in Berkhamsted over the plan period, including 143 dwellings of known commitments and 1,876 dwellings of Local Plan Strategic Allocations. The estimated number of dwellings to be delivered from windfall sites is 217 dwellings for Berkhamsted.

We consider that the estimation of the number of dwellings to be delivered in Berkhamsted is unrealistic on the basis that the urban area is already physically constrained to achieve this target. Furthermore, unjustified designations that could prevent windfall development coming forward, such as the Open Land designation of Edgeworth House, would further hinder the Council from achieving its required windfall targets. Windfalls are a finite but diminishing resource so should not be ignored when they arise.

The Edgeworth House site without the Open Land classification could also assist the Council in other areas where it has targets to meet as well as its obligations in the NPPF. Housing development for older people will be encouraged in the NPPF on sites close to good public transport, local amenities, health services and town and district local centres. Few other sites in the area can satisfy all the above in the way that is achieved by the Edgeworth House site. The Edgeworth site offers almost endless limits in terms of its potential in future plans. The site could well be large enough to assist with the primary school requirements of the area or contributing towards the community health care requirements of the area as alternatives to its contribution to housing. With the identification of Green Belt land to meet the areas growth requirements, whilst this might be necessary, sites such as Edgeworth House should be considered and fully assessed by the Council as a site for housing as a priority and ahead of Green Belt sites being released for housing as this would be consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.

### **Conclusion**

For reasons set out above in this letter, my client strongly objects to the identification of the site at Edgeworth House and associated surrounding land as an Open Land designation in the Emerging Strategy for Growth. It is requested that the Council remove the Open Land designation from the site as part of the continued preparation of emerging Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) beyond the current consultation of the Emerging Strategy for Growth.

**Included files**



<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12703
<b>Person ID</b>	1264257
<b>Full Name</b>	Pam Beeby
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk01</p> <p>As regards to the impact of traffic on schools and existing residential area, development should not be approved if it will cause significant congestion around schools. Bk01 will cause traffic problems down Swing Gate Lane, and apart from the schools on that road (at either end of a steep gradient) it, along with other roads in the area, are a drop off point for pupils at Ashlyns School. There will be an increase in traffic and pollution contributing to child health and safety concerns.</p> <p>All the minor roads leading to London Road will become rat runs. It's likely that Cars from BK01 residents will be parked on Hall Park estate roads to enable residents to walk to the station but to avoid the steep hill. This is already a problem on Hillside and surrounding streets.</p> <p>This and most of the other sites are not well connected by transport infrastructure or close to facilities, including the railway station, town centre shops &amp; restaurants, GP surgeries and leisure facilities. There are no plans for extra medical facilities which are already stretched.</p> <p>The Plan will not contribute towards solving the housing shortage for local residents. Developer led 4+ bedroom homes will not be "affordable".</p> <p>In addition this and many of the growth sites in Berkhamsted are at the top of steep gradients which would not meet the requirement of being able to cycle or walk into the town centre, both from the time and effort involved.</p>

The Ridgetop position of Bk01 is highly visible from AONB.

Water and sewage is already under strain and there are risks of damage to the chalk streams.

Tree protection removing trees will affect air quality and biodiversity.

All the previous reasons for rejection of this site by DBC still hold good.

In 2013 in the Core Strategy, it was stated that 'maintaining the strong valley and linear character of the settlement was important' and that 'the open valley sides and ridge top locations are especially sensitive to new building and development in these locations will not be supported'.

It provided a 'strong greenbelt boundary'

To use the site 'would cause erosion of the bypass buffer'

The site has a 'poor relationship to town and services e.g. station'

It would have a detrimental 'visual impact of gateway from the A416 and A41'

Concerns about 'the proximity of A41 to housing'

I believe all these reasons still hold good and should be reinstated.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12711

**Person ID** 1269600

**Full Name** Alex Marsh

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an  impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12712
<b>Person ID</b>	1269600
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction tra□c on the structure of the bridge and also increased tra□c flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12713
<b>Person ID</b>	1269600
<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and</li> </ul> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following the death of (name removed), who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12718
<b>Person ID</b>	1260680
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs S Hopkinson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260685
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Fearn
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020 - 2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH -NOVEMBER 2020</b> <b>Introduction &amp; Background</b>

We continue to act for a group of owners of 5 plots of land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood, Berkhamsted and write confirming these parties' continued interest in the emerging development plan process.

The landowners are as follows:

- No 13 Oakwood - Mr & Mrs S Hopkinson
- No 14 Oakwood - Mr & Mrs M Fifield
- No 15 Oakwood - Mr & Mrs R Hall
- No 16 Oakwood - Mr & Mrs George
- No 17 Oakwood - Mr & Mrs G Behr

You may recall that we have written to the Council on behalf of these landowners previously, in relation to the consultation upon the emerging Site Allocations development plan document, as well as the Issues & Options consultation regarding the need to correct a Green Belt boundary anomaly in the vicinity of their land. Despite these representations the matter was never put in front of an Inspector, although the site has been reviewed on two occasions by Arup (see below).

The strip of Green Belt land in question includes garden plots at the rear of the Objectors' properties on Oakwood, as well as the gardens of an estate of dwellings built in about 2005 known as Hockeridge View. The plot to the rear of No. 15 had a lawful development certificate granted confirming its use as residential garden. This not only changed the legal status of the land, but clearly physically, alters the whole nature of what was originally one strip of land adjoining the A41.

### **Government Policy**

To be found "sound" the Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires Plans are:

- 1 *Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs<sup>19</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;*
- 2 *Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*
- 3 *Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*
- 4 *Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework*

Other Government NPPF policy, such as that concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 139, is dealt with under the review of the Arup Green Belt Assessments (see below).

### **Emerging Policy**

Draft Policy SP11 "*Development in the Green Belt*" says:

"1. The extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Policies Map. The Green Belt boundary has been reviewed to land in defined Growth Areas to meet identified need over the lifetime of the Plan and to allow for other minor consequential

changes. No further changes are proposed. Sites removed from the Green Belt will be managed as countryside until required for development ”

Draft Policy SP20, entitled “*Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted*” allocates a considerable amount of housing to the south of the Town under draft Policy SP21 “*Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted*”, all of which is currently Green Belt. Of the various sites allocated in Berkhamsted the following 3 all utilise the A41 as the appropriate defining edge of the Green Belt.

- *Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted* (33.45ha);
- *Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields* (6.56ha to the immediate east of the Objectors’ land).
- *Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)* 12.29ha to the immediate west of Hockeridge View / the Objector’s land)

[SEE IMAGE 1]

From the above it can be seen that once the other designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that forming the rear gardens of Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the clear line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary.

### **The Arup Reports**

Arup have been commissioned to carry out 2 reviews of Green Belt in the Borough in recent years:

- ‘Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report’, which was published in December 2016 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2016 Report’); and
- ‘Stage 3 Green Belt Review - Final Report, 27 August 2020 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2020 Report’).

The **Arup 2016 Report** divided the Green Belt into ‘sub-areas’ and the subject land formed part of sub-area BK-A11. Pages 102 & 103 of the Study identify the Green Belt boundary in this part of the sub-area (BK-A11s) as being ‘anomalous’.

[SEE IMAGE 2]

Section 5.6 of Arup’s 2016 Report (headed “*Boundary Assessment*”) advised the Council:

“The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be “defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. Thus, where sub-areas are deemed - less sensitive to change in landscape terms, relatively unconstrained and not fundamental to the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes - there is a need to identify potentially robust alternative Green Belt boundaries for consideration by the Council. Opportunities for strengthening of existing boundaries through various means (e.g. planting, landscaping etc.) were also identified.

This workstream considered both existing physical features and opportunities for boundaries to be strengthened or reinstated, with further refined sub-areas for consideration identified on this basis. The results are described qualitatively and mapped in Table 5.8. Overall summary maps are also provided in Maps 5.11-5.16”.

Beneath the heading “*Other boundary amendments*” Section 7.2.3 (on Page 132) says:

“Other minor boundary amendments are recommended. Through the purposes and site and landscape assessments, an anomalous boundary was identified in part of sub-area BK-A11 (denoted BK-A11s). The proposed amendment (Maps 7.1 and 7.2) would correct the current anomalous boundary, which does not follow a recognised physical features. The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”.

The stated “*Study purpose*” of the **Arup 2020 Report** is given at paragraph 1.1. on page 1 as being:

“Arup was appointed by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan. This Stage 3 Green Belt Review will form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Specifically, the role of this Stage 3 Green Belt Review was to:

- *Assess potential housing and employment site allocations that lie within the Green Belt, considering the acceptability of the sites in Green Belt boundary terms and to provide site specific advice on any mitigation This evidence will inform the Council’s site selection process and will be considered alongside the Council’s wider evidence base and the development of the Borough’s spatial strategy.*
- *Following selection of preferred site allocations by the Council, to advise on the new Green Belt boundaries around the six main settlements of Berkhamsted, Bovington, Hemel Hempstead, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring”.*

Under the heading “*National Planning Policy, Guidance and Case Law*” at Section 1 of the Arup 2020 Report it is stated:

“The NPPF provides the parameters for defining and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 139 (f) states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, ‘using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.’

Given that the general extent of Green Belts has been established, the NPPF specifies that any proposed boundary alterations must be addressed in strategic policies using the criteria and methodology in paragraphs 135-142. As such, it is only during the preparation of Local Plans that evidence can be gathered and used to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ for changing Green Belt boundaries, whether an expansion or contraction of the Green Belt is proposed. However, preparation of a Local Plan in itself, does not amount to exceptional circumstances.

Thus, to amend Green Belt boundaries, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The NPPF does not define what constitutes exceptional circumstances, however, it states (at paragraph 137) that ‘before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.

Although there is no clear definition of what amounts to exceptional circumstances, case law is clear that any justification must be responsive to local conditions and take account of a range of factors. It is worth noting that the legal challenge, *Gallagher Homes v. Solihull MBC* (2014), confirmed that an anomalous Green Belt designation can only be described as incongruous if ‘something [has] occurred subsequent to the definition of the Green Belt boundary that justifies a change” (Arup 2020 Report, Pages 2 & 3).

Within Section 2.4 “*New Single Local Plan*”, Arup state:



“A new single Local Plan is currently being prepared.....In completing the evidential work, the Council is taking the opportunity to review the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries around potential development sites and large settlements” (Arup 2020 Report, page 3).

At Section 2.5 (“*Implications*”) the Arup 2020 Report notes that:

“From the review of policy and previous studies, the following implications for the Green Belt boundary review were identified:

- *Local Plan review offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration, including to accommodate strategic allocations. It will be necessary to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify any alteration.*
- *Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable physical features that are likely to be permanent*
- *The Local Plan review also offers an opportunity to undertake detailed review of the Green Belt boundary to ascertain whether there are any potential anomalies in the Green Belt boundary and where there is clear justification, to recommend a change*
- *Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary. There are three main potential sources of anomalies, which should be considered when reviewing boundaries:*
  - *Minor anomalies, for example, potential digitisation errors, or small-scale adjustments would be required to realign the Green Belt boundary with a readily recognisable and permanent boundary feature*
  - *Future anomalies, that would arise as a result of potential site allocations in the Green Belt.*
  - *Potential alterations to the Green Belt should be undertaken on a case by case basis, which may encompass: examination of the historical reasons behind Green Belt definition, to ascertain whether an error was made in designating the original boundary; or a review of the site to determine if there have been any changes post Green Belt establishment”.*

Subsection 3.3 (“*Identification of Green Belt Boundaries*”), at pages 11-13, “sets out how Green Belt boundaries around sites and selected settlements were assessed”, one of which is “*Appropriate boundary features*”. The Government policy (at NPPF paragraph 139) is reiterated that:

“Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In other words, they must be defensible and well justified to be maintained in the long-term, beyond the lifetime of the development plan”.

For the purposes of the Arup assessment, “*the following features were considered to be readily recognisable and durable features, consistent with the approach taken in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review*”:

- *Infrastructure: motorways, public and made roads, and railway lines*
- *Landforms: river, stream, canal or other watercourse; and prominent physical feature (e.g. ridgeline).*

- *Natural vegetation features: limited to dense mature trees or woodland, or those which were protected by a formal designation*
- *Development: limited to development with strongly established, regular or consistent built form comprising well-defined or rectilinear edges (e.g. building edges or boundary walls / fences).*

Page 12 states that “for clarity, the following ‘soft boundary’ features were not considered as durable” [which amongst others are]:

- *Natural vegetation features: weakly bounded field boundary, intermittent or young tree Less well established, less prominent and/or unprotected features, such as hedgerows, were generally be avoided since they could be easier to remove or alter.*
- *Development: ‘irregular’ or ‘inconsistent’ built form comprising imprecise or ‘softer’ edges*

Furthermore, in the “Absence of boundary features”, page 12 states:

- “In any cases where the Green Belt boundaries do not coincide with defensible boundary features, new boundary features were proposed”.

Sub-section 3.4 is headed “Addressing Green Belt Anomalies”, but it then says:

- "For those anomalies classed as minor, these have largely been retained as Green Belt or Non-Green Belt land, as applicable, with the exception of those relating to digitisation errors. For those anomalies classed as major, an assessment was undertaken as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify a boundary amendment. Major anomalies were discussed at a joint consultant – client workshop. This allowed the client to use their local knowledge and planning judgement to determine whether an amendment would be appropriate.....

If significant areas of land (‘major anomalies’) no longer, or (‘future anomalies’) will no longer fulfil Green Belt purposes, as described at NPPF paragraph 134, these have been proposed for removal.

These anomalies may arise where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature that can serve as a long term permanent boundary, beyond the Plan period” (Arup 2020 Report, page 13).

Specifically, in the case of Berkhamsted, Section 6.2 of the Arup 2020 report said:

“The majority of the Green Belt boundary around Berkhamsted is considered to meet the NPPF requirements of being clearly defined, readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. However, there are 13 sections where potential weaknesses / anomalies have been identified (Figure 6.2, Table 6.1).

Eight of these anomalies (BK.A, BK.B, BK.C, BK.D, BK.E, BK.G, BK.H, and BK.L) relate to development that is present within the Green Belt. However, no exceptional circumstances were identified to justify the release of this land and therefore no changes are proposed.

Five of the anomalies (BK.F, BK.I, BK.J, BK.K and BK.M) relates to the proposed release of sites 12, 4, 16, 18 and 20 (respectively) from the Green Belt as allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Minor release of additional Green Belt land is recommended to avoid creating a small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes.

The resultant Green Belt boundary for Berkhamsted, taking into account proposed allocations and the anomalies, is shown in Figure 6.3”.

[SEE IMAGE 3 & 4]

### **Analysis**

Within the two Arup studies the Council was repeatedly advised of the Government policy position at paragraph 139 of the NPPF that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Objector’s land is ‘weak’, in that it does not follow any defining Features such as infrastructure are taken as strong and permanent boundaries whereas “*soft boundary’ features* [such as hedges or young trees] *were not considered as durable*” (Arup 2020 Report, Page 12).

*“Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report). The Arup 2016 Report was unequivocal that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Oakwood was anomalous in not following any recognised, permanent, physical feature and should be corrected (*“The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”* - Section 2.3 of the Arup 2016 Report).

The findings of the Arup 2020 report also bear this out, and it was the stated purpose of that Study *“to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan”* and form part of the evidence base. The time to address such an anomaly would be during the preparation stage of a new local plan which *“offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report).

It is therefore inexplicable that, having undertaken such an extensive exercise of evidence gathering then to determine that nothing is to be done with the information assembled, if the anomaly is defined as being ‘minor’. The Arup 2020 Report does advise that the Green Belt boundary reviews should be on a ‘case by case’ basis, but then proceeds to avoid dealing with any of the identified ‘minor’ anomalies at all. The reasons for this decision are not given.

However, the Arup 2020 Report did see the need to attend to ‘future’ anomalies. As previously stated, and as can be seen from Figure 6.3 of the Arup 2020 Report immediately above, once the other housing designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that of the gardens in Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary. As a result, as the emerging plan currently stands, this ‘minor anomaly’ will be perpetuated as a ‘future anomaly’. Elsewhere in the Arup 2020 Report additional releases of Green Belt are recommended in order to prevent the creation of *“small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes”*.

The Arup 2020 Report asserts that it found no 'exceptional circumstances' to justify any changes in respect of the eight 'minor' anomalies in Berkhamsted but, in respect of BK.H at least, failed to take account of the following changed circumstances, most of which would have occurred since the Green Belt boundary in this vicinity was originally designated:

- the finalisation of the route of the A41 – originally the Objectors' land was included within the scope of the route of the by-pass and was sold off as separate plots once the road was complete;
- the allocation of all the land immediately adjoining the subject site to its east and west, all of which will take the A41 as its boundary; and
- the incorporation of the subject land into private gardens (including the granting of a lawful development certificate in respect of No. 15 confirming this use) and the building of Hockeridge View, meaning that none of this land performs any meaningful Green Belt role.

**Closing Remarks**

To be found "sound" the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are **Positively prepared; Justified** (i.e. based on evidence); **Effective**; and **Consistent with national policy** (i.e. prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently written, Draft Policy SP11 in particular will be none of those things, unless and until the boundary is drawn in a permanent and defensible manner.

The Objectors would be grateful if the Council would take note of their representations and keep them informed as to future iterations of the emerging plan.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[IMAGE 3 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 4 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 2 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 1 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[Michael Fearn Rumbal Sedgewick - Dacorum Strategy for Growth 2020-12-29 \(002\).pdf](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12729

**Person ID** 405304

**Full Name** Mr & Mrs Martin and Jennifer Fifield

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	1260685
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Fearn
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020 - 2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH -NOVEMBER 2020</b></p> <p><b>Introduction &amp; Background</b></p> <p>We continue to act for a group of owners of 5 plots of land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood, Berkhamsted and write confirming these parties' continued interest in the emerging development plan process.</p> <p>The landowners are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs S Hopkinson</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs M Fifield</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs R Hall</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs George</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs G Behr</li> </ul> <p>You may recall that we have written to the Council on behalf of these landowners previously, in relation to the consultation upon the emerging Site Allocations development plan document, as well as the Issues &amp; Options consultation regarding the need to correct a Green Belt boundary anomaly in the vicinity of their land. Despite these representations the matter was never put in front of an Inspector, although the site has been reviewed on two occasions by Arup (see below).</p> <p>The strip of Green Belt land in question includes garden plots at the rear of the Objectors' properties on Oakwood, as well as the gardens of an estate of dwellings built in about 2005 known as Hockeridge View. The plot to the rear of No. 15 had a lawful development certificate granted confirming its use as residential garden. This not only changed the legal status of the land, but clearly physically, alters the whole nature of what was originally one strip of land adjoining the A41.</p> <p><b>Government Policy</b></p> <p>To be found "sound" the Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires Plans are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <i>Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs<sup>19</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;</i></li> </ol>

- 2 *Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*
- 3 *Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*
- 4 *Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework*

Other Government NPPF policy, such as that concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 139, is dealt with under the review of the Arup Green Belt Assessments (see below).

### **Emerging Policy**

Draft Policy SP11 “*Development in the Green Belt*” says:

“1. The extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Policies Map. The Green Belt boundary has been reviewed to land in defined Growth Areas to meet identified need over the lifetime of the Plan and to allow for other minor consequential changes. No further changes are proposed. Sites removed from the Green Belt will be managed as countryside until required for development ”

Draft Policy SP20, entitled “*Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted*” allocates a considerable amount of housing to the south of the Town under draft Policy SP21 “*Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted*”, all of which is currently Green Belt. Of the various sites allocated in Berkhamsted the following 3 all utilise the A41 as the appropriate defining edge of the Green Belt.

- *Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted (33.45ha);*
- *Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields (6.56ha to the immediate east of the Objectors’ land).*
- *Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41) 12.29ha to the immediate west of Hockeridge View / the Objector’s land)*

[SEE IMAGE 1]

From the above it can be seen that once the other designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that forming the rear gardens of Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the clear line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary.

### **The Arup Reports**

Arup have been commissioned to carry out 2 reviews of Green Belt in the Borough in recent years:

- ‘Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report’, which was published in December 2016 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2016 Report’); and
- ‘Stage 3 Green Belt Review - Final Report, 27 August 2020 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2020 Report’).

The **Arup 2016 Report** divided the Green Belt into ‘sub-areas’ and the subject land formed part of sub-area BK-A11. Pages 102 & 103 of the Study identify the Green Belt boundary in this part of the sub-area (BK-A11s) as being ‘anomalous’.

[SEE IMAGE 2]

Section 5.6 of Arup's 2016 Report (headed "*Boundary Assessment*") advised the Council:

"The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be "defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent". Thus, where sub-areas are deemed - less sensitive to change in landscape terms, relatively unconstrained and not fundamental to the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes - there is a need to identify potentially robust alternative Green Belt boundaries for consideration by the Council. Opportunities for strengthening of existing boundaries through various means (e.g. planting, landscaping etc.) were also identified.

This workstream considered both existing physical features and opportunities for boundaries to be strengthened or reinstated, with further refined sub-areas for consideration identified on this basis. The results are described qualitatively and mapped in Table 5.8. Overall summary maps are also provided in Maps 5.11-5.16".

Beneath the heading "*Other boundary amendments*" Section 7.2.3 (on Page 132) says:

"Other minor boundary amendments are recommended. Through the purposes and site and landscape assessments, an anomalous boundary was identified in part of sub-area BK-A11 (denoted BK-A11s). The proposed amendment (Maps 7.1 and 7.2) would correct the current anomalous boundary, which does not follow a recognised physical features. The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt".

The stated "*Study purpose*" of the **Arup 2020 Report** is given at paragraph 1.1. on page 1 as being:

"Arup was appointed by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum's new Local Plan. This Stage 3 Green Belt Review will form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Specifically, the role of this Stage 3 Green Belt Review was to:

- *Assess potential housing and employment site allocations that lie within the Green Belt, considering the acceptability of the sites in Green Belt boundary terms and to provide site specific advice on any mitigation This evidence will inform the Council's site selection process and will be considered alongside the Council's wider evidence base and the development of the Borough's spatial strategy.*
- *Following selection of preferred site allocations by the Council, to advise on the new Green Belt boundaries around the six main settlements of Berkhamsted, Bovingdon, Hemel Hempstead, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring".*

Under the heading "*National Planning Policy, Guidance and Case Law*" at Section 1 of the Arup 2020 Report it is stated:

"The NPPF provides the parameters for defining and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 139 (f) states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, 'using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.'

Given that the general extent of Green Belts has been established, the NPPF specifies that any proposed boundary alterations must be addressed in strategic policies using the criteria and methodology in paragraphs 135-142. As such, it is only during the preparation of Local Plans that evidence can be gathered and used to justify 'exceptional circumstances' for changing Green Belt boundaries, whether an expansion or contraction of the Green Belt is proposed. However, preparation of a Local Plan in itself, does not amount to exceptional circumstances.

Thus, to amend Green Belt boundaries, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The NPPF does not define what constitutes exceptional circumstances, however, it states (at paragraph 137) that ‘before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.

Although there is no clear definition of what amounts to exceptional circumstances, case law is clear that any justification must be responsive to local conditions and take account of a range of factors. It is worth noting that the legal challenge, *Gallagher Homes v. Solihull MBC* (2014), confirmed that an anomalous Green Belt designation can only be described as incongruous if ‘something [has] occurred subsequent to the definition of the Green Belt boundary that justifies a change’ (Arup 2020 Report, Pages 2 & 3).

Within Section 2.4 “*New Single Local Plan*”, Arup state:

“A new single Local Plan is currently being prepared....In completing the evidential work, the Council is taking the opportunity to review the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries around potential development sites and large settlements” (Arup 2020 Report, page 3).

At Section 2.5 (“*Implications*”) the Arup 2020 Report notes that:

“From the review of policy and previous studies, the following implications for the Green Belt boundary review were identified:

- *Local Plan review offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration, including to accommodate strategic allocations. It will be necessary to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify any alteration.*
- *Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable physical features that are likely to be permanent*
- *The Local Plan review also offers an opportunity to undertake detailed review of the Green Belt boundary to ascertain whether there are any potential anomalies in the Green Belt boundary and where there is clear justification, to recommend a change*
- *Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary. There are three main potential sources of anomalies, which should be considered when reviewing boundaries:*
  - *Minor anomalies, for example, potential digitisation errors, or small-scale adjustments would be required to realign the Green Belt boundary with a readily recognisable and permanent boundary feature*
  - *Future anomalies, that would arise as a result of potential site allocations in the Green Belt.*
  - *Potential alterations to the Green Belt should be undertaken on a case by case basis, which may encompass: examination of the historical reasons behind Green Belt definition, to ascertain whether an error was made in designating the original boundary; or a review of the site to determine if there have been any changes post Green Belt establishment”.*



Subsection 3.3 (*“Identification of Green Belt Boundaries”*), at pages 11-13, *“sets out how Green Belt boundaries around sites and selected settlements were assessed”*, one of which is *“Appropriate boundary features”*. The Government policy (at NPPF paragraph 139) is reiterated that:

*“Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In other words, they must be defensible and well justified to be maintained in the long-term, beyond the lifetime of the development plan”*.

For the purposes of the Arup assessment, *“the following features were considered to be readily recognisable and durable features, consistent with the approach taken in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review”*:

- *Infrastructure: motorways, public and made roads, and railway lines*
- *Landforms: river, stream, canal or other watercourse; and prominent physical feature (e.g. ridgeline).*
- *Natural vegetation features: limited to dense mature trees or woodland, or those which were protected by a formal designation*
- *Development: limited to development with strongly established, regular or consistent built form comprising well-defined or rectilinear edges (e.g. building edges or boundary walls / fences).*

Page 12 states that *“for clarity, the following ‘soft boundary’ features were not considered as durable”* [which amongst others are]:

- *Natural vegetation features: weakly bounded field boundary, intermittent or young tree Less well established, less prominent and/or unprotected features, such as hedgerows, were generally be avoided since they could be easier to remove or alter.*
- *Development: ‘irregular’ or ‘inconsistent’ built form comprising imprecise or ‘softer’ edges*

Furthermore, in the *“Absence of boundary features”*, page 12 states:

- *“In any cases where the Green Belt boundaries do not coincide with defensible boundary features, new boundary features were proposed”*.

Sub-section 3.4 is headed *“Addressing Green Belt Anomalies”*, but it then says:

- *“For those anomalies classed as minor, these have largely been retained as Green Belt or Non-Green Belt land, as applicable, with the exception of those relating to digitisation errors. For those anomalies classed as major, an assessment was undertaken as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify a boundary amendment. Major anomalies were discussed at a joint consultant – client workshop. This allowed the client to use their local knowledge and planning judgement to determine whether an amendment would be appropriate.....*

*If significant areas of land (‘major anomalies’) no longer, or (‘future anomalies’) will no longer fulfil Green Belt purposes, as described at NPPF paragraph 134, these have been proposed for removal.*

*These anomalies may arise where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature that can serve as a long term permanent boundary, beyond the Plan period” (Arup 2020 Report, page 13).*

Specifically, in the case of Berkhamsted, Section 6.2 of the Arup 2020 report said:

“The majority of the Green Belt boundary around Berkhamsted is considered to meet the NPPF requirements of being clearly defined, readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. However, there are 13 sections where potential weaknesses / anomalies have been identified (Figure 6.2, Table 6.1).

Eight of these anomalies (BK.A, BK.B, BK.C, BK.D, BK.E, BK.G, BK.H, and BK.L) relate to development that is present within the Green Belt. However, no exceptional circumstances were identified to justify the release of this land and therefore no changes are proposed.

Five of the anomalies (BK.F, BK.I, BK.J, BK.K and BK.M) relates to the proposed release of sites 12, 4, 16, 18 and 20 (respectively) from the Green Belt as allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Minor release of additional Green Belt land is recommended to avoid creating a small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes.

The resultant Green Belt boundary for Berkhamsted, taking into account proposed allocations and the anomalies, is shown in Figure 6.3”.

[SEE IMAGE 3 & 4]

### **Analysis**

Within the two Arup studies the Council was repeatedly advised of the Government policy position at paragraph 139 of the NPPF that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Objector’s land is ‘weak’, in that it does not follow any defining Features such as infrastructure are taken as strong and permanent boundaries whereas “‘soft boundary’ features [such as hedges or young trees] were not considered as durable” (Arup 2020 Report, Page 12).

*“Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report). The Arup 2016 Report was unequivocal that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Oakwood was anomalous in not following any recognised, permanent, physical feature and should be corrected (*“The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”* - Section 2.3 of the Arup 2016 Report).

The findings of the Arup 2020 report also bear this out, and it was the stated purpose of that Study *“to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan”* and form part of the evidence base. The time to address such an anomaly would be during the preparation stage of a new local plan which *“offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report).

It is therefore inexplicable that, having undertaken such an extensive exercise of evidence gathering then to determine that nothing is to be done with the information assembled, if the anomaly is defined as being ‘minor’. The Arup 2020 Report does advise that the Green Belt boundary reviews should be on a ‘case by case’ basis, but then proceeds to avoid dealing with any of the identified ‘minor’ anomalies at all. The reasons for this decision are not given.

However, the Arup 2020 Report did see the need to attend to ‘future’ anomalies. As previously stated, and as can be seen from Figure 6.3 of the Arup 2020 Report immediately above, once the other housing designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that of the gardens in Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary. As a result, as the emerging plan currently stands, this ‘minor anomaly’ will be perpetuated as a ‘future anomaly’. Elsewhere in the Arup 2020 Report additional releases of Green Belt are recommended in order to prevent the creation of “*small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes*”.

The Arup 2020 Report asserts that it found no ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify any changes in respect of the eight ‘minor’ anomalies in Berkhamsted but, in respect of BK.H at least, failed to take account of the following changed circumstances, most of which would have occurred since the Green Belt boundary in this vicinity was originally designated:

- the finalisation of the route of the A41 – originally the Objectors’ land was included within the scope of the route of the by-pass and was sold off as separate plots once the road was complete;
- the allocation of all the land immediately adjoining the subject site to its east and west, all of which will take the A41 as its boundary; and
- the incorporation of the subject land into private gardens (including the granting of a lawful development certificate in respect of No. 15 confirming this use) and the building of Hockeridge View, meaning that none of this land performs any meaningful Green Belt role.

**Closing Remarks**

To be found "sound" the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are **Positively prepared; Justified** (i.e. based on evidence); **Effective**; and **Consistent with national policy** (i.e. prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently written, Draft Policy SP11 in particular will be none of those things, unless and until the boundary is drawn in a permanent and defensible manner.

The Objectors would be grateful if the Council would take note of their representations and keep them informed as to future iterations of the emerging plan.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[Michael Fearn Rumbal Sedgewick - Dacorum Strategy for Growth 2020-12-29 \(002\).pdf](#)  
[IMAGE 1 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 2 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 4 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 3 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12730
<b>Person ID</b>	1260681
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs R Hall
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260685
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Fearn
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020 - 2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH -NOVEMBER 2020</b></p> <p><b>Introduction &amp; Background</b></p> <p>We continue to act for a group of owners of 5 plots of land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood, Berkhamsted and write confirming these parties' continued interest in the emerging development plan process.</p> <p>The landowners are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs S Hopkinson</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs M Fifield</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs R Hall</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs George</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs G Behr</li> </ul> <p>You may recall that we have written to the Council on behalf of these landowners previously, in relation to the consultation upon the emerging Site Allocations development plan document, as well as the Issues &amp; Options consultation regarding the need to correct a Green Belt boundary anomaly in the vicinity of their land. Despite these representations the matter was never put in front of an Inspector, although the site has been reviewed on two occasions by Arup (see below).</p> <p>The strip of Green Belt land in question includes garden plots at the rear of the Objectors' properties on Oakwood, as well as the gardens of an estate of dwellings built in about 2005 known as Hockeridge View. The plot to the rear of No. 15 had a lawful development certificate granted confirming its use as residential garden. This not only changed the legal status of the land, but clearly physically, alters the whole nature of what was originally one strip of land adjoining the A41.</p>

## Government Policy

To be found "sound" the Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires Plans are:

- 1 *Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs<sup>19</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;*
- 2 *Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*
- 3 *Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*
- 4 *Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework*

Other Government NPPF policy, such as that concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 139, is dealt with under the review of the Arup Green Belt Assessments (see below).

## Emerging Policy

Draft Policy SP11 “*Development in the Green Belt*” says:

“1. The extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Policies Map. The Green Belt boundary has been reviewed to land in defined Growth Areas to meet identified need over the lifetime of the Plan and to allow for other minor consequential changes. No further changes are proposed. Sites removed from the Green Belt will be managed as countryside until required for development ”

Draft Policy SP20, entitled “*Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted*” allocates a considerable amount of housing to the south of the Town under draft Policy SP21 “*Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted*”, all of which is currently Green Belt. Of the various sites allocated in Berkhamsted the following 3 all utilise the A41 as the appropriate defining edge of the Green Belt.

- *Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted (33.45ha);*
- *Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields (6.56ha to the immediate east of the Objectors’ land).*
- *Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41) 12.29ha to the immediate west of Hockeridge View / the Objector’s land)*

[SEE IMAGE 1]

From the above it can be seen that once the other designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that forming the rear gardens of Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the clear line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary.

## The Arup Reports

Arup have been commissioned to carry out 2 reviews of Green Belt in the Borough in recent years:

- ‘Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report’, which was published in December 2016 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2016 Report’); and
- ‘Stage 3 Green Belt Review - Final Report, 27 August 2020 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2020 Report’).

The **Arup 2016 Report** divided the Green Belt into ‘sub-areas’ and the subject land formed part of sub-area BK-A11. Pages 102 & 103 of the Study identify the Green Belt boundary in this part of the sub-area (BK-A11s) as being ‘anomalous’.

[SEE IMAGE 2]

Section 5.6 of Arup’s 2016 Report (headed “*Boundary Assessment*”) advised the Council:

“The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be “defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. Thus, where sub-areas are deemed - less sensitive to change in landscape terms, relatively unconstrained and not fundamental to the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes - there is a need to identify potentially robust alternative Green Belt boundaries for consideration by the Council. Opportunities for strengthening of existing boundaries through various means (e.g. planting, landscaping etc.) were also identified.

This workstream considered both existing physical features and opportunities for boundaries to be strengthened or reinstated, with further refined sub-areas for consideration identified on this basis. The results are described qualitatively and mapped in Table 5.8. Overall summary maps are also provided in Maps 5.11-5.16”.

Beneath the heading “*Other boundary amendments*” Section 7.2.3 (on Page 132) says:

“Other minor boundary amendments are recommended. Through the purposes and site and landscape assessments, an anomalous boundary was identified in part of sub-area BK-A11 (denoted BK-A11s). The proposed amendment (Maps 7.1 and 7.2) would correct the current anomalous boundary, which does not follow a recognised physical features. The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”.

The stated “*Study purpose*” of the **Arup 2020 Report** is given at paragraph 1.1. on page 1 as being:

“Arup was appointed by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan. This Stage 3 Green Belt Review will form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Specifically, the role of this Stage 3 Green Belt Review was to:

- *Assess potential housing and employment site allocations that lie within the Green Belt, considering the acceptability of the sites in Green Belt boundary terms and to provide site specific advice on any mitigation This evidence will inform the Council’s site selection process and will be considered alongside the Council’s wider evidence base and the development of the Borough’s spatial strategy.*
- *Following selection of preferred site allocations by the Council, to advise on the new Green Belt boundaries around the six main settlements of Berkhamsted, Bovington, Hemel Hempstead, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring”.*

Under the heading “*National Planning Policy, Guidance and Case Law*” at Section 1 of the Arup 2020 Report it is stated:

“The NPPF provides the parameters for defining and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 139 (f) states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, ‘using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.’

Given that the general extent of Green Belts has been established, the NPPF specifies that any proposed boundary alterations must be addressed in strategic policies using the criteria and methodology in paragraphs 135-142. As such, it is only during the preparation of Local Plans that evidence can be gathered and used to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ for changing Green Belt boundaries, whether an expansion or contraction of the Green Belt is proposed. However, preparation of a Local Plan in itself, does not amount to exceptional circumstances.

Thus, to amend Green Belt boundaries, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The NPPF does not define what constitutes exceptional circumstances, however, it states (at paragraph 137) that ‘before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.

Although there is no clear definition of what amounts to exceptional circumstances, case law is clear that any justification must be responsive to local conditions and take account of a range of factors. It is worth noting that the legal challenge, *Gallagher Homes v. Solihull MBC* (2014), confirmed that an anomalous Green Belt designation can only be described as incongruous if ‘something [has] occurred subsequent to the definition of the Green Belt boundary that justifies a change’” (Arup 2020 Report, Pages 2 & 3).

Within Section 2.4 “*New Single Local Plan*”, Arup state:

“A new single Local Plan is currently being prepared.....In completing the evidential work, the Council is taking the opportunity to review the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries around potential development sites and large settlements” (Arup 2020 Report, page 3).

At Section 2.5 (“*Implications*”) the Arup 2020 Report notes that:

“From the review of policy and previous studies, the following implications for the Green Belt boundary review were identified:

- *Local Plan review offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration, including to accommodate strategic allocations. It will be necessary to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify any alteration.*
- *Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable physical features that are likely to be permanent*
- *The Local Plan review also offers an opportunity to undertake detailed review of the Green Belt boundary to ascertain whether there are any potential anomalies in the Green Belt boundary and where there is clear justification, to recommend a change*
- *Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary. There are three main potential sources of anomalies, which should be considered when reviewing boundaries:*

- *Minor anomalies, for example, potential digitisation errors, or small-scale adjustments would be required to realign the Green Belt boundary with a readily recognisable and permanent boundary feature*
- *Future anomalies, that would arise as a result of potential site allocations in the Green Belt.*
- *Potential alterations to the Green Belt should be undertaken on a case by case basis, which may encompass: examination of the historical reasons behind Green Belt definition, to ascertain whether an error was made in designating the original boundary; or a review of the site to determine if there have been any changes post Green Belt establishment”.*

Subsection 3.3 (“*Identification of Green Belt Boundaries*”), at pages 11-13, “sets out how Green Belt boundaries around sites and selected settlements were assessed”, one of which is “*Appropriate boundary features*”. The Government policy (at NPPF paragraph 139) is reiterated that:

“Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In other words, they must be defensible and well justified to be maintained in the long-term, beyond the lifetime of the development plan”.

For the purposes of the Arup assessment, “*the following features were considered to be readily recognisable and durable features, consistent with the approach taken in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review*”:

- *Infrastructure: motorways, public and made roads, and railway lines*
- *Landforms: river, stream, canal or other watercourse; and prominent physical feature (e.g. ridgeline).*
- *Natural vegetation features: limited to dense mature trees or woodland, or those which were protected by a formal designation*
- *Development: limited to development with strongly established, regular or consistent built form comprising well-defined or rectilinear edges (e.g. building edges or boundary walls / fences).*

Page 12 states that “*for clarity, the following ‘soft boundary’ features were not considered as durable*” [which amongst others are]:

- *Natural vegetation features: weakly bounded field boundary, intermittent or young tree Less well established, less prominent and/or unprotected features, such as hedgerows, were generally be avoided since they could be easier to remove or alter.*
- *Development: ‘irregular’ or ‘inconsistent’ built form comprising imprecise or ‘softer’ edges*

Furthermore, in the “*Absence of boundary features*”, page 12 states:

- “In any cases where the Green Belt boundaries do not coincide with defensible boundary features, new boundary features were proposed”.

Sub-section 3.4 is headed “*Addressing Green Belt Anomalies*”, but it then says:

- “For those anomalies classed as minor, these have largely been retained as Green Belt or Non-Green Belt land, as applicable, with the exception of those relating to digitisation errors. For those anomalies classed as major, an assessment was undertaken as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify a boundary amendment.



Major anomalies were discussed at a joint consultant – client workshop. This allowed the client to use their local knowledge and planning judgement to determine whether an amendment would be appropriate.....

If significant areas of land ('major anomalies') no longer, or ('future anomalies') will no longer fulfil Green Belt purposes, as described at NPPF paragraph 134, these have been proposed for removal.

These anomalies may arise where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature that can serve as a long term permanent boundary, beyond the Plan period” (Arup 2020 Report, page 13).

Specifically, in the case of Berkhamsted, Section 6.2 of the Arup 2020 report said:

“The majority of the Green Belt boundary around Berkhamsted is considered to meet the NPPF requirements of being clearly defined, readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. However, there are 13 sections where potential weaknesses / anomalies have been identified (Figure 6.2, Table 6.1).

Eight of these anomalies (BK.A, BK.B, BK.C, BK.D, BK.E, BK.G, BK.H, and BK.L) relate to development that is present within the Green Belt. However, no exceptional circumstances were identified to justify the release of this land and therefore no changes are proposed.

Five of the anomalies (BK.F, BK.I, BK.J, BK.K and BK.M) relates to the proposed release of sites 12, 4, 16, 18 and 20 (respectively) from the Green Belt as allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Minor release of additional Green Belt land is recommended to avoid creating a small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes.

The resultant Green Belt boundary for Berkhamsted, taking into account proposed allocations and the anomalies, is shown in Figure 6.3”.

[SEE IMAGE 3 & 4]

### **Analysis**

Within the two Arup studies the Council was repeatedly advised of the Government policy position at paragraph 139 of the NPPF that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Objector’s land is ‘weak’, in that it does not follow any defining Features such as infrastructure are taken as strong and permanent boundaries whereas “*soft boundary’ features* [such as hedges or young trees] *were not considered as durable*” (Arup 2020 Report, Page 12).

“*Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary*” (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report). The Arup 2016 Report was unequivocal that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Oakwood was anomalous in not following any recognised, permanent, physical feature and should be corrected (“*The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt*” - Section 2.3 of the Arup 2016 Report).

The findings of the Arup 2020 report also bear this out, and it was the stated purpose of that Study “to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan” and form part of the evidence base. The time to address such an anomaly would be during the preparation stage of a new local plan which “offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration” (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report).

