

Results for Website

Policy SA1: Housing Site Allocations

Do you support this policy?

67% Yes (68 responses)

33% No (34 responses)

Reference	Comment
00304 (Gade Investments)	Policy should acknowledge that subject to detailed design and site testing, further capacity may be released within areas such as the Kings Langley Employment Area, and that this will be supported. The possibility of any particular allocation delivering more homes is positive, given the underlying housing need in the District and the need for flexibility to ensure the housing requirement is met overall if delivery on other sites fail to come forward as anticipated.
00373	Have been huge amounts of housing developed in Abbots Langley and Leavesden, village atmosphere will be lost if development goes ahead. Why is there nothing in Chorleywood.
00428	Land East of Jacketts Field and East of Summerhouse Way, Abbots Langley should be allocated for housing. There is insufficient land in Abbots Langley for social housing.
00492	25% of proposed housing is in the Green Belt. The need should be confirmed before development is carried out.
00497	Do not have water to keep up with development. Should inform Government that if they require development in Hertfordshire, they should fund a new reservoir.
00543	Density of housing in the area already too high.
00543, 00544, 03454, CU/0377, NSI/0204	Infrastructure will not cope with more housing.
00544, 03905, 04015, 04092, 04095, CU/0232	There must be a policy to consider/improve infrastructure before new homes built.
00643	Carpenders Park can provide a greater proportion of housing than 25%.
00649 (HBRC)	No direct ecological implications of the policy itself, unless it affects sites with significant ecological interest.
00658	Thrive homes have identified development opportunities through pooling land holdings which would help maximise development on previously developed land.
00748	East of Links Way should be a mixed site for a secondary school and residential.
01100	Best practice and prudent planning for capacity of allocated sites to exceed Core Strategy target by a reasonable margin to allow for some sites not delivering expected housing numbers within the plan period. The Site Allocations provide no headroom so removal of identified sites cannot be supported.
01264	Before any development, should be surveys on access routes, schools, garage needs etc.
01367	Woodside Road, Abbots Langley should be allocated as a site for housing with a primary school.
01367	Plan does not directly compare scoring of proposed sites with those not intended for allocation, and does not explain why sites are proposed for

	allocation.
01367	Explanations of dwelling capacities for sites are unclear, and many sites have been assigned excessively high yields which are unlikely to be realistically deliverable and would not complement or integrate with the local area.
01367	No justification for including windfalls.
01367	45% affordable housing requirement would make many sites unviable.
01948, CU/0024	No further Green Belt land should be taken.
02119	24 Denham Way should be allocated as a housing site.
03191	Policy logical as attempts to produce space for residential development without too much encroachment on Green Belt.
03191	Replacement of commercial and industrial sites with housing will lead to increased car use as employment opportunities will not fit with provision of public transport. Needs for cars will conflict with proposed reduction in parking for town centre developments.
03193	Land opposite Alpine Press should be allocated for residential or mixed use.
03454	No more development in Croxley Green.
03454	New development too dense.
03632	Green areas should be preserved.
03632	Housing should not be too densely packed.
03672	Land at East Lane, Bedmond should be allocated as a housing site.
03799	More sites should be designated for affordable housing.
03905	Support new housing in South Oxhey as people on waiting list.
03905	South Oxhey needs 2 bed properties which if delivered will free up may 1 bed properties too small for many local families.
04000	Fir Trees, Dawes Lane, Sarratt should be allocated for housing.
04104	Land between river and Uxbridge Road opposite Church Lane, capacity 60 with mixed use.
04106	Need a balance of residential and commercial in town centres.
CU/0187	Developments should provide a range of types of accommodation.
NSI/0002	Hall Farm, Berry Lane should be allocated for housing.
NSI/0063	Fairways Farm, Garston should be allocated for housing.
NSI/0204	Level of development will change character of District for the worse.
NSI/0257	Do not want to lose retail outlets to detriment of Croxley Green.
NSO/0004	Densities should be viewed as a guide, and may change over 15 year plan period.
NSO/0061	The Roughts, Eastbury should be allocated as a housing site.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	Council should only allocate sites not important as part of the local ecological network or of notable value for wildlife. If sites of importance to wildlife and ecological network allocated, harm to ecological interests should be minimised, mitigated and compensated for from the earliest stages of planning through to completion and long-term habitat management. If sites adjacent to important sites for nature conservation are allocated, steps must be taken to contain impacts on these sites including by limiting density, planning sensitive layouts and providing adequate robust mitigation and enhancement for biodiversity as an integral part of the development.
SCO/0006 (Hertfordshire County Council)	No proposed housing sites are areas of search for permanent facilities for re-use, recovery, transfer and recycling of waste. Majority of District is identified as within a mineral consultation area but none of the proposed housing sites are considered to have significant

	workable mineral reserves that could be extracted prior to development taking place.
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	<p>No specific reference to Gypsy and Traveller sites within the document. We note this will be picked up in a separate document and support commitment to tackling needs of this part of the community. Would welcome a joint approach to updating our evidence base.</p> <p>It would be helpful in understanding housing supply if associated housing figures could be summarised in a table.</p>
SCO/0010 (Hertsmere BC)	Bushey and South Oxhey are separated by the Green Belt and its continued protection is welcomed. We hope as adjoining authorities to continue to work together on matters to ensure that development, infrastructure and Community Infrastructure Levy are coordinated.
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Support encouragement of affordable housing provision.
SCO/0017 (Hertfordshire County Council-landowner)	Generally support policy.
SCO/0017 (Hertfordshire County Council-service provider)	<p>Generally support policy. Previous representation have identified rising birth rates throughout county and that additional school places are likely to be required.</p> <p>There is a need for a composting facility to serve Three Rivers, Dacorum and Watford. Not clear how this will be dealt with by Site Allocations/Development Management policies.</p> <p>Flexible housing policies will enable HCC to assist clients in most appropriate accommodation as needs change over time.</p>
SCO/0018 (Abbots Langley Parish Council)	Infrastructure should support new housing.
SCO/0022 (Watford Rural Parish Council)	Object to any erosion of Green Belt.
SCO/0040 (Veolia Water)	Propose all allocations of more than 50 units within Green Belt should be removed from Green Belt rather than be treated as exception sites. High ranking sustainable sites should be developed in 2011-2015.
SCO/0057 (Natural England)	<p>Would be useful if Core Strategy and Development Management policies were cross referenced throughout document. Allocations refer to Green Belt but not landscape/wildlife designations. It would be helpful to refer to these where on-site/nearby so developers are aware of potential constraints and to support opportunities for enhancement, restoration and Green Infrastructure delivery early in process. Document should also highlight that PDL can be constrained by biodiversity interest.</p> <p>Note that there are wildlife sites on/near some sites. Where designated sites on/near site, measures to avoid impacts will need to be provided by developers and supported by adequate ecological survey. Opportunities for ecological management, enhancement and restoration should be sought whether adverse impacts anticipated or not.</p> <p>Ecological surveys and appropriate mitigation/enhancement must be</p>

	provided where development could impact on species protected under EU or statutory legislation or which could impact on UK or local BAP habitats/species.
--	---

Site H(1) Land West of Bluebell Drive, Bedmond

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

70% Yes (26 responses)

30% No (11 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Should be no more Green Belt development unless Green Belt allocated elsewhere.
00649 (HBRC)	Cannot support the use of site given part of it is a wildlife site, but unlikely to be able to object to proposals. Site is a former landfill and may have been re-seeded (although green lane to the northern boundary is an older feature) and consequently its intrinsic value is compromised. If any is to be lost, would seek some compensation as well as appropriate management of remainder of site to secure existing value and enhance local environment. Use as a community orchard may be appropriate.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes stock. Arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive to be involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00665	Open land.
00665	No defensible boundaries.
00694	Site still being tested for methane gas, and a dividing wall prevents gas leaking into homes. Would no longer protect homes if site opened up or built on.
00694	Access should be from Toms Lane not Bluebell Drive.
00822	Access issues.
00822	Green Belt.
02112	No objection if guarantee that site is fit, proper and safe to build on as was once a rubbish tip and had toxic gas fault.
CU/0133	Housing provision likely to be beneficial.
NSI/0038	When Bedmond Green built in 1990s, was designed to be a pleasant place to live and boundary set with this in mind. Expanding boundary into Green Belt is an affront to the Green Belt and intentions of the Council.
NSI/0038, NSI/0145	Overdevelopment.
NSI/0038	Traffic issues on Toms Lane and Bedmond High Street.
NSI/0175	Site is good as in the village.
NSO/0004	<p>Substantial part of site owned by Ridgebrae Ltd. Third party benefits from a licence agreement but surrendered at short notice upon approval for development so site available and deliverable. Site has consistently been identified for potential development. Site represents rounding off to some newer development in the village and has easy access to village hall and school. Ideally placed to meet requirements of PSP4 and CP4.</p> <p>Not clear why phasing is final period. CP2 advises phasing will be guided by infrastructure, deliverability and sustainability. Infrastructure and deliverability are not an issue. Acknowledged that Bedmond is a village with limited services and facilities but H(13) is phased 2011-2015 and this site is larger and could bring greater benefit so should be brought forward.</p>

NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	Point of connection will need to be determined to avoid detrimental impact on existing network.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	Approximately half of site is a Local Wildlife Site -an area of rough semi-improved neutral grassland supporting grassland indicators. The whole allocation site and the Local Wildlife Site should be subject to ecological survey to establish ecological interest and value. If surveys indicate that the area is of particular ecological interest, or can be managed or restored to increase its ecological value, site should be retained as a Local Wildlife Site and managed appropriately in the long term, rather than be developed. Allocating this site for housing contrary to policies within the Core Strategy.
SCO/0006 (Hertfordshire County Council Environment)	Would require financial contribution towards improving local bus services to significantly improve accessibility of site which is within 400m of a bus stop on Toms Lane but bus services are very limited. In addition speeding problem on Toms Lane would need to be addressed if this site were to be developed.
SCO/0018 (Abbots Langley Parish Council)	Reluctantly accept as although Green Belt, is a former tip site and would square off existing development.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Allocation is partly located on a historic landfill which took a wide range of wastes from 1964 to 1976. Any future development will need to take this into account. It is particularly important not to increase the risk of contamination of groundwater at this site as it lies within a Source Protection Zone 3 for a potable water abstraction.

Site H(2) Adjacent 65 Toms Lane, Kings Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

82% Yes (31 responses)

18% No (7 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Stop encroaching on Green Belt.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Likely to have tree and possible protected species considerations (bats) but unlikely to provide any significant constraints.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes stock. Arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive to be involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00822, NSI/0038	Toms Lane is narrow and busy.
00822	Object to Green Belt development
01100	There are no constraints which impact upon the principle of residential on this site. Site is brownfield, adjoining residential property. Current B2 use incompatible with residential location and potential to inconvenience local residents and highway users from HGV and articulated lorries parking/loading/unloading. Brownfield site should take precedence over greenfield releases and have

	an earlier phasing.
02112	Steep slope.
02112	Close to the railway.
02112	Problems with noise and air quality.
02112	New road would have to be built.
02112	Toms Lane is a designated dangerous road and access would be at spot where designated dangerous.
02112	Children would have to walk under bridge with no pavement to get to park.
NSI/0038	15 homes would create overcrowding and problems with access. 6 or 7 larger homes could fit in with nature of area and surrounding properties.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Accept as will tidy up an existing self-contained brownfield site, albeit in the Green Belt.