It is therefore inexplicable that, having undertaken such an extensive exercise of evidence gathering then to determine that nothing is to be done with the information assembled, if the anomaly is defined as being ‘minor’. The Arup 2020 Report does advise that the Green Belt boundary reviews should be on a ‘case by case’ basis, but then proceeds to avoid dealing with any of the identified ‘minor’ anomalies at all. The reasons for this decision are not given.

However, the Arup 2020 Report did see the need to attend to ‘future’ anomalies. As previously stated, and as can be seen from Figure 6.3 of the Arup 2020 Report immediately above, once the other housing designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that of the gardens in Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary. As a result, as the emerging plan currently stands, this ‘minor anomaly’ will be perpetuated as a ‘future anomaly’. Elsewhere in the Arup 2020 Report additional releases of Green Belt are recommended in order to prevent the creation of “small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes”.

The Arup 2020 Report asserts that it found no ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify any changes in respect of the eight ‘minor’ anomalies in Berkhamsted but, in respect of BK.H at least, failed to take account of the following changed circumstances, most of which would have occurred since the Green Belt boundary in this vicinity was originally designated:

- the finalisation of the route of the A41 – originally the Objectors’ land was included within the scope of the route of the by-pass and was sold off as separate plots once the road was complete;
- the allocation of all the land immediately adjoining the subject site to its east and west, all of which will take the A41 as its boundary; and
- the incorporation of the subject land into private gardens (including the granting of a lawful development certificate in respect of No. 15 confirming this use) and the building of Hockeridge View, meaning that none of this land performs any meaningful Green Belt role.

### Closing Remarks

To be found “sound” the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are **Positively prepared; Justified** (i.e. based on evidence); **Effective**; and **Consistent with national policy** (i.e. prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently written, Draft Policy SP11 in particular will be none of those things, unless and until the boundary is drawn in a permanent and defensible manner.

The Objectors would be grateful if the Council would take note of their representations and keep them informed as to future iterations of the emerging plan.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">IMAGE 3 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 4 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 2 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 1 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">Michael Fearn Rumbal Sedgewick - Dacorum Strategy for Growth 2020-12-29 (002).pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12731
<b>Person ID</b>	1260684
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs G Behr
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260685
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Fearn
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020 - 2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH -NOVEMBER 2020</b></p> <p><b>Introduction &amp; Background</b></p> <p>We continue to act for a group of owners of 5 plots of land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood, Berkhamsted and write confirming these parties' continued interest in the emerging development plan process.</p> <p>The landowners are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs S Hopkinson</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs M Fifield</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs R Hall</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs George</li> <li>• - Mr &amp; Mrs G Behr</li> </ul>

You may recall that we have written to the Council on behalf of these landowners previously, in relation to the consultation upon the emerging Site Allocations development plan document, as well as the Issues & Options consultation regarding the need to correct a Green Belt boundary anomaly in the vicinity of their land. Despite these representations the matter was never put in front of an Inspector, although the site has been reviewed on two occasions by Arup (see below).

The strip of Green Belt land in question includes garden plots at the rear of the Objectors' properties on Oakwood, as well as the gardens of an estate of dwellings built in about 2005 known as Hockeridge View. The plot to the rear of No. 15 had a lawful development certificate granted confirming its use as residential garden. This not only changed the legal status of the land, but clearly physically, alters the whole nature of what was originally one strip of land adjoining the A41.

### **Government Policy**

To be found "sound" the Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires Plans are:

- 1 *Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs<sup>19</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;*
- 2 *Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*
- 3 *Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*
- 4 *Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework*

Other Government NPPF policy, such as that concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 139, is dealt with under the review of the Arup Green Belt Assessments (see below).

### **Emerging Policy**

Draft Policy SP11 "*Development in the Green Belt*" says:

"1. The extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Policies Map. The Green Belt boundary has been reviewed to land in defined Growth Areas to meet identified need over the lifetime of the Plan and to allow for other minor consequential changes. No further changes are proposed. Sites removed from the Green Belt will be managed as countryside until required for development "

Draft Policy SP20, entitled "*Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted*" allocates a considerable amount of housing to the south of the Town under draft Policy SP21 "*Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted*", all of which is currently Green Belt. Of the various sites allocated in Berkhamsted the following 3 all utilise the A41 as the appropriate defining edge of the Green Belt.

- *Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted (33.45ha);*
- *Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields (6.56ha to the immediate east of the Objectors' land).*

- *Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)* 12.29ha to the immediate west of Hockeridge View / the Objector's land)

[SEE IMAGE 1]

From the above it can be seen that once the other designations go forward, the Objector's land and that forming the rear gardens of Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the clear line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary.

### **The Arup Reports**

Arup have been commissioned to carry out 2 reviews of Green Belt in the Borough in recent years:

- 'Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report', which was published in December 2016 (referred to here as the 'Arup 2016 Report'); and
- 'Stage 3 Green Belt Review - Final Report, 27 August 2020 (referred to here as the 'Arup 2020 Report').

The **Arup 2016 Report** divided the Green Belt into 'sub-areas' and the subject land formed part of sub-area BK-A11. Pages 102 & 103 of the Study identify the Green Belt boundary in this part of the sub-area (BK-A11s) as being 'anomalous'.

[SEE IMAGE 2]

Section 5.6 of Arup's 2016 Report (headed "*Boundary Assessment*") advised the Council:

"The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be "defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent". Thus, where sub-areas are deemed - less sensitive to change in landscape terms, relatively unconstrained and not fundamental to the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes - there is a need to identify potentially robust alternative Green Belt boundaries for consideration by the Council. Opportunities for strengthening of existing boundaries through various means (e.g. planting, landscaping etc.) were also identified.

This workstream considered both existing physical features and opportunities for boundaries to be strengthened or reinstated, with further refined sub-areas for consideration identified on this basis. The results are described qualitatively and mapped in Table 5.8. Overall summary maps are also provided in Maps 5.11-5.16".

Beneath the heading "*Other boundary amendments*" Section 7.2.3 (on Page 132) says:

"Other minor boundary amendments are recommended. Through the purposes and site and landscape assessments, an anomalous boundary was identified in part of sub-area BK-A11 (denoted BK-A11s). The proposed amendment (Maps 7.1 and 7.2) would correct the current anomalous boundary, which does not follow a recognised physical features. The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt".

The stated "*Study purpose*" of the **Arup 2020 Report** is given at paragraph 1.1. on page 1 as being:

"Arup was appointed by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum's new Local Plan. This Stage 3 Green Belt Review will form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Specifically, the role of this Stage 3 Green Belt Review was to:

- *Assess potential housing and employment site allocations that lie within the Green Belt, considering the acceptability of the sites in Green Belt boundary terms and to provide site specific advice on any mitigation. This evidence will inform the Council's site selection process and will be considered alongside the Council's wider evidence base and the development of the Borough's spatial strategy.*
- *Following selection of preferred site allocations by the Council, to advise on the new Green Belt boundaries around the six main settlements of Berkhamsted, Bovington, Hemel Hempstead, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring”.*

Under the heading “*National Planning Policy, Guidance and Case Law*” at Section 1 of the Arup 2020 Report it is stated:

“The NPPF provides the parameters for defining and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 139 (f) states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, ‘using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.’

Given that the general extent of Green Belts has been established, the NPPF specifies that any proposed boundary alterations must be addressed in strategic policies using the criteria and methodology in paragraphs 135-142. As such, it is only during the preparation of Local Plans that evidence can be gathered and used to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ for changing Green Belt boundaries, whether an expansion or contraction of the Green Belt is proposed. However, preparation of a Local Plan in itself, does not amount to exceptional circumstances.

Thus, to amend Green Belt boundaries, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The NPPF does not define what constitutes exceptional circumstances, however, it states (at paragraph 137) that ‘before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.

Although there is no clear definition of what amounts to exceptional circumstances, case law is clear that any justification must be responsive to local conditions and take account of a range of factors. It is worth noting that the legal challenge, *Gallagher Homes v. Solihull MBC* (2014), confirmed that an anomalous Green Belt designation can only be described as incongruous if ‘something [has] occurred subsequent to the definition of the Green Belt boundary that justifies a change” (Arup 2020 Report, Pages 2 & 3).

Within Section 2.4 “*New Single Local Plan*”, Arup state:

“A new single Local Plan is currently being prepared.....In completing the evidential work, the Council is taking the opportunity to review the Borough's Green Belt boundaries around potential development sites and large settlements” (Arup 2020 Report, page 3).

At Section 2.5 (“*Implications*”) the Arup 2020 Report notes that:

“From the review of policy and previous studies, the following implications for the Green Belt boundary review were identified:

- *Local Plan review offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration, including to accommodate strategic allocations. It will be necessary to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify any alteration.*

- *Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable physical features that are likely to be permanent*
- *The Local Plan review also offers an opportunity to undertake detailed review of the Green Belt boundary to ascertain whether there are any potential anomalies in the Green Belt boundary and where there is clear justification, to recommend a change*
- *Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary. There are three main potential sources of anomalies, which should be considered when reviewing boundaries:*
  - *Minor anomalies, for example, potential digitisation errors, or small-scale adjustments would be required to realign the Green Belt boundary with a readily recognisable and permanent boundary feature*
  - *Future anomalies, that would arise as a result of potential site allocations in the Green Belt.*
  - *Potential alterations to the Green Belt should be undertaken on a case by case basis, which may encompass: examination of the historical reasons behind Green Belt definition, to ascertain whether an error was made in designating the original boundary; or a review of the site to determine if there have been any changes post Green Belt establishment”.*

Subsection 3.3 (“*Identification of Green Belt Boundaries*”), at pages 11-13, “*sets out how Green Belt boundaries around sites and selected settlements were assessed*”, one of which is “*Appropriate boundary features*”. The Government policy (at NPPF paragraph 139) is reiterated that:

“*Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In other words, they must be defensible and well justified to be maintained in the long-term, beyond the lifetime of the development plan*”.

For the purposes of the Arup assessment, “*the following features were considered to be readily recognisable and durable features, consistent with the approach taken in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review*”:

- *Infrastructure: motorways, public and made roads, and railway lines*
- *Landforms: river, stream, canal or other watercourse; and prominent physical feature (e.g. ridgeline).*
- *Natural vegetation features: limited to dense mature trees or woodland, or those which were protected by a formal designation*
- *Development: limited to development with strongly established, regular or consistent built form comprising well-defined or rectilinear edges (e.g. building edges or boundary walls / fences).*

Page 12 states that “*for clarity, the following ‘soft boundary’ features were not considered as durable*” [which amongst others are]:

- *Natural vegetation features: weakly bounded field boundary, intermittent or young tree Less well established, less prominent and/or unprotected features, such as hedgerows, were generally be avoided since they could be easier to remove or alter.*
- *Development: ‘irregular’ or ‘inconsistent’ built form comprising imprecise or ‘softer’ edges*

Furthermore, in the “*Absence of boundary features*”, page 12 states:

- “In any cases where the Green Belt boundaries do not coincide with defensible boundary features, new boundary features were proposed”.

Sub-section 3.4 is headed “*Addressing Green Belt Anomalies*”, but it then says:

- “For those anomalies classed as minor, these have largely been retained as Green Belt or Non-Green Belt land, as applicable, with the exception of those relating to digitisation errors. For those anomalies classed as major, an assessment was undertaken as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify a boundary amendment. Major anomalies were discussed at a joint consultant – client workshop. This allowed the client to use their local knowledge and planning judgement to determine whether an amendment would be appropriate.....

If significant areas of land (‘major anomalies’) no longer, or (‘future anomalies’) will no longer fulfil Green Belt purposes, as described at NPPF paragraph 134, these have been proposed for removal.

These anomalies may arise where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature that can serve as a long term permanent boundary, beyond the Plan period” (Arup 2020 Report, page 13).

Specifically, in the case of Berkhamsted, Section 6.2 of the Arup 2020 report said:

“The majority of the Green Belt boundary around Berkhamsted is considered to meet the NPPF requirements of being clearly defined, readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. However, there are 13 sections where potential weaknesses / anomalies have been identified (Figure 6.2, Table 6.1).

Eight of these anomalies (BK.A, BK.B, BK.C, BK.D, BK.E, BK.G, BK.H, and BK.L) relate to development that is present within the Green Belt. However, no exceptional circumstances were identified to justify the release of this land and therefore no changes are proposed.

Five of the anomalies (BK.F, BK.I, BK.J, BK.K and BK.M) relates to the proposed release of sites 12, 4, 16, 18 and 20 (respectively) from the Green Belt as allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Minor release of additional Green Belt land is recommended to avoid creating a small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes.

The resultant Green Belt boundary for Berkhamsted, taking into account proposed allocations and the anomalies, is shown in Figure 6.3”.

[SEE IMAGE 3 & 4]

### **Analysis**

Within the two Arup studies the Council was repeatedly advised of the Government policy position at paragraph 139 of the NPPF that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Objector’s land is ‘weak’, in that it does not follow any defining



Features such as infrastructure are taken as strong and permanent boundaries whereas “*soft boundary features* [such as hedges or young trees] *were not considered as durable*” (Arup 2020 Report, Page 12).

*“Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report). The Arup 2016 Report was unequivocal that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Oakwood was anomalous in not following any recognised, permanent, physical feature and should be corrected (*“The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”* - Section 2.3 of the Arup 2016 Report).

The findings of the Arup 2020 report also bear this out, and it was the stated purpose of that Study *“to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan”* and form part of the evidence base. The time to address such an anomaly would be during the preparation stage of a new local plan which *“offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report).

It is therefore inexplicable that, having undertaken such an extensive exercise of evidence gathering then to determine that nothing is to be done with the information assembled, if the anomaly is defined as being ‘minor’. The Arup 2020 Report does advise that the Green Belt boundary reviews should be on a ‘case by case’ basis, but then proceeds to avoid dealing with any of the identified ‘minor’ anomalies at all. The reasons for this decision are not given.

However, the Arup 2020 Report did see the need to attend to ‘future’ anomalies. As previously stated, and as can be seen from Figure 6.3 of the Arup 2020 Report immediately above, once the other housing designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that of the gardens in Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary. As a result, as the emerging plan currently stands, this ‘minor anomaly’ will be perpetuated as a ‘future anomaly’. Elsewhere in the Arup 2020 Report additional releases of Green Belt are recommended in order to prevent the creation of *“small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes”*.

The Arup 2020 Report asserts that it found no ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify any changes in respect of the eight ‘minor’ anomalies in Berkhamsted but, in respect of BK.H at least, failed to take account of the following changed circumstances, most of which would have occurred since the Green Belt boundary in this vicinity was originally designated:

- the finalisation of the route of the A41 – originally the Objectors’ land was included within the scope of the route of the by-pass and was sold off as separate plots once the road was complete;
- the allocation of all the land immediately adjoining the subject site to its east and west, all of which will take the A41 as its boundary; and
- the incorporation of the subject land into private gardens (including the granting of a lawful development certificate in respect of No. 15 confirming this use) and the building of Hockeridge View, meaning that none of this land performs any meaningful Green Belt role.

### **Closing Remarks**

To be found “sound” the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are **Positively prepared; Justified** (i.e. based on evidence); **Effective**; and **Consistent with national policy** (i.e.

prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently written, Draft Policy SP11 in particular will be none of those things, unless and until the boundary is drawn in a permanent and defensible manner.

The Objectors would be grateful if the Council would take note of their representations and keep them informed as to future iterations of the emerging plan.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> comment	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Michael Fearn Rumbal Sedgewick - Dacorum Strategy for Growth 2020-12-29 (002).pdf</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 1 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 2 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 4 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a> <a href="#">IMAGE 3 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12732
<b>Person ID</b>	1260682
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs George
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1260685
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Michael Fearn
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>DACORUM LOCAL PLAN (2020 - 2038) EMERGING STRATEGY FOR GROWTH -NOVEMBER 2020</b> <b>Introduction &amp; Background</b> We continue to act for a group of owners of 5 plots of land situated to the rear of Nos 13-17 Oakwood, Berkhamsted and write confirming these parties' continued interest in the emerging development plan process.

The landowners are as follows:

- - Mr & Mrs S Hopkinson
- - Mr & Mrs M Fifield
- - Mr & Mrs R Hall
- - Mr & Mrs George
- - Mr & Mrs G Behr

You may recall that we have written to the Council on behalf of these landowners previously, in relation to the consultation upon the emerging Site Allocations development plan document, as well as the Issues & Options consultation regarding the need to correct a Green Belt boundary anomaly in the vicinity of their land. Despite these representations the matter was never put in front of an Inspector, although the site has been reviewed on two occasions by Arup (see below).

The strip of Green Belt land in question includes garden plots at the rear of the Objectors' properties on Oakwood, as well as the gardens of an estate of dwellings built in about 2005 known as Hockeridge View. The plot to the rear of No. 15 had a lawful development certificate granted confirming its use as residential garden. This not only changed the legal status of the land, but clearly physically, alters the whole nature of what was originally one strip of land adjoining the A41.

### **Government Policy**

To be found "sound" the Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires Plans are:

- 1 *Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs<sup>19</sup>; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;*
- 2 *Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;*
- 3 *Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross- boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and*
- 4 *Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework*

Other Government NPPF policy, such as that concerning the definition of Green Belt boundaries in paragraph 139, is dealt with under the review of the Arup Green Belt Assessments (see below).

### **Emerging Policy**

Draft Policy SP11 "*Development in the Green Belt*" says:

"1. The extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Policies Map. The Green Belt boundary has been reviewed to land in defined Growth Areas to meet identified need over the lifetime of the Plan and to allow for other minor consequential changes. No further changes are proposed. Sites removed from the Green Belt will be managed as countryside until required for development "

Draft Policy SP20, entitled “*Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted*” allocates a considerable amount of housing to the south of the Town under draft Policy SP21 “*Delivering Growth in South Berkhamsted*”, all of which is currently Green Belt. Of the various sites allocated in Berkhamsted the following 3 all utilise the A41 as the appropriate defining edge of the Green Belt.

- *Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted* (33.45ha);
- *Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields* (6.56ha to the immediate east of the Objectors’ land).
- *Growth Area Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)* 12.29ha to the immediate west of Hockeridge View / the Objector’s land)

[SEE IMAGE 1]

From the above it can be seen that once the other designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that forming the rear gardens of Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the clear line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary.

### **The Arup Reports**

Arup have been commissioned to carry out 2 reviews of Green Belt in the Borough in recent years:

- ‘Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report’, which was published in December 2016 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2016 Report’); and
- ‘Stage 3 Green Belt Review - Final Report, 27 August 2020 (referred to here as the ‘Arup 2020 Report’).

The **Arup 2016 Report** divided the Green Belt into ‘sub-areas’ and the subject land formed part of sub-area BK-A11. Pages 102 & 103 of the Study identify the Green Belt boundary in this part of the sub-area (BK-A11s) as being ‘anomalous’.

[SEE IMAGE 2]

Section 5.6 of Arup’s 2016 Report (headed “*Boundary Assessment*”) advised the Council:

“The NPPF states that Green Belt boundaries should be “defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent”. Thus, where sub-areas are deemed - less sensitive to change in landscape terms, relatively unconstrained and not fundamental to the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes - there is a need to identify potentially robust alternative Green Belt boundaries for consideration by the Council. Opportunities for strengthening of existing boundaries through various means (e.g. planting, landscaping etc.) were also identified.

This workstream considered both existing physical features and opportunities for boundaries to be strengthened or reinstated, with further refined sub-areas for consideration identified on this basis. The results are described qualitatively and mapped in Table 5.8. Overall summary maps are also provided in Maps 5.11-5.16”.

Beneath the heading “*Other boundary amendments*” Section 7.2.3 (on Page 132) says:

“Other minor boundary amendments are recommended. Through the purposes and site and landscape assessments, an anomalous boundary was identified in part of sub-area BK-A11 (denoted BK-A11s). The proposed amendment (Maps 7.1 and 7.2) would correct the current anomalous boundary, which does not follow a recognised physical features. The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”.

The stated “*Study purpose*” of the **Arup 2020 Report** is given at paragraph 1.1. on page 1 as being:

“Arup was appointed by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan. This Stage 3 Green Belt Review will form part of the evidence base for the new Local Plan.

Specifically, the role of this Stage 3 Green Belt Review was to:

- *Assess potential housing and employment site allocations that lie within the Green Belt, considering the acceptability of the sites in Green Belt boundary terms and to provide site specific advice on any mitigation This evidence will inform the Council’s site selection process and will be considered alongside the Council’s wider evidence base and the development of the Borough’s spatial strategy.*
- *Following selection of preferred site allocations by the Council, to advise on the new Green Belt boundaries around the six main settlements of Berkhamsted, Bovingdon, Hemel Hempstead, Kings Langley, Markyate and Tring”.*

Under the heading “*National Planning Policy, Guidance and Case Law*” at Section 1 of the Arup 2020 Report it is stated:

“The NPPF provides the parameters for defining and reviewing Green Belt boundaries. Paragraph 139 (f) states that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined, ‘using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.’

Given that the general extent of Green Belts has been established, the NPPF specifies that any proposed boundary alterations must be addressed in strategic policies using the criteria and methodology in paragraphs 135-142. As such, it is only during the preparation of Local Plans that evidence can be gathered and used to justify ‘exceptional circumstances’ for changing Green Belt boundaries, whether an expansion or contraction of the Green Belt is proposed. However, preparation of a Local Plan in itself, does not amount to exceptional circumstances.

Thus, to amend Green Belt boundaries, exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated. The NPPF does not define what constitutes exceptional circumstances, however, it states (at paragraph 137) that ‘before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development’.

Although there is no clear definition of what amounts to exceptional circumstances, case law is clear that any justification must be responsive to local conditions and take account of a range of factors. It is worth noting that the legal challenge, *Gallagher Homes v. Solihull MBC* (2014), confirmed that an anomalous Green Belt designation can only be described as incongruous if ‘something [has] occurred subsequent to the definition of the Green Belt boundary that justifies a change” (Arup 2020 Report, Pages 2 & 3).

Within Section 2.4 “*New Single Local Plan*”, Arup state:

“A new single Local Plan is currently being prepared.....In completing the evidential work, the Council is taking the opportunity to review the Borough’s Green Belt boundaries around potential development sites and large settlements” (Arup 2020 Report, page 3).

At Section 2.5 (“*Implications*”) the Arup 2020 Report notes that:

“From the review of policy and previous studies, the following implications for the Green Belt boundary review were identified:

- *Local Plan review offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration, including to accommodate strategic allocations. It will be necessary to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify any alteration.*
- *Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable physical features that are likely to be permanent*
- *The Local Plan review also offers an opportunity to undertake detailed review of the Green Belt boundary to ascertain whether there are any potential anomalies in the Green Belt boundary and where there is clear justification, to recommend a change*
- *Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary. There are three main potential sources of anomalies, which should be considered when reviewing boundaries:*
  - *Minor anomalies, for example, potential digitisation errors, or small-scale adjustments would be required to realign the Green Belt boundary with a readily recognisable and permanent boundary feature*
  - *Future anomalies, that would arise as a result of potential site allocations in the Green Belt.*
  - *Potential alterations to the Green Belt should be undertaken on a case by case basis, which may encompass: examination of the historical reasons behind Green Belt definition, to ascertain whether an error was made in designating the original boundary; or a review of the site to determine if there have been any changes post Green Belt establishment”.*

Subsection 3.3 (“*Identification of Green Belt Boundaries*”), at pages 11-13, “*sets out how Green Belt boundaries around sites and selected settlements were assessed*”, one of which is “*Appropriate boundary features*”. The Government policy (at NPPF paragraph 139) is reiterated that:

“Green Belt boundaries should be defined clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. In other words, they must be defensible and well justified to be maintained in the long-term, beyond the lifetime of the development plan”.

For the purposes of the Arup assessment, “*the following features were considered to be readily recognisable and durable features, consistent with the approach taken in the Stage 2 Green Belt Review*”:

- *Infrastructure: motorways, public and made roads, and railway lines*
- *Landforms: river, stream, canal or other watercourse; and prominent physical feature (e.g. ridgeline).*
- *Natural vegetation features: limited to dense mature trees or woodland, or those which were protected by a formal designation*
- *Development: limited to development with strongly established, regular or consistent built form comprising well-defined or rectilinear edges (e.g. building edges or boundary walls / fences).*

Page 12 states that “for clarity, the following ‘soft boundary’ features were not considered as durable” [which amongst others are]:

- *Natural vegetation features: weakly bounded field boundary, intermittent or young tree Less well established, less prominent and/or unprotected features, such as hedgerows, were generally be avoided since they could be easier to remove or alter.*
- *Development: ‘irregular’ or ‘inconsistent’ built form comprising imprecise or ‘softer’ edges*

Furthermore, in the “Absence of boundary features”, page 12 states:

- “In any cases where the Green Belt boundaries do not coincide with defensible boundary features, new boundary features were proposed”.

Sub-section 3.4 is headed “Addressing Green Belt Anomalies”, but it then says:

- "For those anomalies classed as minor, these have largely been retained as Green Belt or Non-Green Belt land, as applicable, with the exception of those relating to digitisation errors. For those anomalies classed as major, an assessment was undertaken as to whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify a boundary amendment. Major anomalies were discussed at a joint consultant – client workshop. This allowed the client to use their local knowledge and planning judgement to determine whether an amendment would be appropriate.....

If significant areas of land (‘major anomalies’) no longer, or (‘future anomalies’) will no longer fulfil Green Belt purposes, as described at NPPF paragraph 134, these have been proposed for removal.

These anomalies may arise where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature that can serve as a long term permanent boundary, beyond the Plan period” (Arup 2020 Report, page 13).

Specifically, in the case of Berkhamsted, Section 6.2 of the Arup 2020 report said:

“The majority of the Green Belt boundary around Berkhamsted is considered to meet the NPPF requirements of being clearly defined, readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. However, there are 13 sections where potential weaknesses / anomalies have been identified (Figure 6.2, Table 6.1).

Eight of these anomalies (BK.A, BK.B, BK.C, BK.D, BK.E, BK.G, BK.H, and BK.L) relate to development that is present within the Green Belt. However, no exceptional circumstances were identified to justify the release of this land and therefore no changes are proposed.

Five of the anomalies (BK.F, BK.I, BK.J, BK.K and BK.M) relates to the proposed release of sites 12, 4, 16, 18 and 20 (respectively) from the Green Belt as allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Minor release of additional Green Belt land is recommended to avoid creating a small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes.

The resultant Green Belt boundary for Berkhamsted, taking into account proposed allocations and the anomalies, is shown in Figure 6.3”.

[SEE IMAGE 3 & 4]

### **Analysis**

Within the two Arup studies the Council was repeatedly advised of the Government policy position at paragraph 139 of the NPPF that the existing boundary in the vicinity of the Objector’s land is ‘weak’, in that it does not follow any defining Features such as infrastructure are taken as strong and permanent boundaries whereas “*“soft boundary’ features [such as hedges or young trees] were not considered as durable”* (Arup 2020 Report, Page 12).

*“Anomalies in the Green Belt are areas of land where change has taken place so that they no longer serve Green Belt purposes, or where the Green Belt boundary does not follow any recognisable feature therefore not ensuring a long term permanent boundary”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report). The Arup 2016 Report was unequivocal that the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Oakwood was anomalous in not following any recognised, permanent, physical feature and should be corrected (*“The A41 is a more robust and defensible boundary for the Green Belt”* - Section 2.3 of the Arup 2016 Report).

The findings of the Arup 2020 report also bear this out, and it was the stated purpose of that Study *“to undertake a review of Green Belt boundaries to support the preparation of Dacorum’s new Local Plan”* and form part of the evidence base. The time to address such an anomaly would be during the preparation stage of a new local plan which *“offers a window of opportunity to consider whether Green Belt boundaries require alteration”* (Section 2.5 of the Arup 2020 Report).

It is therefore inexplicable that, having undertaken such an extensive exercise of evidence gathering then to determine that nothing is to be done with the information assembled, if the anomaly is defined as being ‘minor’. The Arup 2020 Report does advise that the Green Belt boundary reviews should be on a ‘case by case’ basis, but then proceeds to avoid dealing with any of the identified ‘minor’ anomalies at all. The reasons for this decision are not given.

However, the Arup 2020 Report did see the need to attend to ‘future’ anomalies. As previously stated, and as can be seen from Figure 6.3 of the Arup 2020 Report immediately above, once the other housing designations go forward, the Objector’s land and that of the gardens in Hockeridge View would be the only stretch of the Southern part of the town not using the line of the A41 to delineate the Green Belt boundary. As a result, as the emerging plan currently stands, this ‘minor anomaly’ will be perpetuated as a ‘future anomaly’. Elsewhere in the Arup 2020 Report additional releases of Green Belt are recommended in order to prevent the creation of *“small islands or slithers of Green Belt land surrounded by built development that would no longer serve Green Belt purposes”*.

The Arup 2020 Report asserts that it found no ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify any changes in respect of the eight ‘minor’ anomalies in Berkhamsted but, in respect of BK.H at least, failed to take account of the following changed circumstances, most of which would have occurred since the Green Belt boundary in this vicinity was originally designated:

- the finalisation of the route of the A41 – originally the Objectors’ land was included within the scope of the route of the by-pass and was sold off as separate plots once the road was complete;



- the allocation of all the land immediately adjoining the subject site to its east and west, all of which will take the A41 as its boundary; and
- the incorporation of the subject land into private gardens (including the granting of a lawful development certificate in respect of No. 15 confirming this use) and the building of Hockeridge View, meaning that none of this land performs any meaningful Green Belt role.

**Closing Remarks**

To be found "sound" the emerging Local Plan needs to comply with the NPPF, specifically paragraph 35, which requires plans are **Positively prepared; Justified** (i.e. based on evidence); **Effective**; and **Consistent with national policy** (i.e. prepared in accordance with the policies in the NPPF). As currently written, Draft Policy SP11 in particular will be none of those things, unless and until the boundary is drawn in a permanent and defensible manner.

The Objectors would be grateful if the Council would take note of their representations and keep them informed as to future iterations of the emerging plan.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[IMAGE 3 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 4 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 2 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[IMAGE 1 MICHAEL FEARN.jpg](#)  
[Michael Fearn Rumbal Sedgewick - Dacorum Strategy for Growth 2020-12-29 \(002\).pdf](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS12760

**Person ID**

1269618

**Full Name**

Alistair Heath

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	One particular location close to Thomas Coram school, of which I am particularly fond, is due to become a housing estate. Whilst it is close to the bypass this small stretch of forest is a vital corridor for wildlife. I frequently see a variety of birds and small mammals there. In 2020 on numerous occasions I spotted deer there (see photo attached) demonstrating the key role this small patch of land plays in our local ecosystems. It is also worth noting that the field here is one of the first visible on the train out of London due to its prominent ridge-top position, making this an important part of the British country side for locals and indeed tourists alike.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">ALISTAIR HEATH PHOTO.jpeg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12763
<b>Person ID</b>	1146108
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Alex Taylor
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>We would like to add the following points:</p>

1) Sustainable development is defined as that which can be done again and again until the end of time without increasing damage being done. Anything that cannot say this is, by definition, unsustainable. Anything that builds on the limited resource that is green, undeveloped land, is clearly unsustainable as the land will eventually run out.

We agree that more dwellings need to be built, but the only sustainable way to do this is to build on previously-developed land and find ways to improve on density. Any ingress into the countryside, no matter how gradual, is unsustainable as the end result is no countryside.

2) The area between London Road and Bank Mill Lane that is proposed as a development site is a uniquely beautiful and precious landscape for animals. It forms the boundary of Berkhamsted at present and, despite the landowners best attempts to destroy it, has a variety of habitats that make it incredibly precious.

Hérons, Falcons, Kites, Newts, Badgers and Bats all make this their home, whether in the pools at the south-western corners, or in the barns. It is staggeringly beautiful and would be a great loss to the community and cause a terrible loss of habitats.

It will also have a hugely negative impact on the protected area that is the first thing people see when they arrive in Berkhamsted.

I enclose a few photos of the area which is proposed to be built on. This is not like building homes on a former factory site.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

[Alex and Naomi Taylor - all pictures v1.pdf](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS12765

**Person ID**

1269619

**Full Name**

Naomi Taylor

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Berkhamsted Residents Action Group (BRAG) has responded in full to the consultation. To avoid full repetition of the extensive points made in the BRAG response, I request you accept this as confirmation that we wish DBC to duplicate BRAG's responses under my name.</p> <p>We would like to add the following points:</p> <p>1) Sustainable development is defined as that which can be done again and again until the end of time without increasing damage being done. Anything that cannot say this is, by definition, unsustainable. Anything that builds on the limited resource that is green, undeveloped land, is clearly unsustainable as the land will eventually run out.</p> <p>We agree that more dwellings need to be built, but the only sustainable way to do this is to build on previously-developed land and find ways to improve on density. Any ingress into the countryside, no matter how gradual, is unsustainable as the end result is no countryside.</p> <p>2) The area between London Road and Bank Mill Lane that is proposed as a development site is a uniquely beautiful and precious landscape for animals. It forms the boundary of Berkhamsted at present and, despite the landowners best attempts to destroy it, has a variety of habitats that make it incredibly precious.</p> <p>Hérons, Falcons, Kites, Newts, Badgers and Bats all make this their home, whether in the pools at the south-western corners, or in the barns. It is staggeringly beautiful and would be a great loss to the community and cause a terrible loss of habitats.</p> <p>It will also have a hugely negative impact on the protected area that is the first thing people see when they arrive in Berkhamsted.</p> <p>I enclose a few photos of the area which is proposed to be built on. This is not like building homes on a former factory site.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Alex and Naomi Taylor - all pictures v1.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12809
<b>Person ID</b>	1144694

<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Barry Fuller
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case for releasing Green Belt land for development in Berkhamsted has not been made and was rejected by Councillors in the previous Core Strategy. However this very large site results in the irreversible loss of over 33 hectares of our valuable green belt and the loss of the buffer between the town and the A41. Residents on the site would be subjected to considerable increased airborne and noise pollution from the A41.</li> <li>• The ridge top position of the site makes it highly visible from the surrounding hills.</li> <li>• The site is beyond the natural walking and cycling range from the existing services and facilities in the town centre (including the Railway Station) especially due to its position at the top of steep hills.</li> <li>• As the Local Plan does not include any new employment sites, inevitably most residents will have to commute to and from work and a significant number of those would have to do so via the station. This would massively increase traffic up and down Swing Gate Lane, a road with 2 infant/junior schools located upon it. If the east/west link to Chesham Road materialises it may mitigate against some of the increase in congestion around Swing Gate Lane and the Hall Park estate roads but would be of no benefit to the wider community and would contribute to the feeling that the site is semi-detached from Berkhamsted, therefore making no contribution to the vision of a 'sustainable and vibrant market town'. The suggestion of a new community hub acknowledges that the site does not integrate with the town.</li> <li>• There are frequent sewage/waste water issues at the bottom of the Hall Park estate (by the A416), suggesting the current sewage system is already struggling to cope. There is no explanation in the plan as to how this would be mitigated.</li> <li>• Unless there is any new health provision on the site there would be pressure upon the existing GP's who are already at capacity.</li> <li>• 'As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the site' - this is disingenuous. It is not possible to deliver a net gain while removing a large area of Green Belt and the buffer (and wildlife corridor) with the A41.</li> </ul>

- 850 homes would probably result in around 2000 people and 1200 cars. It is unacceptable that the Council could impose that level of housing growth all in one area of the town without having clear plans to improve the existing infrastructure
- **For all the above reasons, I object to the use of this site.**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12810

**Person ID** 1144694

**Full Name** Mr Barry Fuller

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

- **I also object to Bk03, Bk04, Bk08 and do not support any proposal to increase the size of Berkhamsted by 25% or Tring by 50%,as I consider that to be totally out of proportion to their existing size and would totally change their historic character.**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12818
<b>Person ID</b>	1269634
<b>Full Name</b>	Frank Worth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>— During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</p> <p>— The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12819
<b>Person ID</b>	1269634
<b>Full Name</b>	Frank Worth
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12820
<b>Person ID</b>	1269634
<b>Full Name</b>	Frank Worth



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</p> <p>—The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</p> <p>— Following the death of (name removed), who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12846
<b>Person ID</b>	1145801
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Guy Barlow
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.</p> <p>Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway would surely impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire’s hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure.</p> <p>Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is “minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB”, it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their selfassessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy is fuelled by faulty vision, settlement hierarchy, unjustified housing target and exacerbated by flawed handling of windfall projections, thus failing to maximise growth in urban areas at the expense of Green Belt. Also fail to take into account post-pandemic working practices.</p>

Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS12853

Person ID 1269653

Full Name Tony Dowle

Organisation Details Director  
Rathbawn Properties Ltd

Agent ID 1269652

Agent Full Name Miss  
Lucy  
Morris

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>On behalf of our client, Rathbawn Properties Ltd, we write in response to the consultation of the new Local Plan prepared by Dacorum Borough Council (DBC): <i>“Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)”</i>, under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>Our client is currently preparing an outline planning application for circa 80 dwellings, including specialist accommodation to be given over to the neighbouring Hospice of St Francis, at Thorn Plant Hire, Spring Garden Lane, Berkhamsted.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Regulation 18 <i>“Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038)”</i> document and have set out our comments below.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Rathbawn Propoerties Ltd - Agent Lucy Morris - WSP_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12861
<b>Person ID</b>	1269653
<b>Full Name</b>	Tony Dowle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Rathbawn Properties Ltd
<b>Agent ID</b>	1269652
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Miss Lucy Morris
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><b>SPRING GARDEN LANE</b></p> <p>Our client is in the process of preparing an outline application for the development of up to 80 dwellings, including specialist accommodation to be given over to the neighbouring Hospice of St Francis, at Thorn Plant Hire, Spring Garden Lane, Berkhamsted (see <b>Appendix A</b> - for the site location plan).</p>

## THE SITE

The site is located to the southwest of Berkhamsted and extends to 3.48ha. The existing operation comprises two large, visually unappealing industrial sheds, a significant area of hardstanding and stored materials. The warehouses provide a total of 1,242 sqm of internal storage space and are up to 12m in height, with 6,530 sqm of formal external storage space provided from the areas of hardstanding within the site. The materials stored externally on site are approximately equal in height to a two-storey house. The adjoining land comprises low quality scrubland that has been blighted by previous industrial uses, not least the brick works, and comprises grassed areas which covers the detritus left by the former brickworks and its use as a landfill site.

The site lies within the London Metropolitan Green Belt and at the edges of the Chilterns AONB.

To the north of the site lies Sunhill Montessori Nursery School and Berkhamsted Golf Range which was recently subject to a planning application for a 70 bed care home. To the east is The Hospice of St Francis. To the west, the site is screened from wider views to the AONB by dense vegetation beyond which sits a small motocross track.

The A41 runs to the south west which bounds the settlement of Berkhamsted from the wider countryside.

A Public Right of Way (known as Pea Lane) runs along the western boundary of the site, which provides pedestrian access to the amenities along the High Street. Bus stops are located a 15 minute walk away with services to Berkhamsted railway station and into Hemel Hempstead.

## INCLUSION IN THE LOCAL PLAN

Taking into consideration the points set out previously within these representations, it is argued that the site should be removed from the Green Belt and included as part of the future Regulation 19 version of the Plan with an allocation for housing.

### Housing need

With the Council's housing requirement increasing to 1,023dpa, it needs to allocate more sites to meet and exceed its housing requirement and ensure a continuous supply of land for housing.

Based on the Council's performance in recent years, it is critical that **as a minimum** the Council seeks to meet its requirement in full in order to avoid the continuing worsening of housing affordability in the local area and to boost housing delivery.

The inclusion of this site in the Plan with an allocation for up to 80 dwellings will make a significant contribution to delivering this additional need.

In the interests of positive plan-making and meeting its objective to boosting the supply of housing, the Council should allocate this site for residential development.

### Previously developed land

Part of the site comprises previously developed land, which is made up of hardstanding, open storage and two buildings that are used by Thorn Plant Hire. The site currently benefits from a historic planning permission which does not restrict the use of the land for noisy employment uses and does not limit the hours or frequency of HGV deliveries.

The rest of the site, although technically greenfield, was previously used for landfill during its former use as a brickworks. This has since grassed over but there is no topsoil and the ground is unstable, meaning the land is of poor quality and makes very little contribution to the setting or quality of the AONB.

The NPPF at paragraph 117 supports a “brownfield first approach” in order to make the most effective use of land. In terms of land within the Green Belt, paragraph 138 of the NPPF states that [emphasis added]:

*“Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously- developed **and/or** is well-served by public transport.”*

Note that the NPPF does not require land to be brownfield *and* well-served by public transport in order to qualify.

As such, the brownfield nature of the site should be considered a great benefit when assessing its contribution to the Green Belt (further detail on this is set out later in these representations) and the site is accordance with the “brownfield first approach” endorsed by national policy.

### **Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

It is not clear if sites which comprise partly of previously developed land but were located within the AONB were excluded at the outset in the initial site selection process. As such, due consideration has not been given to understanding the context given to the quality of the land within AONB, visual openness or how parcels of land contribute to sustainable patterns of development.

The Council’s approach to site selection and assessment has excluded this sustainable location for a wider extension to Berkhamsted, purely based on its designation within the AONB. As set out previously in these representations, this approach is not in accordance with the PPG and national policy.

By virtue of its current use as a plant and scaffolding hire company and the historic use as landfill, the site does not make a positive contribution to the AONB or its setting. The landscape quality is poor which could be enhanced through sensitive development for residential uses.

The site is well screened by vegetation, meaning that long range views to and from the AONB are obscured and development in this location would not lease to severe adverse impacts on the AONB designation.

The methodology employed by the Council to omit this site from consideration has meant that a part brownfield site, which makes a limited contribution to the setting of the AONB has been overlooked for residential development which will help DBC meet its critical housing need.

### **Green Belt**

The Green Belt Assessment Stage 1 (November 2013) assessed the site as part of the wider Strategic Parcel 6 which covers 143 hectares and comprises the parcel of land between the southwest of Berkhamsted, the A41 and Two Ponds Lane.

The assessment drew the following conclusions in relation to the contribution of the wider parcel to four purposes of the Green Belt, as set out under paragraph 134 of the NPPF and an additional assessment criterial looking at the maintenance of existing settlement patterns.

## **Purpose**

### **Contribution**

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.

Limited or no contribution.

2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging.

Partial contribution.

3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

Partial contribution.

4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

Significant contribution.

5. To maintain existing settlement pattern.

Limited or no contribution.

It is agreed that Strategic Parcel 06 makes limited or no contributions to purposes one and five.

In terms of purpose two, the Assessment argues that Parcels 03, 04, 05, 06 and 07 form a strategic gap between Tring and Berkhamsted. This gap is 3.9km wide.

It is understood that parcels 03, 04, 05, 06 and 07 together can be seen to form part of the strategic gap between Tring and Berkhamsted. However, when looking at parcel 06, it is clear that it is surrounded on two sides by built development, with the A41 to the south. Development within the parcel 06 would not result in a narrowing of the large 3.9km strategic gap with Tring as development would not extend any further west than Berkhamsted currently does.

In terms of the parcel making a contribution to the visual gap between the two settlements, the parcel incorporates numerous pockets of development and thick bands of vegetation, including the application site. Therefore, it is considered that development within this parcel would have a limited impact on this visual gap.

In terms of purpose three, the Assessment states that the southern edge of Berkhamsted provides the strongest boundary. However, it is clear that the A41 is a much stronger and permanent boundary, which meets the requirements set out in paragraph 139 of the NPPF. There are many examples of built development within parcel 06 and very little on the south side of the A41.

There are few opportunities to cross the A41 along this section, making it a much stronger and permanent boundary than the development along the south of Berkhamsted. As such, it is considered that the parcel only makes a limited contribution to this purpose of the Green Belt.

In terms of purpose four, the Local Government Association and Planning Advisory Service's "Planning on the Doorstep: The Big Issues – Green Belt" (Updated February 2015) provides guidance to councils on the application of the Green Belt in policy.

At page seven, the guidance notes that purpose four, “to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns” is:

*“...generally accepted as relating to very few settlements in practice. In most towns there already are more recent developments between the historic core, and the countryside between the edge of the town.”*

The Assessment acknowledges that the parcel does not contain any historic settlements. Issues of the impact of development on Conservation Areas and heritage assets are dealt with through other mechanisms in the planning process.

It should also be noted that the impact of potential development on the setting of the named Conservation Areas varies across the 143ha parcel and cannot be considered as a whole to make a significant contribution to purpose four of the Green Belt.

Based on the above, it is considered that the site makes a limited or no contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt and should have been considered for release.

The Green Belt Review Stage 2 (January 2016) was prepared solely for Dacorum and revisited the findings of the Stage 1 report. In this report, three parcels of land west of Berkhamsted were considered for further analysis. These are:

- BK-A11
- BK-A12
- BK-A13

The site falls within BK-A13. This parcel received a ‘pass’ in relation to whether the sub area is at the edge of one or more distinct large built-up areas. The parcel scored three out of five in relation to preventing the outward sprawl of large built-up areas. The parcel also scored three out of five in preventing the merging of neighbouring settlements and two out of five in protecting the openness of the countryside. Both parcels BK-A11 and BK-A12, which include land that has been allocated as part of the emerging Plan scored a ‘pass’, three out of five, one out of five and three out of five respectively.

It is clear that, from this assessment, that parcels BK-A11 and BK-A12 are only marginally preferable to BK-A13. In any event, the report states that BK-A13 meets Green Belt purposes moderately and should be considered for further assessment.

However, further on in the report at Table 5.6, it states that this sub-area would “compromise the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes – exclude from further consideration”.

It is not clear how this conclusion has been reached and its validity is disputed. As set out previously, the site makes no or limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site should, therefore, be reassessed and recommended for release from the Green Belt.

Furthermore, the proposed ‘growth area’ allocations close to the site (namely BK05, BK06 and BK08) have changed the context of the immediate area. All of these allocations have primary access onto Shootersway which is a strategic artery for future growth.



The Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study (November 2020) allocates funding for various improvements to the local transport network, including Shootersway and Darr's Lane, which will increase sustainability in the area.

It is considered that within this context, the site becomes more sustainable and therefore an increasingly appropriate location for residential element. There is also the opportunity for the site to feed into and contribute towards the planned wider transport infrastructure improvements to deliver further benefits to the local area.

As such, the site should be allocated for residential development in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan

### **SUMMARY**

As set out within these representations, the Council needs to increase its level of housing provision in line with the most recent Standard Method calculation, to a **minimum** of 1,023dpa. Due to the historic undersupply of housing and worsening affordability, the Council must plan effectively to meet and exceed this requirement.

The Council's approach to site selection, including through omittance of sites within the AONB, is not reasonable and is not in accordance with national planning policy.

It is agreed that there are exceptional circumstances to release land from the Green Belt, however the methodology for reviewing land parcels is not consistent and the Site Assessment Study has ignored site context. Therefore, the Council must review its site selection methodology and look into how sites which are located in the AONB can contribute to the delivery of housing and sustainable patterns of development.

The lack of acknowledgement of the withdrawal of SADC's Local Plan and its implications on the delivery of the North Hemel Communities, is concerning. The Council must consider the impacts this could have on the deliverability of housing in this location and on the Council's housing trajectory.

Berkhamsted, as the second largest urban area, has greater capacity for housing delivery than is currently being proposed. Land at Spring Garden Lane has the ability to help deliver the additional housing needed by DBC and therefore should be included as an allocation.

We trust our representations will be taken into account in preparing the next version of the Local Plan. Our client is keen to engage with DBC and wish to continue to be involved in further consultations on the Local Plan process moving forward.

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Rathbawn Propoerties Ltd - Agent Lucy Morris - WSP_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12893
<b>Person ID</b>	1269665
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Martin Hicks
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Growth Area Bk03: Haslam Playing Fields Loss of grassland meadows require full assessment. If valuable the proposals are unsustainable.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12925
<b>Person ID</b>	1269668
<b>Full Name</b>	Sally Chrispin
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**BOURNE END DEVELOPMENT (BULBOURNE CROSS) NOT ON PLAN**

I understand that there is a potential site at Bourne End that is not currently included in the local plan. This site and the proposed development of it by Thakeham homes appears to address many of the concerns I have raised above and provides additional benefits if development of it were included as they propose. I believe that the council have not properly considered this as a viable alternative. Specifically:

- 1 The main reason given for not including it I believe was that it would risk merging Berkhamsted with Hemel Hempstead. I do not accept this, as Boxmoor is still considered to be very much its own town and there is still large tracts of undeveloped land between the proposed development and Hemel Hempstead, whereas the proposed houses being built in Northchurch and Berkhamsted risk Northchurch losing its identity due to its proximity to Berkhamsted.
- 2 One larger area of development rather than lots of piecemeal areas and including providing a road off the A41 services, which would reduce traffic and infrastructure in Berkhamsted Town centre.
- 3 The development leads directly on to the main road and near bus routes so easy access to the town. In addition I understand that a cycle path is proposed for access to the town, which again would ease congestion in the town. The area is also not so steep at that part of the town as it is coming out of the valley area so would be better suited for sheltered accommodation.
- 4 Carbon neutral builds with an additionally developed “country park” nearby
- 5 Many acres of land for community sports has been offered to the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Trust as part of the proposed development and including a purpose built gymnastics facility, which might enable expansion of Ashlyns School if Berkhamsted Gymnastics Club were to move out of the facility it currently occupies. It would also enable the town to have access to a “community sport hub” of many different sports in the area with a clubhouse for use by all.
- 6 Proposal to move Berkhamsted Football stadium to a brand new FA approved site, which would free up area in the town centre for residential flats and near the station thus reducing the number of cars on the road. We could also allow the new car park or the station car park to be used for residential parking.
- 7 New school and community area/shops with cycle paths and parking areas also reducing the congestion in the town.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS12938

**Person ID** 1269678

**Full Name** GARY TRENT

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	No Green Belt land should be sacrificed for development.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12954
<b>Person ID</b>	1269679
<b>Full Name</b>	GARY CALLUM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bovingdon Strategy  The draft Strategic Local Plan calls for 241 homes to be build in Bovingdon up to 2038.

with infill/windfall this will reach 300 plus and does not include the 59 homes that are likely to be built on the site of the former Bobsleigh Hotel - so about 400 homes for a village (small town) that suffers from a Victorian infrastructure and huge pressure on its High Street and country lanes. With 2071- ish homes currently in the parish - that is a 20 per cent increase for which I cannot see much by way of infrastructure increase ( maybe a doctors surgery and care home as part of the Whiteacres Grange Farm development and a flood alleviation scheme).

We are caught between - we cannot build sufficient homes in Bovingdon to benefit from/justify the building of a new school which is estimated at £10-12 million, unless HCC is equipped with a substantial budget to meet the shortfall after CIL etc, but we will put severe pressure on all existing services.

Can these scheduled new homes not be built in towns where greater infrastructure exists?  
and has the Government calculated the numbers correctly that necessitate building on Green Belt land?

If Bovingdon must carry a share of new homes then DBC current proposal for 150 at Grange Farm and 40 at LA6 (Molyneaux) is the best solution on the edge of the Village offering quick and easy access to Chesham Road/Hempstead Road and keeping additional traffic away from the already congested High Street. That is essential.

I would draw the Council's attention to its map of Bovingdon within the draft Local Plan and suggest it needs to be corrected. It includes main roads that are merely country lanes.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12955
<b>Person ID</b>	1269679
<b>Full Name</b>	GARY CALLUM

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bovingdon Strategy</p> <p>The draft Strategic Local Plan calls for 241 homes to be build in Bovingdon up to 2038. with infill/windfallthis will reach 300 plus and does not include the 59 homes that are likely to be built on the site of the former Bobsleigh Hotel - so about 400 homes for a village (small town) that suffers from a Victorian infrastructure and huge pressure on its High Street and country lanes. With 2071- ish homes currently in the parish - that sa 20 per cent increase for which I cannot see much by way of infrastructure increase ( maybe a doctors surgery and care home as part of the Whiteacres Grange Farm development and a flood alleviation scheme).</p> <p>We are caught between - we cannot build sufficient homes in Bovingdon to benefit from/justify the building of a new school which is estimated at £10-12 million, unless HCC is equipped with a substantial budget to meet the shortfall after CIL etc, but we will put severe pressure on all existing services.</p> <p>Can these scheduled new homes not be built in towns where greater infrastructure exists? and has the Government calculated the numbers correctly that necessitate building on Green Belt land?</p> <p>If Bovingdon must carry a share of new homes then DBC scurrent proposal for 150 at Grange Farm and 40 at LA6 (Molyneaux) is the best solution on the edge of the Village offering quick and easy access to Chesham Road/Hempstead Road and keeping additional traffic away from the already congested High Street. That is essential.</p> <p>I would draw the Council sattention to its map of Bovingdon within the draft Local Plan and suggest it needs to be corrected. It includes mainroads that are merely country lanes.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12959
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 - Housing development too large BK02 - Reduce dwellings by 50% BK03 - Housing development too large BK06 - Housing development too large BK07 - Reduce dwellings by 50% BK08 - Housing development too large BK11 - Housing development too large</p> <p>I wish to make following points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 These developments are politically motivated (a feather in the cap of the Council) in building so many homes</li> <li>2 Doubtful many of these will be badly needed social housing or affordable for local people</li> <li>3 Local Authority are not to be trusted to make necessary infrastructure</li> <li>4 Assume each dwelling has two cars - Dacorum's already poorly maintained roads will not cope</li> <li>5 Environmental impact - destruction of countryside, pollution levels will</li> <li>6 Northchurch will be swallowed up by Berkhamsted and lose its unique</li> </ol>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12960
<b>Person ID</b>	
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Keep hands off Broadwater the ground of Berkhamsted FC and no development on Green Belt in Bourne End
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS12963
<b>Person ID</b>	1269767
<b>Full Name</b>	J E HUNT



<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk07 Lock Field, Northchurch</p> <p>Residential development of this field should be resisted for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 The Dacorum Green Belt Boundary Reviews Stage 1-3 carried out emphasize more generally the importance of realigning long term defensible boundaries for the Green Belt and in particular ensuring they follow strong man made or natural features. In judging defensible boundaries around Berkhamsted the canal is stated by consultants to be a strong defensible boundary and yet at Lock Field, which is 'beyond the canal' the railway is perversely selected as the new defensible boundary. Cartographically that indeed makes sense because its triangular shape on plan lends itself as an infill site. However, physically on site the canal is undisputably the strongest landscape feature; the railway being mainly in a cutting leading into a tunnel. The canal should remain the natural Green Belt boundary at this point. Releasing Lock Field would represent a quite un-natural intrusion into the Green</li> <li>1 Lock Field is the primary access point used by Network Rail for heavy engineering, maintenance, materials and large machinery to access the railway line 'at grade' i.e. where the ground level is level with the tracks. It is also the only obvious point at which emergency services and railway plant can access the Northchurch Tunnel in the event of a collapse or de-railment. By contrast the east end of the tunnel portal exits in a deep cutting. The Network Rail site compound in Lock Field is used on a regular basis, often at night, and has been so for many decades. This is the reason why there is security fencing at the Lock Field entrance. I believe in considering this site for development it is imperative that Network Rail be consulted on the implications for losing a potentially critical access to their infrastructure or alternatively seek their views on what area and access facilities they require and in turn the Planning Authority should re-assess the operational effect on any proposed residential</li> </ol>

1 The proposed access road joining onto New Road close to the canal bridge, school and cemetery is already a congested stretch of highway that I believe is not capable of satisfactorily dealing with additional traffic from a 60 house estate. It is difficult to see how mitigation measures suggested can make this

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS12976

Person ID 1264971

Full Name Louise Watson

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

Site where Lidl was going to build in Gossoms End should be using for housing instead.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13028
<b>Person ID</b>	1269883
<b>Full Name</b>	KARIMA SOUTSANE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am opposed to the development of the Local Plan, in particular the proposals for South Berkhamsted.</p> <p>It will destroy the beautiful landscape on the towns of Berkhamsted and Tring by building on green belt land which is surrounded by the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It will waste and destroy acres of farmland and beautiful countryside.</p> <p>Irreparable harm would be done to the unique character of the historic market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring – which must be preserved for current and future generations. It will put a strain on these communities and overload the local facilities in these areas.</p> <p>The additional transport links will cause serious environmental harm - congestion, noise, air pollution, etc - for all of Dacorum's residents, businesses and visitors.</p> <p>You are planning for too many of the wrong houses in the wrong places. This plan needs to be reassessed. Please reconsider the plan and base it on recent housing data.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13085
<b>Person ID</b>	1270032
<b>Full Name</b>	MRS JILLY HENRY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	1270033
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	MR JOHN C.E. PHILLIPS
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>It is requested that land to the west of Darrs Lane - referred to as PC1 - and shown on the attached Red Line Boundary Map should be deleted from the Green Belt, and identified for housing and related services. The land PCI is approx 1.2 hectares and could therefore provide approximately 35-40 dwellings.</p> <p>PCI can be developed either separately or in conjunction with other land immediately adjacent to the northeast, shown on the site location plan edged in blue, "Willow Cottage, Darrs Lane" of 1.2 hectares and "Little Oaks, Darrs Lane" of around 2 hectares, which we believe are also subject to representations to the draft plan. The total area of the 3 parcels is around 4.2 hectares providing sites for approximately 120 dwellings.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is identified in para 5.4 of the draft plan as one of the three 'most sustainable developments' in the Dacorum Borough where future growth should be focused. Furthermore at para 5.2 the draft plan states that,</p>

'the key principles behind the strategy include ensuring the important market towns of Berkhamsted and Tring play a much greater role in delivery growth in the Borough and complement Hemel Hempstead in providing more balance to the growth and focus and help deliver housing, employment and infrastructure in these locations.'

As stated elsewhere in this response this strategy is supported. Identification of the land west of Darrs Lane would accord with and reinforce this strategy.

The land PCI lies immediately on the north-western edge of the town as already committed by the existing local plan allocation to the east of Darrs Lane, referred to in the draft plan as 'Growth Area Bk06; East of Darrs Lane'.

The land PC1 forms part of a large area of former worked out brick clay workings. It is bounded

-On its western side by the old brickworks building and industrial site, tracts of scrub land unused for any purpose for at least 70 years, the buildings and surroundings of a hospice built in 2004/5, a nursery school, a golf driving range and 5 detached dwellings at The Larches;

-On its southern side by 6 detached dwellings;

-On its northern side by 17 semi-detached and detached dwellings, and

-On its eastern side by Growth Area Bk06; East of Darrs Lane - 23 hectares for 200 new dwellings.

The land PC1 has dual access - excellent access onto the section of Shooters Way that is a dead end and also to Darrs Lane, and is unimpeded by any known constraints.

In previous landscape assessments by the Dacorum Council, the land PCI has not attracted adverse comment. It performs no function within the AONB being basically derelict land enclosed by urban uses on all four sides.

The site PCI is level, and well contained by existing landscape features which can be retained and reinforced either separately or in conjunction with neighbouring land to provide a new Green Belt boundary. The site is not at any risk of flooding.

In previous studies, the land PCI has been identified as having no inherent objections and that it may be suitable for future development subject to the outcome of reviewing the boundary of the Green Belt.

It is noted that in relation to the allocation Bk406, East of Darrs Lane, that there are significant social infrastructure requirements including the provision of a new secondary school and local park; allocation of the land PCI west of Darrs Lane can benefit both the provisions of the facilities and potentially contribute to their capital and revenue costs.

**Included files** [ATTACHMENT TO COMMENT EGS13085.pdf](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13101

**Person ID** 1270037

**Full Name** MRS GINA BARLOW

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In response to residents concerns of the A41 when being built some years back, the areas of green belt around it were described as green lungs that would help protect the nearby towns with regard to the increased levels of pollution such a road brings.</p> <p>What concerns me about the scale of the plans for Berkhamsted is that many of the site are immediately adjacent to the A41. This would have two detrimental effects.</p> <p>Firstly, it effects existing residents as the sites if developed would remove green-space which help address some air pollution by reducing the formation of ground-level ozone and capturing airborne particulates that are a known contributing factor to reducing health and resulting in earlier death.</p> <p>Secondly, placing new housing adjacent to such a busy dual carriageway (which will only get busier) will impact on the health of new residents placing long term strain on West Hertfordshire's hospital capacity.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is constrained by the valley within which it sits and as such has limited scope for new road infrastructure. Many of the new sites are only served by access to town by narrow lanes that are single track in places. For any new sites we must ensure there is ample and safe provision for walking, cycling and public transport into the town centre. Many of these sites seems at odds with these goals.</p> <p>A general comment with regards to the proposed sites as pointed out by the CPRE The Country Side Charity : 85% of Dacorum is rural, 60% is Green Belt, and 33% of the countryside is within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the Council states that a key objective is "minimising and managing the requirement for development on Green Belt land and the impact on the Chilterns AONB", it is clear that in their declared mission to provide at least 100% of their self-assessed housing need, regardless of the impact on the environment, infrastructure, climate change and biodiversity (including that of the hugely important Chilterns Beechwoods SAC), will cause significant harm to the Green Belt and AONB.</p> <p>The Housing Strategy is fuelled by faulty vision, settlement hierarchy, unjustified housing target and exacerbated by flawed handling of windfall projections, thus failing to maximise growth in urban areas at the expense of Green Belt. Also fail to take into account post-pandemic working practices.</p> <p>Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Brownfield sites should be prioritised for housing and only when developers have utilised all these spaces should our Greenbelt areas be considered. Developers have historically preferred green space due to the greater multipliers of financial return they bring but the Council should defend these natural resources for their residents.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13113
<b>Person ID</b>	1264860
<b>Full Name</b>	Alan Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In Berkhamsted the destruction of playing fields (of Berkhamsted School)
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13129
<b>Person ID</b>	1270061

<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs Coughtrey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In Berkhamsted the destruction of playing fields (of Berkhamsted School)
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13168
<b>Person ID</b>	1270069
<b>Full Name</b>	Patrick Moloney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms</li> </ul>



a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.

- During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.
- The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13169

**Person ID** 1270069

**Full Name** Patrick Moloney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

- The site on **Lock Field, BK07**, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is

much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13170

**Person ID** 1270069

**Full Name** Patrick Moloney

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

- Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.
- The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.

- Following the death of (name removed), who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS13182

Person ID 1144725

Full Name Mr Philip Anderson

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

- The site between **Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06** — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the 'Lonely Tree' and the 'Wishing Tree'. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.
- During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.

- The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13183

**Person ID** 1144725

**Full Name** Mr Philip Anderson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

- The site on **Lock Field, BK07**, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13184
<b>Person ID</b>	1144725
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Philip Anderson
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</li> <li>• The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.</li> <li>• Following the death of (name removed), who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13201
<b>Person ID</b>	1270127
<b>Full Name</b>	Amy Moloney
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>• During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>• The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> <li>• The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> <li>• Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.
- Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13265

**Person ID** 1270153

**Full Name** Mr Peter Cracknell

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

The 2 sites proposed up Swing-Gate Lane, and to the south of Upper Hall Park are not well positioned for additional housing.

The location is too far from town centre for walking to the shops. The hills are too steep for cycling, except for the fittest committed cyclists. I never see any people cycling into town, except for 1 oldish lady, and she lives at the bottom of the hill on London Road, ie she does not attempt the hills!

This will mean that the number of car journeys in Berkhamsted will increase further, and the town-centre is already heavily trafficked. The location of these 2 sites will mean that most of the resultant traffic will use Swing-gate Lane, passing by 2 schools. This will increase pollution for our children, and constitute a safety hazard morning and afternoon.

Berkhamsted is already over developed, compared with the local employment available. Thus any new incomers would perforce have to commute to work in Hemel, Watford or London. Hardly a sustainable approach.

It seems very wrong to build on green field space, in a town with little employment potential. Surely new development should be focused in towns like Hemel & Watford, with their considerable employment infrastructure.

Swing-gate Lane and Sugar Lane are regularly used by walkers, dog-walkers, and runners, and this area provides a really valuable 'lung' to the south side of town.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13315

**Person ID** 1270198

**Full Name** Mr Hilary Curtis

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**



**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.

There are significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.

Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.

Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.

In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

BK06

Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13332

**Person ID** 1270200

**Full Name** Mr Richard Harman

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

- This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all

basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13333
<b>Person ID</b>	1270200
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Richard Harman
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane - This site is an unsustainable location for further housing development. The existing roads surrounding the site are one track and already congested. There is no capacity to increase connectivity. The High Street at Northchurch is highly congested with many accidents, one fatal, occurring due to speed and intensity of traffic. Air pollution is a factor in this location - the existing residents in Northchurch would suffer acutely from any further traffic in this locality. The proximity to the AONB makes it a highly undesirable location for development. The longer views into the AONB would be ruined. This site should be kept as a buffer zone to the surrounding countryside, maintaining the definition between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. New residential development should be focused to the South of Berkhamsted not ad hoc piecemeal sites such as this.</p> <p>Building on vast swathes of open green belt land will have a disastrous impact on the natural beauty of the area, in particular the CAONB. The views of this distinctive landscape will be ruined for future generations and should be preserved. The proposed developments merges Berkhamsted and Northchurch thus destroying these distinctive individual settlements. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13354
<b>Person ID</b>	490211
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Barbara Saville
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site between <b>Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06</b> — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’ and the ‘Wishing Tree’. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</li> <li>• During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this.</li> <li>• The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.</li> <li>• The site on <b>Lock Field, BK07</b>, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single track canal bridge. It’s historic appearance enhances the view from the canal and is much valued. However there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single track bridge.</li> </ul>

- Discussions on the local plan have led to recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41.
- The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a ‘green lung’ to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location.
- Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13398

**Person ID** 1153922

**Full Name** Roger Hyslop

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** (24) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13478
<b>Person ID</b>	1270267
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON HARDING
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I am writing to protest at the strategic plan for Berkshmssted. The number of new houses is outrageous and would increase the popuation by about 50%. I am partocularly worried about:</p> <p>Water supply</p> <p>Sewage treatment</p> <p>The increase in traffic through the town and hence reduction in available parking.</p> <p>Building on green field sites</p> <p>The proposed removal of the Football ground from the town centre making much less accessible to young and old alike</p>

Lack of amenities

Lack of affordable housing

I think it is unsustainable and being pushed by those interested in making money from the scheme, not usually a great criterion for town planning. So thats a no to this strategic plan. Housing and jobs are required in the North of the country not the home counties.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13490

**Person ID** 1270270

**Full Name** ANDREW WORBOYS

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** Re: Draft Local Plan 23.1 - Berkhamsted Delivery Plan

I wish to strongly OPPOSE the building plan proposed for Berkhamsted & in particular the building on Berkhamsted Football Club's Broadwater stadium. This club was started after the First World War & is a facility for the people of Berkhamsted not Bourne End.

Most people who go to matches there WALK due to its central location. Away fans often arrive by train as the station is next door. It is a very eco-friendly stadium. The proposed new ground will require access by car and there is no suitable public transport, indeed for evening matches there is NONE.

The additional building will produce a traffic nightmare for Berkhamsted and should be wholly rejected.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13491

**Person ID** 1270271

**Full Name** ANGELA ROW

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Potential houses - green belt land top of Swing Gate Lane

I would like to lodge the strongest objection to the planned development as above.

Slowly but surely our green belt land is being taken away, during this pandemic areas such as this have been one of the few places to walk with no other people. There is also no infrastructure planned for schools, doctors (which are totally overwhelmed at present) in Berkhamsted.



Instead of me having to object I would be very interested to hear why you feel this happen ?

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13525

**Person ID** 1270291

**Full Name** Mr Mark Smith

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I am particularly against BK-01 the land south of Berkhamsted – 1000 houses shoe-horned onto those two fields with no added schools, doctors, playing areas etc will have a very disruptive effect on that part of town not to mention the total loss of fields that are used regularly by lots of people, including my family.

Berkhamsted is a lovely place to live – with period charm, swathes of countryside within walking distance and just the right size – a perfect combination, please don't ruin it with over development.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13559
<b>Person ID</b>	1270302
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Hannah AlQadhi
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK07 Lockfield - this is the most dangerous site DBC is proposing and should be removed on grounds of safety in particular.</p> <p>There are significant safety concerns regarding the potential of building on Lockfield. The road is extremely dangerous: Busy and fast with a narrow pavement opposite the proposed site and poor visibility over the single track bridge.</p> <p>Congestion is high on this road at school times, rush hour and weekends with queues stretching up the road past Bridgewater Hill. The proposed addition of another 120 cars and additional deliveries would exacerbate this further and the already high levels of pollution, just outside a junior school.</p> <p>Users of this road include school children, disabled service users at Sunnyside and the elderly at Compass Point as well as numerous wild animals including deer, foxes and badgers. DBC has recognised the dangerous nature of New Road for some time but the link road was never built and no other solutions have been forthcoming. Adding more dwellings would compound the problem further.</p> <p>In addition to safety concerns, Lockfield provides wildlife corridors north to Ashridge and east/west along the Grand Union canal. The canal is bordered by a chalk stream which I am told has an internationally significant habitat, any additional builds or changes in the road could irrevocably damage this stream's ecosystem. A Northchurch Parish Council newsletter lists over 80 different bird types in this immediate area.</p>

Lockfield is Green Belt. There is no amount of mitigation work that can compensate for the destruction of this area and its habitat.

The views across Lockfield to the Chilterns (AONB) and the southern hills BK06 are beautiful. The proposed dwellings would be at odds to the semi rural nature, current housing density and general character of Northchurch and would ruin this view.

Northchurch is a village and DBC should apply their position policy on village development to Northchurch and ensure there is no spread into Green Belt.

BK06

Many of the arguments above apply to BK06 too. It is beautiful, green belt and outside a village. BK06 Darrs Lane has been proposed for building even though archaeological investigation and a Habitat Regulation assessment have not been completed. Further, the distruction of green belt is unnecessary.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13566

**Person ID** 1270306

**Full Name** Mr Mike WHITAKER

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I believe that there is also a lot of land behind the Council Offices in Berkhamsted High Street</p> <p>I understand that the golf range in Berkhamsted is being sold. This is a great pity because it provides a lot of enjoyment and leisure to many in the town, and it would be far better if this site was acquired by the Council for leisure of Berkhamsted residents, however, this is a brownfield site</p> <p>Before the Council consider building any houses on green belt, which is against national policy, why doesn't it consider all sites where businesses are no longer trading, and this includes public houses, many of which are closed down frequently, and any businesses which are closing down in Northbridge Road and anywhere else in Berkhamsted.</p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13567
<b>Person ID</b>	1270306
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Mike WHITAKER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>To build houses amongst ancient lanes which do not have the capacity for traffic, and which are single track in places, is dangerous and completely inappropriate.</p> <p>To build houses in Lockfield in New Road is utterly dangerous due to the narrow road, the mass of traffic already on that road and near two schools, and the narrow and ancient bridge</p>
Yes / No	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13650
<b>Person ID</b>	1270345
<b>Full Name</b>	CLARE SIDEBOTTOM
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lock field – the access to this site is just after the single passing hump back bridge, pulling in and out of this close will likely create an accident hotspot. There are already regular accidents at the junction between new road and High Street (I am aware of 2 in the last few months where New road has been closed as a result) this development would only make this situation worse. In addition, the death of the young child on Northchurch High Street just a few years ago is a further example of how much pressure the local area is already under from a traffic point of view. Let's not make this situation more dangerous for our children.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have received literature from developers for Bullbourne Cross which highlighted what they believe are the benefits of this proposal. However, when we were made aware of plans for the local development it was confusing as we assumed the two were related.</li> </ul>
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS13763
<b>Person ID</b>	1270372
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p><b>20. Thakenham's 'Bulbourne Cross' submission at Bourne End.</b> While outside the precise scope of this public consultation, this publicity stunt by a major developer is a good demonstration of the power wielded by developers. This company put forward their plots of land at Bourne End for consideration in the local plan, but they have been rejected by the Green Belt assessment. This is not stopping them from drafting ambitious plans full of 'green' language, persuading local businesses to get on board with their plan (Berkhamsted Sports ground charitable trust) and some local politicians, and spending vast sums on a publicity campaign to woo local residents.</p> <p>20.1 Thakenham has been on a major public promotion drive to try and persuade the town's residents that this is a good idea and to lobby the council, and I have no doubt whatsoever that the company will also be privately lobbying DBC councillors very hard indeed. In the face of this onslaught of power and influence, can DBC reassure residents that they will stand firm in their original assessment of the land at Bourne End, and ensure that ribbon development and the joining of Berkhamsted to Hemel Hempstead doesn't happen?</p> <p>(See attached photo)</p> <p>Looking south to Hall Park and the rejected site to the east, from the Chilterns AONB. Plus the 'South Berkhamsted' proposed development site is visible at the top of the picture behind Hall Park.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">EGS13763.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS13764
<b>Person ID</b>	1270372
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>21.1 <b>BK01 – South of Berkhamsted</b> The main parcel south of Hall Park is a large field with a planted ley crop and a single old oak in the centre. This is a local wildlife site with the woodland bordering the A41. There is a lot of traffic noise from the A41. This site is on the ridge of the hill, where development presents an issue with the view from across the valley from the AONB (from the north looking south - see above photo). I have logged endangered bird species at this site. The field perimeter is used as a green space by locals.</p> <p>The adjoining parcel to the west was formerly part of the Ashlyns Hall Estate (as per the 1878 OS map), with one historic cedar tree. It is the only remaining view across to the Grade II* listed house. This view should be protected and not built over.</p> <p>(see attached photo)</p> <p>The small paddock to the west of Ashlyns Hall is a small self-contained area. Although it has a healthy bird population, it is less important, it is adjacent to the A41 and Chesham Road, and is more suitable for a small development.</p> <p>I challenge the supposition that the primary access would be from Chesham Rd, with Swing Gate the secondary access. In reality, the Chesham Rd access would be used by residents driving away from the town, however the Swing Gate Lane access would become the primary route <b>into</b> the town itself to access shops, restaurants, and other services. Chesham Rd is one way from the High St going out of town, so it's impossible for traffic to head <b>down</b> Chesham Rd into the town.</p> <p>The Plan says that the development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The prominent landform and intervisibility with the opposing rural valley sides with particular attention to any views from or toward the Chilterns AONB.</li> </ul>

- The setting of and views from Ashlyns Hall Grade II\* listed building

**Neither of these points can be ‘mitigated’ - the only mitigation is to refrain from building here.**

Furthermore, the Climate Change and Sustainability Options paper mentions guidance on conserving the historic environment:

*82.28 Chapter 16 sets the policy context for conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It makes clear that heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance and are an irreplaceable resource. Such assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. **This guidance is not being followed at Ashlyns Hall.***

Biodiversity – it is impossible to deliver a ‘net gain’ on a site if the only area to be retained is the small area of woodland adjoining the very noisy and polluted A41. The field itself is also used by some wildlife. Some threatened species need grassland, not woodland habitat, so unless a substantial portion of the open field is retained and made into a natural meadow, there will be biodiversity loss not gain.

The Plan suggests offering SANG on-site to offset potential adverse effects on the Chilterns SAC (ie Ashridge Estate). Any area retained as green space would need to be of considerable size to fulfil this purpose. This field in its current size is already used by existing local residents as an alternative green space – dog-walkers, families, etc. Reducing the size of the green space and building 850 dwellings is not going to offset any potential adverse effects on the SAC.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files** [EGS13764.jpg](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13765

**Person ID** 1270372

**Full Name** Janet Tuppen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>21.2 Growth Area BK03: Haslam Playing Fields</b> I have no objection in principle to developing the playing field itself, as long as the hedges/trees are retained. However the area of rough grassland to the south of the playing field adjacent to the A41 is a sensitive wildlife area and should be maintained in order to preserve biodiversity. It is a wildlife corridor.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13766
<b>Person ID</b>	1270372
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>21.3 Growth area BK04: Land between Hanburys and A41</b> From a previous planning application for Hanburys, the planning regulations stipulated that the boundary to the south needed to be clear so that the Green Belt was protected. This area is still as important today as in that previous planning application. It is such a small site, squashed up against the A41, and it should be retained as wild space.

The Strategy for Growth document states that ‘Southern part to be predominantly used to deliver a new wildlife corridor –however it **is** currently a wildlife corridor! To make it any narrower will make all the area subject to an ‘edge effect’. With the exception of a few species, most species prefer to stay away from the edge of a habitat. What is consistent across all research is that if a corridor is too narrow, it becomes ‘all edge’ and inappropriate for wildlife. This would risk rendering it ineffective as a useful habitat.

*“For the movement of a species, when much is known of its biology and when the corridor is expected to function over years, the width should be measured in 100’s of metres”.* Harris and Scheck (1993)

From a report into wildlife corridor widths for Welwyn Garden City:

[https://www.what.gov.uk/media/15978/EX181-Mr-Peter-Oakenful-BGS-corridor-width.pdf/EX181\\_Mr\\_Peter\\_Oakenful\\_BGS\\_corridor\\_width.pdf?m=637163169508170000](https://www.what.gov.uk/media/15978/EX181-Mr-Peter-Oakenful-BGS-corridor-width.pdf/EX181_Mr_Peter_Oakenful_BGS_corridor_width.pdf?m=637163169508170000)

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13767

**Person ID** 1270372

**Full Name** Janet Tuppen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**21.4 Growth Area BK05: Blegberry Gardens (land adjacent to)**

This field was removed from the 3rd stage of the Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal. Following a detailed submission by lawyers for the developer, Crest Nicholson, the site has been restored to the Emerging Strategy for Growth. The main thrust of the legal argument is that this site is no more sensitive than most of the others in the plan,

so it should still go forward. While this may be an argument for relativity, it equally highlights the high sensitivities of the other sites. Their Landscape Comparison Appraisal makes interesting reading:  
<http://www.spbroadway.com/crestberkhamsted/wp-content/uploads/sites/61/2018/10/15426-Land-adj.-to-Blegberry-Gdns-Berkhamsted-Reps-13.12.17.pdf>  
 There is little mention of the gradient of the land, at this site, which slopes down towards the A41. When driving along the A41 this land parcel is very exposed to the view of the road, and it would be impossible to screen it entirely. The tree barrier would need to be placed at the southern edge of the boundary, which is at the bottom of a steep hill, and on inspection of the land, there is a deep gully along this boundary, currently filled with bracken.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13768
<b>Person ID</b>	1270372
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>21.5 Growth Area Bk06: East of Darrs Lane</b> The southern boundary of this extremely large arable field is on the ridge of the hill. This line joins immediately to the AONB to the west, and is evident from the opposing hill to the north (also within the AONB). Any development on this hilltop would have a detrimental effect on the character of the AONB.

Any extremely limited potential development on this plot should be constrained to the northern portion of the field, which would render access from Shootersway impossible. However, Darrs Lane is very narrow would not sustain additional traffic.

The only redeeming feature of this proposal is the proposed public park to deliver SANG. In order for this to be a genuine alternative to the Chiltern SAC as a recreational space, it would need to be large in scale, and would need to be a pre-condition of any development, and not one which could subsequently be removed (unlike some of the original conditions for the Bearroc Park development.)

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13769
<b>Person ID</b>	1270372
<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>21.6 Growth Area BK07: Lock Field, Northchurch</b></p> <p>This site has been described as having existing development on all 3 sides of this small, triangular shaped plot. This is misleading. The development to the south is in fact the Grand Union Canal with a hedge boundary, which is a recognised wildlife corridor. The development to the north is the railway line, which enters the tunnel, and to the north of the railway there are allotments then woodland. The development to the east is New Road, also enclosed by a tall hedge. The scrub which has been allowed to grow on this site is a haven for wildlife. Scrub is often perceived as unkempt in appearance, but for wildlife it is a far richer habitat than a neat, open field. I lived for 7 years on the Springwood estate</p>

just south of the canal, and I would regularly birdwatch from the canal looking across to Lock Field. It is an important site for summer migrants. Scrub has already been lost in the Chiltern Beechwoods due to overgrazing by deer. Species like the Nightingale are already locally extinct in Hertfordshire. If we clear all the scrub in existence, even more species will decline, resulting in a net loss of biodiversity.

I note the density of dwellings put forward for this site is much higher than for some of the larger sites. There is no precedent for dwellings of more than 2 storeys on the western side of New Road, and there is no housing at all to the north of the canal on this side of New Road. Some of the development on the Springwood Estate to the south of the canal is single storey. New Road itself forms a distinct east-west boundary between Berkhamsted housing estates and Northchurch which is more rural in character. The land to the north of Lock Field is woodland and an open field, and beyond that the AONB. This is not an appropriate site for high density flats.

I would also like to point out that the bridge over the canal on New Road is a dangerous local pinch-point, as it is a single carriageway, and traffic heading south down the hill has to stop to give priority to traffic heading north up the hill over the bridge. This give way junction is exactly opposite the gate to lock field, and it would be a very dangerous entrance/exit point for vehicles.

(see attached photo)  
New Road by Lock Field

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files** [EGS13769.jpg](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13770

**Person ID** 1270372

**Full Name** Janet Tuppen

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment	<p><b>21.7 Growth Area BK08: Rossway Farm</b></p> <p>This land was left out of the Green Belt Phase 2 assessment as being unsuitable for release from the Green Belt. Dacorum Borough Council Stage 2 Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal Report244026-00-4-05-REP   Issue   January 2016 (Published December 2016)</p> <p><i>BK-A11 While the release of the sub-area would not constitute a significant southward expansion of Berkhamsted as a result of the A41, which is a hard buffer to further growth, it would represent sizeable outward expansion westwards. Field boundaries could be used to contain this sprawl in a more managed release. The release of this sub-area may compromise the ability of Green Belt to the north to meet this purpose.</i></p> <p><i>Aside from the eastern part of the sub-area, which has suffered historic encroachment (thus resulting in a boundary anomaly), it predominantly retains an unspoilt, rural character and a stronger relationship with the countryside to the south than Berkhamsted to the north. Its release would result in encroachment.</i></p> <p>Yet in the topic paper on site selection:</p> <p><i>“Of the 46 sites from the AECOM Site Assessment Study and five from the addendum considered to be potentially suitable, the Council has carried forward 37 sites for detailed testing, having regard to the emerging development strategy of the Local Plan. This, exceptionally includes one site that AECOM considered to be unsuitable. 3.84Site 16 -“Rossway Farm, Land between Shootersway and A41 bypass” is located immediately adjacent to other sites at Berkhamsted considered in the same assessment to be suitable. The Council believe that the testing of this site would allow for a more holistic approach to considering options for growth (including reasonable alternatives) in Berkhamsted.”</i></p> <p><b>The southern strip forms a wildlife corridor to the A41. The plot is very open to the south and suffers from noise from the A41. It also links visually to the rest of the Rossway estate to the south of the A41.</b></p>
Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment	
Included files	
Title	Berkhamsted
ID	EGS13771
Person ID	1270372

<b>Full Name</b>	Janet Tuppen
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>21.8 Growth Area BK09: Bank Mill Lane</b></p> <p>From the ARUP Annex Report 5 - which divides the parcel into a and b (to avoid the Bulbourne and Flood Zone 3)</p> <p><i>“The parcel is defined by flood pasture, meadow and rough grazing, with a slightly neglected quality. Invasive species, such as Himalayan Balsam, are frequently apparent. The parcel is bounded by rising land within the AONB to the north, although screened by the hedgerow network.”</i></p> <p><i>“Overall landscape sensitivity of this parcel is considered <b>medium</b>, by virtue of its visual containment and relationship to existing development at Hall Park, plus settlement influences such as transport corridors. The intimate scale and landscape pattern (river channel, riparian vegetation and flood meadow) increase sensitivity, however the degraded character imparted by neglected landscape management reduces sensitivity.”</i></p> <p><b>I disagree with the interpretation that the presence of Himalayan Balsam and a bit of overall neglect reduces the sensitivity of the land.</b> Himalayan Balsam is an issue on protected wildlife sites as much as those without protection – the Herts &amp; Middlesex Wildlife Trust holds regular Himalayan Balsam clearing parties on its own sites and gives recommendations on the time of year to tackle it. Even with no intervention this land holds a wide diversity of species, and with minimal intervention it could improve further. The mature trees surrounding the parcel of land on all sides, the internationally important chalk stream following its natural path, and the riparian vegetation mean this meadow is of huge importance and could contribute further to the restoration of the River Bulbourne. <b>I have been conducting a bird survey on this field over the past 6 weeks and have counted a total of 27 species, some of which have been feeding on the meadow. This includes overwintering species which turn to fields of this nature in search of food when most of the berries in the hedgerows have been eaten.</b></p> <p>The developer with an ‘option’ to purchase the land intends according to their current presentation to build luxury retirement properties on the southern side of the river, and construct new bridges across the river to the lower, northern portion. Any land clearance and ‘tidying’ of the green space for retirees to walk around would inevitably reduce the biodiversity of this precious habitat. There is no serious discussion of the flood risk associated with this site, both for the development, the runoff into the delicate chalk stream, and runoff into Bank Mill Lane. <b>The lane floods on a regular basis in winter – this would only be exacerbated by developing the field in question.</b></p>

(see attached photos)

Bank Mill Lane

This meadow would be of far greater use as a mitigation project against other proposed development. A wildflower meadow can hold as much carbon as a woodland, and would be a significant contribution in any carbon offsetting.