Site H(3) Land at Three Acres, Toms Lane, Kings Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

71% Yes (27 responses)

29% No (11 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Stop encroaching on Green Belt.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00649 (HBRC)	Small remnant of traditional orchard within south east corner of site which has been recognised as a priority habitat. If this cannot be retained in development, would expect to see compensation provided on site or elsewhere. Likely to have tree and possible protected species considerations (bats) but unlikely to provide any significant constraints.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes stock and shares access. Arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive to be involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00655	Site should be phases 2011-2015 as it is viable for development, it is available for immediate development, it is capable of providing affordable housing, and it is deliverable unlike several other sites programmed for 2011-2015. Applicant willing to submit detailed planning application now.
00822, NSI/0038	Toms Lane narrow and busy.
00822, 02112	Green Belt.
02112	Close to the railway.
02112	Problems with noise and air quality.
02112	New road would have to be built.
02112	Toms Lane is a designated dangerous road and access would be at spot where designated dangerous.
02112	Children would have to walk under bridge with no pavement to get to park.
02112, NSO/0038	Very narrow entrance to site.
04104	Poor access.
NSI/0038	Property does not have a proper access.
NSI/0038	Meets Toms Lane at a very narrow point with no room to manoeuvre. 20

	houses would cause issues and confrontations.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Bus services along Toms Lane itself are limited but there are more regular services along Primrose Hill with bus stops within 400m. Issues in Tom's Lane with speeding would need to be addressed if these sites were to be developed.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Accept as this will tidy up an existing self contained brownfield site, albeit green belt, subject to resolving what is a constrained access.

Site H(4) Land West of 10 Toms Lane, Kings Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

73% Yes (29 responses)

27% No (11 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Stop encroaching on Green Belt.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00440, NSI/0038	Could set a precedent for developing green belt south towards M25.
00440, NSI/0038	Current service road beset with parked vehicles, particularly at entrances which can lead to hazards at the lower corner because of restricted view when approaching from west.
00440	With other sites would lead to considerable increase in traffic in Toms Lane.
00440	Higher risk to pedestrians negotiating railway bridge. If development goes ahead, should be s106 to install a safety system as under Hyde Lane bridge.
00665, 04104, 04105	Open, highly visible land.
00822, NSI/0038	Toms Lane narrow and busy.
00822, NSI/0038	Green Belt.
03644	Should not build on open land.
04104, 04105	No defensible boundary contrary to PPG2.
04105	Inappropriate in accordance with PPG2 and site selection criteria.
NSI/0038	Located at narrowest part of the lane.
NSI/0038	Too close to railway line which is a dead end.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0039	Support allocation of site which has been the subject of detailed technical, environmental and design work for residential development. No explanation of delay in phasing to 2021-2026. Site is available and deliverable now, is a suitable location and would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities. No technical or environmental constraints to delivery which will provide much needed affordable housing as a planning obligation.

	Phasing should be changed so that delivery is from 2014-2016 otherwise there will be no delivery on sites at the edge of Kings Langley 2014-2016.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Bus services along Toms Lane itself are limited but there are more regular services along Primrose Hill with bus stops within 400m. Issues in Tom's Lane with speeding would need to be addressed if these sites were to be developed.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Reject as incursion into Green Belt. Would reluctantly accept as a last resort if inclusion enabled the Council to protect Green Belt to the south from any further development by squaring off the current road.

Site H(5) Kings Langley Employment Area

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

76% Yes (32 responses)

24% No (10 responses)

Reference	Comment
00304	Very sustainable location close to facilities and station. Capacity could be increased to 200 as site can and will deliver more than 150 dwellings as substantial area. Site to north of Masters Yard well positioned and will provide attractive and sustainable housing. Do not accept some findings of SFRA as due to change in levels of the ground, land not currently affected by flood risk. Development would not adversely affect hydrology of area and could enhance river corridor. Large proportion of site PDL and history of nuisance so environmental benefit from closure of existing operations. Wildlife designation inappropriate as significant part of site hardstanding with no wildlife value.
00649 (HBRC)	Includes small section of wildlife site buffering lake at north of site. Should be retained and managed as a buffer to the lake although some loss could be accommodated given land itself unlikely to be of wildlife site quality. Bats may be an issue within buildings.
00665	Have looked closely at individual sites making up area and contacted a number of companies. High site coverage of existing buildings and therefore high existing use value means residential development would not generate sufficient value to encourage owners to sell, particularly given affordable housing requirement. Therefore unlikely to bring forward more than 10 dwellings per year, and estimate only 50 units up to 2020 and no more than 20 2011-2015.
00837	Would be better as an employment area.
03193	Land opposite Alpine Press proposed for residential/mixed use.
03193	Alpine Press would be suitable for residential/mixed use.
03193	Capacity to be increased as 150 too low.
03454	Too many dwellings for employment area.
03877	Not appropriate or realistic to promote Imagination Technologies site for use other than employment given commitment to the site. Current redevelopment proposals which will leave no potential or surplus space for additional uses. More appropriate areas such as vacant and under used land that could deliver 150 house target so allocation should not include Home Park Industrial Estate.

04104	Need to include ASM Recycling yard for mixed use if not already proposed.
CU/0133	Housing capacity could be reduced to allow waterside amenity space for residents and visitors.
NSI/0063	Site within flood zone and fails sequential test so contrary to PPS25 and may fail exception test.
NSI/0063	Site in multiple ownerships and no control over delivery or prevention of piecemeal development.
NSI/0063	Economic role of employment land should be safeguarded.
NSI/0063	Specific parcels not identified so not clear where housing located. Boundaries require redefining.
NSI/0063	Supply overestimated as 30dph minimum density requirement removed and demand is for larger family properties. Recommend 10% discount to compensate.
NSI/0063	No evidence that developable for 150 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 para 54-56, and concern that will not deliver housing within plan period.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	Network upgrades may be required.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>South of lake designated as a wildlife site, and Grand Union Canal/River Gade local wildlife site. Allocation on and surrounding wildlife site should be subject to ecological survey to establish interest and value. If surveys indicate area in question is of particular ecological interest, or can be managed or restored to increase ecological value, this part should be retained as a LWS and managed appropriately in the long term. Some form of buffer zone would need to be established between the LWS and any new housing/mixed use development.</p> <p>Developing this part of the site for housing (or mixed use) runs counter to policies within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>If development goes ahead in other parts of site H(5), need to ensure adequate habitat protection, mitigation and enhancement on site and adjacent habitat areas planned and delivered part of dev.</p>
NSO/0087 (Sport England)	<p>Site includes Primrose Hill playing fields. If not intended to lose Playing Fields as part of redevelopment, allocation should make it clear that Playing Fields would need to be retained, or replaced with at least equivalent facilities, as part of any redevelopment. If Playing Fields are to be retained, opportunities should be taken as part dev to consider potential for enhancing facilities on the site. Objection would be addressed if confirmed that Playing Fields would be retained or that at least equivalent replacement provision would be made as part of any development.</p> <p>Would strongly object to loss of playing fields.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	<p>There are regular inter-urban bus services running along both Primrose Hill and Hempstead Rd. Kings Langley station is also within walking/cycling distance with bus services also calling there.</p> <p>Issues in Tom's Lane with speeding would need to be addressed if these sites were to be developed.</p>
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	Cross reference to related employment allocation E(f) would be helpful as this sets out the potential land parcels where housing development might occur. Greater clarity is important as the amount and location of housing and employment will impact on the immediate environment around the allocation and on Kings Langley as a whole.
SCO/0014	Support retention of employment land.

(Watford BC)	
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	<p>Would support high quality development in this area resolving current conflict between industrial and housing, subject to securing further traffic and environmental improvements along C76 and enabling the upgrade of existing public amenities as part of developments.</p> <p>Small plot developments should be avoided in this area which is very mixed and randomly developed. Consideration should be given to preparing a planning brief for the area.</p> <p>HGV traffic is a major problem in the area and should be addressed.</p>
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of site within flood zones 3b, 3a, 2 and 1. Would currently find allocation unsound as contains more vulnerable use in flood zone 3b. Would need to pass sequential test, and any more vulnerable development would need to pass exception test. Flood risk assessment would be required for planning application.</p> <p>Minimum of 8m undeveloped buffer must be provided along River Gade. Dacorum River Restoration Strategy suggests enhancement options.</p> <p>Historical landfill and mixed employment use would require preliminary risk assessment as part of any planning application.</p>

Site H(6) Mansion House Farm Equestrian Centre, Bedmond Road, Abbots Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

63% Yes (24 responses)

37% No (14 responses)

Reference	Comment
00272	Boundary should be in line with residential properties next door.
00373	Already excessive development on Aerodrome site.
00373	How will Abbots Langley infrastructure cope.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00665	Very open, highly visible.
00665	Not defendable boundary.
00665	Should be 5 units maximum.
00822,	Green Belt.
01367	Scores lower than unallocated sites. Green Belt beyond built edge of Abbots Langley. M25 250m away so likely noise pollution requiring mitigation reducing developable area. Much of site undeveloped and agricultural buildings do not meet definition of PPS3. Small site bordering agricultural fields. Existing housing low density and high standard of design with listed buildings/conservation area nearby. 50dph would be out of character. Access close to access to dwellings/builders yard so mitigation measures required. Deliverability questioned.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSI/0175	Very busy already.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006	Bus stops within 400m on Tibbs Hill Rd with regular services available.

(HCC Environment)	
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Object to the inclusion of a relatively isolated site in the Green Belt where the boundary may be difficult to defend. Concerned at the possible loss of equestrian facility and likely requirement for replacement farm or equestrian buildings on the agricultural land. Parish Council requests site excluded from final list.

Site H(7) Former Kings Head Public House, High Street, Abbots Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

76% Yes (28 responses)

24% No (9 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00822	Green Belt
01367	Small site currently in use. High score a result of proximity to local services and lack of designations but outweighed by constraints. Within conservation area and abuts rear gardens, listed buildings and shops. Significant concerns about highway capacity, car parking and safety. Capacity of 10, much greater than The Crescent and would be out of character. Deliverability questioned, site completely unsuitable for dev.
04098	Housing development, let alone 10 dwellings, not appropriate for this location given that it is conservation area and would have a significant impact on usage, feel and character of the area.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Request withdrawal from list unless site owner indicates they may be prepared to release land.