I also object to the developer advertising this site as 'built in 2022' on their website, when the Local Plan has not yet been ratified.

<https://housingcare.org/housing-care/facility-info-163552-audley-berkhamsted-berkhamsted-england>

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

[EGS13771a.jpg](#)  
[EGS13771b.jpg](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS13783

**Person ID**

1144292

**Full Name**

Mrs Rachel Hyland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

- I appreciate the need for more housing but am concerned that this is not the right housing for the demand. The development at the end of Swing Gate Lane is as great success giving housing to local people, surely, we need



- more developments like this providing local housing for local people rather than 850 houses on green belt land that leads to extra traffic and removes the green lungs between the town and the A41.
- Although the development at the top of Swing Gate Lane states that the primary access will be from Chesham Road there will be extra traffic on the already busy Swing Gate Lane. With a school at either end of the lane school drop of and pick up already cause traffic chaos. The addition of another 850 houses will only add to this chaos. There appears to be an assumption that residents will walk up Swing Gate Lane this doesn't consider the size of the hill which young children will struggle with leading parents to drive. Also there appears to be no allowance for a change in the junction of Swing Gate Lane and London Road. On a weekly basis turning right into Swing Gate is a hazard as cars coming from Hemel direction do not give way at the mini roundabout.
  - At present any large downfall of rain leads to torrents of water running down the lower end of Swing Gate lane with increased concreted areas at the top of the hill this will only lead to increased rainfall with nowhere to go, I can't see in the plans where these issues have been taken into account, building at the top of the valley will have a huge impact on the bottom of the valley.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13941

**Person ID** 1145435

**Full Name** Mr Paul Crosland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment** **Bk01 South Berkhamsted.** Green Belt. The ' Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not described. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments

against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how can Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times with schools along its length, be identified even as a 'secondary' access.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS13942

Person ID 1145435

Full Name Mr Paul Crosland

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Yes

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment **Bk02 BFI.** Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS13943
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk03 Haslam Field.</b> Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13944
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch.</b> Safe access to New Road will be very difficult given how narrow the road is north-east of the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13945
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk09 Bank Mill Lane.</b> Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13946
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk11 Jewson.</b> Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13947
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk12</b> Civic Centre. Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13952
<b>Person ID</b>	1145435
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Paul Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	

<p><b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b></p>	<p><u>Additional comment in respect of the proposal made by ThakehamDevelopments to develop around 1,100 new homes on last east ofBerkhamsted, between Berkhamsted and Bourne End.</u></p> <p>The proposed Bulbourne Cross scheme has been quite aggressively promoted by Thakeham Developments Limited to residents of Berkhamsted during the currency pf the Consultation period for the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The developer has promised some benefits of sports facilities provision and a country park (to replace mainly farmland) alongside the housing offer. In my view, and notwithstanding these promised benefits, which would accrue mainly to residents of Boxmoor, western Hemel Hempstead and Bourne End rather than Berkhamsted, within the boundaries of which the majority of the proposed development sits, the proposed development would 'coalesce' Berkhamsted with Bourne End, which will itself become a satellite of Hemel Hempstead by virtue of the LA3 development, west of Hemel. In fact, it would help to create ribbon development along the Bulbourne/ Gade valley all the way from Northchurch to Kings Langley. Preventing coalescence of communities is one of the fundamental tenets of Green Belt policy.</p> <p>The developer has also made promises of "net zero homes" and "carbon neutral living" as if this is something revolutionary. In terms of 'construction' and 'use' carbon consumption, that is the direction of travel for all new buildings.</p> <p>Despite claims by the developer to contrary, the fact that the new development is 3km from Berkhamsted town centre, and probably the same to Hemel town centre means that most journeys will probably be undertaken by car. Although cars will be electric in time, until then, I cannot see how the developer's claim of "carbon neutral living" can be substantiated.</p> <p>Similar claims are put forward for 'affordable housing' percentages. I would argue that affordable housing would be better provided in established town centres so that residents on low incomes are not forced to spend limited funds on personal mobility.</p> <p>I note that the Bulbourne Cross proposals were considered by Dacorum Borough Council for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan, but ultimately the scheme was rejected for inclusion. This is a decision that I fully support.</p>
<p><b>Included files</b></p>	
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Berkhamsted</p>
<p><b>ID</b></p>	<p>EGS13962</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1270381</p>
<p><b>Full Name</b></p>	<p>Alexandra Das-Crosland</p>
<p><b>Organisation Details</b></p>	

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk01 South Berkhamsted.</b> Green Belt. The ' Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not described. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how can Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times with schools along its length, be identified even as a 'secondary' access.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13963
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk02 BFI.</b> Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.



Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment	
Included files	
Title	Berkhamsted
ID	EGS13964
Person ID	1270381
Full Name	Alexandra Das-Crosland
Organisation Details	
Agent ID	
Agent Full Name	
Agent Organisation	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment	<b>Bk03 Haslam Field.</b> Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment	
Included files	
Title	Berkhamsted
ID	EGS13965

<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch.</b> Safe access to New Road will be very difficult given how narrow the road is north-east of the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13966
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk11 Jewson.</b> Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13967
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk12 Civic Centre.</b> Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS13972
<b>Person ID</b>	1270381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alexandra Das-Crosland
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p><u>Additional comment in respect of the proposal made by ThakehamDevelopments to develop around 1,100 new homes on last east ofBerkhamsted, between Berkhamsted and Bourne End.</u></p> <p>The proposed Bulbourne Cross scheme has been quite aggressively promoted by Thakeham Developments Limited to residents of Berkhamsted during the currency pf the Consultation period for the Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The developer has promised some benefits of sports facilities provision and a country park (to replace mainly farmland) alongside the housing offer. In my view, and notwithstanding these promised benefits, which would accrue mainly to residents of Boxmoor, western Hemel Hempstead and Bourne End rather than Berkhamsted, within the boundaries of which the majority of the proposed development sits, the proposed development would 'coalesce' Berkhamsted with Bourne End, which will itself become a satellite of Hemel Hempstead by virtue of the LA3 development, west of Hemel. In fact, it would help to create ribbon development along the Bulbourne/ Gade valley all the way from Northchurch to Kings Langley. Preventing coalescence of communities is one of the fundamental tenets of Green Belt policy.</p> <p>The developer has also made promises of "net zero homes" and "carbon neutral living" as if this is something revolutionary. In terms of 'construction' and 'use' carbon consumption, that is the direction of travel for all new buildings.</p>

Despite claims by the developer to contrary, the fact that the new development is 3km from Berkhamsted town centre, and probably the same to Hemel town centre means that most journeys will probably be undertaken by car. Although cars will be electric in time, until then, I cannot see how the developer's claim of "carbon neutral living" can be substantiated.

Similar claims are put forward for 'affordable housing' percentages. I would argue that affordable housing would be better provided in established town centres so that residents on low incomes are not forced to spend limited funds on personal mobility.

I note that the Bulbourne Cross proposals were considered by Dacorum Borough Council for inclusion in the Draft Local Plan, but ultimately the scheme was rejected for inclusion. This is a decision that I fully support.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS13973

**Person ID** 1270381

**Full Name** Alexandra Das-Crosland

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted comment** **Bk09 Bank Mill Lane.** Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14003
<b>Person ID</b>	1270423
<b>Full Name</b>	BERNAREGGI GRAZIA
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Bk06 East of Darrs Lane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this will lead to too much traffic on a narrow road which is already dangerous due to speeding</li> <li>• permanent loss of green belt which should be</li> <li>• loss of ancient hedgerows which are important for</li> <li>• not enough affordable housing; too many large</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14004
<b>Person ID</b>	1270423
<b>Full Name</b>	BERNAREGGI GRAZIA
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	BK13 Gossoms End: This site was previously intended for a supermarket which will no longer be built so the site could incorporate higher density blocks of flats. This site is within walking distance of the town centre and railway station which will avoid increasing traffic.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14009
<b>Person ID</b>	1270424
<b>Full Name</b>	OLNEY JOSEPHINA
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	In addition, looking at the proposals for my area Bell Lane, Berkhamsted), it will take away all the green belt between Darrs Lane/Bell Lane and along Shooters Way. It will also interrupt the continuing view to Ashridge, an area of outstanding natural beauty, and from Ashridge back over Northchurch (NOT West Berkhamsted). This is totally unacceptable. Green belt can be used in exceptional circumstances. I would be interested to know what these are!

Infrastructure is a further problem. How would you propose to solve that? Bell Lane and Darrss Lane are single track roads, lined with ancient hedges. The proposed school at the bottom of the Wishing Tree field (which, by the way, has many sink holes) the 200 houses at the top of this field and all the proposed houses along the green belt of Shooters Way, will mean thousands of additional cars for an already congested area. I note, with interest, that there is no plan for future infrastructure in place.

It should also be noted, that there is no gas nor sewage connection in this area. Bearroc Park phase1 along Shooters Way has a large septic tank that is emptied at night. Why? The sewage system cannot cope. No doubt the same will happen at Bearroc Park phase 2 along Shooters Way and Durrants Lane. What are the plans to deal with sewage for the proposed houses and, for that matter, fresh water supply?

I could add many more reasons to object to his plan, like historical interests such as the Grim's Dyke running along the Wishing Tree field, the added air pollution in the valley of Northchurch and Berkhamsted, the lack of GP and hospital facilities, schools etc and sadly the loss of our so much loved and necessary green spaces, wildlife and biodiversity.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14021

**Person ID** 1270425

**Full Name** EMMA LELIEVELD

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	After the publication of this consultation, flyers were sent to local residents about a further development by Thakenhams in the Bourne End area. The developers propose this development as an alternative to sites included in the draft Local Plan. DBC should formally consult on this separately rather than rely on the informal process the developers have undertaken. The timing and sequencing of this new proposal should not result in it becoming additional to what is already proposed under the draft Local Plan.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14066
<b>Person ID</b>	1270476
<b>Full Name</b>	ALISON CHESHIRE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes BK06 — this site contains single track lanes up steep hills that are bordered with ancient hedgerows. The field itself is valued by residents in Northchurch and also Berkhamsted, where it forms a valued view. It contains a single tree which is known variously as the ‘Lonely Tree’, the ‘Wishing Tree’ and “One Tree Hill”. This view is so valued that local photographers sell pictures of it to local residents.</p> <p>During the pandemic, many people have used the borders of the wishing tree field (BK06) for dog walking and jogging. From the top of the wishing tree field there is a spectacular view of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) on the other side of the valley and all sign of the village of Northchurch itself disappears into the valley. This gives an impression of unending rolling countryside towards the AONB. The reverse view from the AONB mirrors this. The view from the top of the wishing tree field has been particularly beneficial for the mental health of local residents during the</p>

time of the pandemic. Should housing be built as planned, this will permanently mar the view from the AONB and destroy its beauty. Insufficient regard has been given to this in the proposals.

The site on Lock Field, BK07, causes concern because it will generate parking for at least 120 additional cars. This is located above an historic single-track canal bridge. It's historic appearance enhances the view from canal and is much valued. However, there are concerns about the impact of construction traffic on the structure of the bridge and also increased traffic flow from the additional housing. There is long standing evidence of road safety concerns on New Road. A speed indicator device is soon to be installed on New Road as a result of concerns. Many parents feel that it is too dangerous to allow their children to walk on New Road due to the uneven and narrow pavements and perceived speeding to get over the single-track bridge.

Discussion on the local plan have led to a recognition of the historic significance of —BK08 - Rossway farm between Shootersway and A41. The area of this proposal was originally conceived as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution. It is unacceptable to build family homes in such proximity to the A41, which is already congested. This congestion will increase with building across the area causing a health risk to those who live in this location. Following the death of Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a major circular road in southeast London and died in February 2013, it is irresponsible to public health that a local authority would consider building family homes in a location that risks the lives of those with asthma or respiratory illnesses and conditions affected by air pollution.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14078

**Person ID** 1270478

**Full Name** HANSEN L & H

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>BK01 – Land South of Berkhamsted - Reject</p> <p>The roads are already congested and more traffic will increase pollution near schools. The scale of this development means that many of the houses will be occupied by commuters to other towns and will mainly commute by car due to the location of the site. The development will be highly visible across the valley and from AONB land and the important transition area between the town and open countryside will be damaged. The land is not well connected to existing services and facilities in the town centre and the distance and gradient will discourage walking and cycling.</p> <p>As it will be located near A41 noise and pollution from the cars will affect resident's health and wellbeing. There will no longer be a 'green lung' between the A41 and Berkhamsted.</p> <p>It is not an appropriate site for affordable housing or for the elderly population due to the distance from the town centre or vital services.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14079
<b>Person ID</b>	1270478
<b>Full Name</b>	HANSEN L & H
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	There is a shortage of pitches in Berkhamsted and it is really not appropriate to build houses on this field. If Berkhamsted School no longer need this field, they should consider gifting it to the community.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14080
<b>Person ID</b>	1270478
<b>Full Name</b>	HANSEN L & H
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The site is very close to the A41 and it is an important transition area between the town and countryside. It will have a negative impact on adjacent AONB. There is no public transport in the area at the moment and it is highly unlikely or unrealistic this will change in the future and provision for cycling and walking is not viable. Shootersway is already overstretched and any development will cause even more congestion and pollution.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14081
<b>Person ID</b>	1270478
<b>Full Name</b>	HANSEN L & H
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Shootersway is already overstretched and any development will cause even more congestion and pollution. It will be visible from across the valley and have an impact on Chilterns AONB.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14111
<b>Person ID</b>	1270501
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	These
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14112
<b>Person ID</b>	1270501
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	These sites are adjacent to each other and run between Shooters Way and the A41. Many residents enjoy walking the footpath that runs along the edge of these fields and the views across the Green Belt. These fields act as a corridor for wildlife between the houses on Shooters Way and the A41.
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14113
<b>Person ID</b>	1270501
<b>Full Name</b>	DAVID WHITE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>5.2.1 The proposed development is too large and will overwhelm this part of Northchurch</p> <p>This site is on the north side of Shooters Way. To the east, it runs alongside Bearroc Park 2, a large, 80-dwelling development being built on the other side of Durrants Lane. Heading west, it crosses the field, over Bell lane, to Darrs Lane which is the boundary for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The development of 200 dwellings includes a secondary school with access from Darrs Lane. It runs alongside Bearroc Part 2, the recent development of 80 dwellings on Durrants lane.</p> <p>Taken together, these developments comprise 560 dwellings and cover over 40 acres of Green Belt. This huge area fulfils the primary aim of Green Belt policy; to prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, and to prevent neighbouring towns and communities merging into one another. These 560 dwellings form a large crescent-shaped development which merges a large part of Berkhamsted with Northchurch.</p> <p>5.2.2 Dacorum previously rejected this site as unsuitable for development</p> <p>DBC's 2013 review of Green Belt in Dacorum concluded that the parcel of Green Belt west of Durrants Lane strongly supports the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt: to prevent urban spawl. The site was further assessed in Dacorum's Schedule of Site Appraisals (For Large Greenfield Sites) October 2017 and was rejected for its impact on the Green</p>

Belt. This appraisal concluded that “Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term”.

### 5.2.3 The impact on biodiversity

The Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation is a site of European importance of biodiversity and wildlife conservation. In July 2018, the Chilterns Conservation Board submitted a request to Natural England for a review of the designation and requested that National Park status be considered. DEFRA’s Landscapes Review 2019 (The Glover Report) strongly supported this request. The proximity of the developments will damage the nearby AONB and its prospects for becoming a National Park. Dacorum’s Local Plan should consider the economic and environmental benefits of a new National Park and put on hold any proposed developments that could impact on the AONB hold until the outcomes of the Glover Report.

### 5.2.4 The impact on physical and mental health

The loss of Green Belt will have a detrimental impact on local peoples physical and mental health which contradicts national and local policies. Very many local people walk up these lanes and along Shooters Way for exercise and fresh air. At various points, they stop to enjoy uninterrupted views across the valley and towards the AONB, and down into the built-up parts of Northchurch. The fields, hedges, wildflowers, groups of trees, ancient woodland and embankments combine to enhance the view and attract birds and wildlife which are pleasant to see and hear. This green fields, footpaths and lanes makes a significant contribution to people’s physical health and mental wellbeing. The loss of 40 acres of green fields will not be offset by the provision of a very small park.

The Darrs Lane site forms an important view from the other side of the valley. Although people adjacent to it in Northchurch enjoy the bucolic vista and the ability to exercise in the field, it is admired from the other side of the valley too. There have been recent discussions on social media about the single tree in the field - whether it is called the ‘wishing tree’ or the ‘Lonely tree’ - one resident reports that his little girl calls it Aerial — to desecrate this field will damage the sense of place of everyone in the surrounds and to see it destroyed will damage the sense of security, identity and wellbeing of all who see it - local photographers even sell photos of the view of this lonely tree field as it is so loved by the community. It is possible to walk some way up the field and look over towards Northchurch Common and Ashridge and not see the village of Northchurch at all, because of how it dips into the valley - the same will be true in reverse. To build an urban environment in this beautiful landscape is desecration that will detract from the beauty, ambiance and sense of place from those enjoying the countryside for miles around. Where once they saw the beautiful, lonely tree, they will soon see rooflines and asphalt. This will significantly damage the amenity and identity of the area, overwhelm the strong identity of the people of Northchurch, and damage their mental health.

### 5.2.5 The impact on heritage



Darr's Lane and Bell Lane are characterful rural lanes that are deep and high-sided from centuries of use. A Dacorum Heritage Trust study in 2010 concluded that the hedges in Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and parts of Shooters Way were over 800 years old. They need a 10-metre margin to protect them from damage. The proposed developments will damage or destroy these hedges.

The Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2016 report (a desk-based assessment of land off Durrants Lane), found that a rare surviving example of mediaeval to post-mediaeval plateau ridge and furrow had been recorded across the whole field that lies North of Grimm's Dyke and adjacent to Bell's Lane. This is an archaeological pattern of parallel ridges and troughs created by an historical system of ploughing typical of the open field system and they are still present, then they are of national importance. Although there was no clarification of whether these earthworks are still present, it suggests that Bell Lane has been in use since medieval times to provide access these features. There is a case that the lanes themselves merit conservation on the grounds of being an historic environment that adds rural character to Northchurch. Pre-historic artefacts were found on the proposed site and Roman finds reported in the vicinity. Darr's Lane and Bell Lane should be recognised as being an environment of historic importance in the Local Plan and the ridge and furrow ploughing patterns should be preserved.

#### 5.2.6 The lack of infrastructure planning

Although the report says that "a masterplan will be bought forward", there is no evidence of planning for infrastructure. For example, there is no traffic management plan for these sites. Previous assessments of these sites have raised significant difficulties that have caused them to be rejected for future development. Both Bell Lane and Darrs Lane have sections which are not wide enough for two vehicles to pass and are unsuitable for increased traffic. Where these two lanes meet the High Street, road traffic is heavily congested and dangerous for pedestrians to cross, particularly children from the three nearby schools (and the proposed secondary school in Darrs Lane.) The bottom of Darrs lane is a bottleneck with an S- bend and insufficient parking spaces for customers visiting Tesco Express. The proximity of houses, means there is no opportunity to improve or expand Darrs Lane at this point. The suggestion that access to this school will be from Darrs Lane indicates that no consideration has been given to how cars and coaches will enter and leave the school.

#### 5.2.7 Impact on the semi-rural character of Northchurch

Widening the surrounding lanes to accommodate increased traffic would alter the rural nature of Northchurch. Darrs lane and Bell Lane are attractive, narrow, hedge-lined country lanes which typify the lanes in Northchurch. Any road-widening would alter the country lane appearance to the detriment of the rural character of this part of Northchurch and the adjacent AONB.

Preservation of the Beechwoods in the Darrs Lane site would support the creation of a new National Park. Dacorum Borough Council is required to undertake a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) involving a Screening Exercise to determine whether Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth has aspects within it that will impact adversely on the Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation. However, the development proposals include the Beechwoods together with consideration of compensatory measures. This implies that Dacorum have reached a conclusion about the

Beechwoods without the Screening Exercise. Therefore, Dacorum has not complied with its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to determine if a plan or project may affect the protected features of a habitats site before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise it.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14114

**Person ID** 1270501

**Full Name** DAVID WHITE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Lock Field is a triangular stretch of Green Belt that is surrounded by significant parts of heritage and countryside. To the south of Lock Field, the Northchurch Conservation Area sits at the bottom of a valley that rises towards Northchurch Common. Above the Conservation Area and on either side of Lock Field are the canal and the two Northchurch allotment sites. The importance of Lock Field is highlighted on page 52 of Dacorum's 2017 Conservation Area Appraisal which states that views to the north towards the river and canal "form part of the character and significance of the conservation area".

The Landscape Considerations on DBC's Draft Strategy (page 317) highlight Lock Field's "relationship to the Grand Union Canal, it's setting and the associated views; the long-distance views of the AONB and the tree lined Ashridge horizon.

Taken together, the Conservation Area, the canal, Lock Field, the allotment sites and the hill rising to Northchurch Common provide a culturally important, green corridor. The importance of preserving this corridor was recognised in

Dacorum's 2017 Northchurch Conservation Area Appraisal which proposed extending the conservation area "to encompass the canal, tow path, lock gates, lock keeper's cottage and open space between the River and Canal:

1.) "As the Grand Union Canal is an important historic influence on the wider area from the latter 18th/early 19th centuries, the area forms a key amenity link to the Grand Union Canal tow path which creates a pedestrian/cycle route to Berkhamsted to the east and Dudswell and Tring to the west. The section of the Grand Union Canal from Brentford to Berkhamsted was completed in 1798, and the link to Birmingham was opened in 1805. The building is a component of a nationally significant canal development which linked London and Birmingham by 1905 and which remained commercially operational until the 1960's. The setting of the building alongside the lock chamber to the north of Northchurch remains unchanged, enhancing the clearly legible functional relationship between the 2 structures. The lock cottage stands alongside the lock chamber of one of 2 operational locks. The lock retains wooden gates of traditional design to both ends of the chamber, which is brick lined below massive stone copings. The building is of distinctive architectural form and character and remains clearly identifiable as a canal-related structure."

2.) The open area to the north east of the current conservation area boundary is open space which is visually connected to the existing conservation area and leads to the tow path and canal and a definable boundary."

NPPF, paragraphs 133-147, states that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. In relation to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt, the development at Lock Field would "significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt, to its considerable detriment

### 5.3.2 Lock Field is a potential community amenity

If Lock Field is removed as a development area, Northchurch Parish Council would seek to purchase this Green Belt as a community amenity for people to visit and enjoy. Residents have demonstrated a high demand for recreational and exercise areas. Northchurch Recreation Ground had to be temporarily closed due to surface damage as a result of people exercising. Paths at Northchurch Common Trespassers exercising on and Northchurch cricket ground have been damaged by the amount of people exercising there. The Lock Field Site would be highly valued by the local community as a nature reserve with some gravel and brick pathways to enable exercise and enjoyment of nature.

### 5.5.3 Risk of flooding

During heavy rain on 31st January 2021 and a Flood Alert on 7th February 2021. the Lock Field site was the subject of a surface water run-off flood warning. The National Flood Warning Service shows that part of the site is at Medium Risk, meaning that each year that section has a chance of flooding between 1 and 3.3%. The proposed development will require flood prevention measures

### 5.5.4 Impact of increased traffic flows

The Local Plan has no masterplan to assess the impact on infrastructure or traffic. Northchurch Parish Council has had more complaints from residents about road safety traffic in New Road in the vicinity of this site than anywhere else in Northchurch. Residents are fearful that traffic from the Lock Field site will increase the likelihood of a pedestrian being injured. Vehicles often speed down the hill towards the canal bridge. The canal bridge is the primary cause of danger and it is just above the bridge that traffic will enter and leave the estate. It is not possible to prevent these additional vehicles adding to what is already a very dangerous location.

The Transport Study proposes moving the stop line on the north of the single-track bridge up the hill beyond the new Lock Field access road; and lengthening the footpath on the south side. This would lengthen the single-track section over the canal bridge and cause further congestion on either side of the bridge.

In 2017, a development company circulated proposals for a residential development on Lock Field. At the time, the primary concern for residents was the danger from road traffic leaving the estate by the canal bridge. The canal bridge is only wide enough for one vehicle. Private houses on either side of the canal prevent any widening. The pavement outside the school is very narrow and lined on both sides by parked cars. The narrow pavement gives little room for error and parents with buggies are forced into the road, particularly by the canal bridge. Cars approaching from either side, sometimes accelerate to get through the gap first. An unsupervised child crossing the road will appear from between parked cars and give an approaching driver very little time to brake. At this point, many drivers are accelerating towards the canal bridge with eyes focussed on approaching traffic. To protect children, Northchurch Parish Council pay for a crossing patrol.

#### 5.5.5 Impact on air quality

According to the 2020 Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices: “The main source of air pollution within Dacorum Borough is generated from road traffic”

The section of Northchurch High Street running from St. Marys School to Darrs lane is one of three areas in Dacorum identified as vulnerable to pollution from nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). This stretch of road is narrow and the tall houses trap NO<sub>2</sub> from queueing vehicles. Although the air quality has improved in the past two years, any increase in traffic from additional residential developments may make the problem return. The main users of this part of the High Street are junior school children who are particularly vulnerable to lung damage.

Also particularly vulnerable to lung damage are the elderly, and Northchurch has a high percentage of elderly residents: about 30% are aged over 60. In February 2021, Asthma UK and the British Lung Foundation published a new report explaining the health risks:

“Exposure to air pollution increases the chance of a person dying early, developing lung cancer and cardiovascular disease. Emerging research has even shown links with air pollution and cognitive decline, including dementia.<sup>5</sup>”

The report revealed that 59% of older people are living in areas where fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), the most worrying type of pollution that can penetrate deep into the lungs, is above the levels recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO).

In conclusion the air pollution caused by increased vehicle journeys is likely to cause significant harm to the health of Northchurch residents, particularly to the young and old.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS14115

Person ID 1270501

Full Name DAVID WHITE

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Developers own this 1.48-acre site and have planning consent for a retail food store, 30 flats and a carpark. However, they no longer wish to build a retail store on this site and Berkhamsted already has three, large, retail food stores. This site could provide many low-cost residential apartments, like the adjacent Turner Court Apartments, with a small grocery store below. Unlike a retail store, which would attract many out-of-town shoppers in cars, residential apartments would provide low-cost accommodation, that local people could afford, within walking distance on level ground of the town centre and train station. Improving the canal path would encourage residents to make that journey on foot. In contrast,

the proposed developments in Darrs Lane and shooters Way encourage car journeys. This site should be included in the Local Plan as suitable for residential development.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14128

**Person ID** 1270505

**Full Name** EKATERINA COBURN

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** Strongly Object (BK01)

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14153

**Person ID** 1163439

**Full Name** Lindy Weinreb

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In general, the justification for including most of the Berkhamsted sites are a result of planners accepting the Central Government 'target' and claiming this as 'exceptional circumstances' despite a Central Government commitment to protecting the Green Belt. Most of these proposed allocations should be rejected. The weakness of infrastructure plans are highlighted elsewhere but for instance exactly how and by whom are the networks of new pedestrian links with adjacent allocations to be provided?</p> <p><b>Bk01</b> South Berkhamsted. Green Belt. The 'Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not specified. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how will Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times be kept as a 'secondary' access. See film made about this development for the last draft Local Plan.  <a href="http://www.deetv.tv/#south-berkhamsted-concept">http://www.deetv.tv/#south-berkhamsted-concept</a></p> <p><b>Bk02</b> BFI Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.</p> <p><b>Bk03</b> Haslam Field. Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.</p> <p><b>Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch</b> Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy. The canal is a very important tourism asset within Berkhamsted and the Borough of Dacorum. Development should not be countenanced along this priceless asset. Once lost it is gone for ever as green space and an important wild life corridor.</p> <p><b>Bk09</b> Bank Mill Lane. Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. It is on the flood plain. It is an irreplaceable asset to our local green space.</p> <p><b>Bk11</b> Jewson. Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.</p> <p><b>Bk12</b> Civic Centre. Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.</p>

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14179
<b>Person ID</b>	1270554
<b>Full Name</b>	JOHN CYSTER
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Called me on 14 February to say he hadn't heard anything from DBC and did not have a computer. He felt it would be tragic if the built on the green belt. he said he and his wife first moved into the area in 1959 and recalled going to a meeting about proposals to build on BK-06 at that time. They objected successfully on the grounds of road access.</p> <p>Due to the CV-19 restrictions he has no way of going to a library or the Forum as he is disabled. In 2017 he attended a meeting at the Egerton Rothesay School about the development at Bearoc Park and would wish to participate in a consultation in a similar way again. He recalls that in 1959 he attended a meeting in a church hall to oppose development in BK-06.</p> <p>Consultee is concerned re the loss of the green belt - he thinks Green Belt land should not be released for development as it is precious. He is concerned about traffic congestion from over- development.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	



* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14183
<b>Person ID</b>	1270557
<b>Full Name</b>	DOROTHY MULLINS
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>She lives next to BK-06. She was concerned about road access to the site and water pressure.</p> <p>She says that she has experienced problems with water pressure since the houses at Bearoc Park were built.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14201
<b>Person ID</b>	1264035

<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Knowles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I would like to address the following points and raise your awareness of how this will affect my family and neighbouring residents.</p> <p>I live at the top of Darrs Lane, Northchurch and have resided in the village for nearly 10 years. We moved here to bring up our family in this beautiful semi-rural setting. We did not want to live in a town, but a village with the benefits of a lovely market town on our doorstep, but more importantly protected countryside with a wealth of flora and fauna for our children to grow up in. I am now fully embedded into the community and countryside and my whole family's physical and mental well-being is hugely reliant on the green space around us. I am a keen runner and 5 days a week run several miles a day through country lanes, fields, footpaths, woods, Ashridge and wherever I can find that is away from the roads. The hedgerows and wealth of countryside are home to a rich source of wildlife and out and about I regularly see many species of birds, Hare, Deer including Muntjac, squirrels, rabbits and much much more. I bring home news most days of somewhere idyllic that I have found or something rare that I have seen. I then spend spare family time exploring these beautiful surroundings with my husband and children, educating them about their home surroundings and the importance of outdoor space and fresh air for their health.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14203
<b>Person ID</b>	1264035

<b>Full Name</b>	Alex Knowles
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Then there is the matter of roads, traffic, waste and pollution. We are already a stretched community as the popularity of the beauty of this area brings in a wealth of families and professionals to settle down. I wanted my children to be able to walk to school relatively safely and at the moment they can just about safely walk down Darrs lane to the pavement, although there is still the odd speeding driver or cars struggling to pass in the narrow lane. Darrs Lane can fall beautifully quiet at times which is why we chose this spot, but it also can act as a rat-run in rush hour. With an extra 400 houses in Northchurch, naturally that will add circa 800 extra cars to our already busy lanes and high street. With Tring an area of proposed growth too, Northchurch High Street will become clogged, gridlocked and dangerous. Tesco express already has insufficient parking so how will it cope? Shootersway along the top is already a route used by motorists to avoid the High Streets of Berkhamsted and Northchurch and there is no way it can cope with hundreds more cars. We have untold pot hole problems on the lanes and slowly the verges are getting destroyed. All these need attention before proposing more housing. And lets not forget the death of a 9 year old girl on Northchurch High Street nearly 3 years ago after she was hit by a van.</p> <p>I chose to live in the beautiful village of Northchurch on the outskirts of Berkhamsted as that is the semi-rural setting that I wanted to bring my family up in. I fear we will become submerged into Berkhamsted and I am also shocked we have been referred to as "West Berkhamsted". This proposal is writing Northchurch out of existence which is a total tragedy and distressing for us residents who have chosen to settle here.</p> <p>And secondly you have omitted my house from the map of Northchurch. There are a row of houses in the idyllic spot at the top of Darrs Lane and you have failed to add them to the area of Northchurch. This clearly mis-leads people into thinking the proposed field of housing here backs onto fields, when in fact it does not. It faces straight onto many houses who currently enjoy a view out over the fields into the woodland skirting down Bell Lane and Durrants Lane.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Dacorum Darrs Lane map.docx</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14228
<b>Person ID</b>	1270582
<b>Full Name</b>	NADIA LUPO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	— BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field' This unnecessary destruction of Green Belt land will blight the view of uninterrupted countryside from the AONB opposite; it will damage the 800 year old hedgerows that line this field along single track roads - this development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track using the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lane causing congestion and hazard to walkers and cyclists.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14229
<b>Person ID</b>	1270582

<b>Full Name</b>	NADIA LUPO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side. Local people have expressed a desire to develop this into a nature reserve. As a dudswell resident we are appalled at this proposal. Our daughter goes to St Mary’s school it is already very busy at sch drop times, no parking etc.</p> <p>— Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with application for road safety improvements having recently been granted. Local residents would like to see more road safety improvements, but these are limited by what is physically possible. Residential homes line New Road but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Learning disabled adults and young children travelling to school are already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safely pass on the pavement meaning people having to a walk in the road. Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents.</p> <p>— This will also put pressure on the New Road/Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for improvement. Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would mean moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are too close to the junction. This would mean that children on route to school would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary’s Church Yard. The pavements are too narrow to permit this to take place safely</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS14230
<b>Person ID</b>	1270582
<b>Full Name</b>	NADIA LUPO
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the A41. This ignores the recent case of Ella Adoo- Kissi-Debrah, a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.</p> <p>— There is no plan to improve infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion,  — further damage to internationally recognised chalk streams such as the Bulbourne — reduced water pressure  — there is no plan for dealing with increased sewage</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14288
<b>Person ID</b>	1270629
<b>Full Name</b>	Rob Bray
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Head of Sponsorship & Fundraising

Tring Rugby Club

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	(22) This section gives details of all the individual sites proposed for development in the Borough. Berkhamsted sites start at Bk01 South Berkhamsted. They are all basically valley sides (with gradients of up to 1:11) and ridge-top Green Belt locations and cannot be regarded as sustainable locations. The Green Belt land in between these settlements currently preserves these historic settlements.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14294
<b>Person ID</b>	1270631
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON LEGG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We are upset that our Northchurch, is not even referenced in the plan, instead, it is assumed to be West Berkhamsted. To the people who live here, we are part of a small village. A fish and chip shop, Tesco, pub, school and church are what make up our lovely community.</p> <p>We are very concerned that the Lock Field site will add considerable traffic to New Road. This road is already very busy and has lots of traffic, especially at the weekend with visitors to Ashridge. It is very difficult to safely walk our children to school along the narrow pavements. The Lock Field site will add additional strains on the very limited parking, ruin the canal side view and historic bridge that crosses it. It will encroach onto Northchurch Common and develop our valuable green belt. Air quality is already very poor in the area and this will make it worse, with increased traffic, right next door to the school playing field.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14295
<b>Person ID</b>	1270631
<b>Full Name</b>	SIMON LEGG
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The site between Darrs and Durrants Lanes would develop open fields that currently can be admired by almost every house in Berkhamsted. These fields bring green, calm and tranquility to the lovely area we live. During Covid, they provided residents with somewhere to exercise, to get fresh air and help with our mental health. The site are accessed</p>



via single file roads, up steep hills bordered by attractive hedges. In creased traffic and over deveopment of the lanes is wholly wrong and inappropriate.

It is totally irresponsible to local peoples health and wellbeing to consider building in these two areas of Northchurch (or what you call West Bekhamsted!).

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14323

**Person ID** 1270637

**Full Name** TOM GROVES

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment** Too many houses proposed.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14378
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The Civic Centre in Berkhamsted should remain as public facility and a separate consultation is being conducted about the citizens' vision for its future use. DCB cannot go on increasing the population while removing recreational, cultural and civic amenities. The quality of life will be diminished, health and well-being will decline, civic pride will be lost, and crime will increase. Localism is also important – to have facilities and accessible recreation in the locality makes a community worth living in. I attend many events in the Civic Centre. If that goes my quality of life will be much reduced.</p> <p>Bk12 Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear of High Street Given Dacorum Council's track record, redevelopment will see the loss of the largest community accessible facility, the hall, from the Town. Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM65 Community Stewardship and Management Preference to retain.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS14380
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Bk11 Billet Lane (Jewson site) Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the communities' needs and provides employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and not only demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and needs of Berkhamsted, it is also a contradiction of the Council's objective of providing 116,500sqm of industrial/warehouse floorspace for which they acknowledge there is a land shortage in the Borough.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14381
<b>Person ID</b>	1270640
<b>Full Name</b>	Geoffrey Llewellyn
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No	No
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	The 'Bullbourne Cross' proposals being promoted Thakeham and the Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Trust should be rejected for all the same reasons BRAG rejects the Green Belt developments contained in this consultation document. The zero carbon credentials that Thakenham advertise for the proposed development are the bare minimum that DBC should be demanding from developers and they do not outweigh the damage done by building on this Green Belt site, which complete the coalescence of Berkhamsted and Bourne End.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14426
<b>Person ID</b>	1207481
<b>Full Name</b>	Town Planning Dept
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Town Planning Dept Network Rail
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	As you are aware Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order).  Network Rail has the following comments which are additional to the ones submitted via Carter Jonas:

Lock Field Northchurch

**Growth Area Bk07: Lock Field, Northchurch**

This site includes a Network Rail access road leading to a vital track access point known locally as 'Lock Keepers Cottage' – Network Rail definitely requires the access longer term. Please see the attached plan showing the access through the site in brown.

Network Rail would therefore request that this site is removed from the Local Plan.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14438

**Person ID** 1270665

**Full Name** Cllr Stephen Claughton

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

Although in general I support developing brownfield rather than greenfield sites, I do not agree with the designation of Berk11 Site Sarthe Business Park (Jewson Site) for housing. The site provides useful local employment and should be retained for that purpose. Changes to lifestyle and working patterns as a result of the pandemic will mean that other brownfield sites are likely to become available.

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14466
<b>Person ID</b>	1270669
<b>Full Name</b>	Taylor Wimpey Taylor Wimpey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed allocation of Land East of Darr's Lane (Growth Area Bk06) is strongly The suitability and benefits of the site have been comprehensively presented in previous representations to the emerging Local Plan-making process, including a Site Promotion Document (submitted December 2017) accompanied by comprehensive technical input. Taylor Wimpey remain committed to working collaboratively with the Council to ensure the prompt delivery of housing on the site, including the delivery of key strategic objectives and policies, particularly with regards to housing mix and affordable housing provision in accordance with emerging Policy DM1 and Policy DM2.</li> <li>• The Site Assessment Study (AECOM, January 2020) assessed the site's suitability, availability and achievability (i.e. viability) and concluded the site is suitable for allocation subject to constraints relating to Green Belt, heritage and landscape being satisfactorily</li> <li>• In respect of the Green Belt, the NPPF is explicit that changes to Green Belt designations should only be altered in exceptional circumstances through the Local Plan-making process (paragraph 136) and in the context of promoting sustainable patterns of development (paragraph 138). Accordingly, the preparation of the emerging Local Plan</li> </ul>

provides the appropriate mechanism to review the Borough's Green Belt boundaries and, where exceptional circumstances apply, to release suitable sites for development where this promotes sustainable patterns of

- Dacorum acknowledge through the emerging Local Plan that the need to deliver significant levels of new housing in the Borough form the foundations of the exceptional circumstances required to justify the release of sustainable sites from the Green Belt, in accordance with paragraph 136 of the The Green Belt Topic Paper (November 2020) clearly sets out that the opportunities to meet housing need outside the Green Belt is limited, whether on brownfield sites (supported by the Urban Capacity Study, November 2020) or greenfield sites (supported by the Greenfield Site Assessment). This shortfall in available and suitable non-Green Belt sites to meet identified housing needs is further exacerbated when factoring in the uplift in housing needs now required by virtue of the 2018 Standard Methodology for calculating housing need.
- Moreover, as highlighted above, when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should also be considered (NPPF, paragraph 138). The geography of the Borough is therefore a key factor as the most sustainable settlements, such as Berkhamsted, which are capable of accommodating significant new growth are located in the Green Directing growth to the more unsustainable areas of the Borough outside the Green Belt would not therefore satisfy the requirements of the NPPF to promote sustainable patterns of development.
- Accordingly, the exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt are considered to be firmly established at the strategic level.
- Key to establishing whether a site is suitable for release from the Green Belt is to understand the 'value' of the site in Green Belt terms when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the Framework (NPPF, paragraph 134). In this context it is important to highlight that Land East of Darr's Lane, has been identified as a potential site for release through successive Green Belt Review documents commissioned by The Stage 2 Green Belt Review (Arup, December 2016) assessed the site as a small-scale sub area (reference BK-A12). The Green Belt Review found that the site makes only a 'Limited/No Contribution' to the first purpose of Green Belt (i.e. preventing urban sprawl); and only a 'partial' contribution to the second and third purposes of Green Belt (i.e. preventing neighbouring towns from merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment respectively). Moreover, the accompanying Landscape Appraisal (January 2016) found:
  - The overall findings of the Green Belt Review are supported in that the site

clearly makes, at best, a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes and is not overly sensitive to change in landscape terms and therefore the release of the site would not give rise to significant harm in Green Belt terms. The proposed allocation of Land East of Darr's Lane is therefore supported by Taylor Wimpey and endorsed by the Council's evidence base.