Site H(8) Leavesden Pumping Station, East Lane, Abbots Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

84% Yes (32 responses)

16% No (6 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00665	Not capable of accommodating 15 units.
00806	Not a residential area, return it to a field.
00822	Green Belt.
01367	Scores 792, some way into Green Belt, detached from existing settlement. Beyond guideline access distances to all services except maybe secondary schools. East Lane wide enough for only one vehicle. Site bordered completely by mature trees, likely to contain important wildlife habitats and protected species. Possible contamination from previous use. Wholly inappropriate for housing dev. No justification for allocation and clearly not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable

	alternatives.
03811	Ideal for regeneration.
NSI/0063	<p>Site not sequentially preferable to other more accessible and sustainably located sites. Former pumping station likely to require remediation to safeguard against contamination. Council overestimated supply at the site. PPS3 has removed min density requirement of 30dph. Property market and housing demand seeking larger family properties within lower density development.</p> <p>Council has not provided evidence that site developable for 15 residential dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56.</p> <p>Dwelling capacity amended to reflect a realistic density based on national trend towards lower density development. Recommend 10% discount applied to compensate for overestimate capacity. Also concern that the proposals will not deliver housing within the Plan period 2016-2020 as identified and therefore the Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of England Plan requirements.</p>
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	<p>This site is located in close proximity to a Thames Water pumping station. Therefore, potential impacts on amenity for future occupiers of the proposed development must be considered and assessed. This should include an appraisal of existing odour, noise and lighting from the pumping station and its potential impact on future occupiers of the proposed development. The local planning authority must ensure they are satisfied with the applicant's assessment in that the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development will be acceptable. If amenity is considered acceptable by the local planning authority then we would request that any proposed mitigation that is set out in the assessment is controlled via a planning condition.</p>
NSO/0077 (CPRE)	<p>Area of the sites extends beyond the currently developed part of the site, which would result in the intrusion of development into the Green Belt contrary to the stated objectives and intentions of the Core Strategy. In our view, allocation unsound, by virtue of conflict with national policy and by being unreasonable and unjustified, and the site boundary would need to be amended to make sound.</p>
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	<p>Reluctant acceptance as previously developed although in the Green Belt. Could be developed earlier but would require improvements to protect neighbouring cemetery and improvements to access road.</p>

Site H(9) Furtherfield Depot, Furtherfield, Abbots Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

82% Yes (32 responses)

18% No (7 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Already excessive development on Aerodrome site.
00373	How will Abbots Langley infrastructure cope.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats and slow worms.
00665	Valuable employment generator for industrial.
00822	Green Belt.
01367	Less sustainable than Woodside Road. GB but only borders housing along 1 boundary. Poorly related to existing development. Little opportunity to successfully integrate housing into urban form or surrounding landscape,

	and dev likely to have visual impact on surrounding housing. 44dph would be out of character with surroundings. Possible contamination. Should not be allocated as not the most appropriate when considered against alternatives.
CU/0377	Sites will bring major revenue and jobs to the area.
NSI/0175	Near hazard site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	Accept as already brownfield subject to housing being of no more than a similar density to the neighbouring Furtherfield area (30dph).

Site H(10) Leavesden Aerodrome, Abbots Langley

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

70% Yes (29 responses)

30% No (12 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Already excessive development on Aerodrome site.
00373	How will Abbots Langley infrastructure cope.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00492	Will require substantial infrastructure. Will s106 provide for most of this?
00643	Negative impact on the local area in terms of traffic and other services of the release of this site from the Green Belt has not been fully considered. Is this because the site is on the edge of the District and the effects of the development will be felt far more acutely by neighbouring authorities? Why do the applicants not have to meet the requirements of the Councils affordable housing policy given the acute need in the District?
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats and slow worms.
01367	Already has outline permission and no evidence that doesn't represent double counting in assessment of housing provision. Site less appropriate than Woodside Road. Site within Green Belt but does not border existing housing so less appropriate than Woodside Road in terms of loss of Green Belt. Poorly related to existing development. Little opportunity to integrate housing with surrounding landscape and likely to have significant visual impact on surrounding housing. Possible contamination. Proximity to business park. Neighbouring industrial units accessed through site- Transport Assessment required to assess impact. Concern re capacity of local junctions. Not particularly accessible to services.
03454	Contrary to Green belt policy.
03644	Should not build on open land.
03811	Significant increase in traffic in area where already several traffic hotspots (especially southbound entry onto the M1 at J6 and Dome roundabout. Most people living here would surely be commuting towards London on a daily basis and Leavesden does not have a railway station. Blur distinction between Leavesden and Abbots Langley, creating one sprawling suburb. Would be negative for the image of the two areas. Negative impact on local environment by removing a large area of valuable greenfield. Flood the housing market, leading to a drop in value of existing homes. Potentially be negative for WB Studio Tour. Studios currently sit alone, spoil the magic if in the middle of a housing estate! Overpopulate small villages of Leavesden and Abbots Langley. Save big

	<p>developments for bigger towns like Watford</p> <p>Pressure on local services potentially lead to reduced quality of services for existing residents.</p> <p>Increase in competition for good local schools.</p>
CU/0024	Acceptable if no change to the Green Belt.
CU/0377	Will bring major revenue and jobs to the area.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSI/0175	Very busy already.
NSO/0015	<p>We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and how any necessary upgrades will be provided ahead of the occupation of development in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	<p>Improvements to local bus services currently supported by Local Sustainable Transport Fund giving better links to Watford Town Centre. Other bus services in vicinity also currently supported by HCC. Further development may help increase patronage of these services and any contributions could be used towards ensuring the longer term provision. Scheme TR13 in emerging SW Herts Cycling Strategy (SWHCS) identifies need for improved cycle link from Abbots Langley to Croxley Green via Gypsy Lane and Canal Towpath. Particular issues at Gypsy Lane and Hempstead Road.</p> <p>Scheme TR15 identifies additional cycle parking required in Abbots Langley village centre.</p> <p>Scheme TR19 identifies need for cycle route between Abbots Langley and Kings Langley station.</p> <p>Scheme TR20 identifies need for improved pedestrian and cycle route to Kings Langley station via an existing bridleway from Abbots Rd.</p> <p>Abbots Langley identified as an area 3RDC would like to carry out a TravelSmart initiative similar to Croxley Green. Would be of benefit when above enhancements to the network begin to be implemented, which could be on the back of further development.</p>
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	WBC support the principle of development at Leavesden but objected to the percentage of affordable housing proposed which was not aligned to the Core Strategy policy.
SCO/0018 (ALPC)	<p>Accept as received outline permission as a brownfield site subject to Green Belt wedges to the north becoming public open space and ensuring that Green Belt here prevents linking of Abbots Langley and Watford.</p> <p>Development should be principally accessed via Aerodrome Way and provide for improved bus access to Watford and Abbots Langley.</p> <p>Employment land at Studios should be protected. Council should investigate conversion of unoccupied offices to dwellings or mixed use.</p>

Site H(11) Hill Farm Industrial Estate, Hill Farm Avenue, Leavesden

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

79% Yes (31 responses)

21% No (8 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	All ready too much development in Abbots Langley/Leavesden.
00373	Why is there no development in Chorleywood.
00492	Not necessary bearing in mind H(10).
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00665	High existing use value unlikely to facilitate residential coming forward. Not deliverable. Owner who occupies 80% of the buildings and runs a successful business from here has no plans to move. Furthermore the high site coverage of existing buildings means existing use value is likely to be higher than the land value generated by a residential development particularly when accounting for affordable housing. Additionally the highest land value for residential would be for flats, but the markets reluctance to seek planning permission for a high density scheme and the banks reluctance to fund such sites in out of town areas like this, means there is no realistic prospect of this site coming forward in the period 2011 – 2015. Site will not be developed before 2016
01367	Although free of restrictive environmental designations, difficult to understand how scored so high. Poorly related to existing housing, access from South through industrial buildings. Concern about junction capacity especially re H10. Possible contamination. Very high density.
03454	Green Belt.
03866	Small site for 30 dwellings.
NSI/0175	Busy area.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Improvements to local bus services are currently being supported by LSTF funds giving better link to Watford town centre. Other bus services in vicinity are also currently supported by HCC. Further development may help to increase patronage of these services and any developer contributions could be towards ensuring the longer term provision of these routes No new infrastructure identified in the SWHCS for this area. Need to bear in mind additional traffic flows in relation to Harry Potter World visitor attraction at studios due to open in March 2012.

Site H(12) Langleybury House/School, Langleybury

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

32% Yes (28 responses)

68% No (60 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269, 01680, 01727, 02667, 03037, 04115, 04117, CU/0133, NSI/0145	Should be used for educational use.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be ecological constraints. Possible bats- buildings and icehouse. Orchard potential

	(former sites) and land management issues will need to be dealt with if principle land use changes. Key farm locally.
00806	Development of site would seem right as derelict at the moment. Hotel similar to The Grove would be appropriate.
03119	Includes large area of open space which if developed later would impact on area.
03119	If part of hotel good redevelopment, but not all houses.
03632	No secondary school nearby, where will children go to school?
03644, 04092	Old building should be retained and converted/refurbished.
03839	70s buildings are very ugly and not in keeping so opportunity for enlightened scheme with variation of house sizes to suit mix of buyers with access to parkland.
03866	Large site for 25 dwellings.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03969, 04141	The site as a whole forms an important part of the Metropolitan Green Belt surrounded in the main by open countryside.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03945, 03969, 04048, 04066, 04068, 04070, 04072	Allocating 25 houses will be severely detrimental to the openness, rural character and the visual amenities of the area.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03948, 03969, 04048, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072, 04150	No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to overcome the presumption against inappropriate development in the Metropolitan Green Belt.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03948, 03969, 04048, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072	The remoteness, lack of services, public transportation and facilities renders residential development on this site unsustainable.
03892, 03895, 04032	Site important part of the Green Belt.
03892, 03895, 04032	Houses will ruin views and rural character of the area.
03892, 03895	Development will result in more traffic on already busy and fast part of Langleybury Lane, causing danger to St Paul's School and riders.
03892, 03895, 03906, 03908, 04033, 04069, 04071	Inappropriate development of Green Belt
03895	Access insufficient for development and opens onto a blind bend.
03895	Would require prohibitive levels of traffic calming to make safe.
03895	Traffic already queues at peak times beyond Langleybury Fields.

03906, 03907, 04033	Would reinforce application for caravans at junction of Old House Lane and Langleybury Lane.
03907	Do not object to limited number of affordable houses.
03907	Possible site alongside Langleybury Lane not 'less sensitive', and would be highly visually intrusive.
03935, 03936, 03940,	Would cause enormous traffic on already overcrowded country roads.
03950	25 dwellings outstrips the infrastructure and out of character with rural nature of the area.
03956	If 50% of houses are low cost for workforce.
03956	Should not open the door to destruction of Green Belt.
03978, 04032, 04140, NSI/0110	Not enough facilities in the area for more houses.
03978	Not enough water.
04039	Development should be in keeping with the surroundings.
04040	Support refurbishment of Langleybury House and demolition of secondary school.
04040	Residential development would be out of context with area and would require services and access roads.
04051, 04052	Oppose residential use of site.
04052	Use only existing building area.
04060	Lanes too narrow to cope with traffic.
04140	Should remain Green Belt.
04092	Should provide affordable well built/designed, high quality and sustainable housing.
04150	Should be preserved to provide food requirements.
NSI/0108	Area of outstanding natural beauty.
NSI/0110	Detrimental to rural character of area.
NSI/0110	Concerned about increase in traffic.
NSI/0145	Langleybury House should be retained.
NSI/0204	Something needs to be done soon about the deteriorating buildings around Langleybury House. Provided that the Green Belt is preserved the proposed mixed use for residential/leisure/farming makes sense.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	It lies adjacent to Local Wildlife Site 83/045 (Grand Union Canal - Watford Road to Old Mill House), nearby LWS 83/014 (Brickfield Spring) and contains ponds and woodland areas. It is noted that the consultation document states that most of the site is not proposed for development. The Council must ensure if this site is allocated, ecological surveys are carried out and measures taken to mitigate and compensate for harm to ecological interests within and in the vicinity of the site. Habitat enhancement and management as part of the development should be secured.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Any application should be supported by a Transport Assessment. Brief recognises current Langleybury mansion and secondary school access below the required visibility standards. As part of any scheme, junction will need to be upgraded. Should proposals make use of the Home Farm junction, assessment should be made of this junction and, if required, scheme developed to bring it up to appropriate highway standards. Any planning app will need to be accompanied by robust Travel Plan and a

	<p>package of compensatory measures and planning obligations as set out in the TA.</p> <p>Site is poorly located in relation to available bus routes and local facilities within walking/cycling distance are limited. Development small which may mean less traffic generation but unlikely to provide contributions significant enough to improve bus services to the extent necessary and unlikely to provide sufficient patronage to make any diversion of service viable in the long term.</p>
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Support the principle.
SCO/0021 (Sarratt PC)	Concern about a site allocation for 25 residential houses on agricultural land. Sarratt Parish Council is strongly opposed to residential development at this location, which would have a serious impact on the openness of the Green Belt
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of site within Floodzones 3b, 3a, 2 and 1. Though site is predominantly in FZ1, currently find allocation unsound as contains a more vulnerable use within FZ3b. (PPS25 Para D1). If the FZ3b designation was removed from the site or the site boundary was altered to not include areas of FZ3b then the site would need to pass the sequential test in order for us to find the allocation sound. This is because parts of the site lie within FZ3a and 2.</p> <p>If this site passes the flood risk Sequential Test. Any more vulnerable development (housing) would also need to pass the Exception Test. Part C requires that a FRA be submitted with the planning application at this site. The minimum of a five metre undeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the ordinary watercourses on the site. The area of Flood Zone next to the ordinary watercourses, towards the bottom of the site provides an opportunity to create an area of wet woodland. This would greatly improve the sweet of habitats provided in the area.</p>

Site H(13) Royal British Legion, Church Lane, Sarratt

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

72% Yes (31 responses)

28% No (12 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00706	Site should be a play area or allotments in recognition of outstanding work of RBL.
00706	10 units too many.
00706	Would be out of keeping with surroundings.
00837	Do British Legion want to sell?
01367	Not suitable for 65dph. Scores poorly. Small site within Green Belt, adjacent to Conservation Area and close to listed building. Densities in adjacent area approximately 30dph. Located opposite an existing access-concerns over highway capacity, parking and safety. Deliverability questioned. Unsuitable for development.
02659	Proposals state that the bus route is not within walking distance. I contend

	that it is. In villages in the main, buses do not venture down individual roads. The bus service we have in Sarratt, albeit infrequent but reliable is only about 2 or 3 minutes walk from the proposed development area. In village terms, this should be considered within walking distance.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Church Lane very narrow and not suitable for more housing.
03799	Not sufficient to meet need for affordable housing in Sarratt. Another site needs to be allocated.
03839	Need housing available for those brought up in Sarratt that can't afford to buy a house here and have to move away.
03907	Support small number of affordable houses but object to commercial or over development.
04000	Delivery of site questionable as sat empty for a considerable period. Suggestion of 10 dwellings would mean either very small residential units or developed at very high density which is inconsistent with Green Belt status. 10 dwellings on 0.15 equates to 67dph, not appropriate in Sarratt. LPA need to consider other sites in Sarratt to realistically deliver 1% of allocations i.e. 45 dwellings in Bedmond and Sarratt. H13 expected to deliver 100% affordable housing which is unrealistic in planning policy terms, not economically viable and therefore undeliverable. Need to explore alternative sites in Sarratt for the delivery of houses as important that villages grow organically and do not stagnate.
04039	Housing should be in keeping with area.
04052	Green Belt should not be encroached upon.
04115	Sarratt needs more affordable housing for first time buyers.
04150	Pity that no steps have been taken to provide an entrance. Is the village school on the ex British Legion site. This would solve the serious traffic and parking problems at certain times of the day.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSI/0175	Leisure site for the community.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

Site H(14) 33 Baldwins Lane, Croxley Green

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

28% Yes (72 responses)

72% No (187 responses)

Reference	Comment
00430	Building here will not affect residents.
00430	Site is not Green Belt.
00467	Impact of Croxley Rail Link needs to be considered.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00665	Has been compulsory purchased so no longer available. Owner submitted planning application for flats several years previously but was advised to withdraw the application as it was only suitable for houses. A housing development would equate to a maximum of 5 houses. Site is no longer likely to come forward at all. If the CPO was withdrawn the site could only accommodate 5 dwelling and not before 2016.
00823	Oppose more houses being built in Croxley Green.

01786, 02666	Impact of development on infrastructure.
01813, 02667, 04086	Area already overdeveloped.
02089	Should remain in commercial use.
02089, 03632	Unsuitable for housing.
02279	Baldwins Lane major bottleneck at rush hour, and worse if school built.
02667, 03916	No need for more development.
03432, 03621, 03821, 04052, NI/0179	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03454	Needs adequate off street parking.
03632	Narrow road already congested.
03793	Support building, probably flats as railway line and hopefully affordable.
03916, 03972, CU/0079, NSI/0161	Will add to traffic in already congested area.
04052	Croxley will become urban sprawl.
04086	Will become dormitory of Watford.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSI/0170, NSI/0204	Conflicts with Croxley Rail Link plans.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0020 (Croxley Green PC)	Site should be safeguarded for commercial or retail use.

Site H(15) Killingdown Farm Buildings, Croxley Green

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

19% Yes (54 responses)

81% No (228 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269, NSI/0156	Limit to 30 dwellings maximum.
00280	Support identification of the farm buildings for residential development. Site has been the subject of previous consultations and was a banked site by the Council to meet part of its housing shortfall. Client has proposed in the past to increase the site area to enable greater provision of dwellings should the need arise, that is, if the housing numbers increase or identified sites do not come forward or have reduced housing numbers. Council will be aware part of the public response to a larger housing development at Killingdown Farm was due to the pressure on existing schools. It appears that this concern has been addressed with the proposal for a new secondary school at Baldwins Lane a relatively short distance from the site
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00658	Original allocation extended to the boundary of Thrive Homes stock at Grove Crescent. An area of Thrive Homes' existing stock which has considerable scope for remodelling in order to generate a more appropriate mix to meet needs. Objective would be much easier to achieve if sites were

	coterminous i.e. if allocated site was increased to the original proposal. Would support that extension.
00787	Conservation area appraisal forbids this kind of development.
00823	Oppose more houses in Croxley.
01234, 01270, 03273, 03972, NSI/0161, NSI/0179, NSI/0233	Keep Green Belt.
01235, 01270, 01813, 02667, 03621, 03893, 03916, 04052, 04086, NSI/0259	Too much development in Croxley Green.
01235, 03632, 03916, CU/0079, CU/0240, NSI/0233	Roads already congested, will be worse with housing.
01270, 03632, NSI/0233	Narrow/rural lane.
01367	Inappropriate for housing, poorly related to existing dev and constraints. Within Green Belt and occupied by agricultural buildings. Greenfield site. Small boundary with housing to south but otherwise freestanding. Little opportunity to integrate dev with surrounding landscape and visual impact on housing to south. Within Croxley Green Conservation Area and contains listed farmhouse. May be contamination. Not the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.
01786, 02666, 03432, 03621, 03821, 04052, NSI/0179	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
02009	Overdevelopment could destroy Croxley Green's character.
02279	30 dwellings unsustainable without local facilities and transport links.
02279	Croxley Green is in danger of becoming a suburb of Watford if continued development of the Green Belt continues.
02659	Unless there is a dramatic change of road networks in this area, all traffic would be directed via Sarratt Road and The Green. Access is likely to be on the bend where Little Green Lane adjoins Sarratt Road. As the only entrance of the development, likely to create problems at the junction. Most traffic would then go via Sarratt Road to Croxley Green alongside a high brick wall already beginning to crumble in places. Also a public footpath (SA15) joins the road at the bend. At present designated a footpath but has been a proposal to upgrade it to a bridleway. Has been initially rejected by HCC but subject to an appeal. Additional traffic on Baldwins Lane needs to be considered. There is already the prospect of a large increase in volume following the development at Merchant Taylors' place. With the proposed Little Green Lane development this would mean traffic from an additional 200 or so properties travelling along Baldwins Lane to Watford, the major centre of business and shopping.
02666	Too much building will make Croxley Green cramped.
02667	No need for more development.
02667	Will destroy village feel.
03040,	Will spoil a rural and peaceful area.

CU/0240	
03040	Will cause access and traffic concerns.
03273, NSI/0259	Already large development at Old Merchant Taylors.
03222	No new buildings to be allowed on fields.
03222	Could be new secondary school and fields used for playing fields. Access away from main roads and safe for walking or travelling by car/coach.
03497	Access must be from Baldwins Lane end of Little Green Lane.
03632	Not suitable for housing.
03947	Access would have to be either into Little Green Lane, which is not wide enough or strong enough to deal with increase in vehicle movement and fairly certain Highways could not sanction this point. Alternative would be Grove Crescent, creating danger to pedestrian traffic with an additional 45 vehicles approx. moving through a confined area. All additional traffic would have to enter Baldwins Lane, causing even more congestion than there already, which would also be exacerbated by the Durrants site. With S(d) on top, the amount of vehicles entering and exiting the area with only one main road can easily be imagined. The addition of the 160 house on Durrants will already have a major detrimental effect on the area. For the Council to volunteer another 30 houses, after originally refusing Durrants would appear contradictory. Cannot imagine reasons for refusal have ever changed. Planning permission granted on appeal against the better judgement of Council. Those objections still hold from the local residents.
04038	Too rural to be spoilt.
04052	Croxley will become urban sprawl.
04104	Should be enlarged to 75 homes which can deliver sustainable new cluster of homes. Better than sites H(3) or H(4).
CU/0240	Killingdown Farm Grade II listed.
NSI/0161, NSI/0170	Could be the start of development on Green Belt.
NSI/0170	Council could consider taking over farm building site (now in poor condition) and creating a more suitable civic amenity.
NSI/0179	Need to protect historical buildings.
NSI/0204	Killingdown Farm important part of Croxley Green and should not be converted to residential unless proposals to manage agricultural land without access to farm buildings.
NSI/0204	Area of Little Green, including Killingdown, is one of the most attractive and historically interesting parts of Croxley and any development must be sensitive to the surroundings.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	Network upgrades may be required.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Remote from bus services and development size unlikely to provide patronage significant enough to make new or diverted bus service viable

Site H(16) 50-52 New Road, Croxley Green

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

29% Yes (67 responses)

71% No (161 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269	Should protect retail use as Core Strategy objective 8.
00430	Not Green Belt.
00430	Houses here will not affect residents.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00823	Against more houses in Croxley Green.
01141, 01235, 01813, 02089, 02667, 03916, 04052	Croxley Green overdeveloped already.
01235, 03632, 03916, CU/0079	Roads already congested, will be worse with more housing.
01235, 01264, 01491, 03794, CU/0133, NSI/0170, NSI/0183, NSI/0257	Service station is valuable asset to Croxley Green.
01618, 02089, NSI/0257	Should retain as commercial building.
01786, 02666, 03432, 03621, 03821, 04052, NSI/0179	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
02089, 03632	Unsuitable for housing.
02666	Too much building will make Croxley cramped.
02667, 03916	Do not need more development.
03632	Narrow roads.
04052	Croxley will become urban sprawl.
04086	Croxley becoming a dormitory of Watford.
NSI/0161	Unsuitable as current pressures on road including inadequate parking for residents, visitors, deliveries etc.
NSI/0170	Should encourage use of site as local business.
NSI/0204	Will reduce mixed retail/employment/residential character of New Road.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0020 (Croxley Green PC)	Site should be safeguarded for commercial land.

Site H(17) Former Yorke Road School, Yorke Road, Croxley Green

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

33% Yes (82 responses)

67% No (170 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269, 00274, 01235, 01264,	Should only be conversion.