- The Site Assessment Study (AECOM, January 2020) identifies constraints concerning landscape and heritage matters as being 'significant' given the proximity of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and heritage assets, however the overall conclusions are supported whereby it states:
- The potential major constraints have been addressed in previous submissions to Dacorum (refer to the previously submitted Site Promoter Document) through demonstration of sensitive masterplanning and appropriate mitigation. For instance, following engagement with Dacorum's Conservation Officers, the proposed Illustrative Masterplan for the site as presented at Appendix 1 has been amended to incorporate an appropriate design response to the indicative location of Grim's Ditch through the centre of the site. The Illustrative Masterplan now removes all development from the area where Grim's Ditch is assumed to cross the site, with allowance for an additional buffer in line with the draft policy wording for Bk06. This in turn also creates a large, central area of public open space that further enhances the landscape and place-making potential of the site, further demonstrating how the development of the site can make a meaningful contribution to the Borough's housing need whilst responding to its surroundings through a landscape-led scheme.
- Moreover, as highlighted in the previously submitted Site Promoter Document, the masterplanning of the site has been informed by a detailed Landscape Appraisal and Capacity Study which identified the areas within the site of highest landscape and visual sensitivity and therefore seeks to direct development towards the most practical and least impactful location towards the south-east of the western. This approach allows the northern areas

of the site to be used as Public Open Space (community parkland). Within the Public Open Space to the north of the site it is also proposed to introduce substantial structural planting to further screen the site from potentially sensitive long-distance views from the AONB to the north of Berkhamsted.



- The draft policy wording also refers to the Grade II listed Old Cottage located to the south-west of the The heritage asset has been assessed as deriving some significance from its setting, although the site itself makes a negligible contribution to its significance in this regard. However, the Illustrative Masterplan therefore includes appropriate landscape buffers between the edge of the site and the proposed developable areas to the south-west of the site to ensure no harm arises to the significance of the heritage asset.
- The conservation of these heritage assets through the retention and enhancement of green spaces throughout the site further enhances the site's placemaking potential and maintains as far as possible the perceived openness of the The site can thus be appropriately developed with minimal adverse impact in landscape and heritage terms and is therefore concluded to be entirely suitable for allocation.
- In terms of land uses, Policy Growth Area Bk06 allocates the site for:
  - Around 200 dwellings, subject to masterplanning;
  - Provides land to deliver a new secondary school; and
  - A new public
- The proposed allocation of the site for residential development is supported. The Illustrative Masterplan highlights how the site could be appropriately developed to deliver approximately 180 new homes and a country park, having regard to the key constraints and opportunities at this
- The proposed quantum of development in the draft policy wording of Growth Area Bk06 seeks the delivery of 200 dwellings in addition to the delivery of a new secondary school. Taylor Wimpey are keen to ensure that the proposed quantum of residential development can be achieved and that the site can make a meaningful contribution to Dacorum's housing need given its sustainable The ability of the site and surrounding sites to

accommodate education uses should be the subject of further engagement with Dacorum and Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) to seek to find an appropriate solution. Taylor Wimpey and the other landowners/developers in the West Berkhamsted Growth Area intend to proactively engage on this matter ahead of the Regulation 19 consultation and would welcome the opportunity to meet with Dacorum and HCC to discuss this further.

- The delivery of a new public park on the site is supported and considered feasible as demonstrated by the Illustrative Masterplan. The new public park will not only deliver significant social benefits for existing and new residents, thereby helping to ensure the delivery of a cohesive and integrated development, but will also help mitigate landscape impact (as addressed above) and create new and improve existing habitats for wildlife. Taylor Wimpey is committed to delivering a biodiversity net gain of 10% in accordance with emerging Policy DM30, recognising the site is well-placed to make a significant contribution to the biodiversity objectives set out in the emerging Local Plan. However, as referred to above, it is not considered that evidence exists to justify a requirement for
- In conclusion, the deliverability (suitability, availability and viability) of Land East of Darr's Lane is recognised by the proposed allocation of the site and in combination with the site's sustainable location and ability to introduce appropriate mitigation and sensitive masterplanning to address site Exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the release of land from the Green Belt do exist at the strategic level and the site is considered to make limited contribution to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Its release to meet housing need and the Borough's wider sustainable development objectives is therefore considered justified. Importantly, the new Green Belt boundary along Darr's Lane and Shootersway has strong physical features that would allow the boundary to have permanence beyond the Plan period as required by para. 136 of the NPPF. The proposed allocation of Growth Area Bk06 for residential-led development is therefore fully supported.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14487

**Person ID** 1270672

**Full Name** ICP Asset Management Ltd

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Policy sP20 should include an additional allocation, on the former Golf Driving Range at Spring Gardens Lane for a new care home facility to help contribute to meeting housing needs. A plan identifying the site is included at Appendix 1 of this Statement.</p> <p>The former Golf Driving Range is a brownfield site, as confirmed by the Council in their consideration of planning application 20-02052-MFA. In addition to being previously developed land, the site is located in a cluster of local services and facilities as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children’s nursery, which directly adjoins the site;</li> <li>• Residential dwelling, adjoining the nursery;</li> <li>• The Hospice of St Francis, an established significant development providing care and end of life support and accommodation;</li> </ul> <p>An extensive and long established industrial/commercial site with substantial buildings and open air storage.</p> <p>It is therefore in a location surrounded by established substantial uses, of comparable use types. There is thus a clear synergy and logic for locating a care use in this location given the presence of the excellent and well respected Hospice of St Francis.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site is free of all technical restraints as confirmed by the Council’s consideration of application 20-02052-MFA. Unlike many Local Plan sites, this one has had the benefit of a full detailed technical consideration having been subject to a full planning application. The Council found no technical issues with the site and did not find any issues with sustainability in refusing the application. This consideration overcomes the reasons stated in the document “Site Selection: Appendix A Summary of Site Selection” for not progressing the site (which, it should be noted, was based on consideration of a larger site area than which is now being put forward as part of these representations). The Evidence Base is therefore not accurate or correct and must be updated to reflect the Council’s consideration of the application, otherwise the Plan will be found unsound as it will not be based on a robust or justified Evidence Base.</p> <p>Moreover, as per NPPF para 138, the fact the land is previously developed means it should be prioritised over non-previously developed land, irrespective of whether or not it is well served by public transport. The public transport accessibility of the site should not be used as a reason for not progressing consideration of the site, particularly given the adjoining land uses and potential for creating sufficient critical mass that would in turn deliver public transport for this area.</p> <p>The only reason for refusal for the application related to a lack of VSCs to outweigh Green Belt harm and AONB considerations. However, plainly an allocation would remove that matter and it is therefore clear, based upon the Council’s own consideration of this planning application, that the site is suitable for care home development and should be allocated as such.</p>

The site is suitable, deliverable (as confirmed by the planning application consideration) and available now to meet identified needs.

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14497

**Person ID** 1173484

**Full Name** Crest Nicholson

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

**The Site**

- These representations have been prepared by Lichfields on behalf of Crest Nicholson Chiltern (“*Crest Nicholson*”) in relation to Land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens, Berkhamsted (“the site”). The site is identified in the draft Local Plan as a ‘major urban extension’ (ref. Policy SP20, Table 35), principally allocated for around 80 dwellings, with public open space. It is not clear that a relatively modest scheme (in the context of the emerging Local Plan) warrants the description of “*major.*”
- The 2017 representations to the LPIAO (referenced in Section 1 of this report) set out a comprehensive description of the site and its context. The site circumstances remains largely unchanged since submission of the 2017 representations to DBC, which is reflected in the following description of the
- Site Bk05, referred to as land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens, Berkhamsted is irregularly shaped and measures approximately 3.5 ha. It currently comprises greenfield land which falls from Shootersway in a south/south westerly

direction towards the A41. The site's southern boundary forms a mini valley, with the adjoining land then rising back towards the boundary with the

- Access to the site is currently provided by a part tarmacked farm access onto
- The site benefits from clearly defined boundaries including a mature tree belt on the northern and western boundaries and a mixture of mature trees and hedgerows on the eastern and southern boundaries. A small part of the site (the south eastern corner) is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO) (DBC ref TPO 184 A1) alongside additional land to the east at Blegberry Gardens.
- The site is located on the south western edge of Berkhamsted, north east of the A41. Berkhamsted Railway Station lies approximately 8 kilometres north east of the site providing frequent train services to London Euston and Tring as well as Northampton and East Croydon. The site lies approximately 1.7 kilometres southwest of Berkhamsted Town Centre. It is bordered by more greenfield land towards the western and southern boundaries, while the eastern site boundary adjoins residential development. The surrounding houses comprise a mixture of large detached dwellings on spacious plots along with some smaller semi-detached dwellings.
- Immediately north of the site is a site known as Bearroc Park (or 'land at junction of Durrants Lane and Shootersway'). A residential development is currently under construction on this site

which will ultimately provide at least 92 dwellings along with open space provision and facilities for the nearby Egerton Rothesay School.

- The site is not located within a designated Neighbourhood Plan
- The site is within the Green Belt and an Area of Archaeological Significance (No.55 'Oakwood, Berkhamsted, A41'). The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is approximately 750m to the west of the
- The site is not in a Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings. The nearest heritage assets are Old Cottage, opposite Darr's Lane (1 kilometre north east of the site) is Grade II listed (source: [www.magic.defra.gov.uk](http://www.magic.defra.gov.uk)). The Grim's Ditch Scheduled Monument is approximately 450m to the north east of the

- The Crest Nicholson design team has undertaken detailed assessments of the prospects for residential development on the site Bk05, identifying any potential issues and how these can be appropriately resolved in order to bring forward the site allocation in the short term, in line with DBC's aspirations set out in the draft Local Plan.

#### Transport and Accessibility

- The Transport Strategy prepared by Vectos for the site concludes:
  - that the site can be accessed via sustainable modes of transport including by foot, bicycle and public transport;
  - appropriate provision can be made for access in accordance with guidance within Manual for Streets;
  - the proposals are unlikely to result in a material increase in two-way vehicle movements during the peak hours; and
  - the site is well located with respect to key facilities and travel destinations when compared with the other identified sites in
- Site accessibility and the feasibility of achieving vehicular access to site Bk05 have been The preliminary assessment shows highway access can be achieved via Shootersway, respecting the existing trees and vegetation in a form that would be within acceptable highway standards. There is additional flexibility to locate the junction further west if this becomes a preferred solution as a site development scheme progresses.

#### Landscape

- The Landscape Partnership has reviewed the site in the context of DBC's draft Local Plan and associated evidence base, namely the Dacorum Borough Landscape Sensitivity Study (April 2020) and the Green Belt Stage 3 Review (August 2020).
- Their review considers that the site is able to be developed to meet the objectives and landscape guidelines for the site as set out in the draft Local Plan and evidence base, through:
  - protection and enhancement of the existing characteristic landscape and ecological features

on the Site's boundaries;

- provision of improvements to the south-western boundary of the Site and some additional screening of the A41;
- provision of easily accessible public open space and green space;
- creation of opportunities for green infrastructure, ecological enhancements, and wildlife corridor links; and
- integration of the proposed development into the wider landscape and views from the adjoining valley

#### Ecology

- A preliminary ecological desk study, Phase 1 Habitat Survey and assessment of constraints and opportunities has been prepared for the site Bk05. The site comprises 'improved' grassland, a small area of rough ruderal vegetation

with some associated scrubby and woody boundaries likely to originate from outgrown hedgerows. The site is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site designated for its 'unimproved'

Pg 5

- The site itself supports habitats provisionally considered to be of lower value to wildlife although with potential to support some protected species. However, it has not identified any ecological constraints which would preclude development of the

#### Archaeology

- A Desk Based Assessment has been prepared which considers the site Bk05's below ground archaeological In terms of relevant designated heritage assets, no World Heritage Sites, Scheduled Monuments, Historic Battlefield or Historic Wreck Sites lie within, or in immediate proximity to the site.
- The assessment considered that the site is likely to have a moderate to high archaeological potential for remains associated with the Later Prehistoric period, and a limited potential for all other
- Agricultural activity from the Medieval period onwards is considered likely to have had a low, but widespread, negative impact on below ground archaeological
- As remains of national significance are not anticipated, mitigation can follow the granting of planning consent secured by an appropriate

#### Flood Risk & Drainage

- An initial Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. The report shows the site Bk05 is within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore an area with a low probability of river or sea flooding. It is also at negligible risk of ground water

#### Noise

- An Environmental Noise Assessment has been carried out for the site Bk05. The assessment shows that with suitable mitigation, based on the survey data, noise should not be factor in preventing development for residential

## Ground Conditions and Contamination

- In January 2020 a Ground Conditions Desk Study was undertaken for the site to identify any risks to future development of the A copy of the report has been issued to DBC.
- The study concludes, based on historical land uses and the site's current use, that whilst some mitigation measures may be required, it is considered that there are no geotechnical or geo- environmental development constraints, which could not be mitigated using standard engineering practices.
- In relation to the historical inert landfill identified in DBC's January 2020 Site Assessment Study, the Ground Conditions Desk Study concludes that the landfill, which is located predominantly off site, to the north-west with a slight intrusion into the north-west of the site, is a low risk to the proposed development, because:
  - the plotted location of the landfill is erroneous and that no soil has in fact been placed on the site;
  - the landfill was only licenced to accept 'clean non-hazardous excavation spoil and other similar inert waste; subsoil/topsoil';
  - it is understood that the that the landfill was used for disposal of wastes arising from the construction of the A41 (posing a low risk); and

Pg 6

- if the landfill does contain some organic material, the volumes and concentrations of ground gas generated are expected to be low and not considered a significant
- Overall, the risk from land contamination at the site is considered to be very low or
- Informed in part by the analysis above, an illustrative development scheme has been prepared by OSP Architects on behalf of Crest Nicholson which shows the proposed concept of how development could come forward on the
- This Masterplan shows a scheme for 95 dwellings on the site, at an average density of 27.14 dph (based on a 3.5 ha site area). A copy can be found at Appendix 3. It shows a mixture of houses and apartments, and 40% affordable



- The layout indicates how the Site could be laid out with the inclusion of an area of public green space along the south-western boundary and public open space, with a play area to the north- east of the Site. The former is in the lowest part of the Site, which enables the provision of SuDS features, green infrastructure, and hedgerow and tree planting to strengthen the south-western The mature woodland to the north-west and the mature hedgerow along the north- eastern boundary are retained, with the exception of needing to provide some widening of the existing field access to provide vehicular and pedestrian access to the Site. Buffer / protection zones are provided as an offset from the woodland and the mature hedgerow, being retained in the public realm and planted with new native planting and/or public open space. It also incorporates new planting on the Southern and Eastern site boundaries, to create characterful boundaries which would contain the development and mitigate the effects of the A41 through screening.
- The Masterplan illustrates how trees could be incorporated within the layout to create a character of houses set within a treed landscape and this includes trees that form part of the public realm in the streetscape, as well as trees in gardens, allowing a mixture of small and larger tree
- The Masterplan is only indicative at this stage to show what is considered to be the preferred option for development of the site, and the Masterplan will be refined further in due course, working closely with DBC and other stakeholders.
- The housing strategy set out in the draft Local Plan has a strong focus on delivery within the Plan period. In support of this aspiration, Crest Nicholson is able to deliver the proposed site allocation (Bk05) in the initial part of the plan period (0-5 years), providing an ideal opportunity to contribute to securing required homes in the short term.
- The above analysis of the site and previously completed design work confirms that there are no issues on the site that cannot be resolved with appropriate mitigation measures. Furthermore, the site is one of the smaller allocations in the draft Local Plan, meaning that early delivery will be easier to achieve compared to the larger, more complex
- Crest Nicholson is one of the Country's leading developers and has been creating well-designed sustainable communities for over 50 years. Crest Nicholson holds a well-regarded capability and track record for delivering high quality residential developments of varying size and

- Draft Policy SP20 ('Delivering Growth in Berkhamsted') identifies the site as a 'major urban extension', allocated for around 80 dwellings, with public open
- Crest Nicholson strongly supports the inclusion of site Bk05 in the draft Local Plan,. It believes that the allocation is based on a robust evidence base and that the site will play a meaningful role in contributing to the required housing supply, notably in the short-term as the site is able to be brought forward in these timescales due to its lack of constraints. Development would also provide benefits in the form of contributions towards much needed affordable housing in the local area.
- The site provides sustainable access to key facilities and travel destinations via foot, bicycle and public transport, making it an ideal site to bring forward for residential
- The site can play a significant role in contributing to a strong local economy, through direct and indirect employment creation, resident spending in the town and contributions to local infrastructure and services. These merits will contribute considerably to the draft policy objectives of supporting a prosperous economy in the
- It is however noted that the indicative masterplan discussed above, which has been prepared for the site on behalf of Crest Nicholson, presents an effective development concept for the site for up to 95 homes. This is still considered to be a modest size development, in-keeping with Berkhamsted's place in the Settlement Hierarchy. The review of the housing strategy in Section 2 of this report, acknowledges that the housing numbers in the draft Local Plan are yet to be finalised, and therefore it is considered that the proposed housing figure for both Berkhamsted and the individual site allocations within (notably Bk05), are likely, and able, to accommodate a modest uplift to reflect the future housing need figure for DBC. Such an uplift is all the more relevant in the context of the subsequent revisions to the Governments assessment for housing need within
- The technical studies undertaken by Crest Nicholson's design team have not identified any technical constraints to development of the site, which is consistent with the findings of the majority of the Council's evidence base to date of the site

#### Landscape Sensitivity Study (ARUP, April 2020)

- The Landscape Sensitivity Study was undertaken to inform the Stage 3 Green Belt Review and residential allocations within the emerging Local Plan. Within the Study, the site (Bk05) is assessed as having *neighbourhood* landscape value, which is the lowest value on the assessment scale, due to its absence of identified landscape features of value and *moderate* susceptibility to change from residential development.
- The site is said to have a reduced sense of remoteness caused by the surrounding development and the loss of tranquillity, negative views, and loss of connection with the wider agricultural landscape structure caused by the A41. This analysis further supports the proposed site allocation in the draft Local Plan.

#### Green Belt Stage 3 Report (ARUP, August 2020)

- The Site was identified in the Green Belt Stage 3 Review (Final Report) (August 2020), which considers the acceptability of potential housing and employment site allocations within Green

Pg 8

Belt boundary terms, provide guidance on any required site mitigation, and any consequential changes to the Green Belt boundary.

- TLP has reviewed the Stage 3 Review in relation to the recommendations made for the Site (Site 4), and support the analysis provided for the site, agreeing that all boundaries (except the south- western) are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent and that the south-western boundary potentially needs strengthening. It is noted that the strengthening of the south western boundary is dependent on whether the adjacent Site 16 ('Land between Shootersway and A41 bypass' (Site BK08) to the west of the site) is also released from the Green Belt. TLP advise that if this occurs the A41 boundary would form the new Green Belt boundary, which would form a readily recognisable, durable and likely permanent boundary and there would be no need to strengthen the boundary within the site (Site 4).
- TLP also highlight that if the Site (Site 4) is released, but not Site 16 from the Green Belt then the narrow strip of land within Site 16 that separates Site 4 from the A41, provides little meaningful benefit in Green Belt terms, and should be released, so that the A41 can become the new Green Belt boundary. Similarly, this applies with regard to the narrow strip of Green Belt between the existing houses and the A41 further to south-east i.e. land considered as part of Site
- This is in accordance with the conclusions drawn in the Comparison Landscape Appraisal undertaken on behalf of Crest Nicholson in December 2017, which states that the site warrants release from the Green Belt, and there is ample opportunity to mitigate landscape sensitivities through woodland belt planting along the southern boundary, and tree planting dispersed through site. These mitigative measures have already been developed effectively into the indicative masterplan layout for the site, as discussed

- The Development Strategy Topic Paper provides an outline of the Council's approach to the growth options taken forward in the draft Local Plan. This, along with the Green Belt and Rural Area Topic Paper, conclude that Dacorum '*needs to release land from the Green Belt to meet its development needs, as urban capacity is not sufficient to satisfy the housing need figure*'. This will continue to be particularly relevant following the review of the figure in the context of the Government's 16th December announcement about the standard method for local housing

#### Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study (November 2020)

- The Sustainable Transport Study identifies a number of potential sustainable transport improvements to be implemented across Berkhamsted. SP-B1 (from Figure 6-1 of the Sustainable Transport Study) sets out the improvements identified in relation to Shootersway, mainly providing enhancements to walking and cycling facilities along
- The strategy outlined in the Study and accompanying Topic Paper is to focus on sustainable travel initiatives rather than large infrastructure projects that are principally aimed at highway capacity improvements to address peak commuter period delays.
- The Study also concludes that there is opportunity for new or diverted bus services along These will need to be supported by contributions to support early services and the provision of new bus stop facilities.
- Whilst details relating to the delivery of measures and mechanisms for the collection of financial contributions needs to be defined, the strategy which is based on the promotion of sustainable travel modes is

Pg 9

- The range of sustainable measures proposed and delivered by all sites should be considered when determining the need to improve highway This will ensure priority is afforded to sustainable modes which may reduce car travel and avoid the need for highway capacity improvements.
- The site Bk05 forms part of the large-scale extension (on separate sites) west of Berkhamsted which will create a new neighbourhood, which in total includes around 500 homes, primary schools, a new secondary school, a district heating network and a network of green spaces including the delivery of Sustainable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) if

- Policy SP22 ('Delivering Growth in West Berkhamsted') states that a Masterplan will be prepared for the West of Berkhamsted by the Council (in collaboration with key partners and landowners) and adopted as an The Masterplan will be supported by Development Parcel Design Codes which will inform planning applications.
- Crest Nicholson supports a Masterplanning led approach to developing West Berkhamsted in principle, as it will enable the delivery of a well-connected, cohesive urban extension to However, it is important that this approach should not delay site allocations that are deliverable in the short term.
- When looking at site Bk05 in the context of the West Berkhamsted Masterplan Area, it is apparent that the site is relatively small in size compared to some of the other sites that form the Masterplan Area, and lacks direct connectivity with all but one of the other proposed allocations. The site is located at the periphery of the Masterplan Area, and is not reliant on any other sites to come forward, nor does it share any infrastructure requirements. The site has many merits when considered in isolation from the Masterplan Area, as discussed above, notably that it is able to come forward in the short term (0-5 years).
- Crest Nicholson therefore suggest that the Council may wish to consider the merits of a Concept Framework document as a visioning exercise for the West Berkhamsted Area in place of a formal SPD approach. A Concept Framework could demonstrate that the Growth Area is robust and deliverable whilst not delaying the delivery of sites early in the plan
- Nevertheless, Crest Nicholson is keen to work with adjoining landowners, developers and the Council, and will ensure any development brought forward does not prejudice other sites coming forward within the West Berkhamsted
- Crest Nicholson is also willing to develop the indicative masterplan for site Bk05 with consideration of the intentions for any Development Parcel Design Code being prepared as part of the West Berkhamsted Masterplan led approach.
- These representations have been prepared by Lichfields on behalf of Crest Nicholson Chiltern ("Crest Nicholson") in relation to Land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens, Berkhamsted ("the site") in response to Dacorum Borough Council's (DBC's) Local Plan (2020 - 2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth (Regulation 18 Consultation Document) published in November 2020.
- The site is in an ideal location to contribute to meeting the increasing housing need within Dacorum and Crest Nicholson supports the proposed site allocation (BKO5) for residential development in the draft Local Plan. The evidence base confirms that exceptional circumstances exist for the release of land from the Green Belt. Further to this, the housing need figure for Dacorum will need to increase to reflect the changes made in December 2020 to the Standard Methodology.
- The draft Local Plan highlights the need to increase the housing supply within Berkhamsted over the Plan period. Given that Berkhamsted is the second largest settlement in Dacorum and considering its resident population, it is considered that it has the potential to accommodate a higher proportion of DBC's final housing supply figure.
- Berkhamsted is a sustainable location for modest sized residential sites like Site Bk05, which is well located on the edge of the built-up area. The Crest Nicholson team's analysis and design work confirms that there are no constraints on the site that cannot be resolved with mitigation measures and that:
  - The site benefits from clearly defined boundaries including a mature tree belt on the northern and western boundaries and a mixture of mature trees and hedgerows on the eastern and southern
  - The site can be accessed via sustainable modes of transport including by foot, bicycle and public

transport and is well located with respect to key facilities and travel destinations when compared with the other identified sites in Berkhamsted.

- The site is able to be developed to meet the objectives and landscape guidelines for the site as set out in the draft Local Plan.
- No ecological constraints have been identified which would preclude development on the
- The site is at low probability of river or sea flooding and is at negligible risk of ground water
- The risk from land contamination at the site is considered to be low/very low. There are no Geotechnical or geo-environmental development constraints which could not be mitigated using standard engineering
  - The Indicative Masterplan demonstrates that a scheme of around 95 dwellings is capable of being brought forward on the site and Crest Nicholson is able to deliver the proposed site allocation in the short term (0-5 years) and it could come forward in the early part of this period, either as a standalone site or a first phase of the wider Growth Area allocation, providing an ideal opportunity to contribute to securing required homes in the short term.
  - Crest Nicholson supports a Masterplanning led approach to developing West Berkhamsted in principle, as it will enable the delivery of a well-connected, cohesive urban extension to Berkhamsted and will co-operate with adjoining landowners on this. However, it is important that this approach should not delay site allocations that are deliverable in the short term and not reliant on wider West Berkhamsted Growth Area infrastructure coming forward, such as BK05. Crest Nicholson therefore suggests that the Council may wish to consider the merits of a Concept Framework document as a visioning exercise for the West Berkhamsted Area in place of a formal SPD approach. A Concept Framework could demonstrate that the Growth Area is robust and deliverable whilst not delaying the delivery of sites early in the plan period.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14531

**Person ID** 1270690

**Full Name** Akzo Nobel CIF Nominees Ltd

**Organisation Details**

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Our client hold's specific land interests in respect to Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted, HP4 3AP (hereafter 'the Site'). This comprises a sustainably located, brownfield site with the potential to deliver one of two development options:</p> <p>¾ Option 1: Residential-led mixed use scheme comprising circa 80 new homes including affordable homes and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace.</p> <p>¾ Option 2: Managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common "clubhouse" leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level.</p> <p>The Site is suitable for either a residential-led mixed-use development or a later-living development, is available and deliverable in accordance with the NPPF. A Site Location Plan is included at Appendix 1.</p> <p>The Site is located within the administrative area of Dacorum Borough Council (hereafter 'DBC'). The Site is not currently allocated in the Draft Local Plan. The Site was not included in the DBC Site Assessment Study (January 2020).</p> <p>Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted comprises a 0.44 hectare, underutilised site within the settlement boundary and town centre boundary of Berkhamsted. Within the town centre, the Site lies within the Primary Shopping Area, where ground floor retail development is concentrated.</p> <p>The Site is located on the northern side of the High Street, between Boots on the western boundary and Costa on the eastern boundary. The Site includes land to the rear of these buildings, including some small car parking areas behind the buildings. The Royal British Legion car park adjacent to the Pump House is also part of the Site, but the Royal British Legion building is not. A Site Location Plan is included at Appendix 1.</p> <p>The Site is located within Berkhamsted Conservation Area and there are a number of listed buildings close by. The Site also lies adjacent to designated 'Open Land' to the north of the Site, beyond the existing car park.</p>

The Site benefits from good public transport links and is situated 0.48 km (6-minute walk) from Berkhamsted railway station which is served by London Northwestern railway services south towards Hemel Hempstead, Watford and London, and north towards Milton Keynes and the Midlands. The Site is also served by a main bus route along Berkhamsted High Street and is a short drive to the A41, which links the town to the wider Borough, Buckinghamshire and the M25.

The Site is available, suitable for either a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising circa 80 new homes, including affordable homes and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace or managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common “clubhouse” leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level. There is also potential to include the adjacent Royal British Legion club as part of a comprehensive development of the Site, involving the relocation of the Royal British Legion to a new social club within the Site. The Site is deliverable in the short-term, i.e. within the first five years of the new Plan Period.

As promoted throughout these representations, Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted should be allocated for a residential-led mixed-use or later-living allocation. The Site is capable of delivering either a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising circa 80 new homes, including affordable housing and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace; or a managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common “clubhouse” leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level. The Site is suitable for residential, residential-institution, retail, leisure and community uses given its sustainable urban location, and is deliverable in the context of the NPPF in that it is available now and is developable within the next five years as it is within single ownership and not subject to any infrastructure constraints. Our client urges the Council to formally consider this Site for a residential-led mixed-use allocation in the next iteration of the emerging Local Plan.

In response to the Council’s Spatial Strategy for Growth (Policy SP2), our client welcomes the identified growth at Berkhamsted, including the provision of at least 2,200 new homes and enhancements to the town centre to strengthen its market town function. However, additional housing growth can be accommodated at Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted which is suitable for circa 80 new apartments, either as new market and affordable homes as part of a residential-led mixed use

Our client supports the Council’s retail and leisure strategy (Policy SP6) and specifically the provision of main convenience and comparison shopping facilities, services and leisure uses in Berkhamsted town centre and new development that supports the role of town centre. Future redevelopment of Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted would complement existing uses, either through a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising circa 80 new homes, including affordable homes and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace; or a managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common “clubhouse” leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level. Both development options would deliver new retail,



leisure and community uses; are both deliverable in the short-term, i.e. within the first five years of the new Plan Period; and would bring about significant regeneration to the High Street and act as a catalyst for wider regeneration.

Our client supports the provision of a mix of house types and sizes (Policy DM1) and the Council's approach to affordable housing (Policy DM2). Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted could deliver circa 80 new homes either through a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment to include affordable homes and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace; or a managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common "clubhouse" leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level, subject to viability.

Our client supports Policy DM9 and the provision of new specialist housing for older people. The emerging Local Plan seeks to deliver 1,340 new retirement and extra care housing in the Borough. Our client supports this requirement and can confirm Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted has potential to deliver a managed later-living scheme comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common "clubhouse" leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level to help meet the Borough's needs. This Site is available and suitable for such retirement living type accommodation given its sustainable town centre location which benefits from good public transport accessibility and is well-served by local shops, amenities and community services. The National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (June 2019) paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 63-001- 20190626) states:

*"Offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision- taking".*

In respect to development densities, Policy DM11 requires a minimum density of 70 dph (net) or 30% uplift in town centre locations. Whilst it is recognised minimum densities are fairly crude tools for placemaking, and density should be considered on a site specific basis with consideration for access to public transport, our client supports this policy and good place-making principles of accommodating higher density development in town centres. Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted is capable of delivering high density development (circa 80 dwellings either as part of a residential-led mixed use scheme or a managed later-living scheme at a density of 182 dph), thus satisfying the Council's minimum density requirements and achieving an efficient use of an underutilised urban and brownfield site.

Our client notes the Government's recent 'Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure' consultation which closed in January 2021. In light of COVID19 and the pressures on the vitality of High Streets, including the uncertainty of office and retail floorspace demand, our client supports the proposed new Permitted Development right

for the change of use from Class E to residential (C3) with no size limit and it would apply to Conservation Areas. This would offer additional flexibility and help deliver new homes in urban areas, particularly in town centres. That said, our client is mindful of the need for comprehensive development as part of the regeneration of town centres, including Berkhamsted High Street, as opposed to piecemeal development and smaller Permitted Development and minor applications coming forward independently at different times. In respect to design, our client supports the detailed design principles and requirement for high quality design that reflects local character as set out under Policy SP13. The Council should amend Policy SP13 to clarify what schemes will qualify for the Council's Design Review Service. In respect to development heights and tall buildings, our client supports Policy DM41 which directs taller buildings to the town centres. Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted has potential to accommodate a tall or landmark building to rear of the Site, subject to necessary detailed design, townscape visual impact and heritage analysis.

Our client is committed to preserving and where possible, enhancing the historic environment in respect to Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted. It is acknowledged that the proposed scheme must be in-keeping with the character and appearance of Berkhamsted Conservation Area and preserve the significance and not cause substantial harm to the adjacent heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF and Policies DM43, DM44, DM45, DM46 and DM47. In the interests of soundness, these draft policies should make specific reference to the NPPF (chapter 16).

In relation to existing community facilities, our client supports the pragmatic approach under Policy DM64, whereby such facilities will be protected unless in specific circumstances where evidence can be submitted to support the loss, the loss may be offset by nearby facilities or alternative community provision is proposed. Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted has the potential to deliver a new community floorspace as part of either a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment or managed later- living scheme.

Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted is capable of delivering circa 80 new homes either through a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment or managed later-living development and in either of these development scenarios would deliver a significant amount of the 217 new homes earmarked to come from newly identified/windfall sites. This Site is in a prominent and sustainable location, within the town centre boundary and benefits from good access to public transport. Redevelopment of this Site would be of a high design quality, conserve the appearance of Berkhamsted Conservation Area and adjacent heritage assets and would further contribute to the long-term vitality and viability of Berkhamsted Town Centre.

These representations confirm Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted Site should be allocated for a mixed-use allocation in the next iteration of the Local Plan either for a residential-led mixed-use redevelopment comprising circa 80 new homes, including affordable housing and circa 1,500 – 4,000 sqm GIA of new, flexible retail, leisure and community floorspace; or a managed later-living development comprising circa 80 age-restricted apartments combined with common “clubhouse” leisure, retail, healthcare facilities and other ancillary uses at ground level. The Site is suitable for a mix of

such residential or residential institution, retail, leisure and community uses, and is available and deliverable in the short-term.

In order for the Plan to be robust and satisfy the appropriate policy tests to be found sound, consideration should be given to the appropriate allowance for any possible delays in housing delivery, particularly in relation to large scale strategic sites dependent upon new infrastructure to facilitate growth. The Council should therefore prioritise the delivery of suitable, available and deliverable sites in urban areas that are capable of delivering significant number of market and affordable housing or later-living housing such as Land at 168-192 High Street, Berkhamsted.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[Akzo Nobel CIF - Agent andy Pearce - CBRE Global Investors - 210228 - DBC Emerging Strategy Reps Appendix Only.pdf](#)

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS14768

**Person ID**

1207558

**Full Name**

Ms Jane Barnett

**Organisation Details**

Director  
Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Growth Area Bk01: Land South of Berkhamsted  
*Site-specific requirements*

#### *Urban Design Principles:*

- *The site will be brought forward with an **illustrative** masterplan showing an **indicative comprehensive** phasing programme for*
- *Design codes will be developed alongside the preparation of any outline planning application and agreed by means of*

#### *Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport:*

- *Primary highway access to be provided via Chesham Road with secondary access from Swing Gate*
- *Contribute towards off-site enhancements to the local road network, including but not limited to junction improvements along Chesham Road, A416/Shootersway and A4251/Berkhamsted High Street **and based on impact.***

#### *Social and Community:*

- *The new community hub should include new community facilities, including a retail unit to serve the day-to-day needs of new and existing*
- *Provide three hectares of land for ~~and deliver~~ **the delivery of** a new primary school.*

#### *Environmental Health:*

- *Investigate potential noise, air and light pollution impacts arising from the A41 and identify mitigation measures as*  
*Adopt basic radon protective measures.*

#### *Landscape Considerations:*

*Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities:*

- *the prominent landform and intervisibility with the opposing rural valley sides with particular attention to any views from or toward the Chilterns AONB;*
- *the setting of and views from Ashlyns Hall Grade II\* listed building;*
- *the existing level of vegetative screening;*
- *road noise from the A41 ~~and views of pylons~~ **if deemed to have a** detrimental influence on perception; and*
- *the degraded pattern and structure opportunities to restore historic boundaries or connections.*

#### *Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure:*

- *As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, retain and enhance the designated wildlife site in the south-eastern corner of the*

- ~~Deliver Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on-site to offset potential adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC arising from recreational pressure. The scale and form of this SANG will need to be agreed with Natural England in advance of the submission of an outline planning application.~~

*Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage:*

- *Development must conserve and where possible enhance the setting of a number of listed buildings in the area, including Ashlyns School, the Stables at Ashlyns Hall , and Ashlyns*
- *Archaeological investigations required to be undertaken **in support of future planning applications***

As is evident throughout Savills’ Planning Document (February 2021) and the supporting technical reports, the site specific requirements are largely considered reasonable and can be satisfied as part of the comprehensive approach to delivery. However, to ensure consistency between the allocation and the technical evidence base and be able to demonstrate that all requirements are justified in satisfying the NPPF tests of soundness a number of amendments are recommended.

The draft allocation should not be pre-determining the extent of contributions sought towards off-site highway works as this be subject to detailed testing and based on impact. In accordance with CIL Reg 122 and NPPF paragraph 56, such contributions will only be required where considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Similarly, the development cannot provide compensatory/mitigation measures to address pre-existing issues, such as the pylons.

The mechanism for the delivery of the primary school, to include specification and responsibilities, will need to be agreed in consultation with Hertfordshire County Council, as the education authority, and will form part of more detailed discussions at later stages in the planning process. Therefore, the site-specific requirements should only refer to provision of land and commitment to facilitating the school’s delivery at this plan stage.

In terms of SANG, the effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC and any associated requirements for mitigation remain unknown at present and existing evidence does not suggest a need for mitigation. The allocation should not therefore be seeking to pre-empt technical conclusions by *indicating a need for on-site SANG provision. It is noted that this is recognised elsewhere in the draft Plan where references to SANG in association with South Berkhamsted are caveated with “if required”* (ESG, paragraph 23.131). For completeness, it is recommended this reference is deleted from policy/allocation requirements until and unless the position is resolved.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14771
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Growth Area Bk04: Land between Hanburys and A41</p> <p><i>Site-specific requirements</i></p> <p><i>Urban Design Principles:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a network of new <b>and/or improved</b> pedestrian links with adjacent allocations</li> <li>• Public open space should be designed in a manner that is easily accessible to <del>existing communities in the area</del> <b>new communities within the site</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to be provided via the adjacent allocation Haslam Playing Fields, unless a suitable alternative is identified and agreed with Hertfordshire County Council</li> <li>• <del>Contribute towards new/enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre and train station, including off-site</del></li> <li>• Contribute towards off-site enhancements to the local road network, including but not limited to junction improvements along A416/Kingshill Way, Kings Road, Shootersway and A4251/Berkhamsted High Street <b>and based on</b></li> </ul>

*Environmental Health:*

- *Investigate potential noise, air and light pollution impacts arising from the A41 and identify appropriate mitigation measures as necessary*

*Landscape Considerations:*

*Development will need to take account of and/or mitigate the following landscape sensitivities:*

- *views to and from the valley and the wider rural landscape;*
- *the existing development pattern of Berkhamsted; and*
- *screening of the A41.*

*Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure*

- *As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, deliver ~~a new wildlife site~~ **ecological enhancements** on the southern parcel of the site ~~to which~~ links into the adjacent network.*

The site specific requirements listed under the allocation have informed the Concept Plan and are agreed and largely justified where required as mitigation or in contributing to the wider place-making principles.

However, the allocation should not be identifying requirements for off-site provision and contributions where these will be subject to detailed testing and based on impact. The provision of new pedestrian and cycle links within the existing town centre and train station in particular is not considered to satisfy the tests set out under CIL Regulation 122 and paragraph 56 of the NPPF in which such obligations should only be sought where they are required to make development acceptable in planning terms. Emphasis should be instead on the provision of these new routes within the site and the new/improved connections to existing links beyond the boundaries, where appropriate. Similarly, whilst the allocation will deliver on-site Public Open Space, given the scale, nature and location of it, the provision of wider accessibility enhancements in addition is not considered fair or reasonable.

In terms of the reference to “*a new wildlife site*”, it is assumed that this relates to the chalk grassland field to the south-east. On this basis, CSA has confirmed that there are certainly opportunities for this in principle through the creation of new and improved habitats as part of the proposed ecological enhancements but further information on this is required to understand the extent of this and before this site specific requirement is agreed.

The proposed amendments are therefore considered necessary to ensure the Plan can be considered to be justified and consistent with national planning policy in satisfying the NPPF tests of soundness. Please refer to Savills' Planning Document (February 2021) for detailed commentary on the proposed amendments to this draft policy, as formally submitted as part of the planning representations and set out under Section 7.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14772

**Person ID** 1207558

**Full Name** Ms Jane Barnett

**Organisation Details** Director  
 Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**



<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">1 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-9 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14773
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">2 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-10 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14774
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">3 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-8 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14775
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">4 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-1 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14776
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">5 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-2 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14777

<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">6 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-3 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14779
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">7 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-4 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14780
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	

<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">8 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-5 - Copy.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14781
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">9 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-6.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14782
<b>Person ID</b>	1207558
<b>Full Name</b>	Ms Jane Barnett
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Director Savills (on behalf of Taylor Wimpey)

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">10 Taylor Wimpey South Berks - Agent Jane Barnett - Savills - 2977-A-4001-C Vision Document - Feb 2021_compressed-7.pdf</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14866
<b>Person ID</b>	1145605
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Premier Property Acquisition
<b>Agent ID</b>	1145599
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Buckwell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director DHA Planning
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	<p>I write on behalf of our client, Premier Property Acquisitions, in relation to land west of Ivy House Lane, Berkhamsted and in respect of the Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038) consultation. The site has been identified as site BK15 in the Council's Site Assessment Study.</p> <p>We are promoting the site for allocation for residential development in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The site comprises a single rectangular arable field to the west of Ivy House Lane, between the road and the existing edge of the settlement. The site is enclosed on its northern, western and southern boundaries by existing residential development at Lanrick Copse, Hunters Park and Meadway.</p> <p>Ivy House Lane forms the site's western boundary beyond which lies open countryside. The site lies in the countryside in planning terms and is also within the Green Belt. It is adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which lies on the eastern side of Ivy House Lane at this point.</p> <p>Despite its countryside location in planning terms the site lies immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Berkhamsted. The site is located approximately 1.1km from the centre of Berkhamsted and approximately 0.9km from the railway station. Given the site's location a bus service can readily be extended to the location to serve not only future residents but also existing residents along Gravel Path.</p> <p>Berkhamsted is identified as a sustainable location with the emerging local plan and has been identified as a focus for significant development.</p> <p>Our client's site can provide development of around 100 dwellings and as identified in previous representations to the Council in May and June 2020 the site is able to deliver Green Belt compensatory improvements and a demonstrable safe access.</p>



<b>Included files</b>	Premier Property Aquisitions - Agent Jonathan Buckwell - DHA Planning Ivy House Lane Reps_Redacted.pdf Premier Property Aquisitions - Agent Jonathan Buckwell - DHA Planning Ivy House Lane Reps_Redacted.pdf
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14870
<b>Person ID</b>	1145605
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Premier Property Acquisition
<b>Agent ID</b>	1145599
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	Mr Jonathan Buckwell
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	Director DHA Planning
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>The Council have stated that Berkhamsted will need to accommodate 2,200 dwellings over the plan period. It is not therefore clear why the Council have only allocated c.1,870 homes in the emerging Local Plan. The Council have acknowledged that an 'urban intensification strategy would detract from the character of the location' and the entire town is encircled by Green Belt (which significantly restricts the prospects of windfall sites).</p> <p>Our client's site has been compared with Council's own evidence base and scores better in terms of sustainability, landscape impact and Green Belt than a number of greenfield sites currently proposed in the emerging plan.</p> <p>We are strongly of the opinion, that given the constraints to windfall development in Berkhamsted the Council should not be relying on this to satisfy the shortfall of 330 homes and we object to the plan on this basis. Our client's site is sustainably located, free from any overriding constraint, in single ownership and deliverable. We therefore believe there</p>

is a strong basis for including our client's site as an allocation in the Local Plan to address the shortfall that would result from the emerging Local Plan in its current form.