01491, 01727, 02040, 03119, 04016, 04144, CU/0247, NSI/0170, NSI/0204	
00430	Not Green Belt.
00430	Houses here will not affect residents.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bats.
00823, 02666	Against more houses being built in Croxley.
01141, 01813, 02667, 03621, 04052	Croxley Green already overdeveloped.
01234	Should be a nursery.
01235, 03222, 03916, CU/0079	Roads already congested and will be worse with housing.
01270, CU/0024	Keep for primary school.
01618	Small site.
01618	Desecration of historic building.
01786, 02666, 03432, 03621, 03821, 04052, NSI/0179	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
02009, 03222, 04092	Could be used as an arts or community centre.
02279, 03893, NSI/0145, NSI/0233	Building should be preserved/refurbished.
02279, 03454	Building should be listed.
02667, 03916	No need for more development.
03222	Houses would increase cars parking in road.
03632	Narrow roads.
03632	Unsuitable for housing.
03644	Too small for extra houses as well as conversion.
03794	Much loved school building could be put to much more creative use than yet more housing. Given the increased population and demand for childcare, what about a nursery/pre-school/breakfast club/after-school club? This would seem fitting given the building's origins.
04052	Croxley will become urban sprawl.
04086	Croxley is becoming a dormitory of Watford.
NSI/0161	Unsuitable as current pressures on road including inadequate parking for residents, visitors, deliveries etc.
NSI/0179	Need to protect historical buildings.
NSI/0257	Should be as few houses as possible with character.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is located on the A412 which is an important bus corridor for routes into Watford. Some routes avoid this part of the A412 and divert up New Rd and Barton Rd to serve residential areas of Croxley but there are regular routes available and obviously the site is very close to a station

	which will provide improved access into Watford town centre when the Croxley Rail Link is completed.
--	--

Site H(18) Croxley Station Car Park and Timber Yard, Croxley Green

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

24% Yes (61 responses)

76% No (188 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269, 03531, 03632, 03644	Losing station car parking would cause congestion on local roads which is already a problem.
00269, 00277, 00278, 03531	Closure of Watford Met likely to bring Cassiobury residents to Croxley so will require more parking.
00274, 04016	No objection if provision for retaining station car park area.
00274, 01264, 01762, 04016	Metal railings and verge should be retained and maintained.
00277, 00278, 02089	Car park should be extended to accommodate traffic that blocks local roads.
00278, 03222, NSI/0170	Car park will need extending to cope with parking for rail link.
00430	Not Green Belt.
00430	Houses here will not affect residents.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Locally significant tree belt should be retained.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00706, 00787, 01264, 01491, 01762, 01793, 02040, 02089, 03222, 03454, 03799, 04038, CU/0232, NSI/0170, NSI/0204	Station car park must be retained.
00748	Welcomes and supports the inclusion of Croxley Station Car Park and Timber Yard (Site Ref H18) for a mixed use development scheme comprising of a retail element and 25 residential units. A mixed use scheme on the Station Car Park site will actively contribute to the Three Rivers District housing target which seeks to provide 180 dwellings per year until 2026.
00795, 03531, 03632, 03916, CU/0079	Roads already congested and will be worse with housing.
00806	Close to the railway line so not appropriate for housing.
00823	Against more housing in Croxley Green.
01141, 01234, 01813, 02666, 02667, 03916, 04052	Croxley Green already overdeveloped.
01764	Archaeological implications of development on the following sites can be

	mitigated by a condition/s requiring a programme of archaeological work on any planning permission the LPA is minded to grant
01786, 02666, 03432, 03621, 03821, 04052	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
02089	Site has poor access.
02089	Site low down relative to local residential areas and not suitable for residential.
02279	Only if currently unused.
02667, 03916	No need for more development.
03632	Narrow roads.
03799, 04092	Parking should be extended.
03885	No suitable roads or public transport.
04052	Croxley will become urban sprawl.
04060	Train stations need a car park. Prices should be lowered.
04086	Croxley is becoming a dormitory of Watford.
04115	Housing would enhance the area.
CU/0232	Should be considered for local health/clinic provision with residential above to provide additional and improved facilities needed in the area.
NSI/0161	Unsuitable as current pressures on road including inadequate parking for residents, visitors, deliveries etc.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site, especially with retail.
NSI/0204	Hedgerow on Watford Road should be retained and improved.
NSI/0233	Do not need another retail store which will kill shops in New Road.
NSI/0233	Not appropriate for housing as trains in and out of station and announcements from platform.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0020 (Croxley Green PC)	Members objected to this on the grounds of the loss of parking spaces adding that if anything, there should be more parking spaces. It was also questioned as to whether it was a suitable site for housing in that it was next to a railway and a long, dark area low down from the road. Members also felt that the access and egress from the car park would not be suitable.

Site H(19) Branksome Lodge, Loudwater Lane, Loudwater

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

25% Yes (28 responses)

75% No (82 responses)

Reference	Comment
00430, 03882	Loudwater Lane dangerous road.
00430	10 extra houses will lead to more traffic and accidents.
00430	Will destroy Green Belt outlook.
00430	Will destroy quiet residential area.
00430	Other non-Green Belt areas more appropriate for housing.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Retain boundary hedgerows as appropriate. May require site survey to assess grassland.
00706	Would lead to further requests for development along Loudwater Lane.
00706	Development would cause extra hazards to all road users.
00706	Only suitable for 5 dwellings.

00727, 00843, 03788, 03831, 03832, 03854, 03882, 03884, 03896, 03921, 03970, 03973, 04011, 04012, 04013, 04024, 04034, 04049, 04052, 04087, 04097, 04103	Designated as Green Belt, should be protected.
00727, 03832, 03840, 03855, 03963, 03964, 03970, 04087, 04097, 04103	Will lead to more traffic on busy and sometimes dangerous Loudwater Lane.
00727, 03840, 03855, 03921, 03970, 03973	Entrance to site likely to be dangerous as road narrow here and entrance at centre of double twist in the road so around a blind bend with traffic approaching from either direction.
00733, 03882, 03884, 04094	Lane too narrow.
00733	Land dangerous with excessive speed limit allowed from Croxley Green.
00733, 03832, 03882, 03963, 03973, 03992	Traffic on the lane increasing as used as a cut through.
00733	Already difficult exiting driveways here, let alone development of 10 houses.
00843	Site is in a conservation area.
00843, 03973, 04024	Will set a precedent for further developments.
02126	Well related to existing settlement in visual and spatial terms. Previously subject of full assessment including in SHLAA. Site self contained, on fairly level terrain and much of front boundary marked by hedging. Development would resolve historic ambiguity with Green Belt boundary for Loudwater and result in clearly defined defensible boundary. Would not compromise purposes of Green Belt. Sustainable location within reach of range of facilities and services. Allocation consistent with draft NPPF. Can be safely accessed from surrounding highway network. Would not prejudice ecological interests. Would make provision of affordable housing (either on or off site) and would promote housing choice in the locality. Suggested phasing and capacity should be reviewed in light of Annual Monitoring Report. Site would make material contribution to housing supply in the District.
02666	Would spoil existing countryside.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Loudwater Lane will need improvement if to take more traffic.
03644	Should not build on field/open space.
03788	Would create more traffic on already overburdened lane.
03788	Access hazard.
03831	Wildlife area.
03831, 03882, 03992, 04094	Entrance too dangerous.
03831, 03897, 04018, 04034, 04049	Would increase traffic.

03831	Would increase noise.
03831	Would increase pollution.
03838	Would make roads far more dangerous.
03839	If developed, developer should improve Loudwater Lane which is too narrow for the amount of traffic it takes and vans delivering to Loudwater.
03854	Unacceptable to squeeze 10 houses on site.
03896	Development would breach regulations to enforce sustainable development.
03896	Significant adverse effect on visual amenity of area.
03898, 03964	Development would be in direct sight line of nearby Green Belt/conservation area.
03898	Affordable housing should be built on easily accessible areas where services such as bus, shops, schools and other amenities are available. This is definitely not the case at the above property which is on a narrow country road in an isolated, very expensive area.
03898, 04024	Loudwater Lane already shows signs of extreme wear due to traffic volumes. Will be made worse by increasing traffic.
03964	Loudwater Lane already in constant need of repair.
03970	Will encroach on privacy and views on residents in Armitage Close, Chess Close, Chess Hill and Chess Lane.
03973	Nibbling at Green Belt here and there defeats purpose of creating and maintaining Green Belt policy.
04011, 04012, 04013, 04018	Impact on fauna and wildlife.
04011, 04012, 04013	Will lead to dangerous traffic conditions.
04042	Branksome Lodge should not be pulled down.
04042	Homes would not be starter homes which is what is needed.
04094	Problem with application to enlarge drive as aesthetics considered more important than safety.
04097	Rural aspect would be completely blighted.
04103	Views across green paddock would be lost.
CU/0133	Probably OK in spite of nibbling away of some open space.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	Network upgrades may be required to serve this development.

Site H(20) Land Rear of The Queens Drive, Mill End

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

54% Yes (25 responses)

46% No (21 responses)

Reference	Comment
00467, 00665, 00806, 03230	Too near M25.
00544, 04095	Following M25 widening works, land is not stable enough to proceed so misleading to include site.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Retain existing scrub if possible; possible slow worm interest. May require site survey to assess grassland.
00665	Noise.
00665, 03632	No suitable access.

03230, 03632	Loss of amenity space.
03432, 03659,	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03432	Traffic on already busy roads.
03632	Queens Drive already clogged with parked cars.
03644, CU/0133	Should not build on open land.
03659	Overcrowding of residential area.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and how any necessary upgrades will be provided ahead of the occupation of development in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is over 400m from current bus stops and bus service in vicinity is only 2 hourly.

Site H(21) Land at Arnett Close, Upper Hill Rise, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

69% Yes (34 responses)

31% No (15 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Retain existing scrub if possible; possible slow worm interest. May require site survey to assess grassland.
00806	Not sure about access.
00806	Might be more suitable for school expansion.
02279	Danger of building flats with no infrastructure for increased pressure on local resources.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0063	Site landlocked and requires third party land for access. The Council has overestimated supply at the site. PPS3 has removed the minimum density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare. The property market and housing demand is seeking larger family properties within lower density developments and no longer a significant proportion of flats. In light of the foregoing the Council has not provided evidence that the site is developable for a scheme of 5 residential dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56. Accordingly, the dwelling capacity amended to reflect a realistic density based on national trend towards lower density development. Would recommend a 10% discount be applied to compensate for overestimate capacity. There is also concern that the proposals will not deliver housing within the Plan period 2016-2020 as identified and therefore the Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of

	England Plan requirements.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

Site H(22) Garages Rear of Drillyard, West Way, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

84% Yes (43 responses)

16% No (8 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Retain existing scrub if possible; possible slow worm interest. May require site survey to assess grassland. Possible bat (unlikely).
00658	Small site close to Thrive Homes' existing stock at Mead Place. There is a large area of open space and community buildings between that scheme and the identified site. A masterplanning exercise of the larger area has the potential to generate a more appropriate mix, plus re-provision of community facilities and amenity space which would benefit the whole area, compared with looking at the small site in isolation.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Access would be difficult.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0156	In need of tidying up to make the area neater.
NSO/0015	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	We see no benefit in including the site in the schedule given this has such a small capacity (of 3 units).