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14897

**Person ID** 1144629

**Full Name** Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**

**Berkhamsted comment**

(see attachment for photos and maps)

The site known locally as the 'Wishing Tree field', an open field above Northchurch, bounded by two rural soft-verged single-track lanes lined with hedgerows, and clearly visible from nearby Northchurch Common (part of the AONB), is slated as a site for 'major urban extension' to accommodate around 200 dwellings, with land for a new secondary school.

The site, which is currently **Green Belt land** forms part of "Growth Area Bk06" in the Plan:

Green Belt protection should not be removed from the Wishing Tree field for a significant number of reasons:

***Independent consultants have repeatedly provided evidence that demonstrate the inappropriateness of DBC's proposal to remove this parcel from the Green Belt***

As noted above, two independent assessments of Green Belt in the borough and beyond have been carried out over the past years.<sup>45</sup> Each of these has made clear that the Bk06 parcel is strongly associated with the characteristics of the Green Belt and that as such the Green Belt protection remains warranted:

- SKM Report (Green Belt Phase 1 Review):

The SKM Report was as "*an independent and comprehensive Green Belt review*", which included an assessment of the relative contribution played by a number of candidate parcels of land to the Green Belt.<sup>46</sup> That report concluded that the area including Bk06 (and indeed the other nearby parcels now put forward for removal from the Green Belt, including BK05 (Blegberry Gardens), and BK05 (Rossway Farm) is one of just four "*key networks of parcels which preserve setting and special character*" across the whole SW Herts area under consideration. The area is therefore assessed to make a "*significant contribution*" towards "*preserving the setting and special character of historic towns*".<sup>47</sup>

Unsurprisingly, the report therefore did not include the area including Bk06 (or the other nearby parcels) in the list of parcels contributing least from the Green Belt.<sup>48</sup> The SKM Report also rightly concluded that:

- "*The Green Belt continues to perform an important role in checking the restricted expansion of large built-up areas, preventing neighbouring towns from merging by providing strategic gaps and preserving the special character of towns*";
- "*A clear distinction is evident and has been maintained between land which is built-up and part of existing settlements and the adjacent surrounding countryside, and this is in large part a result of the success of the Green Belt designation*";
- "*All strategic parcels in the Green Belt, at least in part, clearly perform a key role and need to be given maximum protection into the future*".<sup>49</sup>

The report also observed that while A-roads (such as the A41) do pass through such areas, "*these routes are often well concealed by landscaping [...] The effect of this landscape buffering along routes, as well as around settlements is to retain a strong visual connection across the countryside and a sense of openness*".<sup>50</sup> The report particularly points to the area between Tring and Berkhamsted in this regard.

- [Arup 1 Report \(Green Belt Phase 2 Review\)](#)

The second independent report on the Green Belt in Dacorum was prepared by Arup and published in December 2016 as Stage 2 of DBC's Green Belt Review and Landscape Appraisal.<sup>51</sup>

This report looked at specific parcels of land in Dacorum in more detail: area Bk06 was at that point referred to as BK-A12.<sup>52</sup>

The report noted that the area "*predominantly retains an unspoilt, rural character*" which is "*particularly prominent in the wider Bulbourne Valley setting, highly visible from the AONB to the north*".<sup>53</sup> The report also commented on "*visual prominence and degree of intervisibility with the opposite side of the valley (Ashridge Estate) creates increased visual sensitivity*".<sup>54</sup> The Ashridge Estate is (of course) a designated AONB and as such, visual sensitivity in related areas will be damaging to the AONB itself.

Arup also considered the "*special qualities and characteristics of the AONB*" to be evident on the parcel itself<sup>55</sup> and the north-western parts of the area in particular (i.e. broadly coinciding with the 'Wishing Tree' field, by contrast with the field behind Westfield Road/alongside Durrants Lane to the eastern part of the site). This area related "*strongly to the wider rural landscape*".<sup>56</sup> In particular, the report noted that "*the parkland and landscape features at Woodcockhill are highly sensitive by virtue of their sense of time depth, intactness and historical continuity as well as the intricate landscape mosaic they create*".<sup>57</sup>

Arup concluded that while area BK-A12 (which included all of the area now referred to as Bk06 in the Plan) could be considered for partial amendment to the Green Belt designation, the only part of the area identified for such reconsideration is the area which is now a new playing field at the corner of Durrants Lane and Shootersway.

For reference, the full area BK-A12 assessed in the Arup report and the only area then proposed for reconsideration are set out below:<sup>58</sup>

Crucially, the Report concludes that even for the modest sub-area proposed, "*the Council may wish to consider the overall desirability of this recommendation, given the identified landscape sensitivities of the land surrounding the identified area. Aside from a number of small clusters of houses to the east, Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west*

*may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term*".<sup>59</sup>

The area encompassed by the current proposal was not therefore recommended by Arup for removal of Green Belt status. The Arup 1 Report noted: "*Bell Road [sic - it is clear that the reference should have been to Bell Lane] bisects the parcel on a northeast/south-west axis, while there are a series of historic hedgerows, small plantations and planting buffers around the edge of Woodcock Hill House. These features enclose the south-eastern corner of the sub-area and would form a robust and defensible new boundary for the Green Belt*".<sup>60</sup> It reiterates that "*The historic boundary of the estate to the north, as well as Durrants Lane, Shootersway and Bell Lane, would form robust and defensible new boundaries for the Green Belt [...] minimising the impact on the wider Green Belt and the surrounding countryside in landscape terms*".<sup>61</sup>

This conclusion is supported by the NPPF, which requires that when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should (*inter alia*) "*define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent*".<sup>62</sup>

- The Local Plan fails to respect the conclusions of the Green Belt Phase 1 and 2 reports

It is important to understand the nature of Arup's conclusion (as explained above) when considering the Plan. It appears that their conclusion has either been misunderstood, or ignored. For example, in a Site Selection publication, AECOM, another independent consultancy involved in assessing potential sites on the basis of a range of factors, refers to the conclusion of the Arup Report in relation to a sub-area of the parcel, but does not make clear that the only sub-area recommended by Arup for potential removal is not even within the new BK06 parcel.<sup>63</sup> In any event, like Arup, AECOM goes on to state that the site has "*significant constraints in terms of Green Belt, heritage and landscape*".

#### **The site negatively affects the Chilterns AONB**

Viewed from Northchurch Common/Ashridge (part of the Chilterns AONB), the Wishing Tree field (site Bk06) is visible as a green space above Northchurch, bordered by beech trees (alongside Bell Lane). As noted in the Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Report, the landform in this location is of 'moderate-high' susceptibility, and the "*largely rural, scenic qualities*" also "*result in a moderate-high susceptibility*".<sup>64</sup> In particular "*the high plateau of the parcel has much less development around it and most views feature the arable field and wooded surroundings with a high degree of separation, tranquillity and scenic quality*".<sup>65</sup> The site Selection Topic Paper also recognises that "*The land to the south, on the higher plateau, has a moderate to high landscape sensitivity*" and that "*the site forms part of the setting of the AONB*".<sup>66</sup> Yet the south part of the plot is precisely the part which appears destined for a housing development.

While the "*intervisibility*" from the AONB is acknowledged in the Plan,<sup>67</sup> and is also noted by AECOM ("*may impact the setting of the Chilterns AONB due to its proximity*"<sup>68</sup>), there is no suggestion as to how this landscape sensitivity can be mitigated. Indeed, if 200 houses are built on the south part of this site (as proposed), it is inevitable that the development will intrude visually on the AONB on the other side of the valley, contrary to the legal obligations of DBC to protect the Chilterns AONB. (See also comments above.)

#### **The development will result in significant loss of amenity for local residents in and around Northchurch**

Developing the site will harm a local public right of way used by Northchurch residents (running off Bell Lane onto the Wishing Tree field), at the very least destroying its rural character. That right of way offers particularly spectacular views across the valley to the Ashridge AONB:

It sees significant use by dog walkers, runners and walkers from Northchurch/Berkhamsted. During the recent snowfall, children from Northchurch used the hill for tobogganing.

As noted above, this development will also exacerbate the more general loss of accessible open spaces between Northchurch and A41 - exacerbated by the sudden decision of DBC to close the footpath access across the A41 without any replacement in early 2020.

The proposal suggests that the inclusion of a park with the parcel would "add" open space. That is clearly nonsensical - the entire area is open space now, whereas after development only a tiny portion will be.

The possible location of the park is also at odds with the character of the site - that part of the site is much more urban in character, given that it is located immediately behind the existing housing estate on Westfield Road and development alongside Durrants Lane (so from the other side of the valley already appears within the existing development) and offers views of the industrial area at Northbridge Road. (For this reason, it is also much nearer to transport infrastructure than the other part of Bk06 where access will be via Shootersway.) As noted in the Landscape Sensitivity Study, "*The eastern field is much more exposed to the development edge of Berkhamsted. The open, undulating agricultural landscape and long distance views provide good scenic quality, but there is an urbanising affect [sic] from the unscreened, short range views of garages and residential streets*".<sup>69</sup> By contrast, it is the Wishing Tree field (between Darrs Lane and Bell Lane) which has a "*high degree of separation, tranquillity and scenic quality*"<sup>70</sup> and thus the much stronger Green Belt character, offers the best views across the valley to the Chilterns AONB and will itself impact on the AONB if built up.

### **The location is unsuitable for development**

The site is located on the sides of and at the top of a steep hill - notably, it appears that the proposed housing will be at the top of the hill, with primary highway access from Shootersway, while the lower portion of the hill will be used for a secondary school (with access from Darrs Lane) and park.

The nearest (small) supermarket (Tesco Express in Northchurch) is 1 mile away, and Berkhamsted Station is over 2 miles away. AECOM suggests that the site has "*reasonable access to local facilities and public transport*", but this appears not to take account of the topography or of the distance of the access point to the site from any infrastructure.<sup>71</sup> (AECOM states that from the Rossway Farm site, which is just the other side of Shootersway, "*access to public transport and local facilities is relatively poor*".<sup>72</sup> This inconsistency likely stems from the failure to take account of the proposed access off Shootersway from the Bk06 site.)

By contrast, Dacorum's Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report recognises that "*the site is located a distance from the town centre, which would discourage walking and cycling*".<sup>73</sup> This conflicts with the county council's aspiration to promote "*a more balanced approach [to transport] which caters for all forms of transport and seeks to encourage a switch from the private car to sustainable transport (e.g. walking, cycling and passenger transport) wherever possible*".<sup>74</sup> As the recently updated Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan notes, this has significant disadvantages for the environment, for residents' ability to access services and ultimately for their health: "*Those who live in rural areas, people who have a disability or other mobility impairment, or people who do not have access to a car often struggle to access key services, because alternatives to the private car are currently not realistic, affordable or convenient. High levels of car use is a factor in low levels of physical activity contributing to obesity and poor health*".<sup>75</sup>

The topography and location of the planned housing at site Bk06 means that residents would in most cases need to drive to access shops, rail transport or other infrastructure. It is almost inevitable that there will be significant reliance on cars to take children to and from school and for the purposes of commuting. (While the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report suggests that the developments in/around Berkhamsted are positive for "*employment and skills*",<sup>76</sup> other parts of the Plan reflect the reality that the town, and indeed the borough more generally,<sup>77</sup> does not offer significant opportunities for employment, resulting in many people needing to travel to work.) This runs directly counter to the NPPF, which states that new development should be planned for in ways that "*help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as through its location, orientation and design*".<sup>78</sup> The hypothetical reference to a possible future bus service<sup>79</sup> would at best slightly reduce the number of car journeys.

The plot itself is also understood to be affected by sinkholes (perhaps connected with the historical landfill site mentioned by AECOM<sup>80</sup>), some of which are shown in the photos below.

The Iron Age **Grim's Ditch, a site of archaeological significance** also runs across the parcel. The AECOM report acknowledges that "*Archaeological investigations will likely be required to further evaluate the site*".<sup>81</sup> It is noted that the local plan proposes that archaeological investigations should be carried out before any development, and that the site of Grim's ditch should remain undeveloped. This is recognised as a further constraint on the site.

### **Existing infrastructure is inadequate to accommodate the proposed development**

This is particularly so given other recent development a short distance from the site (Bearroc Park phases 1 and 2) and the other nearby development on the Green Belt proposed in the Plan.

### **Public Transport**

There is no public transport around the site. As noted above, the topography means that few residents will walk or cycle to town/the station. In normal times, trains are already very crowded (including at "off-peak" times when LNW typically runs only 4-carriage trains) and the station car park full. It is unclear if it is feasible to run more trains per hour with the existing infrastructure. (It is also noted that the potential cross-rail extension to Hemel / Berkhamsted appears not to be going forward.)

#### Roads/access:

Bell Lane and Darrs Lane are both single track, steep, rural roads without pavements. Bell Lane in particular is a historic sunken lane (dating back many hundreds of years<sup>82</sup>), which is attractive to walkers from Northchurch. It merits protection in its own right, and if any development goes ahead on site Bk06 (which would be contrary to the many reasons mentioned in this note), a substantial buffer should be retained around the lane.

This part of Shootersway also has no pavements, and is an open-limit highway, which means that pedestrian access towards Berkhamsted is impeded.

Access from Bell Lane to Northchurch High Street is one-way and currently other traffic is routed either via Durrants Lane or Darr's Lane / Granville Road (which runs parallel to the Northern edge of the site) is invariably parked up on both sides, owing to the houses not having any garage space. In effect, this is also a single track road on which hold-ups are common. AECOM has acknowledged that Bell Lane is "*not suitable for vehicle access*",<sup>83</sup> but it is inevitable that the lane will see increased traffic. Indeed, it is far from clear that any development will respect this or that DBC endorses AECOM's view. The Plan (in the Guiding Development section) appears to view Bell Lane as an "*important transport corridor*" for "*South-North movements to Berkhamsted Town Centre*".<sup>84</sup> How a tiny rural lane, bounded by (protected) Beech trees with no access at the lower end of the road out onto the High Street (at this point in Northchurch, not Berkhamsted) can be described in this way is incomprehensible.

Darr's Lane (which is single track for part of its length) also appears unsuitable for increased traffic, yet it is suggested as a potential access point for the potential secondary school on the site.<sup>85</sup> Alternatively access would be "*from within the site*", which either suggests that Bell Lane would be used, or that traffic would pass through the development from Shootersway. The Bell Lane option appears unfeasible (as well as being highly undesirable), as noted above. The alternative option of opening up access from Shootersway also seems undesirable, as it would mean that anyone wishing to attend the school from the Northchurch side would need to drive up to the top of the hill and then back down again.



Inevitably, and as acknowledged in the Plan, traffic from the site will mainly have to use Shootersway for access. Traffic intersections at the end of Shootersway and Durrants Lane (anyone driving into Berkhamsted, Northchurch or the A41 would need to use one of these) are already subject to significant tailbacks at peak times, even prior to additional traffic from Bearroc Park phase 2.

In total (i.e. including the 200 houses planned for Bk06), DBC plans to build 890 additional houses in the immediate area which will need to use these junctions.<sup>86</sup> Other Berkhamsted / Northchurch residents are also likely to make increased use of the Durrants Lane/Shootersway route to the A41 given existing congestion in the centre of Berkhamsted during peak hours. As noted in the Site Selection Topic Paper, the "*development is likely to have an impact on the local road network at peak periods, including along Shootersway and Kings Road/A416. Significant improvements would likely be required, including enhancements to Darr's Lane, Durrants Lane, Berkhamsted High Street, Shootersway, Kings Road and the A416*".<sup>87</sup> The road infrastructure in this area is based predominantly on rural lanes, and is simply not capable of accommodating this projected volume of traffic.

#### Local shops

Northchurch village is the nearest location where food can be purchased. Tesco Express (the only supermarket) is a small premises and the small parking areas outside and on the other side of Darrs Lane are usually full up. There is no other local parking other than on residential streets, most of which are unsuitable. While there are some references in the Plan to the local shops at Northchurch, it appears that Northchurch is not given "neighbourhood centre" status in Policy DM20 of the Plan.<sup>88</sup>

The Emerging Strategy for Growth states that the council will support the development of a supermarket at Gossom's End:<sup>89</sup> this is already beyond walking distance of elderly residents or most of those who live at the top of the hill. In any event, it is understood that Lidl no longer plans to develop this site, contrary to the assumptions in the Plan.<sup>90</sup>

Residents will therefore need to drive into the centre of Berkhamsted or further afield. Education

The Plan mentions the possibility of locating a new secondary school on the site. However, education provision is of course the responsibility of Hertfordshire County Council, not DBC.

Although the documents refer to a need for two new primary schools within Berkhamsted,<sup>91</sup> the detailed review of sites in part 4 of the 'Emerging Strategy for Growth' mentions only one, in the planned South Berkhamsted area of development, i.e. a number of miles distant from Northchurch.

### Waste disposal

The waste disposal facility on Northridge Road is only open part time and there are often very long queues of vehicles waiting to get onto and use the facility. Waiting times are sometimes in excess of 30 minutes. This is reflected more generally in the Sustainability Appraisal, which notes: "Production of waste and disposal of this waste is becoming increasingly difficult, with diminishing numbers of suitable sites for landfill disposal"<sup>92</sup>.

### Gas/sewage/water

The few houses alongside site Bk06 currently do not have access to mains gas or sewage.

As noted above, Water resources in the borough are already described in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report as "*over-abstracted*".<sup>93</sup>

### Healthcare

There are no doctors' surgeries in Northchurch. The new Berkhamsted Group Practice site at Gossom's End is relatively nearby, but it is unclear if it can serve a significantly increased population. In any event, there is next to no parking at the site, which is likely to represent a significant problem for those that need the service the most. The nearest hospitals with A&E are a considerable distance away (Aylesbury / Watford). If the local population grows further as planned by DBC, the gap in healthcare provision is liable to become critical.

### **The Natural environment on the site will be harmed**

The site is currently rich in nature - forming a habitat for bird and animal life including bats, hedgehogs, badgers, larks, red kites, buzzards, herons and tawny owls (with the exception of hedgehogs,<sup>94</sup> all other species have been observed many times over a 10 year period). Extensive development of the area to the north of the A41 (effectively a hard boundary for wild animals as well as local residents) will leave inadequate space for wildlife to flourish.

Consistent with the animal life found on the site, the site is bordered by mature trees on part or all of the North, West and South sides, as well as by established hedgerows on part of all of the East, West and South sides.<sup>95</sup> DBC has an obligation to protect hedgerows under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997.<sup>96</sup>

Policy DM36 (Tree Retention and Protection) in the Plan states that “*Developers will be expected to protect and retain existing trees and hedgerows as part of development proposals, and to replace them where their loss is justified*”.<sup>97</sup> This provides insufficient protection as it leave developers free to remove even mature trees and hedgerows at their discretion (where they can “justify” it), contrary to the obligation set out in the NPPF to “*promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats*”; and the requirement that “*development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons*”.<sup>98</sup>

Indeed, recent development close to the site in question has evidenced developers' bad practices: a mature oak tree (estimated at >200 years old) in the middle of the site at the corner of Durrants Lane and Shootersway was removed without warning during the creation of playing fields on that site, even though it would have been perfectly possible to incorporate it into the green space between the two fields.

As long ago as 1992, the UK committed to a United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity; the UK Action Plan which put the Convention into effect in the UK, noted among the main concerns “*the continuing loss and fragmentation of habitats [...] the loss of habitats, linear features such as hedgerows, field margins and ditches*”.<sup>99</sup> DBC has direct obligations under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to conserve biodiversity.<sup>100</sup>

Those principles and rules require the council to take a more active role to directly ensure that no harm is done to biodiversity or natural habitats.

45 Described as Green Belt Reviews Phase 1 and 2 respectively. See footnote X above.

46 Green Belt Review: Purposes Assessment (SKM), Part 1, p.6. Available at: [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\\_final-report-part1.pdf?sfvrsn=3babc89f\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review_final-report-part1.pdf?sfvrsn=3babc89f_0)

47 SKM Report, Part 2, para. 7.5.1-7.5.2, Figure 7.5, pp.49-50 and Annex 1.1 at p.22.  
Available at:

[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review\\_final-report-part2.pdf?sfvrsn=babc89f\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/green-belt-review_final-report-part2.pdf?sfvrsn=babc89f_0)

48 SKM Report, Part 2, para.8.3 and Figure 8.1, pp.64, 66-67.

49 SKM Report, Part 2, para. 9.1, p.69.

50 SKM Report, Part 2, para. 7.4.13, Part 1, p.46.

- 51 Reference 244026-00-4-05-REP (**Arup Report**). Available at:  
[http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-gbr-landscape-appraisal-report-issue-22-12-2016-\(pdf-20mb.pdf](http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-gbr-landscape-appraisal-report-issue-22-12-2016-(pdf-20mb.pdf)
- 52 See Arup Report, p.21 (map of Berkhamsted parcels).
- 53 Arup Report, p.A4
- 54 Arup report, p.95. (Note that the reference to Woodcock Hill which is within the BK06 parcel is incorrectly mentioned by Arup within the adjacent portion of land (referred to as BK-A13 in the Arup report.)
- 55 Arup Report, p.64.
- 56 Arup Report, p.98.
- 57 This section is incorrectly noted on plot BK-A13; however, as Woodcockhill is clearly within BK-A12, this appears to have been an error. In 2015, DBC considered whether to designate Woodcockhill (including all the currently undeveloped land between Bell and Durrants Lane) as a Historic Landscape Site (see Issues Paper - Looking after the Environment, 2015, p.46:  
[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/issues-paper---looking-after-the-environment-2015.pdf?sfvrsn=6178439e\\_0](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/issues-paper---looking-after-the-environment-2015.pdf?sfvrsn=6178439e_0)). While it did not do so, this conclusion was reached due to existing protections, including notably green belt protection, being sufficient (See Appendices, p.97: <https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/issues-paper-looking-after-the-environment-appendix-.pdf?sfvrsn=0>). With green belt protection removed, this issue requires reconsideration.
- 58 Arup report, pp.21, 105, 112.
- 59 Arup Report, p.131. 60 Arup report, p.116. 61 Arup report, p.131.
- 62 NPPF, paragraph 139(f).
- 63 Site Assessment Study, vol. 3, p.30. [https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dbc-site-assessment-study---volume-3---part-1---pages-1-to-80.pdf?sfvrsn=63b90c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dbc-site-assessment-study---volume-3---part-1---pages-1-to-80.pdf?sfvrsn=63b90c9e_4)
- 64 Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study, p.64.  
[https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-borough-landscape-sensitivity-study---part-3.pdf?sfvrsn=47c20c9e\\_4](https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/dacorum-borough-landscape-sensitivity-study---part-3.pdf?sfvrsn=47c20c9e_4)
- 65 Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study, p.64.
- 66 Site Selection Topic Paper, Appendix B, p.22.
- 67 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.306.
- 68 Site Assessment study - vol 3, p.31
- 69 Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study, p.64.
- 70 Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study, p.64.

- 71 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.30.
- 72 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.26.
- 73 Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, page E-42.
- 74 Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan 2018 - 2031, p.5; <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/media-library/documents/about-the-council/consultations/ltp4-local-transport-plan-4-complete.pdf>
- 75 Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan 2018 - 2031, p.5.
- 76 Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, p.38.
- 77 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039 notes: "*we are unable to meet our full future employment land needs over the Plan period*", p.10.
- 78 NPPF, paragraph 150, emphasis added.
- 79 Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, page E-42.
- 80 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.30.
- 81 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.30.
- 82 Based on the depression formed by the lane, compared to the banking, the lane may be as old as medieval. Although the map is not annotated, Drury & Andrews' map of Hertfordshire produced in 1766 clearly shows Bell Lane running from the north-western edge of the former Woodcock Hill property to Northchurch High Street. See archaeological report in relation to Bearroc Park development, p.31, available at: DBH16-143dskreport.pdf (tvas.co.uk)
- 83 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.30.
- 84 Policy DM51, Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.164.
- 85 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.306.
- 86 740 houses off Shootersway (BK03 (Haslam fields) - 150 houses; BK05 (Blegberry Gardens) - 80 houses; BK08 (Rossway Farm) - 200 houses; BK04 and BK10 (Hanbury's) - 110 houses)), likely using one or both of the Shootersway/Kingshill Road and Durrants Lane/Northchurch High Street accesses - this is in addition to the recently added 170 houses at Bearroc Park (phases 1 and 2); 90 houses near the junction of Shootersway/Kingshill Road (BF1 site - BK02); 60 houses in Northchurch (Lock Field site - BK07), likely also regularly using the Durrants Lane / Shootersway route to access the A41.
- 87 Topic Paper - Site Selection - Appendix B, p.23.
- 88 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.95.
- 89 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.47.
- 90 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.97; see <https://d318h7gdotxtz7.cloudfront.net/listings/pdf/3264630b-bc93-469f-bb68-1376c3ef3c52/8ee33bad1e84f0d431c39c574d51369e3aac8b65.pdf>.

91 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, paragraphs 23.110 and 23.113, pp.224-225.  
 92 Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report November 2020, p.18.  
 93 Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report November 2020, p.25.  
 94 Recently (late 2020) observed in woodland off Shootersway, near Bell Lane junction.  
 95 Hedgerow in the vicinity of Shootersway is said to be around 800 years old: <http://www.dacorumheritage.org.uk/article/unravelling-the-mystery-of-street-names/>.  
 96  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/438652/hedgerow\\_guide\\_part\\_1.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/438652/hedgerow_guide_part_1.pdf)  
 97 Dacorum Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020-2038), page 129.  
 98 NPPF, paragraphs 174 and 175(c).  
 99 Biodiversity, the UK Action Plan, 1994, p.95  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/272038/2428.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/272038/2428.pdf)  
 100 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files** [EGS14897.docx](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14898

**Person ID** 1144629

**Full Name** Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

- \* Yes
- \* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

A number of the points made in relation to the 'Wishing Tree field' above apply equally to the planned Rossway Farm development. The site is similarly distant from any infrastructure and entirely at the top of the hill (whereas all infrastructure is at the bottom), necessitating car use for the vast majority of journeys. Part of this site is actually within the AONB.

As with site Bk06, Rossway Farm forms part of the areas assessed by SKM and Arup as contributing towards the Green Belt. In this case, AECOM also agrees, noting that the "*site makes an existing contribution to Green Belt purposes and performance on this criterion is not outweighed by any other factors. Site is also in the setting of and partially within the AONB. As such, site is considered unsuitable for allocation*".<sup>101</sup> Despite AECOM's conclusion, DBC includes the site within its proposals.

Removal of this site will remove a crucial 'green lung' alongside the A41, which is a wildlife corridor and a further amenity used by local residents the length of Shootersway. The public right of way running along the edge of the fields (or in the winter period routinely used on the field itself) is used by residents from Berkhamsted as a safe and pleasant route for accessing countryside Cock Grove, which is the only access point at this end of the town to the countryside and footpaths on the other side of the A41. After Durrant's Lane, Shootersway has no footpaths, so as well as being a more pleasant route, this route is also safer. Full access for pedestrians/walkers wishing to access the South side of the A41 should be maintained. Preferably, if development of some kind goes ahead, access across the A41 for both pedestrians and wildlife should be put in place.

Like site Bk06 above, this site also includes a number of mature trees and hedgerows (some on the border with the neighbouring Bk05 (Blegberry Gardens) site ) which must be protected:

**[Photographs of mature trees and hedgerows, forming wildlife habitats, on the Rossway Field (Bk08) site, with views to the Blegberry Gardens site (Bk05) on the top two images]**

(see photos attached)

Living alongside the A41 (which already generates significant noise and presumably poor air quality in the wider area) appears highly undesirable for future residents. Dacorum's Adopted Core Strategy states that "*the green swathe between the town and the A41 will be maintained*".<sup>102</sup> Development of this site is therefore at odds with the borough's Core Strategy which remains applicable until 2031.

<sup>101</sup> Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.27.

<sup>102</sup> Dacorum Adopted Core Strategy, 2013, paragraph 21.6, p.160.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">EGS14898.jpg</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14899
<b>Person ID</b>	1144629
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>In principle, this area appears somewhat more suitable than the areas considered above: it is not in the Green Belt, and is within the existing settlement of Northchurch.</p> <p>However, there are two significant concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First, the safety of the road access from the site, which will need to come out on New Road immediately to the North of the single track, traditional brick-built bridge over the canal at this The pinch point at the bridge already causes regular traffic tailbacks (not mentioned by AECOM) and has inadequate pavement space for pedestrians (this point is acknowledged by AECOM).<sup>103</sup> If the site is to be used in part for homes for the elderly, proper pavement access, suitable for wheelchairs, will be required.</li> <li>• Second, the impact on nature and biodiversity is highly regrettable. This impact is noted in the Sustainability Report)<sup>104</sup> yet the Site Selection Topic Paper incomprehensibly suggests that there are "<i>no identified ecological constraints</i>".<sup>105</sup> The Plan suggests that the site will accommodate 60 houses, which is an increased number compared to the amount endorsed by DBC in 2009.<sup>106</sup> This draws into question the suggestion that the development</li> </ul>



could somehow be used to "*deliver a net gain in biodiversity [and to] deliver enhancements to the wildlife corridor along the Grand Union Canal*".107

Finally, it is unclear how a site which is essentially a cul-de-sac can "*contribute towards new / enhanced pedestrian and cycle links with Berkhamsted town centre*".108

103 Site Assessment Study (AECOM), volume 3, p.32.

104 Appendices to Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report, page E-52.

105 Site Selection Topic Paper, Appendix B, page B25.

106 Spatial Strategy for The Town Of Berkhamsted, p.49, <http://46.17.93.43/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/cs31-emerging-core-strategy---june-2009---spatial-strat-for-the-berko.pdf?sfvrsn=0>

107 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.307.

108 Dacorum Local Plan Emerging Strategy for Growth 2020-2039, p.307.

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites</b> <b>comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14900
<b>Person ID</b>	1144629
<b>Full Name</b>	Mrs SOPHIE LAWRANCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b>	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The questionnaire also asks if there are any sites which should be included with the Plan. In addition to any regenerated urban centre sites which may become available as shopping patterns change, I note that the planned supermarket at Gossom's End (between Berkhamsted and Northchurch) appears not to be proceeding (Lidl has put the site up for sale). This site (which is at valley level and within reach of transport hubs) could accommodate more than the 11 dwellings originally planned by Lidl, 109 and merits inclusion in the Plan.</p> <p>109 See Topic Paper, Housing Policy, p.147 (development reference 4/02607/17/ROC).</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14927
<b>Person ID</b>	1270586
<b>Full Name</b>	RACHEL CHAPMAN
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>We have all been sent a brochure re a proposed and fantastic sounding housing development on the eastern side of Berkhamsted i.e. by Gardenfield lane with a country park, playing fields, allotments, a primary school and zero carbon homes, etc. etc. This technically planned on new Green Belt land which has never to the best of our knowledge been brought to our attention in the recent past. Is this being slipped under the radar or is it just pie in the sky? It is bad</p>

enough that Dacorum are planning to build houses all along the stretch of the A41 By Pass in Berkhamsted on Green Belt, let alone building more houses to the east of the town. In the near future Berkhamsted will possibly amalgamate with Bourne End and Hemel Hempstead - just like London gobbling up more and more towns and villages. What a dreadful future for us all and our children.

If nothing else this Pandemic has shown that the population is in need of a green countryside in which to walk, to get out from our homes for our physical and mental well being. I sincerely hope that neither Gardenfield Lane nor Long Meadow will suffer from this overdevelopment and any other minor lanes and green areas.

Yes / No

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14957

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** Please note that a Sequential test and a level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) will need to be carried out for any site allocations that have flood risk **before we would consider the local plan sound**.

Our detailed comments are provided below, following the general order of the topics presented in the draft local plan document. Where we wish to see policies strengthened we have outlined the additional content we would like included.

**While waste water capacity has been mentioned, it will need to be embedded within plan policies for us to find the plan sound.** Major development should be required to demonstrate that there is adequate capacity for local water supply. The subject of water resources and supply needs to be embedded as much as possible within any development plan.

Wherever green infrastructure is mentioned we would like to see this changed to 'green and blue infrastructure' to recognise the importance of the interconnectivity of the green and blue network.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14992

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

Our records show that this site is part of a local wildlife site. The appropriate body should be consulted to ensure this site is suitable for development. You will need to include appropriate acknowledgement of site and that it will be protected/enhanced throughout development.

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

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14993
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.
<b>Yes / No * Yes * No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14994
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Please see our comments above in regard to the sustainability appraisal in relation to this site.</p> <p><b>Interim Sustainability Appraisal</b></p> <p>In the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (upon looking at the site allocations) it is worth highlighting the Sustainability Appraisal report along with Local Plan Policies. Quoting Section 6.4.3 SA2 Water (Pages 50-51):</p> <p>“...New development could also result in the <b>pollution of water courses both during construction and when developments are occupied</b>, as well as affecting groundwater resources, particularly if the development is in a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). New development increases the potential for water pollution, associated with increased run-off from impermeable surfaces and the potential for sewer flooding in high rainfall events. The <b>likelihood and level of such effects will be dependent on the specific development locations</b>.</p> <p>However, significant positive effects on this SA objective have been identified as a result of the Local Plan policies under the Environment and Biodiversity theme, in particular: ‘DM33 - Protection and Enhancement of the River Character and Water Environment’; ‘DM34 – Flood Risk and Protection’; and ‘DM35 - Protection from Environmental Pollution’.</p> <p>Policy DM33 requires that the water environment be managed by restoring water courses, <b>avoiding damage</b> of or abstraction from the Rivers Ver, Gade and Bulbourne, and <b>locating development away from waterbodies, thereby directly supporting this objective</b>. In addition, by restricting the types of development which can take place in flood risk areas and requiring measures for the control and reduction of surface water run-off, DM34 should help to protect the water environment, whilst DM35 aims to improve water quality standards. Significant positive effects against this objective have</p> <p>therefore been identified in relation to these policies.”</p> <p>The above states that pollution from arising from new development construction and occupancy is only likely depending on the site locations. However looking at the some of the site locations, development opportunities are being considered in Greenfield areas surrounding WFD water bodies. These locations are concerning and contradict policy <b>DM33</b> which</p>

states it will “secure opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity, to include reinstating natural buffer zones”. The locations of particular concern in this regard are **BK09, MK01**. Both of these locations already have buffer zones either natural or managed, providing protection from flooding, non-point pollution. However the proposed development in these locations will reduce the buffer zone, and allowing development up to 10m of the water bodies in these locations. This will result in an increase in non-point source pollution and ultimately a local deterioration of the water body. The locations identified should instead be given greater protection from development as they are unique pockets of green field surrounding the water bodies in their usually urban encroached setting. Furthermore these sites should instead be seen as opportunities to provide enhancement to the riparian zone of these sites to provide associated protection from extreme wet and dry weather. It will need to be acknowledged that these sites contradict these goals.

The Bulbourne runs west-east through the site. We are pleased to see that no development will take place in Flood zones 2 and 3. This will leave a large portion of the site undevelopable and it may not be possible to fit the 50 projected dwellings on site, especially after leaving the 10m buffer zone from the river. Our Flood risk team have severe concerns with the northern half of the site which is where the majority of the flood zones are. Flood risk starts at the 1 in 2 return period which connects the canal and the river. With no defences currently along this section the model would suggest quite a bit of work would need to be done if you want to use the northern half of the site.

These concerns have been raised in relation to this site via our free preliminary opinion pre-application service to the landowner/potential developer of the site. We would suggest that this site is removed from the site allocations. Development of this site may also mean the two WFD actions on this site below are unachievable.

Any development within 8 meters of a main river will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.

Our records also show the site to be a Protected habitat under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006) Section 41 habitats of principal importance. Advice should be sought from Natural England.

It appears that there are two WFD actions at this site that should be addressed in any planning application:

WFD Action ID 33,887. At Berkhamsted south at New Lodge parallel with New Bank Lane manage 320m riparian zone. Establish and manage riparian buffer zones to enhance river corridor habitat. (Width of buffer zone to be in line with local Byelaws: minimum of 8 metres from bank top). Enhance in-channel, marginal aquatic and bank habitats. Reduce poaching pressure.

WFD Action ID 33842. Floodplain restoration - creation of floodplain scrapes (520m). Floodplain restoration - creation of floodplain scrapes u/s TL0038107295 d/s TL0077607042

A minimum of 10m buffer zone between the River Bulbourne and any built environment which could form part of the biodiversity net gain requirement. There should be no lightspill above 2 lux. The development should protect and enhance the chalk stream priority habitat. A WFD assessment will be required to be submitted as part of any application.

This site is also under consideration for an Affinity Water project in their AMP7 cycle.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS14995

**Person ID** 1207224

**Full Name** Chris Padley

**Organisation Details** Environment Agency

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment** We are pleased to see that no development will take place in Flood zone 3. We still have concerns around the nature of the flood risk on site with a 1 in 2 year return period. As much redevelopment should be outside the flood zone as possible.

Redevelopment of flood zones should return the land to flood plain as much as possible.



There is also a culvert that runs through the site. We would expect proposals to de-culvert the river and provide a naturalised 10 m buffer zone to the river. If this is not possible the applicant will need to demonstrate why it is not feasible, and;

- The developer must undertake a survey of the culvert in order to assess its exact location in relation to the proposed development as well as the condition of the The developer must be able to demonstrate that the condition of the culvert is acceptable before the development can proceed.
- The developer must demonstrate that the lifetime of the culvert is commensurate with the lifetime of the building or demonstrate how future upgrading and repair of the culvert will be possible with the building over or near the
  - The developer must demonstrate that there will be no loading on the culvert or that the culvert size and condition can withstand the loading. Loading during and post-construction must be
- The developer must also demonstrate how access to the culvert for maintenance and emergency clearance will be achieved with the building sited over or near the This includes access to manholes/access chambers.
- The developer must demonstrate that the development will not block overland flood flow routes surcharging from the

Any development within 8 meters of a main river (including culverts) will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.

There is a WFD action at this site that should be addressed in any planning application:

WFD Action ID 33852. From Billet Lane west restore planform and manage riparian zone (150m). Deculvert and restore/rehabilitate natural planform. Establish and manage riparian buffer zones to enhance river corridor habitat. (Width of buffer zone to be in line with local Byelaws: minimum of 8 metres from bank top). u/s SP9808008495 d/s SP9820408

A minimum of 10m buffer zone between the River Bulbourne/Grand Union Canal and any built environment which could form part of the biodiversity net gain requirement. There should be no lightspill above 2 lux. The development should protect and enhance the chalk stream priority habitat. A WFD assessment will be required to be submitted as part of any application.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS14996
<b>Person ID</b>	1207224
<b>Full Name</b>	Chris Padley
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Environment Agency
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>The policy wording for this site does not have a flood risk section but had flood zones 2 and 3 on site with a 1 in 2 year return period. No development should take place in the Flood zones. Redevelopment of flood zones should return the land to flood plain as much as possible.</p> <p>There is also a culvert that runs through the site. We would expect proposals to de- culvert the river and provide a naturalised 10 m buffer zone to the river. If this is not possible the applicant will need to demonstrate why it is not feasible, and;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developer must undertake a survey of the culvert in order to assess its exact location in relation to the proposed development as well as the condition of the The developer must be able to demonstrate that the condition of the culvert is acceptable before the development can proceed.</li> <li>• The developer must demonstrate that the lifetime of the culvert is commensurate with the lifetime of the building or demonstrate how future upgrading and repair of the culvert will be possible with the building over or near the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developer must demonstrate that there will be no loading on the culvert or that the culvert size and condition can withstand the Loading during and post-construction must be assessed.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The developer must also demonstrate how access to the culvert for maintenance and emergency clearance will be achieved with the building sited over or near the This includes access to manholes/access chambers.</li> <li>• The developer must demonstrate that the development will not block overland flood flow routes surcharging from the</li> </ul>

Any development within 8 meters of a main river (including culverts) will require a Flood Risk Activity Permit from the Environment Agency.

There is a WFD action at this site that should be addressed in any planning application:

WFD Action ID 33852. From Billet Lane west restore planform and manage riparian zone (150m). Deculvert and restore/rehabilitate natural planform. Establish and manage riparian buffer zones to enhance river corridor habitat. (Width of buffer zone to be in line with local Byelaws: minimum of 8 metres from bank top). u/s SP9808008495 d/s SP9820408.

A minimum of 10m buffer zone between the River Bulbourne/Grand Union Canal and any built environment which could form part of the biodiversity net gain requirement. There should be no lightspill above 2 lux. The development should protect and enhance the chalk stream priority habitat. A WFD assessment will be required to be submitted as part of any application.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15018

**Person ID** 1270845

**Full Name** DOMINIC LAWRANCE

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

**In relation to Bell Lane, Northchurch – a tiny, centuries-old,[1] sunken single-track rural lane – this policy is utterly incomprehensible. The bizarreness of the inclusion of Bell Lane in this policy gives one cause to wonder whether some other road was meant.**

Bell Lane runs along the eastern edge of the site in Northchurch known locally as the “Wishing Tree field” (site Bk06). It does not lead to Berkhamsted Town Centre. It takes little traffic, and is unsuitable to taking any more traffic than at present, not least because there are very few passing places and these are not tarmacked. Bell Lane is not, and is not capable of functioning as, an “important transport corridor”. There is a pinch point to the south of the junction of Bell Lane with Granville and Westfield Roads, due to the close proximity of housing, where the lane cannot be widened.

Widening of Bell Lane anywhere along its length would be environmentally destructive. The lane is bordered by hedgerow and woodland, some of which is ancient, and all of which contributes greatly to biodiversity. **The woodland and hedgerow alongside Bell Lane is a classic conjunction of priority habitats and irreplaceable habitats that are protected under paras 174 and 175 of the NPPF.** It is noted in some of the evidence base documents that woodland alongside Bell Lane shares some of the characteristics of the woodland within the Chilterns AONB.

It is also noted within the evidence base that Bell Lane and the footpath that runs alongside it form an important amenity for residents of Northchurch, providing them with a quiet and relatively safe route up the hill to admire the local views, including the attractive view of the “Wishing Tree” itself and the striking view across the valley to Northchurch Common, part of the Chilterns AONB. This is quite correct; Bell Lane is extensively used by walkers and runners. During the lockdown, use of the lane as a local place of amenity and a relatively safe means to access the local countryside on foot, from the middle of Northchurch, has been particularly extensive and obvious. **It is utterly extraordinary, and shocking, that any suggestion is being made that Bell Lane should be transformed into some sort of arterial traffic route.**[2]

[1] Based on the extent of the depression formed by the lane, compared to the banking, the lane is possibly medieval, but hard evidence of this is lacking. Although the mapping is slightly approximate, Bell Lane can clearly be seen on Drury and Andrews’ map of Hertfordshire produced in 1766 (running from the north-western edge of the former Woodcock Hill property to Northchurch High Street). See p31 of this archaeological report: DBH16-143dskreport.pdf (tvas.co.uk)

[2] If, indeed, that is the suggestion that is being made. As noted above, policy DM51 seems wilfully obscure.

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

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15022
<b>Person ID</b>	1270845
<b>Full Name</b>	DOMINIC LAWRANCE
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Countryside to the south of Northchurch: site Bk06 / parcel 18[1] (including the “Wishing Tree Field”)</b></p> <p>As discussed below (see response to Question 6), site Bk06 / parcel 18 is in reality two separate fields with different characteristics, which require separate consideration. Although both have landscape and biodiversity value, the case for retention of the larger of the fields, between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane, within the Green Belt is particularly strong.</p> <p>This larger field is known locally as the “Wishing Tree field”, after a particular tree roughly halfway up the field, which forms a local landmark. The field extends high up the side of the valley towards the area of AONB to the south, and there is significant intervisibility with a particularly special area of the AONB to the north-east (Northchurch Common / the Ashridge Estate), across the Bulbourne valley. This field has a genuinely rural atmosphere and there is very little existing development, most of which is well concealed from most parts of the field. The Arup “Dacorum Borough Landscape Sensitivity Study” notes the <i>“high degree of separation [from Northchurch], tranquillity and scenic quality”</i> of the southern reaches of this field; and that even at its northern edge tranquillity is preserved.</p> <p>A footpath runs along the eastern edge of the field, alongside Bell Lane, although separated from it by hedgerow. Bell Lane is a sunken, single-track lane of some antiquity.[2] As already noted, the woodland and hedgerow alongside Bell Lane is a classic conjunction of priority habitats and irreplaceable habitats that are protected under paras 174 and 175</p>

of the NPPF. Also as already noted, the footpath, and the lane itself, are a significant recreational resource for Northchurch residents, many of whom use them to gain access to the plateau at the southern end of the field, where it meets Shootersway. From that plateau, and further down the field, there are quite spectacular views across to Northchurch Common / the Ashridge Estate.

**Although farmed, the field has obvious importance for local wildlife. In summer, it is very common for skylarks to nest in the field and to be seen (and heard) in the airspace above it.** The UK's skylark population is in freefall and it is on the RSPB's "red list".[3]

Also in summer, considerable numbers of **bats** hunt in and around the field. **Red kites and buzzards** are frequent visitors to the field, which obviously indicates the presence of small mammals and large insects. **Herons** are occasional visitors to a tree-lined pond near the south-eastern corner of the field,[4] which is thought to be a relic of an old chalkpit. The occasional presence of herons suggests that the pond may be inhabited by frogs and/or newts. **Tawny oils** are very frequently heard, and occasionally seen, in the trees / hedgerows that line the field.

**If this field is developed, this will have a hugely negative impact on skyline views of the scarp slope to the north, as viewed from Bell Lane, Shootersway and Darrs Lane, and will therefore contravene policy DM27. There will also be a negative impact on views from the scarp slope itself, i.e. from the southern reaches of Northchurch Common / the Ashridge Estate.**[5]

Again, this will contravene policy DM27, as views from the AONB have to be taken into account in determining whether proposed development is detrimental to the AONB. Given the topography (i.e. the gradient of the "Wishing Tree field"), it will be impossible for this negative impact to be mitigated in any meaningful way.

**In summary, it is utterly extraordinary that this field, highly valued by local residents, of considerable biodiversity value and of significant landscape sensitivity, and clearly visible from the AONB, is being proposed for development. This needs to be re-thought.**

[1] Parcel 18 is the reference used in the Arup draft "Dacorum Borough Landscape Sensitivity Study".

[2] See footnote [ ].

[3] There was a 54% reduction in the UK's skylark population between 1970 and 2001. See Skylark Conservation | Advice For Farmers - The RSPB

[4] Grid reference SP 97071 08125.

[5] For example, the field (including the “Wishing Tree”) is easily seen from grid reference SP 97670 09673 within the Ashridge Estate.

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment

Included files [dOMINIC IAWRANCE.pdf](#)

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS15023

Person ID 1270845

Full Name DOMINIC LAWRENCE

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
\* Yes  
\* No

Sites Bk03 (Haslam Playing Fields), Bk04 (land between Hanburys and the A41), Bk05 (land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens), Bk08 (Rossway Farm, land between Shootersway and the A41)

If they are developed, access to all of these sites would be from Shootersway, which is already subject to quite serious congestion during “rush hours” / at school drop-off / pick-up times. It is quite normal at these times for there to be a line of stationary traffic running from the junction of Shootersway with Kings Road back to the junction of Shootersway with Cross Oak Road, or even beyond. **Shootersway is ill-equipped to deal with a further increase in traffic levels, and it is naïve to think that a large proportion of the proposed new residents will be using public transport, cycling or walking.**

A further, obvious issue with these proposed sites is that they are all very close to a dual-carriageway A road which has most of the characteristics of a motorway. **Noise pollution and air pollution will surely be significant issues.** When the A41 was planned, care was taken to ensure that there would be a substantial band of countryside alongside it, to act as a wildlife corridor and a “green lung”, absorbing some of the air pollution generated by vehicles. This very sensible policy is gradually being abandoned but the original reasoning was sound.

As with the “Wishing Tree field” (discussed above), these fields have **considerable amenity value for local residents, by virtue of the public right of way that runs across them.** This footpath is of high value in itself, in providing green space that can be freely accessed and enjoyed. Importantly, it also provides a safe and pleasant route by which local residents can access, on foot, the Green Belt countryside on the other side of the A41 (the Cock Grove area). This is otherwise very difficult for many local residents. The alternative is to walk along Shootersway, but at the western end of Shootersway there is no pavement, there is minimal space to stand on the green verge, and the road is unrestricted at this point, so vehicle speeds can be high. **The continued availability of this public right of way, and ensuring that it remains an attractive alternative to walking along Shootersway, are therefore a public safety issue as well as an amenity issue.**

Yes / No  
 \* Yes  
 \* No

Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment

Included files [DOMINIC LAWRENCE 2.pdf](#)

Title Berkhamsted

ID EGS15024

Person ID 1270845

Full Name DOMINIC LAWRENCE

Organisation Details

Agent ID

Agent Full Name

Agent Organisation

Yes / No  
 \* Yes

Yes



* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Sites Bk03 (Haslam Playing Fields), Bk04 (land between Hanburys and the A41), Bk05 (land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens), Bk08 (Rossway Farm, land between Shootersway and the A41)</p> <p>If they are developed, access to all of these sites would be from Shootersway, which is already subject to quite serious congestion during “rush hours” / at school drop-off / pick-up times. It is quite normal at these times for there to be a line of stationary traffic running from the junction of Shootersway with Kings Road back to the junction of Shootersway with Cross Oak Road, or even beyond. <b>Shootersway is ill-equipped to deal with a further increase in traffic levels, and it is naïve to think that a large proportion of the proposed new residents will be using public transport, cycling or walking.</b></p> <p>A further, obvious issue with these proposed sites is that they are all very close to a dual-carriageway A road which has most of the characteristics of a motorway. <b>Noise pollution and air pollution will surely be significant issues.</b> When the A41 was planned, care was taken to ensure that there would be a substantial band of countryside alongside it, to act as a wildlife corridor and a “green lung”, absorbing some of the air pollution generated by vehicles. This very sensible policy is gradually being abandoned but the original reasoning was sound.</p> <p>As with the “Wishing Tree field” (discussed above), these fields have <b>considerable amenity value for local residents, by virtue of the public right of way that runs across them.</b> This footpath is of high value in itself, in providing green space that can be freely accessed and enjoyed. Importantly, it also provides a safe and pleasant route by which local residents can access, on foot, the Green Belt countryside on the other side of the A41 (the Cock Grove area). This is otherwise very difficult for many local residents. The alternative is to walk along Shootersway, but at the western end of Shootersway there is no pavement, there is minimal space to stand on the green verge, and the road is unrestricted at this point, so vehicle speeds can be high. <b>The continued availability of this public right of way, and ensuring that it remains an attractive alternative to walking along Shootersway, are therefore a public safety issue as well as an amenity issue.</b></p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">DOMINIC LAWRANCE 3.pdf</a>

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15091
<b>Person ID</b>	1270924
<b>Full Name</b>	LINDA HUSSEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The fields between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane are Green Belt and should not be built upon. Two fields adjacent to proposed site in Shooters Way have been built upon in the last three years.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15111
<b>Person ID</b>	1270934
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Leonard Hussey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The fields between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane are Green Belt and should not be built upon. Two fields adjacent to proposed site in Shooters Way have been built upon in the last three years.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15113
<b>Person ID</b>	1270934
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr Leonard Hussey
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	The proposed development on land between Bell Lane and Darrs Lane will remove the last area of green space between Berkhamsted and Northchurch. Northchurch will become West Berkhamsted thus losing its identity.
Yes / No	
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15143
<b>Person ID</b>	1270943
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BK06 — The development between Darrs and Durrants Lanes - the 'Wishing Tree field';</li> </ul> <p>This development is at the top of a steep hill and it is likely that the residents will use cars and travel up and down the single track Bell Lane or Darrs Lanes. The steep hill will deter pedestrians or cyclists and instead encourage car use. There is no further infrastructure investment planned and this will cause congestion and a hazard to walkers and cyclists. Heavy traffic is likely to further damage the hedgerows, as traffic already forces its way into these hedgerows at the narrow passing points on the single track lanes.</p> <p>There is already concern about traffic causing hazards to pedestrians on Darrs Lane and the Road Safety Committee frequently hears reports from concerned residents about bollards being knocked out of the verges as traffic enters the village.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15144

<b>Person ID</b>	1270943
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>— BK07 — The development in Lock Field — this is a sliver of land between the railway and canal; it is an important wildlife corridor linking the Dudswell nature reserve with the canal side.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing 60 houses here will lead to additional 120 cars using New Road and then most likely using the junction of New Road and the High Street. There is historic evidence of concerns about traffic safety on New Road, with limited application for road safety improvements having been approved (a speed indicator device), however residents wish to see a reduction in speed limit here and other traffic</li> </ul> <p>Residential homes line the upper part of New Road, but are set back from the road up steep driveways. The entrance to Bridgewater Hill is hard for drivers to see and is hazardous for young families who live there. Residents of New Road have spoken at to NPC of concern over seeing learning disabled adults employed at Sunnyside on New Road and young children travelling to school already having to negotiate narrow uneven pavements with traffic passing close by. Parents wheeling buggies in opposite directions cannot safety pass on the pavement meaning people having to a walk in the road.</p> <p>I have surveyed this road in detail myself and note that there are often dips in the pavement, with the pavement being narrow and uneven and sloped. Many different residents have reported being clipped by car wing mirrors on New Road and examination of the pavement surface commonly reveals fractured shards of wing mirrors consistent with these reports.</p> <p>My communications with families on New Road have revealed many near miss incidents with young children and that families choose to make short journeys with their children by car, rather than walking because of the danger to pedestrians on New Road.</p>

Adding another junction for 120 cars to use is not acceptable to local residents. With the loss of the planned link road several years ago, there really is no significant mitigation that could realistically address the increased traffic movements caused by the proposed development.

- This development will also put pressure on the New Road/ Northchurch High Street junction. There is limited scope for Several years ago a developer proposed converting this to a controlled junction, but this would entail moving the pedestrian traffic lights outside the George and Dragon Pub, as they are would be too close to such proposed ATS at this junction.

This in turn would entail that children on route to St Mary's school, who currently avoid the High Street by crossing from Duncombe Road to St Mary's Church Yard would be drawn to crossing at this junction instead, rather than immediately entering St Mary's Church Yard. This would entail an walking up to the corner along pavements are that are too narrow to permit two buggies to safely pass.

This would development would not only cause a detrimental impact to road safety in New Road, but would have a detrimental impact on road safety of children travelling to St Mary's Primary School, kindergarten and toddler groups held in St Mary's Parish Rooms from all over Northchurch. The impact of moving the traffic lights to mitigate additional pressure on this junction would endanger children from all over Northchurch.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15145

**Person ID** 1270943

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL ROAD SAFETY COMMITTEE

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BK08 — The development at Rossway Park - this area was envisaged as a 'green lung' to protect the population from pollution from the This ignores the recent case of a 9-year-old girl who suffered a fatal asthma attack in 2013, who became the first person in Britain to officially have air pollution listed as a cause of death. It is wrong to plan to subject future generations to the risk of air pollution when we know that it will damage public health. The junction between Shootersway and Upper Kings Road is already congested in the rush hour and this development will make it much worse.</li> <li>• It is generally of concern that there is no plan to improve road infrastructure meaning increased traffic congestion, pollution and endangerment of young families and the elderly would be unacceptable to the residents of Northchurch. People all over Northchurch already opt to use cars for short journeys due to the poor and unsafe infrastructure for pedestrians and this will only get worse if these proposals go ahead.</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15153
<b>Person ID</b>	1270945
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	These sites are adjacent to each other and run between Shooters Way and the A41. Many residents enjoy walking the footpath that runs along the edge of these fields and the views across the Green Belt. These fields act as a corridor for wildlife between the houses on Shooters Way and the A41.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15154
<b>Person ID</b>	1270945
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	These sites are adjacent to each other and run between Shooters Way and the A41. Many residents enjoy walking the footpath that runs along the edge of these fields and the views across the Green Belt. These fields act as a corridor for wildlife between the houses on Shooters Way and the A41.
Yes / No * Yes * No	



<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15155
<b>Person ID</b>	1270945
<b>Full Name</b>	
<b>Organisation Details</b>	NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>5.2.1 The proposed development is too large and will overwhelm this part of Northchurch</p> <p>This site is on the north side of Shooters Way. To the east, it runs alongside Bearroc Park 2, a large, 80-dwelling development being built on the other side of Durrants Lane. Heading west, it crosses the field, over Bell lane, to Darrs Lane which is the boundary for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The development of 200 dwellings includes a secondary school with access from Darrs Lane. It runs alongside Bearroc Part 2, the recent development of 80 dwellings on Durrants lane.</p> <p>Taken together, these developments comprise 560 dwellings and cover over 40 acres of Green Belt. This huge area fulfils the primary aim of Green Belt policy; to prevent the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, and to prevent neighbouring towns and communities merging into one another. These 560 dwellings form a large crescent-shaped development which merges a large part of Berkhamsted with Northchurch.</p> <p>5.2.2 Dacorum previously rejected this site as unsuitable for development</p> <p>DBC's 2013 review of Green Belt in Dacorum concluded that the parcel of Green Belt west of Durrants Lane strongly supports the fundamental purpose of the Green Belt: to prevent urban spawl. The site was further assessed in Dacorum's Schedule of Site Appraisals (For Large Greenfield Sites) October 2017 and was rejected for its impact on the Green</p>

Belt. This appraisal concluded that “Durrants Lane forms a hard edge for the settlement and any loss of Green Belt further west may place undue pressure on the overall integrity of the wider Green Belt in the medium to long term”.

### 5.2.3 The impact on biodiversity

The Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation is a site of European importance of biodiversity and wildlife conservation. In July 2018, the Chilterns Conservation Board submitted a request to Natural England for a review of the designation and requested that National Park status be considered. DEFRA’s Landscapes Review 2019 (The Glover Report) strongly supported this request. The proximity of the developments will damage the nearby AONB and its prospects for becoming a National Park. Dacorum’s Local Plan should consider the economic and environmental benefits of a new National Park and put on hold any proposed developments that could impact on the AONB hold until the outcomes of the Glover Report.

### 5.2.4 The impact on physical and mental health

The loss of Green Belt will have a detrimental impact on local peoples physical and mental health which contradicts national and local policies. Very many local people walk up these lanes and along Shooters Way for exercise and fresh air. At various points, they stop to enjoy uninterrupted views across the valley and towards the AONB, and down into the built-up parts of Northchurch. The fields, hedges, wildflowers, groups of trees, ancient woodland and embankments combine to enhance the view and attract birds and wildlife which are pleasant to see and hear. This green fields, footpaths and lanes makes a significant contribution to people’s physical health and mental wellbeing. The loss of 40 acres of green fields will not be offset by the provision of a very small park.

The Darrs Lane site forms an important view from the other side of the valley. Although people adjacent to it in Northchurch enjoy the bucolic vista and the ability to exercise in the field, it is admired from the other side of the valley too. There have been recent discussions on social media about the single tree in the field - whether it is called the ‘wishing tree’ or the ‘Lonely tree’ - one resident reports that his little girl calls it ‘Arial’ — to desecrate this field will damage the sense of place of everyone in the surrounds and to see it destroyed will damage the sense of security, identity and wellbeing of all who see it - local photographers even sell photos of the view of this lonely tree field as it is so loved by the community. It is possible to walk some way up the field and look over towards Northchurch Common and Ashridge and not see the village of Northchurch at all, because of how it dips into the valley - the same will be true in reverse. To build an urban environment in this beautiful landscape is desecration that will detract from the beauty, ambiance and sense of place from those enjoying the countryside for miles around. Where once they saw the beautiful, lonely tree, they will soon see rooflines and asphalt. This will significantly damage the amenity and identity of the area, overwhelm the strong identity of the people of Northchurch, and damage their mental health.

### 5.2.5 The impact on heritage

Darrs Lane and Bell Lane are characterful rural lanes that are deep and high-sided from centuries of use. A Dacorum Heritage Trust study in 2010 concluded that the hedges in Darrs Lane, Bell Lane and parts of Shooters Way were over 800 years old. They need a 10-metre margin to protect them from damage. The proposed developments will damage or destroy these hedges.

The Thames Valley Archaeological Services 2016 report (a desk-based assessment of land off Durrants Lane), found that a rare surviving example of mediaeval to post-mediaeval plateau ridge and furrow had been recorded across the whole field that lies North of Grimm's Dyke and adjacent to Bell's Lane. This is an archaeological pattern of parallel ridges and troughs created by an historical system of ploughing, typical of the open field system, which suggests that Bell Lane has been in use since medieval times. There is a case that the lanes themselves merit conservation on the grounds of being an historic environment that adds rural character to Northchurch. Pre-historic artefacts were found on the proposed site and Roman finds reported in the vicinity. Darrs Lane and Bell Lane should be recognised as being an environment of historic importance in the Local Plan and the ridge and furrow ploughing patterns should be preserved.

#### 5.2.6 The lack of infrastructure planning

Although the report says that "a masterplan will be bought forward", there is no evidence of planning for infrastructure. For example, there is no traffic management plan for these sites. Previous assessments of these sites have raised significant difficulties that have caused them to be rejected for future development. Both Bell Lane and Darrs Lane have sections which are not wide enough for two vehicles to pass and are unsuitable for increased traffic. Where these two lanes meet the High Street, road traffic is heavily congested and dangerous for pedestrians to cross, particularly children from the three nearby schools (and the proposed secondary school in Darrs Lane.) The bottom of Darrs lane is a bottleneck with an S- bend and insufficient parking spaces for customers visiting Tesco Express. The proximity of houses, means there is no opportunity to improve or expand Darrs Lane at this point. The suggestion that access to this school will be from Darrs Lane indicates that no consideration has been given to how cars and coaches will enter and leave the school.

#### 5.2.7 Impact on the semi-rural character of Northchurch

Widening the surrounding lanes to accommodate increased traffic would alter the rural nature of Northchurch. Darrs lane and Bell Lane are attractive, narrow, hedge-lined country lanes which typify the lanes in Northchurch. Any road-widening would alter the country lane appearance to the detriment of the rural character of this part of Northchurch and the adjacent AONB.

Preservation of the Beechwoods in the Darrs Lane site would support the creation of a new National Park. Dacorum Borough Council is required to undertake a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) involving a Screening Exercise to determine whether Dacorum's Emerging Strategy for Growth has aspects within it that will impact adversely on the Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area for Conservation. However, the development proposals include the Beechwoods together with consideration of compensatory measures. This implies that Dacorum have reached a conclusion about the Beechwoods without the Screening Exercise. Therefore, Dacorum has not complied with its duties under the Conservation

of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to determine if a plan or project may affect the protected features of a habitats site before deciding whether to undertake, permit or authorise it.

1 BKPS

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted Other Sites  
comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15156

**Person ID** 1270945

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details** NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites  
Berkhamsted comment**

5.3.1 Lock Field forms part of a green, open and culturally important corridor

Lock Field is a triangular stretch of Green Belt that is surrounded by significant parts of heritage and countryside. To the south of Lock Field, the Northchurch Conservation Area sits at the bottom of a valley that rises towards Northchurch Common. Above the Conservation Area and on either side of Lock Field are the canal and the two Northchurch allotment sites. The importance of Lock Field is highlighted on page 52 of Dacorum's 2017 Conservation Area Appraisal which states that views to the north towards the river and canal "form part of the character and significance of the conservation area".

The Landscape Considerations on DBC's Draft Strategy (page 317) highlight Lock Field's "relationship to the Grand Union Canal, its setting and the associated views; the long-distance views of the AONB and the tree lined Ashridge horizon.

Taken together, the Conservation Area, the canal, Lock Field, the allotment sites and the hill rising to Northchurch Common provide a culturally important, green corridor. This thin strip of land provides a rich habitat for wildlife and allows wildlife to move, within an urban environment, from the canal to Ashridge and Northchurch Common. The proposed development would block this green corridor causing significant harm to wildlife.

The importance of preserving this corridor, in terms of its visual impact, was recognised in Dacorum's 2017 Northchurch Conservation Area Appraisal which proposed extending the conservation area "to encompass the canal, tow path, lock gates, lock keeper's cottage and open space between the River and Canal:

1.) "As the Grand Union Canal is an important historic influence on the wider area from the latter 18th/early 19th centuries, the area forms a key amenity link to the Grand Union Canal tow path which creates a pedestrian/cycle route to Berkhamsted to the east and Dudswell and Tring to the west. The section of the Grand Union Canal from Brentford to Berkhamsted was completed in 1798, and the link to Birmingham was opened in 1805. The building is a component of a nationally significant canal development which linked London and Birmingham by 1905 and which remained commercially operational until the 1960's. The setting of the building alongside the lock chamber to the north of Northchurch remains unchanged, enhancing the clearly legible functional relationship between the 2 structures. The lock cottage stands alongside the lock chamber of one of 2 operational locks. The lock retains wooden gates of traditional design to both ends of the chamber, which is brick lined below massive stone copings. The building is of distinctive architectural form and character and remains clearly identifiable as a canal-related structure."

2.) The open area to the north east of the current conservation area boundary is open space which is visually connected to the existing conservation area and leads to the tow path and canal and a definable boundary."

NPPF, paragraphs 133-147, states that the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. In relation to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt, the development at Lock Field would "significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt, to its considerable detriment

### 5.3.2 Lock Field is a potential community amenity

If Lock Field is removed as a development area, Northchurch Parish Council would seek to purchase this Green Belt as a community amenity for people to visit and enjoy. Residents have demonstrated a high demand for recreational and exercise areas. Northchurch Recreation Ground had to be temporarily closed due to surface damage as a result of people exercising and paths at Northchurch Common and Northchurch cricket ground have been damaged by the amount of people exercising there. The Lock Field Site would be highly valued by the local community as a nature reserve with some gravel and brick pathways to enable exercise and enjoyment of nature.

### 5.5.3 Risk of flooding

During heavy rain on 31st January 2021 and a Flood Alert on 7th February 2021. the Lock Field site was the subject of a surface water run-off flood warning. The National Flood Warning Service shows that part of the site is at Medium Risk,

meaning that each year that section has a chance of flooding between 1 and 3.3%. The proposed development will require flood prevention measures

#### 5.5.4 Impact of increased traffic flows

The Local Plan has no masterplan to assess the impact on infrastructure or traffic. Northchurch Parish Council has had more complaints from residents about road safety traffic in New Road in the vicinity of this site than anywhere else in Northchurch. Residents are fearful that traffic from the Lock Field site will increase the likelihood of a pedestrian being injured. Vehicles often speed down the hill towards the canal bridge. The canal bridge is the primary cause of danger and it is just above the bridge that traffic will enter and leave the estate. It is not possible to prevent these additional vehicles adding to what is already a very dangerous location.

The Transport Study proposes moving the stop line on the north of the single-track bridge up the hill beyond the new Lock Field access road; and lengthening the footpath on the south side. This would lengthen the single-track section over the canal bridge and cause further congestion on either side of the bridge.

In 2017, a development company circulated proposals for a residential development on Lock Field. At the time, the primary concern for residents was the danger from road traffic leaving the estate by the canal bridge. The canal bridge is only wide enough for one vehicle. Private houses on either side of the canal prevent any widening. The pavement outside the school is very narrow and lined on both sides by parked cars. The narrow pavement gives little room for error and parents with buggies are forced into the road, particularly by the canal bridge. Cars approaching from either side, sometimes accelerate to get through the gap first. An unsupervised child crossing the road will appear from between parked cars and give an approaching driver very little time to brake. At this point, many drivers are accelerating towards the canal bridge with eyes focussed on approaching traffic. To protect children, Northchurch Parish Council pay for a crossing patrol.

#### 5.5.5 Impact on air quality

According to the 2020 Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth Interim Sustainability Appraisal Report Appendices: “The main source of air pollution within Dacorum Borough is generated from road traffic”

The section of Northchurch High Street running from St. Marys School to Darrs lane is one of three areas in Dacorum identified as vulnerable to pollution from nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). This stretch of road is narrow and the tall houses trap NO<sub>2</sub> from queueing vehicles. Although the air quality has improved in the past two years, any increase in traffic from additional residential developments may make the problem return. The main users of this part of the High Street are junior school children and the elderly who are both particularly vulnerable to lung damage.

Northchurch has a high percentage of elderly residents: about 30% are aged over 60. In February 2021, Asthma UK and the British Lung Foundation published a new report explaining the health risks:

“Exposure to air pollution increases the chance of a person dying early, developing lung cancer and cardiovascular disease. Emerging research has even shown links with air pollution and cognitive decline, including dementia.<sup>5</sup>”

The report revealed that 59% of older people are living in areas where fine particulate matter (PM2.5), the most worrying type of pollution that can penetrate deep into the lungs, is above the levels recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO).

In conclusion the air pollution caused by increased vehicle journeys is likely to cause significant harm to the health of Northchurch residents, particularly to the young and old.

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

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted Other Sites  
 comment**

**Included files**

**Title**

Berkhamsted

**ID**

EGS15157

**Person ID**

1270945

**Full Name**

**Organisation Details**

NORTHCHURCH PARISH COUNCIL

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

Yes

**Proposal & Sites  
 Berkhamsted comment**

Developers own this 1.48-acre site and have planning consent for a retail food store, 30 flats and a carpark. However, they no longer wish to build a retail store on this site and Berkhamsted already has three, large, retail food stores. This site could provide many low-cost residential apartments, like the adjacent Turner Court Apartments, with a small grocery store below. Unlike a retail store, which would attract many out-of-town shoppers in cars, residential apartments would provide low-cost accommodation, that local people could afford, within walking distance on level ground of the town centre and train station. Improving the canal path would encourage residents to make that journey on foot. In contrast, the proposed developments in Darrs Lane and shooters Way encourage car journeys. This site should be included in the Local Plan as suitable for residential development.

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15255
<b>Person ID</b>	1262809
<b>Full Name</b>	JUDITH HONOUR
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	No
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	I am writing to express my extreme concern and disagreement regarding the proposed new housing, sports centre and school developments planned for Berkhamsted. I have lived in Berkhamsted for 54 years and have seen the huge expansion of Berkhamsted over this time and am totally distraught at all of the new development proposals planned. Having witnessed the recent Bearoe Park development and the affect this has had on the local roads and the crowding this has created, it is really upsetting to hear of new developments which will build on our beautiful green fields, many of which I have regularly gone for lovely countryside walks across.



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

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

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

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

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15261

**Person ID** 1271090

**Full Name** FRANCES GRAY

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

**Yes / No** Yes

\* Yes

\* No

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

I am writing to object to the planning proposed in Northchurch. I have been a resident in Peters Place for over 30 years and do not want all that I enjoy to be spoilt. I use the Tesco Express on High Street South just off Darrs Lane) for my daily shop which could not cope with the increased volume of residents, let alone the increased number of cars trying to park and accessing the junction with A4251. I walk everywhere and that area would become a dangerous area for me to use and a far from enjoyable experience. Also any proposed housing in the Canal Fields off New Road would increase the traffic over the canal bridge (it is old and single traffic only) plus the T-junction outside St Mary's School would become an accident zone. Again this is an area that I have accessed to enjoy a walk along the Canal.

**Yes / No**

\* Yes

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15306
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b>Bk06: East of Darrs Lane</b></p> <p><b>Bk08: Rossway Farm (land between Shootersway and A41)</b></p> <p>Bk06 and Bk08 fall within the wider setting of a number of designated heritage assets and therefore development here has the potential to impact on the significance of these through a change in their settings. These include the Hertfordshire Grim's Ditch: 210 metre long section immediately north west of Woodcock Hall (scheduled monument), and The Old Cottage opposite Darrs Lane) (Grade II listed building). While development here may be feasible, given the sensitive nature of these sites, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required prior to allocation to confirm their suitability, to determine their extent and capacity, and to inform any development criteria that may be required in order to avoid or mitigate any harm identified.</p> <p>Given the scale and relative complexity of development proposed, we strongly advise that a masterplanning exercise / Concept Framework is carried out prior to a planning application being submitted and determined. This work should be informed by and reflect the findings of the detailed HIA, and this should be stipulated in policy.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15307
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk09: Bank Mill Lane</b> This allocation is situated adjacent to the Berkhamsted Conservation Area which includes three Grade II listed buildings (including Lock Keepers Cottage, and The Old Cottage). While development here may be feasible, given the sensitive nature of the site, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required prior to allocation to confirm its suitability, to determine its extent and capacity, and to inform any development criteria that may be required in order to avoid or mitigate any harm identified.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15308
<b>Person ID</b>	1250151

<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Marsh
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk12: Berkhamsted Civic Centre and Land to the Rear oh High Street</b> This allocation is adjacent to the Berkhamstead Conservation Area which includes 69 Grade II, 5 Grade II*, and one Grade I listed buildings. While development here appears feasible, given the sensitive nature of the site, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required prior to allocation to confirm its suitability, to determine its extent and capacity, and to inform any development criteria that may be required in order to avoid or mitigate any harm identified.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15318
<b>Person ID</b>	1271123
<b>Full Name</b>	Mr & Mrs c/o Strutt Parker Mr & Mrs A Lloyd & Mr R Dunbavand
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes	

* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	<p>I write on behalf of my respective clients Mr and Mrs A Lloyd and Mr Robin Dunbavand in respect of Dacorum Council's current consultation on the Emerging Strategy for Growth (2020 – 2038). This also follows email correspondence between my clients and the planning department (name removed) last year, where it was recommended that they complete the Council's Call for Sites Forms and submit them for consideration as part of the Draft Plan public consultation process. Accordingly, please find attached to this letter two completed Call for Sites forms and supporting plans.</p> <p>While our client supports the Berkhamsted delivery strategy we consider that the proposed allocation land East of Darrs Lane, which is supported, could be expanded to include our clients land, land West of Darrs Lane, which could potentially increase the future housing growth from 2,200 new dwellings to 2,350.</p> <p>We have set out more site specific commentary in respect of our clients sites in the accompanying Call for Sites forms which we would be grateful if you will take into consideration as part of the current consultation exercise. I would be grateful if you would ensure that I am added to your consultation contact list and notified of any further progress in respect of the emerging local plan. Should you have any questions in respect of the enclosed or our representations please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
<b>Included files</b>	<a href="#">Mr &amp; Mrs A lloyd &amp; Mr Dunbavand - Call for sites</a>
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15366
<b>Person ID</b>	1271229
<b>Full Name</b>	B J LLOYD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>I have seen the plans to build 200 new houses and a school on the fields off Darrs Lane and Bell Lane with access from Shootersway. I consider this to be far too densely populated and will create a lot more cars using Darrs Lane and Durrants Lane. Darrs Lane is much too narrow for so much extra traffic and widening it would destroy the ancient hedgerow.</p> <p>With so many new homes, there seems to be no provision for communal play areas for children, although the gardens in such an estate will be tiny.</p> <p>It has been suggested that Bell Lane could be blocked off for motor traffic near the top and bottom after the last houses and it could then be used for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15367
<b>Person ID</b>	1271229
<b>Full Name</b>	B J LLOYD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p>Lock Field proposals. The access on to New Road would be extremely dangerous for pedestrians, especially those with push-chairs and young children, being close to the primary school. The road is only a single lane road above the canal and gets very congested now and also the footpath is very narrow.</p>

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15486
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><b><u>South Berkhamsted Growth Area</u></b></p> <p><i>Bk01 – Land south of Berkhamsted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site will make the largest contribution to Policy SP21 Delivering growth in South Berkhamsted, however it is physically separated from most of the other small site allocations, which means that the other sites are less likely to support the services and facilities that are to be provided on</li> <li>We therefore contend that the allocation of this site would be made more sustainable and provide greater community benefit if Land east of Berkhamsted was also allocated through the Dacorum Local A larger allocation in this location would support:</li> </ul>

The creation of new sports club facilities for Berkhamsted with comprehensive pitch and sports infrastructure provision, including a sports centre, in a single sustainable location which would ensure green space is retained between Berkhamsted and Bourne End The new facilities will allow existing clubs to grow and thrive providing more opportunities for existing and future residents of Berkhamsted to have access to these facilities which are recognised as being critical for people's mental and physical wellbeing.

A direct link through the sites to the A41, removing traffic from the already congested town centre

Construct a new primary school and if required, provide land for a secondary school

Greater provision of SANG to mitigate the impact of recreation on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC

Provision of a country park which could be accessed by all

Higher levels of housing provision across mixed tenures and sizes reflecting Berkhamsted's and the District's diverse population, in one of Dacorum's most sustainable settlements, delivered through a comprehensive masterplan

Potential for improved public transport connectivity to the site through a comprehensive strategy as opposed to a series of piecemeal developments bolted on to existing infrastructure.

**Yes / No**

\* **Yes**

\* **No**

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15487

**Person ID** 1271381

**Full Name** Alison Walker

**Organisation Details** Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects



<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Bk02, Bk03, Bk04 and Bk10 Cluster</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cluster of four sites (Bk02, Bk03, Bk04 and Bk10) to the western end of the growth area are all located some distance from the town centre, with poor accessibility by public transport as well as walking and cycling owing to the gradient. These sites are also some distance from the main allocation (850 dwellings at Bk01) which means they will be unable to benefit from any services and facilities that may be provided as part of the overall delivery of growth in South Berkhamsted.</li> <li>This indicates that the development of these sites is likely to perpetuate unsustainable modes of travel and therefore exacerbate issues of congestion, air quality, and climate change in Berkhamsted as well as not supporting health and wellbeing. This means that they cannot be considered to contribute in a positive way to the vision of sustainable development.</li> <li>Furthermore the redevelopment of Haslam Playing Fields and the British Film Institute will lead to the removal of playing fields and the loss of employment land respectively which will result in negative effects on SA objectives Sustainable Prosperity, Employment and Skills, and Health and Wellbeing</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15488

<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Bk02 - British Film Institute</i> 1.1 The site is previously developed land which means that it scores slightly more favourably than many of the greenfield sites on a number of environmental sustainability objectives such as biodiversity, soils and landscape; however these are balanced by negative economic sustainability effects which are likely to arise from the loss of employment provision at the British Film Institute.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15489
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Bk03 - Haslam Playing Fields</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The re-location of the playing fields to Haresfoot Campus (through policy Cy04) which is south of the A41 will result in them being located in a less accessible location and contribute further to unsustainable travel patterns and may negatively impact on health and wellbeing</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15490
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Bk04 – Land between Hanbury’s and A41</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site does not benefit from any direct road access, so access is dependent on adjoining sites. Policy Bk04 suggests access from Bk03 Haslam Playing Fields. Any delay in that site coming forward will impact on the deliverability of BK04</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b>	

* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15491
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b>	Yes
* Yes	
* No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Bk09 - Bank Mill Lane</i></p> <p>1.1 The Aecom Site Assessment recognises that the site at Bank Mill Lane has major constraints including the River Bulbourne and its floodplains running through the centre of the site and its location within the Berkhamsted Conservation Area. It is however in a more sustainable location than several of the other proposed South Berkhamsted allocations with better connectivity to the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If Land east of Berkhamsted was allocated, Bank Mill Lane would have easy access to the services and facilities that would be provided as part of that development. This would make the allocation of Bank Mill Lane more sustainable as residents would be able to access the country park which would be located to the east of this site</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b>	
* Yes	
* No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15492
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Bk05 - Land adjacent to Blegberry Gardens</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to the concerns raised above, the fact that the Bk05 site is susceptible to surface water flooding in its present greenfield state should lead to the conclusion that a development allocation would likely result in significant negative effects in terms of Flood Risk, however the site was scored as uncertain effects</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15493
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381

<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<p><i>Bk06 - Land East of Darrs Lane</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The vision for this site is unclear within the Emerging Local Plan. The 'Key Developments in Berkhamsted' diagram on page 223 of the Draft Plan indicates housing development on land to the east of Bell Lane, however the policy indicates that this will be delivered as SANG and the SA suggests it may even be a country</li> <li>The SA also credits this site as having the potential for a new secondary school and local centre, however there is no policy requirement for a local centre; and the provision of land for a secondary school does not guarantee that it will actually be delivered nor any timeframe for</li> <li>The capacity of this site to provide a country park is questionable given its small size. Furthermore, the current environment as an agricultural field that will in time become surrounded on three sides by housing will make effective delivery of a country park difficult to achieve. This is the only site in Berkhamsted where the SA considers the opportunity for a new country park, which demonstrates an inconsistency with Land east of Berkhamsted, which actually has the capacity to provide a much larger country park along the River Bulbourne as well as a primary school and if required land for a secondary school, together with a range of other community benefits</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted

<b>ID</b>	EGS15494
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<i>Bk08 - Land at Rossway Farm (Between Shootersway and A41)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites abutting the A41 are all required to investigate potential noise, air and light pollution and identify appropriate mitigation. This indicates that there are likely to be environmental health impacts arising from developing so close to the A41. Any buffer that may be required along the A41 may restrict the developable area of the site</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15531
<b>Person ID</b>	1263124
<b>Full Name</b>	Andrew Criddle
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	Therefore, proposals for developments such as that by Thakeham at Bulbourne Cross (in partnership with the Berkhamsted Sports Grounds Charity Association) which incorporates a consolidated and sustainable new multi-facility sporting hub should be encouraged and given preference. Other appropriate developments should also be directed to seek ways of incorporating such sporting facilities within their plans, especially where this would meet local demand.
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15535
<b>Person ID</b>	1271381
<b>Full Name</b>	Alison Walker
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Associate Director of Strategic/Large Projects Thakeham Homes
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land east of Berkhamsted is promoted by our clients, Thakeham, as Bulbourne Cross. Bulbourne Cross is a new sustainable neighbourhood comprising circa 1,000 homes, circa 32 acre sports hub, a primary school, a country park and a village centre including shops, offices, a community hub and village green with pavilion and supporting infrastructure</li> </ul>



- As has been clearly demonstrated through the critique of the proposed allocations and comparison to Land east of Berkhamsted as set out in Section Two and **Appendix One**, the site represents a sustainable location for an extension to the town. The proposed development would provide significant benefits which can only be delivered through a development of a greater scale than proposed through the piecemeal approach to allocations that the Council currently proposes. The benefits of the vision for Bulbourne Cross are set out below and supported by the accompanying Evolution
- As shown in the Evolution Document Bulbourne Cross will deliver:
  - Open space of circa 9ha (145.5 acres) which includes:
    - Circa 8ha (19.3 acres) Country Park
    - Circa 8 ha (31.6 acres) of sports club facilities for the BSGCA
  - A new primary school with integrated early years provisions with ability to accommodate special education needs
  - Village centre to include shops, offices and a community hub
  - Transport hub adjacent to the main local village centre
  - Approximately 1000 homes
  - Pedestrian and cycle routes within the site and linking to the wider area
    - A new access from the site on to the A4251 London Road (to north) and A41 (to south).
  - Thakeham has developed well designed, energy efficient homes across the South of England and proposes around 1,000 new homes here, of which 40% will be affordable homes for local people, managed by a Housing Association for rent or shared The development will provide a range of 1 – 5 bed houses, apartments and bungalows.
  - The BSGCA (Berkhamsted Sports Ground Charitable Association) is at the heart of sports in Berkhamsted, supporting a range of groups such as Berkhamsted Cricket Club, Berkhamsted Tennis and Squash Club, Berkhamsted Raiders Community Football Club and Berkhamsted Rugby Club. BSGCA has jointly prepared the vision for Bulbourne

Cross with Thakeham to ensure the necessary supporting infrastructure is provided alongside new homes at Berkhamsted.