Site H(23) Long Island Exchange, Victoria Close, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

56% Yes (32 responses)

44% No (25 responses)

Reference	Comment
00467, 04087	Would leave Rickmansworth without any hotel accommodation.
00543	Part of a mixed local economy helping support local employment. Would be detrimental to local economy.
00544, 03644, 04087, 04095, NSI/0145	Too many dwellings.
00544, 03454, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest. Possible bat.
00665	High existing use value prevents residential coming forward.
00837	Is business a willing vendor?
02279	Danger of building flats with no infrastructure for increased pressure on

	local resources.
03191	Oppose density unless can provide parking with no abatement (1.75 or 2 spaces per 1 or 2 bed unit).
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Access would be difficult.
03644, 04087, CU/0024	Already congested road.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
CU/0133	Essential local facility.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

H(24) Police Station, Rectory Road, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

75% yes (45 responses)

25% no (15 responses)

Reference	Comment
00544, 03644, 04095, NSI/0145	Too many dwellings.
00544, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest.
03191	Oppose density unless can provide parking with no abatement (1.75 or 2 spaces per 1 or 2 bed unit).
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03644	Close to congested roundabout.
03644	Fast road.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0156	In need of tidying up and will make the area neater.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Frequent bus services available, very close to railway station and within walking distance of town centre. Surrounded by major roads so pedestrian/cycle access to and from site may need to be improved. Schemes have been identified as needs in this area in the emerging South West Herts Cycling Strategy

H(25) Royal British Legion, Ebury Road, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

56% yes (31 responses)

44% no (24 responses)

Reference	Comment
00544, 04095, NSI/0145	Too many dwellings.

00544, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest.
00665	Long lease prevents site coming forward.
00837	Is business a willing vendor.
03191	Opposition is in principle unless the proposal includes the replacement of the existing facility as well as the provision of the new housing.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Ebury Road already overdeveloped.
03632	Parking a problem now.
03644	Too many houses onto a fast road.
03644	Close to congested roundabout.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0175	Leisure site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

H(26) Langwood House, High Street, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

68% yes (39 responses)

32% no (18 responses)

Reference	Comment
00544, 04095	Too many dwellings.
00544, 03454, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest.
02279	Danger of building flats with no infrastructure for increased pressure on local resources.
03191	Oppose density unless can provide parking with no abatement (1.75 or 2 spaces per 1 or 2 bed unit).
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	High Street already overdeveloped.
03632	Parking a problem now.
04106	Already residential development on the High Street in the last 2-3 years.
04106	Need a good balance of residential and commercial properties to make town vibrant and so local community can support businesses.
04106	Langwood House has businesses in occupation.
04107, 04110, 04139	One of last remaining dedicated office blocks in the High Street accommodating professional service businesses serving local community.
04108	Cost of relocating will cause severe financial costs to companies.
04109, 04139	Important facility for small and medium businesses.
04109, 04110	Staff who work there provide business for local shops.
04109	Should be retained for offices.
04110	Town centre cannot rely solely on retail.
04139	Would force business out of local area.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSO/0015 (Thames	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

Water)	
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of this site lie within Floodzones 3b, 2 and 1. Though the site is predominantly in FZ1, we currently find this allocation unsound as it contains a more vulnerable uses within FZ3b. This stance is supported by Paragraph D1 of PPS25. We would not support the allocation of land in Flood Zone 3b for any land uses that are considered incompatible with this Flood Zone as set out in Table D.3 of PPS25.</p> <p>If the Flood Zone 3b designation was removed from the site or the site boundary was altered to not include areas of Flood Zone 3b then the site would need to pass the sequential test in order for us to find the allocation sound. This is because parts of the site lie within Flood Zone 2.</p> <p>The minimum of an eight metre underdeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the Town Ditch. This buffer zone is necessary to allow access to the river during a flood event and for maintenance. The buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit.</p>

H(27) Gas Works, Salters Close, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

84% yes (48 responses)

16% no (9 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest.
00665	Not likely to come forward. British Gas Site still in use and given timescales involved in de-commissioning a site of this scale; plus delays for decontamination; then widespread marketing of the site; and the lengthy planning process, unrealistic to project this site for development prior to 2015. We understand from agents acting for British Gas that as at the date of. Site will not be developed before 2016
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
04104	Water based innovative new housing designs increase capacity - exemplar design project, biodiversity benefits. Fitting legacy for dirty history, floating homes
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0063	<p>Site within Floodzone 3a and parts may fall within 3b. Fails Sequential Test. May fail Exception Test. Site is former Gas Works and will require remediation to safeguard against contamination. Council has overestimated supply. PPS3 has removed minimum density requirement of 30dph. The property market and housing demand is seeking larger family properties within lower density developments and no longer a significant proportion of flats.</p> <p>Council has not provided evidence that site developable for 20 in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56 Accordingly, the dwelling capacity should be amended to reflect a realistic density based on national trend towards lower density development. Would recommend 10% discount be applied to compensate. Also concern that the proposals will not deliver housing within the Plan period 2011-2015 as identified and therefore the Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of England Plan requirements.</p>
NSI/0156	In need of tidying up and will make the area neater.
NSO/0015	We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site.

(Thames Water)	Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and how any necessary upgrades will be provided ahead of the occupation of development in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>Site lies near to the River Chess – a chalk river of known ecological importance, and identified in Policy CP 9 of the Three Rivers Core Strategy as an important part of the district’s Green Infrastructure network. Numerous lakes are found adjacent or nearby Site H(27), including Local Wildlife Site 89/028 Croxley Hall Lakes, which comprises a flooded former gravel pit site supporting a range of habitats. The lakes are fringed with trees and scrub and support marginal and aquatic vegetation, with several areas of fen/swamp of particular ecological interest.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposed site is currently a gas works, and therefore is already developed.</p> <p>The Council must ensure if this site is allocated, ecological surveys are carried out and measures taken to mitigate and compensate for harm to ecological interests within the site and in the surrounding habitat areas. Habitat enhancement and management as part of the development should be ensured.</p>
NSO/0085	Wholeheartedly support the allocation of the National Grid site at Salters Close/Wharf Lane for residential development. The site is surplus to the requirements of National Grid, is in a single ownership, is vacant and is deliverable in the short to medium to term. Whilst a small part of the site is within flood zone 3a, it is considered that this issue can be overcome.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is within 400m of bus stop in the High St with regular bus services. Schemes have been identified as needs in this area in the emerging South West Herts Cycling Strategy.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of this site lie within floodzone 3b, 2 and 1.</p> <p>We currently find this allocation unsound as it contains a more vulnerable uses within FZ3b. This stance is supported by Paragraph D1 of PPS25. We would not support the allocation of land in Flood Zone 3b for any land uses that are considered incompatible with this Flood Zone as set out in Table D.3 of PPS25.</p> <p>If the Flood Zone 3b designation was removed from the site or the site boundary was altered to not include areas of Flood Zone 3b then the site would need to pass the sequential test for us to find the allocation sound. This is because parts of the site lie within Flood Zone 2.</p>

H(28) Bridge Motors, Church Street, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

65% yes (36 responses)

35% no (19 responses)

Reference	Comment
00544, 04095	Too many dwellings.

00544, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest.
00837	Is the business a willing vendor?
02279	Danger of building flats with no infrastructure for increased pressure on local resources.
03191	Oppose density unless can provide parking with no abatement (1.75 or 2 spaces per 1 or 2 bed unit).
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
CU/0133	Essential local facility.
NSI/0175	Very busy already.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is close to a southbound bus stop but services are only 2 hourly. Within walking/ cycling distance of town centre. Schemes have been identified as needs in this area in the emerging South West Herts Cycling Strategy.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Parts of this site lie within Flood Zones 3b and 2. We currently find this allocation unsound as it contains a more vulnerable uses within Flood Zone 3b. This stance is supported by Paragraph D1 of PPS25. We would not support the allocation of land in Flood Zone 3b for any land uses that are considered incompatible with this Flood Zone as set out in Table D.3 of PPS25. If the Flood Zone 3b designation was removed from the site or the site boundary was altered to not include areas of Flood Zone 3b then the site would need to pass the sequential test in order for us to find the allocation sound. This is because parts of the site lies within Flood Zone 2. The minimum of a five metre underdeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the Ditch on site. The buffer zone should be used to enhance the environment for biodiversity benefit.

H(29) Depot, Harefield Road, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

70% yes (40 responses)

30% no (17 responses)

Reference	Comment
00403	Located within Colne Valley Regional Park. Developers should enter into a planning obligation to make financial contribution to Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company to implement objectives of the Colne Valley Park for local benefit within the vicinity of development and Green Infrastructure Plan Colne Valley links.
00544, 04095	Too many dwellings.
00544, 04095	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest. Possible bat interest.
00837	Is the depot not needed?
03191	Density should not exceed 25-30dph.

03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03795	Harefield Road already congested.
03795	Flood plain.
03795	Drainage problems.
03795	Water shortage.
03795	Poor public transport.
03795	Too many houses for a small village.
03795	Air quality deteriorate more.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0156	In need of tidying up and will make the area neater.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	This site is located in close proximity to a Thames Water Pumping Station. Therefore, potential impacts on amenity for future occupiers of the proposed development must be considered and assessed. This should include an appraisal of existing odour, noise and lighting from the pumping station and its potential impact on future occupiers of the proposed development. The local planning authority must ensure they are satisfied with the applicant's assessment in that the amenity of future occupiers of the proposed development will be acceptable. If amenity is considered acceptable by the local planning authority then we would request that any proposed mitigation that is set out in the assessment is controlled via a planning condition. There is a large main and sewer crossing the site.
NSO/0054	British Waterways would wish to be included in detailed site discussions to ensure that any proposals have a positive impact on the Grand Union Canal and the impact of potential increases in the number of users of the towpath is considered.
NSO/0082	Adjacent to the Grand Union Canal and River Colne, recognised as important Green Infrastructure in the Core Strategy policy CP9. If this site is allocated, the Council should ensure measures are taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is close to pair of bus stops but services only 2 hourly. Close to superstore. Schemes have been identified as needs in this area in the emerging South West Herts Cycling Strategy.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Parts of this site lie within floodzone 3b, 3a, 2 and 1. Currently find allocation unsound as contains a more vulnerable uses within FZ3b (PPS25 Para D1). If FZ3b designation removed from the site or site boundary altered to not include areas of FZ3b then site would need to pass Sequential Test in order for us to find the allocation sound. This is because parts of the site lie within FZ 3a and 2. If this site passes the Sequential Test, any more vulnerable development (housing) would also need to pass the Exception Test. Part C requires that a FRA be submitted with the planning application at this site. As parts of the site fall into an area FZ1 that is surrounded by FZ2, You will also need to be satisfied that there is safe access and egress from the site during a flood. The minimum of an 8m underdeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the River. The buffer zone is necessary to allow access to the river during a flood event and for maintenance. The buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit.

H(30) Depot, Stockers Farm Road, Rickmansworth

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

68% yes (45 responses)
32% no (21 responses)

Reference	Comment
00403	Located within Colne Valley Regional Park. Developers should enter into a planning obligation to make financial contribution to Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company to implement objectives of the Colne Valley Park for local benefit within the vicinity of development and Green Infrastructure Plan Colne Valley links.
00544, 04095, CU/0024	Too many dwellings.
00544, 04095, 03454, CU/0024	Density too high.
00544, 04095	Insufficient thought to parking.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Existing scrub – retain if possible; possible slow worm interest. Includes small section of wildlife site.
00802	Support development provided height restricted to two storeys.
00802	60 units seems high.
00802	Access from a private road, assume if development goes ahead adoption of road would be extended.
00802	Only one access should be allowed as directly opposite school.
00802	Must be sufficient parking to avoid overspill onto road.
00802	Within flood plain.
00802	Current drainage system relies on field drain ditch which has been blocked for many years causing water to flood in the field. Drainage should be improved and maintained.
03191	Density should not exceed 25-30dph
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03632	Stockers Farm Road is clogged with cars at school times.
03795	Harefield Road already too congested.
03795	Flood plain.
03795	Drainage problems.
03795	Water shortage.
03795	Poor public transport.
03795	Too many houses for a small village.
03795	Air quality deteriorate more.
04006	History of flooding in this area which have affected Stockers Farm Road and Harefield Road and risk of serious damage to houses only just averted. New development may increase danger.
04006	New properties will have to be at a level where not liable to flood and where water will not drain away into local low lying properties.
04006	Flood pond and underground pipes have not been maintained which will become a problem.
04065	Harefield Road has been free from raw sewage being pumped onto road by drains as new pumps at Stockers Farm pumping station.
04065	Field at back floods.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0063	Within floodzone 3a and parts may fall within FZ3b. Fails Sequential Test. May fail Exception Test. Former use will require remediation to safeguard against contamination. Council has overestimated supply. Site approx 1ha and likely to accommodate around 40 dwellings. PPS3 removed min density requirement of 30 dph. The property market and housing demand is

	<p>seeking larger family properties within lower density development and no longer a significant proportion of flats.</p> <p>Council has not provided evidence that site developable for 60 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56. Accordingly, capacity should be amended to reflect a realistic density based on a national trend towards lower density dev. Would recommend a 10% discount be applied to compensate for overestimate capacity. There is also concern that the proposals will not deliver housing within the Plan period 2016-2020 as identified and therefore Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of England Plan requirements.</p>
NSI/0156	In need of tidying up and will make the area neater.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0054	British Waterways would wish to be included in detailed site discussions to ensure that any proposals have a positive impact on the Grand Union Canal and the impact of potential increases in the number of users of the towpath is considered.
NSO/0077	Area of the site extends beyond the currently developed part of the site, which would result in the intrusion of development into the Green Belt contrary to the stated objectives and intentions of the Core Strategy. In our view, allocation unsound, by virtue of conflict with national policy and by being unreasonable and unjustified, and the site boundaries would need to be amended.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>SW lies on a wildlife site (89/009 – Stockers Farm Meadow), which extends around western and northern boundary. LWS 89/009 is an ancient water meadow with extensive ditch system supporting species-rich damp mainly neutral to somewhat acidic alluvial grassland. Supports diverse flora and when flooded it provides important habitat for wildfowl and wading birds. Should be subject to ecological survey to establish ecological interest and value. If surveys indicate that the area is of particular ecological interest, or can be managed or restored to increase ecological value, this part of the allocation site should be retained as a LWS and managed appropriately in long term. Some form of buffer zone would need to be established between LWS and any new housing dev. Developing this part of the site counter to Core Strategy.</p> <p>If development goes ahead in other parts of site, will need to ensure adequate habitat protection, mitigation and enhancement on site and adjacent habitat areas is planned and delivered as part of dev.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	The closest bus services run along Harefield Rd and bus stops may not be within 400m of site. Bus services along here are run under contract to HCC. One route is hourly and only covers the middle part of the day, the other is 1 1/2-2 hourly. If there is to be development here, contributions would need to be made in order for bus services to be improved. Any extra patronage from this development may help to make bus services more viable although it is doubtful whether contributions from a site of this size would be sufficient to enable bus services to be made sufficiently attractive to make the site sustainable in the long term. Schemes have been identified as needs in this area in the emerging South West Herts Cycling Strategy
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>We would currently find the site allocation unsound as a sequential test has not been carried out. This is because parts of the site lie within Flood Zones 3a and 2.</p> <p>If this site passes the flood risk Sequential Test. Any more vulnerable development (housing) would also need to pass the Exception Test. Part C</p>

	<p>requires that a Flood Risk Assessment be submitted with the planning application at this site.</p> <p>The minimum of a five metre undeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the two ordinary watercourses on the site. The buffer zone is necessary to allow access to the river during a flood event and for maintenance. The buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit.</p>
SCO/0040 (Veolia Water)	<p>Support allocation for 60 units. Proposed deletion from Green Belt. Phasing to be 2011-2015 on grounds of sustainability. Site important PDL development opportunity which will play valuable role in meeting Rickmansworth's market and affordable housing requirements to 2026. Proposed density comparable to prevailing density of interwar and post war housing to east. Reduced capacity would mean additional sites on edge of Rickmansworth which is tightly constrained. In single ownership and deliverable 2011-2015. Should be removed from Green Belt so no need to delay development. Site does not play significant Green Belt role as PDL, built up so not contribute to openness and redevelopment would not result in encroachment into openness of Green Belt. Development would not conflict with any Green Belt purposes. Detailed comments on site score.</p>

H(31) Land South of Tolpits Lane

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

49% yes (28 responses)

51% no (29 responses)

Reference	Comment
00492, 00806, 00837, CU/0281	Possible flooding location.
00492	Not suitable area.
00637	<p>Capacity of the site (50 dwellings) generally considered appropriate. However phasing should be bought forward due to the characteristics of the site and its deliverability.</p> <p>No constraints to delivery of the land for residential dev in the short term to provide new dwellings. Land is all within a single ownership and currently vacant. No issues in relation to contamination.</p> <p>The SFRA2 identifies that the majority of the site (84%) is in Flood Zone 1, with 88% in Flood Zone 1 or 2 – acceptable for housing. The 12% of the site identified within Flood Zone 3 is contained along the very southern most edge of the site (towards R Colne), where dev would be avoided.</p> <p>Development of the site also offers the opportunity to refurbish the existing listed Tolpits House located within the site, delivering heritage benefits, whilst allocation of the site would enable continued investment into the MT School.</p> <p>On this basis phasing of the site should be bought forward to secure development earlier within the plan period.</p>
00649 (HBRC)	Significant Wildlife Site constraint – habitats adjacent to River Colne.
00748	<p>There are a number of mature trees across the site and blanket TPO.</p> <p>There are two Grade II listed buildings (Tolpits House and Little Tolpits Cottage). The site is opposite an industrial estate and is not near an existing residential settlement. The site has following designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part is within FZ2 and 3; • Part is within a LNR; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part is within a site of Archaeological Interest
01367	Unsuitable for housing. Scores very low. Proposed allocation given low score raises questions re value of scoring sites if scores ignored and consequently overall soundness of plan based on lack of justification for sites proposed. Would result in loss of 7ha, majority greenfield. Completely isolated, no accessibility to local shops of services. Proximity to industrial estate raises concerns over highway impact, access and residential amenity. Development would be contrary to number of CS and national policies. Deliverability questioned.
02279	Danger of building flats with no infrastructure for increased pressure on local resources.
03432	Insufficient infrastructure to support development.
03454, CU/0281	Green Belt
03454	Too dense.
03632	Open country which should be preserved.
04104	Waterbased innovative new housing designs, biodiversity benefits floating homes. Supported but add that the capacity of the site can be increased with a net reduction in flood risk to surrounding properties. Sustainable housing development can include measures to enhance the water environment, including floating and amphibious buildings that have no negative impact on the surrounding hydrology. Indeed there would be a net gain to biodiversity and sustainable use of water. Houseboats are supported and included in the Councils own plan policies as being supported. Given the timescale of the plan and the fact that these systems are now being developed in the UK (particularly the Thames) it would be best to plan for these at this stage and this site is particularly suitable. Recreation can be incorporated and this can be part of an exemplar scheme within the District.
CU/0111	Small development which will not intrude into character of town.
NSI/0063	<p>Within floodzone 3a and parts may fall within FZ3b. Fails Sequential Test, may fail the Exception Test.</p> <p>Council has overestimated supply. PPS3 has removed min density requirement of 30 dph. Property market and housing demand is seeking larger family properties within lower density developments and no longer a significant proportion of flats.</p> <p>Council has not provided evidence that the site is developable for 50 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56.</p> <p>Accordingly, dwelling capacity should be amended to reflect a realistic density based on a national trend towards lower density development. Would recommend a 10% discount be applied to compensate for overestimate capacity.</p>
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>Much of site designated as wildlife site 89/004 – Hamper Mill Lakes. Bounded to the south by the R Colne, running through LWS 89/004. Site currently open land.</p> <p>Due to the proportion of site that comprises LWS and sensitivity of adjacent habitats, HMWT does not find this allocation appropriate.</p> <p>Should be subject to ecological survey to establish ecological interest and value. If surveys indicate that the area is of particular ecological interest, or can be managed or restored to increase ecological value, this part of the</p>

	<p>allocation site should be retained as a LWS and managed appropriately in long term. Some form of buffer zone would need to be established between LWS and any new housing dev.</p> <p>Developing this part of the site for runs counter to policies within CS. Allocation of H(31) as a whole does not seem concordant with the Core Strategy.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Remote from existing bus services/rail station, development size would not be sufficient to make new/diverted bus services viable long term.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of site within floodzones 3b, 3a, 2 and 1.</p> <p>Currently find allocation unsound as contains a more vulnerable uses within FZ3b (PPS25 para D1). If the FZ3b designation removed from the site or site boundary altered to not include areas of FZ3b would need to pass Sequential Test in order for us to find allocation sound as parts of the site lie within FZ 3a and 2.</p> <p>If this site passes the flood Sequential Test, any more vulnerable development (housing) would also need to pass the Exception Test. Part C requires that a FRA be submitted with the planning application.</p> <p>Site is on the Hamper Mill Lakes Wildlife site. EA recently carried out extensive works to the River Colne bank at this site including removal of a weir, creation of a backwater and enhancements to the planting to protect the priority habitat at the site, improve the fishery and work towards the targets of the WFD (identified in the Thames River Basin Mgmt Plan). If site is brought forward, vital that the dev does not lead to deterioration of the habitats present, or it will be in contradiction with Policy DM6.</p>

H(32) Pocklington House, Eastbury

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

82% yes (23 responses)

18% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00492, CU/0111	Depends on suitable replacement site.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bat interest. Landscaping to include retention of exiting trees.
03745	Support proposed allocation of site. The 2016-2020 timeframe and stated capacity of 30 dwellings are both supported. The development of the site is entirely dependent upon a suitable replacement for the care home first being found, and as such anticipate no overall impact on care provision.
CU/0133	Has been an excellent resource for people with visual impairment and area should be proud to have such a facility if need continues.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Closest bus stops are on Watford Rd and are within 400m, with regular bus services into Northwood and Watford. Site is within short walk/cycle/bus ride (0.8 miles) of Northwood station.

H(33) The Fairway, Green Lane, Oxhey Hall

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

81% yes (21 responses)

19% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Possible bat interest.
CU/0111	Is similar accommodation found before development begins.
CU/0133	Community needs local resources for local people.
CU/0187	Concern that residents of care home will be looked after with due consideration and professionalism should site be proposed. Resident whose mother in the home did not know of the proposals- room for improvement in communications.
CU/0187	Site adjacent to CA, one characteristic of which is the size of garden. Should be respected in design of houses, room sizes and gardens.
CU/0187	Site would provide ideal location for part to be allocated for accommodation specifically for elderly. Attempt to do this on Nursery site failed.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is within 400m of bus stops with a regular service.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Sale and redevelopment of this site will assist the County Council's provision of services in the County.