- The sports facilities to be provided on site include circa 32 acres of land for new sports provision including:
- A new full sized hybrid pitch with stadium for Berkhamsted Football Club, designed to enable BFC to gain promotion and meet FA Step 2/3 standards;
- Five new youth pitches for 94 youth teams at Berkhamsted Raiders Community Football Club;
- A new full size multi-use pitch;
- A new rugby pitch for Berkhamsted Rugby Club;
- New indoor 'double-height' space for Berkhamsted Gymnastics Club;
- New indoor members facilities for Berkhamsted Football Club, including a members bar/clubroom and committee room space;
- A new community bar, with club space, together with meeting/training rooms;
- Indoor changing rooms for different age groups and match officials;
- New indoor event space for community hire;
- Pedestrian and cycle links into the sports areas to encourage sustainable travel;
- 400 car parking spaces to cater for larger crowds on match days, accessed directly off the A41, reducing traffic in Berkhamsted Town

1.7 A new village centre will provide a community hub offering a range of community run shops, restaurant/café and co-working office/meeting facilities that will create opportunities for groups to meet and engage with one another and provide a heart to the community. A village green area with play equipment and games areas will be linked to the wider development through cycle links and footpaths. Community allotments, a primary school, alongside the new sporting facilities for existing Berkhamsted sports clubs, will help to create a new, supported community.

- The site landscaping will provide a 20% Biodiversity Net Gain, including new wildlife habitats, varied planting, new green spaces and water features alongside open space and play space. This will include initiatives across the development, such as bird and bat boxes built into homes, hedgehog hotels and routes through gardens alongside retaining trees and enhancing hedgerows as habitats. As detailed in the Evolution Document, Thakeham is committed to exceeding this level of Biodiversity Net Gain at Bulbourne Cross.

- A separated pedestrian and cycle route will provide safe routes through the development to the new village centre, sports clubs, primary school, country park and on to Berkhamsted town centre and railway station (a 9 minute cycle ride from the

proposed village centre). These routes will also create a series of 5k and 10k circular running routes around the green spaces and country park.

- To help encourage more cycle use, crossings will be prioritised at junctions and a network of green corridors, commons and pocket parks will create long, safe routes. Furthermore, electric cycle charging points will be provided at homes and at key Thakeham will also provide incentives for cycle ownership, bike maintenance stations and easy cycle storage at each home.
- Electric vehicle support is important, with fast electric vehicle and cycle charging points and easily accessible secure storage. The site will create new access on to the A4251 London Road (to north) and A41 (to south), avoiding extra traffic needing to go through the centre of town compared to allocated sites in the south and west of Berkhamsted. A transport hub will also be delivered adjacent to the main local village centre for bus connections, opportunity for e-bus charging and e-car
- From 2025, all Thakeham homes will be carbon-neutral in production, and carbon-zero in lifetime use. Bulbourne Cross would be at the forefront of this with measures such as air-source or ground-source heat pumps, grey water recycling, solar panels and highly efficient communal heat networks amongst
- As a significant housebuilder, Thakeham can deliver homes within the first five years of the Local Plan being adopted. It is estimated that around 250 homes per annum can be delivered at peak, leading to a construction programme of eight years including infrastructure works. Thakeham will agree a timetable for early delivery of facilities to support the new
- The site was assessed under site number 17/17a in the Site Assessment Study which supports the Local Plan. In the light of the vision for the development and the additional technical work which has been undertaken by Thakeham and its consultant team to inform the promotion of the site, we respond to the matters raised in the Site Schedules below to provide further clarity to assist in the Council's future assessment of the site.

### **Transport**

Whilst we support the assessment's conclusion that the site benefits from several points of connection on to the local road network and the good access to public transport, this fails to take account of the significant benefits the scheme could deliver. In addition to the provision of services and facilities on site acknowledged by the

Council, Bulbourne Cross would benefit from a direct access on to the A41 and, with the potential for interconnectivity with site Bk01, has the potential to draw traffic away from the congested town centre. With the services and facilities which would be on offer within the site itself and the potential for a more comprehensive approach to be taken to public transport and pedestrian/cycle connection improvements alongside Bk01, this has the potential to provide further enhancement to address the current issues experienced by the town both in terms of traffic and air quality. The development would also deliver a transport hub adjacent to the main local village centre for bus connections, opportunity for e-bus charging and e-car club.

**Flooding** As noted through the assessment, part of the wider site intersects Flood Zone 3. As clearly demonstrated in the accompanying Vision Document, no built development would be proposed in this area with all residential development proposed within areas identified as Flood Zone 1. Accordingly no Exception Test would be required. Initial technical work has been undertaken to inform the masterplanning work in respect of flood risk and a detailed Flood Risk Assessment would be prepared in support of any future planning application.

**Green Belt** The Council has acknowledged that exceptional circumstances exist which require the release of Green Belt in order to meet the Borough's housing needs. As acknowledged in the assessment, part of the site is part of a sub-area that would not compromise the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes. The proposed development has been designed in order to create a new defensible boundary to the Green Belt which would minimise impacts on the Green Belt purposes. This statement is accompanied by a Green Belt Report prepared by Davies Landscape Architects which concludes the proposed development will provide a contained extension within a well- defined new threshold and defensible boundary to Berkhamsted, and remain spatially and visually separated from Hemel Hempstead. Whilst the removal of the proposed development site from the Green Belt would reduce the contribution of some of the parcels localised contribution, it would not weaken the wider Green Belt gap between Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead.

#### **Agricultural land quality grade**

We note that the site is identified as Grade 3 agricultural land. This is the same classification as all sites around Berkhamsted where the Council has accepted loss of agricultural land is required in order to meet housing needs and to ensure a sustainable distribution of growth.

#### **Potential land use based on neighbouring uses**

We support the assessment's recommendation that the site would support a mix of uses. Such a mix of uses is critical to the delivery of the Council's vision for the Plan period and the accompanying Vision Document demonstrates how Bulbourne Cross will assist in achieving this vision.

As noted earlier in this Statement, by allocating larger sites there is greater potential for a broad range of housing types to be accommodated as opposed to a series of smaller allocations.

Thakeham has developed well designed, energy efficient homes across the South of England and proposes around 1,000 new homes here, of which 40% will be affordable homes for local people, managed by a Housing Association for rent or shared ownership. The development will provide a range of 1 – 5 bed houses, apartments and bungalows.

**Heritage assets** As demonstrated by the accompanying Vision Document, the proposed development has considered the surrounding heritage assets and due regard will be had to the settings of these buildings and areas as part of the more detailed proposals as they evolve. Appropriate further investigation in respect of heritage and archaeology would be undertaken at an appropriate time.

### **Landscape and Visual Impact**

As noted by the assessment, the site is not within the Chilterns AONB but due to the proximity of the northern part of the site, it may impact the setting of the Chilterns AONB. It is important to also acknowledge that a number of the allocations proposed by the Council itself are in fact significantly closer to the AONB and have still been considered acceptable. This submission is accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Assessment prepared by Davies Landscape Architects which concludes that the proposals, by their very nature and scale, will result in a permanent change in character from a rural field to new urban development. The assessment however has concluded that in terms of its visual influence and expectations within the locality the proposed development has to be considered within its immediate setting and its influence on the character of the settlement edge of Berkhamsted.

The site does not contribute to the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB or influence the higher quality experiences associated with the designation. In terms of landscape the effects are restricted to the potential view and not the character or its rural setting, the boundary of which is defined by the railway line and transport corridors.

### **Economic development potential**

In addition to the mixed uses proposed on site which would provide employment opportunities within the site itself, as a result of the transport strategy proposed for Bulbourne Cross residents would benefit from good connectivity to existing employment opportunities through a range of means. The delivery of new homes would also have economic benefits through increased spending in the local area by new residents and through construction employment for the development itself.

**Spatial Opportunities and Constraints – local character and history** The assessment's conclusions were based on the development of the entirety of the site. The quantum and distribution of development shown in the Vision Document has been carefully considered to respond to the site constraints and opportunities and to ensure the distinctive nature of Berkhamsted and Bourne End are maintained.

### **Spatial Opportunities and Constraints – defensible boundary potential**

We support the conclusions that the site benefits from strong defensible boundaries to the north and south. A new defensible boundary will be created on the eastern boundary forming a new edge to the settlement.

### **Overall site conclusion**

Through the above assessment and the accompanying information to support this submission it has been clearly demonstrated that there are no major constraints to the development of the site which cannot be overcome by technical work and/or sensitive design. The development of Bulbourne Cross would deliver significant social, economic and environmental benefits. These benefits are considered to be substantially greater than those which would be delivered by the Council's current proposed strategy for development.

- In the light of the above it has been clearly demonstrated that Land east of Berkhamsted should be allocated for development. To assist in the Council's preparation of the next iteration of the Local Plan, suggested policy wording for the allocation is set out below.

**Size (Hectares)**

92.0ha

**Allocated for (key development and land use requirements)**

Around 1,000 dwellings subject to masterplanning;

Reservation of land for creation of new sporting facilities ;

A country park;

Public open space;

A new local centre; and

·A primary school.

**Site-specific requirements**

**Urban Design Principles:**

- The site will be brought forward with a masterplan showing a comprehensive phasing programme for development.
- Design codes will be developed alongside the preparation of any outline planning application and agreed by means of condition.

**Access, Highways, and Sustainable Transport:**

- Primary access to be provided via London Road.
- New highway infrastructure on the site to connect to the boundary of the adjoining site Bk01 – South of Berkhamsted to facilitate connectivity.

**Social and Community:**

- A new local centre should include new community facilities to serve the day-to-day needs of new and existing residents.
- Provide land for and deliver a new 2FE primary school.

### **Environmental Health:**

- Investigate potential noise, air and light pollution impacts arising from the A41 and identify appropriate mitigation measures as necessary.

### **Landscape Considerations:**

- Create a new landscape framework to contain the new development and limit the impact on the wider landscape, including the Chilterns AONB to include:
  - A new woodland along the proposed eastern boundary of the southern site – to strengthen and provide a durable boundary;
  - A new native tree belt encompassing the existing hedgerow along the PRow to the south – to strengthen and provide a durable boundary;
  - The creation of a new Country Park to the east of the northern section of the Proposed Site with close intervisibility and access to the Grand Union Canal – to create biodiversity and recreational opportunities; and
  - A well - defined, clear boundary between the development area and the Country
- As part of delivering a net gain in biodiversity, utilise new landscape mitigation measures and structure to connect at the boundary of the site, with green corridors in the area, including the wildlife site on the south western edge of the site (within SS1 Bk01 –South of Berkhamsted)

- Deliver Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) on-site to offset potential adverse effects on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC arising from recreational pressure. The scale and form of this SANG will need to be agreed with Natural England in advance of the submission of an outline planning
- Ensure development of the site conserves the historic core of Bourne End
- Development must conserve and where possible enhance the setting of the Grade 2 listed Church of St John the Evangelist at the north-eastern corner of the site.
- Archaeological investigations required to be undertaken pre-construction.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - Bulbourne Cross Evolution Document - Low Res.pdf \(1\)](#)  
[Thakeham homes - Alison Walker - Agent Turley - Dacorum Local Plan \(2020-2038\) Emerging Strategy for Growth Consultation\\_Redacted.pdf](#)  
[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - DLA.AONB Technical Note.pdf](#)  
[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - DLA.Green Belt Technical Note.pdf](#)  
[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - DLA.Landscape and Visual Appraisal LOW RES.pdf](#)  
[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - Glanville - Initial Transport Appraisal.pdf](#)  
[Thakeham Homes - Alison Walker - MPC Statement of Community Involvement.pdf](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15540

**Person ID** 1271479

**Full Name** MS JANE HARRISON

**Organisation Details**

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**



<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These representations have been prepared by Barton Willmore LLP on behalf of Retirement Villages, who are promoting a site for an extra care development as an extension to the existing retirement housing at Castle Village, The site is to the south of the existing Village (see Site Location Plan (<b>Appendix A</b>)) and could accommodate in the region of 60 new extra care dwellings.</li>   <li>• The site, along with the existing Castle Village, is currently in the Green Belt, immediately to the north of the existing settlement boundary of These representations propose the removal of the site from the Green Belt in order to facilitate the development.</li>   <li>• This is the first time the site has been promoted to Dacorum Borough Council (DBC) for inclusion within the emerging Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2038).</li>   <li>• These representations are submitted in respect of the DBC Local Plan (2020-2038) Emerging Strategy for Growth which we understand, based on the Sustainability Appraisal, to be a consultation under Regulation 18 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations The following sections provide commentary on the importance of the Council meeting the need figure for homes, including older persons homes, in order to deliver a Local Plan that is “sound” and supports sustainable development. In this regard, Section 7 of these representations express the importance of allocating the Site in order for DBC to demonstrate that every effort has been made to meet its housing needs for older persons accommodation across the Borough.</li>   <li>• These representations demonstrate that the Site is “suitable”, “available”, “deliverable” and therefore “developable”. The suitability of the Site for development is supported by the Landscape, Visual and Green Belt Appraisal (prepared by Barton Willmore, dated February 2021). The site is currently in the ownership of Retirement Villages and, therefore, available for The site is deliverable as an extension to Castle Village and would be able to benefit from existing infrastructure, services and facilities. The allocation of the site for extra care housing would make a meaningful and essential contribution towards meeting housing needs in full within DBC.</li>   <li>• Retirement Villages is a specialist developer and operator of retirement and care Its origins can be found in the principles of retirement development in America, which inspired the development of Elmbridge Village in Cranleigh,</li> </ul>

Surrey in 1981. Elmbridge Village is believed to be the first privately built and funded retirement community of its type in the UK.

i) Suitability of the Site

- The Site comprises an eastern and western field which are both currently used for informal recreational purposes associated with Castle The eastern field is being promoted as a suitable site to accommodate 60 extra care units as an extension to the existing Castle Village. The western field would remain undeveloped with locally-characteristic landscaping to assimilate the development into the landscape, enhance biodiversity and to facilitate informal recreational use by new and existing residents.
- The Site is currently an unallocated greenfield site, located in the Green The Site does not lie within the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The AONB adjoins the Site's western boundary. The Site is positioned between the settlement boundary of Berkhamsted (to the south) and the existing Castle Village site (to the north) which was allocated as a major developed site (MDS) in the Green Belt within the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (adopted April 2004).
- Berkhamsted Town Centre is located approximately 2 kilometres walking distance from the Site (approximately 28 minutes). The areas to the south of the Site are suburban; and residential in nature, with Byways, Hunters Park, Ivy House Lane and Headland's drive being the closest neighbouring residential developments. A Transport Appraisal accompanies these representations (**Appendix C**) which provided further details in relation to access and accessibility.
- Other than the Site's location within the Green Belt and adjacent to the AONB, the Site is not considered to be constrained, insofar as:
  - It is not liable to flooding;
  - It has no strategic ecological constraints;
  - It has a suitable means of vehicular access (either via the existing Castle Village or from Gravel Path);
  - It has no evidence of pollutants; and
  - It is of a modest scale and an extension to an existing community (i.e. it is readily "deliverable" and can come forward more quickly than other strategic sites or indeed than the establishment of a new retirement community).

ii) Proposed Development

- Retirement Villages seek to bring forward an “extra care” retirement proposal on the Site, secured via an allocation for a Use Class C2 development in the emerging Local This would be an extension to the existing retirement community at Castle Village and would require an amendment to the existing Green Belt Boundary.
- At present, the existing retirement community at Castle Village is not “extra care” The existing village was created as a retirement community for the over 55s focussing on lifestyle services. However, as set out in the previous section the age profile of customers is in the mid-high 80s, whilst the average age of incoming residents is in the late 70s-early 80s.
- As a result, Retirement Villages is updating its model towards helping people live in supported independence, with a range of health and wellbeing As part of this, Retirement Villages is intending to upgrade the care offer at Castle Village through the introduction of a partner care agency within the next 2 months. This agency, a quality-assured partner to RV, would be registered with the CQC for the provision of personal care and a range of additional regulated care services. Whilst it would not be mandatory for existing residents to use the partner care agency, based on comparable experience and the presence of the partner agency on the site, RV expects the partner agency to become the provider of choice for residents.
- The partner agency will offer residents a tailored package of care according to their This will predominantly be provided to people within their own home with care staff from the partner agency able to serve multiple residents during the same shift. This will result in a reduction of trips to and from the compared with the existing situation where various agencies visiting the site for independently arranged care arrangements on an individual basis. This improved offer will align the existing site towards an “extra care” provision for which there is significant need within the Borough.
- The partner agency will be well-established by such time that the emerging Local Plan 2020- 2036 is adopted. The proposed extension to Castle Village would be able to benefit from the existing care service which is required for it to function as extra care Our client’s indicative extra care proposals for the extension to Castle Village are as follows:
  - An additional 60 extra care units of living accommodation in the form of apartments and cottages which would utilise the existing supporting services and facilities, including the existing clubhouse building;
  - All 60 extra care units would be designed to accessibility standards and care-ready, with facilities support administration, care and wellbeing services (incl. personal care agency);
  - Mostly 2-storey building forms with the potential for limited 5/3 storey element to reflect buildings within the existing village;

- The range of existing community transport options will be expanded as alternatives to private car use and ownership;
  - Areas for “Green” and “Blue” Infrastructure throughout the Site;
  - Targeting a high level of sustainability in design, construction and operation (further details within the Sustainability Statement at **Appendix D**); and
  - a biodiversity net gain across the
- 
- The occupation of the retirement village would be limited to people aged 65+ provided with a package of care and support The development would serve a mainly local market.

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

[App B -32449 Site Context Photographs.pdf](#)  
[Appendix A 32449 RG-P-001 Site Plan-A3.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 - LVGBA - Appx1 - LCA extracts.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-01 Site Context Plan-A1.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-02 Topography Plan-A1.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-03 Site Appraisal Plan-A3.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-04 Visual Appraisal Plan-A1.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-05 Landscape Character Plan-A1.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 LN-LP-06 Landscape Visual and Green Belt Opportunities and Constraints Plan Rev A-A3.pdf](#)  
[App B -210226 - 32449 - Castle Village Berkhamsted - LVGBA - final.pdf](#)  
[Appendix C 2101-027 Transport Appraisal 210226.pdf](#)  
[Appendix D 32449 A5 P2a MH 210226 Sustainability Statement FINAL.pdf](#)  
[Appendix E 32449 LN-LP-08A Green Belt Boundary Existing and Proposed Revision Plan-A3.pdf](#)  
[App B -32449 Site Appraisal Photographs.pdf](#)

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15544

**Person ID** 1271479

**Full Name** MS JANE HARRISON

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is clear that the emerging Local Plan underpinned by evidence within the SMHA 2016, LHNA 2020 identify an increasing demand for older peoples housing, but policies within the emerging Plan do not go far enough in addressing this need. It is also clear that DBC has not accurately reflected the need for older persons housing arising across the whole Plan Period (2020-2038), instead, only considering need arising 2020-2036. The DBC strategy which seeks to entirely address needs within growth area sites is These sites will deliver in the medium to long term and cannot be relied upon to meet the considerable existing unmet needs which will continue to rise in the early part of the Plan Period.</li> <li>There is an opportunity now for DBC to rectify the short comings of the emerging Local Plan and its supporting evidence</li> <li>Allocating Retirement Villages' site as an extension to the south of Castle Village for approximately 60 Extra Care (Use Class C2) dwellings will ensure delivery in the early part of the Plan Period and will assist the Council in starting to address the existing shortcomings of the Plan</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15550
<b>Person ID</b>	1271479
<b>Full Name</b>	MS JANE HARRISON

<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DBC must give greater consideration to the older persons housing crisis within the Borough and the surrounding West Hertfordshire A range of sites to deliver specialist housing for older people should be allocated within the Plan to ensure that this need is effectively met throughout the Plan Period.</li> <li>• The eastern part of Retirement Village’s site to the north of Berkhamsted could be delivered for approximately 60 Extra Care units. This would be an extension to the existing retirement community at Castle The site is deliverable in landscape and visual terms and offers the opportunity to enhance the setting of the AONB. The Site could be removed from the Green Belt with very limited harm to the purposes of the Green Belt in this location.</li> <li>• Section 9 of these representations concludes that there are other policies contained within the emerging Local Plan which should be removed or amended to improve its soundness /</li> <li>• These representations have sought to provide helpful comments on the emerging Plan at Regulation 18 stage. We trust these will be fully considered by DBC as they look towards the preparation of the Regulation 19 consultation draft</li> </ul>
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15622

<b>Person ID</b>	1154177
<b>Full Name</b>	Nikki Hamilton
<b>Organisation Details</b>	Development Co-ordinator Herts & Middlesex Badger Group
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	Berkhampstead: Interim sites are not an issue.  Northchurch sites x 2 near Bell Lane - no issues in regards to protected species. Site inbetween Shootersway and A41 - no issue re badgers. Site that runs to the east from Ashlyn's Care Home - no major issues although there is a badger run that runs the entire length of the site which would need investigating and mitigating if required and the drive way north of the site in between the school and site is ideal habitat for ground nesting birds and bio diversity was observed. Site near cemetery would need to incorporate corridors and preferably a meadow/green space for bio diversity and the protected species that live adjacent to the site, otherwise you would be removing any foraging ground and forcing them onto the A416 etcetera.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15648
<b>Person ID</b>	1271974
<b>Full Name</b>	EMILY FORD
<b>Organisation Details</b>	SENIOR PLANNER

<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * <b>Yes</b> * <b>No</b>	Yes
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites</b> <b>Berkhamsted comment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support the allocation of Bk08 in the draft Local This section of our representations provides a description of the Site and Croudace’s emerging development proposals for Land at Rossway Farm, Shootersway. The representations are also supported by a Vision Document which is enclosed at <b>Appendix 2</b>. The Vision Document sets out the key components proposed for a new residential community on the Site as part of the wider West Berkhamsted Growth Area. The objective is to create a community that is integrated with and well connected to Berkhamsted, living within a healthy green environment where everyone has direct access to open space, walking/cycling routes, and public transport connections.</li> <li>• The Site comprises approximately 47ha of arable land located to the west of Berkhamsted, bordered by hedgerows and trees. Existing access to the Site is via Shootersway. Areas of woodland are present in the north-west and east of the Site as well as adjacent to the Public Right of Way which crosses the Site from Shootersway to the A41 and runs along the southern site boundary.</li> <li>• The Site is bordered to the north and east by Shootersway and the south and west by the A41. To the north-west, a small number of residential dwellings are present, including Grade II listed The Old Cottage located approximately 100m from the site</li> <li>• Beyond Shootersway lies residential development currently being built out by Taylor Wimpey to the south of Egerton-Rothesay School and new playing fields located off Durrants Lane as well as the southern boundary of Growth Area BK06 (East of Darrs Lane). In addition, Growth Area Bk05 (Blegberry Gardens) is located immediately to the east of the</li> <li>• The Chilterns AONB is located to the north-west of the</li> </ul>



- The Site is considered suitable for the uses allocated in draft Policy SP20, namely around 200 dwellings and public open space. The following section provides a summary of the technical evidence prepared by Croudace's consultant team including in response to the site-specific requirements identified in relation to Growth Area Bk08 (pages 308-9 of the Local Plan).

#### Access, Highways and Sustainable Transport

- Existing access to the Site is via Shootersway, to the north of the hedgerow which subdivides the site.
- A Transport Feasibility Report has been prepared by Calibro to inform the preparation of development proposals for the Site and is provided at **Appendix 4**. The Feasibility Report has been informed following review of the Berkhamsted and Tring Sustainable Transport Study prepared to support the draft Local Plan consultation which in the case of Berkhamsted, identifies the main challenges to be addressed to support the development of Growth Areas in the town as a need to provide enhanced pedestrian and cycle infrastructure (Spatial Package Berkhamsted 1) as well as the improvement of bus services for this part of the town.
- The supporting Transport Feasibility Report considers the Site's geographical location in the context of the available transport networks, pedestrian and cycle connectivity and in particular its proximity to key local amenities, including local employment. Based on the analysis presented it confirms that potential development of the Site and associated proposed measures to enhance connectivity would afford residents with the opportunity to access a range of amenities by several non-car travel modes in line with the objectives of sustainable travel policies, specifically paragraph 103 and 108 of the NPPF as well as draft policy DM53 of the draft Local Plan.
- A preliminary assessment of the capacity of the existing road network/junctions has also been undertaken in relation to three off site locations: Durrants Lane/High Street signalised junction, Durrants Lane / Durrants Road/Westfield Road give-way roundabout and Shootersway/Kings Road/Kingshill Way signalised. This has identified that with the development of Land at Rossway Farm the junctions along Durrants Lane would operate under their theoretical capacity with no severe residual or unacceptable impact on highways.
- The access proposals for the Site have been developed to upgrade the existing Shootersway / Durrants Lane junction to a give way roundabout designed to satisfy all current DMRB Standards whilst also allowing for the potential to divert local bus services to allow for the possible extension of routes to cover the west of the site.

- The cumulative traffic effects of the development within the wider West Berkhamsted Growth Area (Bk05 and Bk06) have also been considered in the context of capacity performance for the proposed junction to confirm the proposed roundabout would operate well under its theoretical capacity limits recognising its potential to be delivered and accommodate the planned growth in the wider
- The Transport Feasibility Report therefore concludes that future residential development of the Site would accord with sustainable transport planning policies within the NPPF and the emerging Dacorum Local Plan and identifies there are no abnormal issues related to the delivery of the Site that would prevent the ongoing positive promotion of the Site for residential

### Noise

- A desktop noise assessment undertaken by Ardent (provided at **Appendix 5**) demonstrates that the Site can be made suitable for residential development through the masterplanning exercise and the incorporation of a relatively continuous built form along southwest boundary supplemented with an acoustic screening fence of a minimum of 3m
- In this regard, noise is not a constraint to the development of the Site and appropriate mitigation can be provided through careful masterplanning of the Site, as illustrated in the submitted Vision

### Ground Conditions

- Initial site investigation work has been commissioned by Croudace to confirm the suitability of the Site for residential. The investigation undertaken has identified no significant contamination and no constraints which would inhibit development for residential purposes.
- Further site investigation work will be undertaken by Croudace to inform detailed development proposals for the

### Landscape

- A Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) and Green Belt Review has been prepared by Barton Willmore and is submitted as part of these representations at **Appendix 2**.
- As part of the Local Plan evidence base, AECOM prepared a Site Assessment Study for Dacorum Borough Council, in January Land at Rossway Farm is included within the assessment of Site 16. It is important, however, to note the extent of Site 16 is greater than the proposed allocation at Rossway Farm and includes an area to the north of Darr's Lane, which falls within the Chilterns AONB. As a result, much of the adverse commentary set out in the AECOM assessment in relation to Site 16 relates specifically to the incursion into the Chilterns AONB and the potential effect on the Chilterns AONB, which is not applicable to the assessment of this individual Site or indeed the wider West Berkhamsted Growth Area.
- The assessment of Site 16, by AECOM, positively notes that there is “limited risk of coalescence as surrounding settlements are not villages but scattered properties”; and that there are “clear defensible boundaries framing the site by the A41”.
- With regard to Landscape and Visual Impact, the AECOM assessment acknowledges part of Site 16 is not within the Chilterns AONB, but “may impact the setting of the Chilterns AONB due to its proximity”. The Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt Review submitted as part of these representations demonstrates that the effects of development on Rossway Farm would be very contained, generally being limited and confined to the Site itself and the immediate locality, with no effect on the wider landscape beyond the A41 or Shootersway, and therefore no adverse landscape effect on the Chilterns
- The LVA supporting these representations further confirms there would be no views of potential development on the Site from within the Chilterns AONB, with visibility limited to a couple of locations on the very edge of the Chilterns AONB, where partial glimpses of the upper parts of the potential development would be obtained but set within the substantial surrounding vegetation and below the existing wooded As a result, views of potential development would not be conspicuous, and the character of the views would remain unchanged, with no significant visual effect on the Chilterns AONB. There would therefore be no impact on the setting of the Chilterns AONB.
- The Green Belt Review completed by Barton Willmore assesses the potential development of the Site against Purposes 1 to 4 of the Green Belt as set out in paragraph 134 of the This concludes, in relation to Rossway Farm, that the Site makes no contribution to Purpose 1: Check the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area; no contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another; limited contribution to assisting in

the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; and no contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

- It concludes, therefore, the Site makes a very limited contribution to the purposes of Green Belt recognising the significant swathe of remaining Green Belt to the north, west and south-west of the Site which would continue to fulfil the purpose of the Green Belt, to a considerably greater extent than the Furthermore, much of the remaining extent of Green Belt is also afforded further protection being designated as the Chilterns AONB, adding to the permanence afforded to the Green Belt in the long term and beyond the plan period.
- AECOM's overall conclusions on landscape and visual impact, state that "overall, due to the extent of the site, it is judged to be potentially suitable with major constraints as a result of the potential for impacts to the AONB and its setting, and to the settlement pattern between Shootersway and Cock Grove road". Croudace challenge this conclusion for the following key
- Firstly, as demonstrated above, the proposed growth area BK08 Land at Rossway Farm does not extend into the Chilterns AONB, and development on the Site, as illustrated by the Development Concept Plan set out within the Vision Document, would not have an effect on the setting of the Chilterns
- Secondly, the Site does not extend beyond Shootersway/Cock Grove Road with development limited to the two main fields on the Therefore, potential development would be well related to the existing and proposed future settlement edge of Berkhamsted and would not impact on the settlement pattern beyond Shootersway, or in the locality of Cock Grove road.
- In conclusion and contrary to the overall findings of the AECOM Site Assessment Survey which identify Site 16 as unsuitable for development, Land at Rossway Farm does not extend into the Chilterns AONB, potential development on the Site would have no significant landscape and visual effects on the Chilterns AONB or its setting; and development of the Site would not prejudice the purposes or character of, the remaining Green Belt; such that it would not "compromise the ability of the wider Green Belt to meet its purposes".
- As such, the Site is suitable for residential development from a landscape perspective, particularly when opportunities for mitigation are taken into account as outlined within the submitted Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Green Belt

- The Site is not subject to any nature conservation designations. A Local Wildlife Site is present in close proximity to the Site, bordering the north-eastern Site
- The Site provides opportunities for enhanced biodiversity, through the retention of existing hedgerows, woodland and scattered trees and addition of new This will enable the creation of enhanced wildlife corridors within and beyond the Site, including connecting to the Local Wildlife Site.
- A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Tree Constraints and Opportunities Report have been prepared by ADAS and are provided at **Appendices 6 and 7**. These reports have identified key ecological features within the Site, specifically hedgerows, woodland and scattered They have also provided recommendations to inform the masterplanning of the Site which will ensure that there is no net loss to biodiversity and opportunities for biodiversity gains are maximised, consistent with emerging national and local policy.
- Further survey work will be undertaken to determine the presence of protected species during the appropriate seasonal windows and the findings of this work will be taken into account at the detailed design

#### Archaeology and Heritage

- The Site does not include any designated heritage assets or locally listed buildings and is not located within a Conservation
- The Site is located partially within an Area of Archaeological An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment has been undertaken by ADAS (**Appendix 8**) to identify the nature and extent of recorded archaeological resource within the site boundary and its immediate environs.
- There are two heritage assets recorded by the HHER within the These assets relate to an undated post hole and pit containing struck flint and a 19th century shaft-like pit identified during a trial trench evaluation carried out within the site boundary in 1992.

- The assessment indicates that there is a moderate to high potential for any groundworks associated with the development of the Site to impact currently unknown buried archaeological remains from the Prehistoric There is low to moderate potential for groundworks to impact currently unknown buried archaeological remains from the Romano-British to the Modern periods to survive under the Site.
- ADAS are liaising with Hertfordshire County Council to agree the scope of further archaeological investigations the results of which will be shared with DBC during the plan making Detailed masterplanning of the Site will take account of the findings of the archaeological investigations.

### Flood Risk and Drainage

- A Flood Risk and Drainage Technical Note has been prepared by Calibro to inform the masterplanning of the Site (**Appendix 9**).
- The Note identifies that the Site is considered to be at negligible risk from all sources of flooding with the exception of surface water Site-specific analysis of the risk of site surface water has been carried out by reviewing the local topography and drainage features to calculate flows from 5 catchment areas. The analysis concludes that the main part of the Site would receive flows of approximately 0.3m<sup>3</sup>/s in a 1 in 1000 year event. This could be safely managed on site through the creation of a 3m wide attenuation channel which would contain and actively manage the flow.
- A corridor through the centre of the Site would not be developed to avoid land at risk of flooding, in accordance with the sequential This has the potential to create a green link/linear park through the centre of the Site to benefit the green infrastructure strategy and bio-diversity enhancements.
- Available information suggests that the chalk bedrock below the Site will allow site surface water to be managed via Any overlying clay material is expected to be shallow.
- Further analysis of the Site will be undertaken to inform detailed This will explore opportunities to provide infiltration features through the development and particularly alongside the central channel. This area offers the potential to manage off- site flood risk and site surface water drainage whilst contributing to high-quality green infrastructure.

## Overall Suitability

- Having regard to the above, we disagree with the conclusion drawn in the Site Assessment Study prepared by AECOM that the Site (which sits within the wider context of Site 16) is unsuitable for
- The Site is evidently suitable for residential development and offers an opportunity for new homes to be provided in a sustainable location, well located to facilities and services provided within Berkhamsted, with minimal impact on the surrounding landscape and Green
- To this end, we welcome DBC's conclusion as set out at paragraph 84 of the Site Selection Topic Paper (November 2020) that the Site should be considered further as it 'would allow for a more holistic approach to considering options for growth (including reasonable alternatives) in Berkhamsted'. We support the consideration of the Site as a growth option, and taking account of the above comments in relation to landscape, feel strongly that the Site's consideration is entirely appropriate given that AECOM's assessment of the Site was flawed.
- In respect of the site assessment as part of the Sustainability Appraisal, we broadly welcome the findings in relation to the However, whilst we consider that the assessment of the Site in the Interim SA Report is broadly accurate there are some areas where amendments are needed, specifically:
  - Biodiversity: The development will be designed to take account of and retain ecological features and will also include new planting; as such, it is expected to have a positive impact on biodiversity
  - Climate Change: The development will be of a high standard of sustainability, with energy efficient buildings, SuDS and enhanced vegetation proposed alongside improvements to walking, cycling and public transport access to key facilities and Croudace are also seeking to explore the potential feasibility to provide district heating, potentially in combination with neighbouring sites. As such, it has the potential to have a positive impact on climate change.
  - Sustainable Locations: The Site is in close proximity to Berkhamsted and also in proximity to other sites proposed to be allocated for development with the West Berkhamsted Growth As such, residents will be able to access a range of facilities and amenities, both existing and provided as part of the wider growth area supported by improved pedestrian and cycle connectivity and enhanced

public transport services. To this end, the Site should be scored positively in respect of sustainable locations.

- We note the quantum of development is incorrectly This should be amended to reflect the proposed allocation of around 200 dwellings.

- A concept masterplan of how the Site could be developed, informed by key site influences, is detailed within the submitted Vision Document prepared by Carter
- The five key underpinning principles for the concept masterplan are outlined, relating to (i) creating a connected green infrastructure network, (ii) noise and air pollution mitigation, (iii) accessibility and circulation, (iv) topography and (v) development zones. Based on this design rationale, the Vision Document presents a high level concept plan demonstrating how the Site could provide up to 220 homes and 7.46 ha of green space, 55% of the total site area.
- The concept masterplan has been developed following a landscape-led approach and integrates existing mature vegetation within the Site, including along Shootersway and adjacent to the Public Right of Way which crosses the Site between Shootersway and the
- Potential development would be accommodated on the Site, set below the existing wooded skyline along Shootersway and within a well-vegetated framework, such that wider views of development on the Site be limited from the AONB, and the overall character of views would not
- An extensive network of open spaces is proposed including a substantial linear open space along the Site's boundary with the A41, a LAP and LEAP within a central greenway and the potential to deliver 5km recreational route around the Site with connections to off-site
- There is an opportunity for the layout, form and massing of potential development to reflect the development pattern of the existing settlement of Berkhamsted, and integrate with potential development on the adjoining Proposed Growth Area Site Bk05: Blegberry
- Vehicular access to the Site is proposed via a new four arm roundabout to be provided at the junction of Shootersway and Durrants Lane. As set out in the submitted Transport Feasibility Report, the junction has been designed to satisfy all current design standards and accommodate U-turn movements by large Segregated footways and enlarged splitter islands would be provided to facilitate pedestrian and cycle crossing on key desire lines. In addition to existing Public Rights of Way which would be maintained, and where possible links enhanced, additional



non-vehicular access points to the Site could be provided, connecting the Site to amenities and services provided as part of neighbouring allocations (Bk05 and Bk06) as well as within the existing town.

- Within the development, a permeable and walkable street network would be provided, anchored around the delivery of a greenway running through the heart of the Site connecting the existing Public Rights of Way to enhance and maximise the opportunity for connectivity beyond the
- Surface water drainage has been incorporated into the proposals to ensure the Site's surface water requirements are addressed in This includes a 3m wide attenuation channel to collect flows from the Site and a 1.2m deep attenuation basin with an additional 0.3m freeboard located in the south at the lowest point of the Site. A cutoff drain is proposed to capture flows that may arise from the wooded area in the northern part of the Site in extreme events, this water would be safely conveyed to the central flow path by a ditch or filter drain.
- A pumping station is proposed as part of the foul water drainage This is proposed to be located in the southern part of the Site, with an appropriate separation distance to residential properties.
- As demonstrated above, the Site is suitable, available and deliverable with no known technical constraints which preclude Croudace are committed to bringing forward development on the Site at the earliest opportunity and the Site will therefore contribute towards the delivery of new homes in the short to medium term, thereby assisting in addressing the need for housing in the Borough.
- Key benefits offered by the Site include:
  - Delivery of up to 220 new homes, including a policy compliant mix of market and affordable housing in a sustainable location, in close proximity to Berkhamsted town centre and the existing facilities and amenities contained therein;
  - A landscape-led housing layout which retains existing mature trees close to Shootersway and the hedgerow that runs between Shootersway and the A41;
  - Creation of an extensive network of open spaces, including the creation of a substantial linear open space along the Site's boundary with the A41, a LAP, LEAP and 5km recreational route around the Site with connections to off-site paths;
  - New walking and cycling routes to complement the existing network of Public Rights of Way;
  - New vehicular and non-vehicular access onto Shootersway and proportionate contributions towards wider highway improvements;

- The creation of new community open space to potentially include allotments or a community growing garden; and
- A masterplan which responds to its context, creating a strong frontage along the A41 and utilising topography to naturally drain the

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

**Title** Berkhamsted

**ID** EGS15684

**Person ID** 1207333

**Full Name** Growth Team

**Organisation Details** Growth team  
 Hertfordshire County Council

**Agent ID**

**Agent Full Name**

**Agent Organisation**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted comment**

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

**Proposal & Sites**  
**Berkhamsted Other Sites**  
**comment**

**Included files**

<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15764
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk01</b> South Berkhamsted. Green Belt. The 'Exceptional Circumstances' justifying removal from Green Belt are not described. The proposals repeat those put forward for, and rejected by the current Plan, 2010-2013. The arguments against development then are still valid. Infrastructure and sustainability provisions are weak, and how will Swing Gate Lane, already congested at certain times be kept as a 'secondary' access.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15765
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	

Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk02</b> BFI Presumably the only reason this is included is because BFI have indicated they wish to move. Site specific requirements are a nonsense.
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15766
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
Yes / No * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk03</b> Haslam Field. Berkhamsted School has been an important part of the Town since 1541. BSGCA has reported that there is a shortage of pitches available to the community. Haslam Field was gifted to the school. If it is surplus to their current requirements it should be passed to BSGCA to use until it is no longer required when it would be returned to the school.
Yes / No * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15767
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk07 Lock Field Northchurch</b> Safe access to New Road will be a challenge given how narrow the road is beyond the Canal bridge. The site has previously been rejected for inclusion in the Core Strategy.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15768
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	

<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk09</b> Bank Mill Lane. Green Belt and at the entrance to the Town. Contains the River Bulbourne. Should kept as it is but if developed a more appropriate use could be the retirement/care home proposal submitted to the council.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15769
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk11</b> Jewson. Provides premises for a number of local concerns serving the community's needs and employment. Replacement with residential dwellings is unthinkable and the idea demonstrates the lack of real understanding of the nature and employment needs of Berkhamsted.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	

<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Berkhamsted
<b>ID</b>	EGS15770
<b>Person ID</b>	1271978
<b>Full Name</b>	JOANNA HARLEY
<b>Organisation Details</b>	
<b>Agent ID</b>	
<b>Agent Full Name</b>	
<b>Agent Organisation</b>	
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted comment</b>	<b>Bk12</b> Civic Centre. Redevelopment will see the departure of community facilities especially the hall from the Town (given Dacorum's track record on public facilities). Local community groups supported by the Town Council have an interest in a transfer as a Community Asset. Disposal by the Borough for development conflicts with Policy DM64 Community Facilities and DM 65 Community Stewardship and Management.
<b>Yes / No</b> * Yes * No	
<b>Proposal &amp; Sites Berkhamsted Other Sites comment</b>	
<b>Included files</b>	