H(34) Crescent Club, Hallows Crescent, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

83% yes (25 responses)

17% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
NSI/0145	Too many houses for size of site.
NSI/0175	Leisure site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

H(35) Jet Public House, Hayling Road, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

97% yes (30 responses)

3% no (1 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
NSI/0175	Leisure site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

H(36) Little Furze School, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

65% yes (20 responses)

35% no (11 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Site adjacent to Oxhey Woods – buffer role.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
00806	Not sure about taking land from recreation and schools. May be needed.
01367	Within Green Belt but only borders housing along one boundary. Poorly related to existing development. Identified as pdl but majority of site playing fields which have not been developed. Surrounded on 3 sides by LNR and wildlife site. Development would have serious detrimental effect on LNR and Green Belt. Housing not appropriate on land surrounded by ecological sites when less constrained alternatives.
03119	Closing schools to build new ones.
03632	Do not support loss of open spaces, playing fields or play areas.
03632	South Oxhey needs more community facilities not less.
NSI/0145	Could be secondary school.
NSI/0175	Need more schools.
NSI/0204	Wrong to put housing on school sites.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	We have concerns regarding Waste Water Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. It will be necessary for us to undertake investigations into the impact of the development and completion of this, on average, takes 12 weeks. It should be noted that in the event of an upgrade to our assets being required, up to three years lead in time will be necessary. In this case we ask that the following paragraph is included in the Development Plan. Developers will be required to demonstrate that there is adequate waste water capacity both on and off the site to serve the development and how any necessary upgrades will be provided ahead of the occupation of development in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy.
NSO/0077	Area of the site extends beyond the currently developed part of the site, which would result in the intrusion of development into the Green Belt contrary to the stated objectives and intentions of the Core Strategy. In our view, allocation unsound, by virtue of conflict with national policy and by being unreasonable and unjustified, and the site boundaries would need to be amended.

NSO/0082 (HMWT)	Adjacent to Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site 90/006 – Oxhey Wood. If site allocated, ensure measures taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning and delivery. These should be based on comprehensive ecological surveys of the site and surrounding habitats.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Gosforth Lane is served by a local town bus service with 20 min frequency which links South Oxhey to Bushey and Carpenders Park stations and Watford town centre. There are bus stops outside the school site.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Sale of site for residential will assist the County Council in provision of services in the county.

H(37) South of St Josephs, Ainsdale Road, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

44% yes (15 responses)

56% no (19 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Site adjacent to Oxhey Woods – buffer role.
00658	Adjoins five mansion blocks in the ownership of Thrive Homes, at the junction of Ainsdale Road and Oxhey Drive. These blocks are in need of redevelopment to overcome structural and environmental problems, as well as offering the opportunity of achieving a more appropriate mix and site layout. Masterplanning of a larger area involving the site plus the Thrive Homes existing stock offers the opportunity to generate a more appropriate mix and amenity space.
00665	School want to retain land.
00748	Loss of amenity space and playing fields raised as a key concern. St Joseph's Primary School responded to the consultation noting that the field was 'well used' and advised of the importance of the land to facilitate school sporting events. Sport England object to the loss of 'playing fields'. In addition there is limited evidence to support the release of the playing fields to accommodate residential development or at a minimum, negate the loss through the re-provision of playing fields elsewhere as per the guidance set out in PPG17. Therefore, release of the site for development will result in the loss of playing fields which the consultation highlighted is an important asset.
00749	Valuable land for the St Joseph's and other primary schools in the area. Used for sports events organised by the local primary consortium. Only open grassed space in the immediate vicinity of school sufficiently large to accommodate events. Also used by St Joseph's for Old boys Football Team on a regular basis. Using land for housing will further urbanise an area, needs open space for both children and adults. Well used, and safe for children to use. Ainsdale Rd is already crowded with vehicles. Will presents a particular risk when children are coming to school and returning home. Adding a further 40 dwellings will put additional pressure on road that is already congested and will add to the risks to pupils at the school. The land is important for the drainage of water from the woods as to the west of (and above) the land. There is considerable run off from that land, a lot of which is absorbed by the field proposed for development. The school already suffers from poor drainage when the weather is really bad. Building on the field will exacerbate these problems.
00806	Not sure about taking land from recreation and schools. May be needed.

03119, 03454, CU/0281	Building on playing fields.
03632	Do not support loss of open spaces, playing fields or play areas.
03632	South Oxhey needs more community facilities not less.
NSI/0063	<p>Sport England object to these proposals as it does not meet one of the exceptions.</p> <p>Council has overestimated supply. PPS3 removed minimum density requirement of 30 dph. The property market and housing demand seeking larger family properties within lower density developments and no longer a significant proportion of flats.</p> <p>Council has not provided evidence that the site developable for 40 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56.</p> <p>Accordingly, dwelling capacity amended to reflect density based on national trend towards lower density dev. Would recommend 10% discount be applied to compensate for overestimate capacity. Also concern that will not deliver housing 2021-2026 as identified therefore the Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of England Plan requirements.</p>
NSI/0204	Wrong to put housing on school sites.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082	Adjacent to the and Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site 90/006 – Oxhey Wood. If site allocated, should ensure measures are taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning and delivery. These should be based on comprehensive ecological surveys of the site and surrounding habitats.
NSO/0087	<p>Strongly object. Would result in loss of the entire PF which aerial photos indicate is operational and includes 1 football pitch. Even if Playing Fields not currently in use, could offer potential to meet any current or future needs of SO and surrounding area. Have considered the TRDC Playing Pitch Assessment Update (2010) which is considered to provide a broadly sound assessment of existing and future playing pitch needs. Assessment indicates that in broad terms, sufficient playing pitches in the Watford Rural part of the district to meet current and future needs. However, not satisfied that evidence base has demonstrated that the playing fields could be released for development on the basis of them being clearly surplus to community needs for the following reasons...</p> <p>Not currently satisfied that there is a clear surplus of playing pitch provision in the South Oxhey area. Proposals would not accord with established playing fields policy ('A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England' (1997), PPG17 paras 10-15, DM11.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	There are bus stops within 400m on Oxhey Drive which give access to a regular local town service enabling access to Bushey and Carpenders Park stations and Watford town centre.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Should be removed as it may be required for education use.
SCO/0057 (Natural England)	Appendix 2a of the SA states that woodland is immediately adjacent to allocated site H37 (Land South of St Josephs, Ainsdale Road, South Oxhey) but that it is not ancient woodland. According to the Natural England Ancient Woodland Inventory this woodland is ancient semi-natural woodland.

H(38) Amenity Space Maylands Road/Ferndown Road, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

67% yes (20 responses)

33% no (10 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
01764	Archaeological implications of development on the following sites can be mitigated by a condition/s requiring a programme of archaeological work on any planning permission the LPA is minded to grant
03454	Can't develop playing fields and woods
03632	Do not support loss of open spaces, playing fields or play areas.
03632	South Oxhey needs more community facilities not less.
03644	Should not build on open land.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.

H(39) South Oxhey Town Centre, South Oxhey

Do you support the identification of this area for increased housing?

72% yes (23 responses)

28% no (9 responses)

Reference	Comment
00492	Consideration required to regulate housing, shopping, leisure and community development- quality of housing should be a pre-requisite.
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Pond Wood constraint.
00658	Obviously an area in which Thrive Homes has a keen interest. Are participating in the Steering Group and Project Group for the SO Initiative. Would be keen to see a masterplanning exercise of a larger area than that shown on the plan, both to maximise site utilisation and to address structural/environmental problems in the mansion blocks along Otley Way and Ainsdale Road. Existing Parameters Plan too modest in scope.
01367	No justification for capacity of 210 dwellings. Support principle of regeneration, but in absence of capacity evidence, Council in danger of failing to meet housing requirements and any sites could not be relied upon to provide affordable housing that is a priority.
03998	Support provision of a balance of residential and commercial development within SOTC in accordance with aim of the adopted CS. Barclays welcome the redevelopment of SOTC to provide a mix of uses to establish a balanced local community. Barclays support Policy SA1 and consider that housing provision needs to be appropriate and identified in terms of; location, dwelling capacity of sites, overall phasing strategy of the redevelopment of South Oxhey and the proportion of affordable homes. This is in order to establish suitable local demand and accessibility to commercial uses in the Town Centre, including Barclays Bank, via public transport, by foot and by bicycle. This will ensure that SO is a fully functioning, self sufficient and sustainable community,

	<p>significantly regenerating the declining District Centre in accordance with the goals of the CS and Draft NPPF.</p> <p>H(39) site plan should be updated to reflect masterplan and provide accurate red line boundaries.</p>
04104	Not significant growth other than logical PDL sites and obvious regeneration.
NSI/0063	<p>Proposed site area not an allocation and not suitable for this document. Has not identified precise parcels suitable to accommodate 210 dwellings. Sites are windfall development and will be provided for within a subsequent SPD. Should not be in SA without specific sites.</p> <p>No explanation of how the quantum of development calculated, whether sites identified and whether landowners willing to release land. If the redevelopment proposals were for area of undeveloped or unused land within 1 ownership, a development which includes a considerable number of dwellings would be achievable, however not realistic in this location. Likely delivery problems as fragmented ownership, existing uses which may not wish to be relocated or redevelopment, likely CPO required which may take years and status of various leasehold arrangements is unknown. Not provided evidence that the site is developable for 210 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	<p>South Oxhey currently benefits from a local town bus route (every 20 minutes) which links South Oxhey to nearby railway stations and Watford town centre and a half hourly inter-urban route that passes through the area. A key theme of the policy for South Oxhey appears to be improving accessibility to services, employment and education. The opportunity should be taken to consider accessibility in transport terms – i.e. pedestrian/cycle routes to bus stops, accessibility of bus stops, and travel information provision. Carpenders Park station is the nearest rail station and this may be the opportunity to look at improving accessibility to the station by sustainable modes of transport which could be enabled if developer contributions were forthcoming. Residential development within town centres benefits from having services and facilities close by and a revitalised town centre can help prevent trips further afield.</p>
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Support the initiative to regenerate South Oxhey and due to its proximity to Watford any proposals should be consistent with Watford's spatial strategy that; 'new development protects residential amenity and protects and enhances the character of the area.'

H(40) Grapevine Public House, Prestwick Road, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

84% yes (26 responses)

16% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Existing information suggests there are unlikely to be any ecological constraints. Compensate loss of woodland.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
03454	Can't develop playing fields and woods
03632	Do not support loss of open spaces, playing fields or play areas.
03632	South Oxhey needs more community facilities not less.

NSI/0175	Leisure site.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	Adjacent to Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site 90/006 – Oxhey Wood. If allocated, should ensure measures are taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning and delivery. These should be based on comprehensive ecological surveys of the site and surrounding habitats.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	There are bus stops very close to the site with regular bus services available.

H(41) Land at Heysham Drive, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

55% yes (18 responses)

45% no (15 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Adjacent to a wildlife site. Potential severe reduction in connectivity.
00658	Access would require remodelling of access to properties on Foxglove Path so argument for cooperation with Thrive.
03119, 03454	Can't develop playing fields.
03632	Do not support loss of open spaces, playing fields or play areas.
03632	South Oxhey needs more community facilities not less.
03644	Should not build on open land.
NSI/0063	Sport England object to these proposals as it does not meet one of the exceptions. Council has overestimated supply at the site. PPS3 has removed minimum density requirement of 30dph. The property market and housing demand seeking larger family properties within lower density developments and no longer a significant proportion of flats. Council has not provided evidence that the site is developable for 50 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56. Dwelling capacity amended to reflect realistic density based on national trend towards lower density development. Would recommend a 10% discount be applied to compensate for overestimate capacity. There is also concern that the proposals will not deliver housing within the Plan period 2021-2026 as identified and therefore the Council should build in flexibility within its Plan to meet the minimum East of England Plan requirements.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082	Lies adjacent to the Local Nature Reserve and Wildlife Site 90/001 – Prestwick Road Meadow. The site is currently open space. If this site is allocated, the Council should ensure measures are taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning and delivery. These should be based on comprehensive ecological surveys of the site and surrounding habitats.
NSO/0087	Strongly object. OS plan indicates that this site is a playing field although current and past aerial photographs do not show any formal playing pitches marked out on the site. If site is, or has been, used as a playing field (i.e. formal playing pitches marked out) then would be concerned about entire loss of the site to development. Even if not currently in use as a playing

	field, it could offer potential to meet any current or future needs in South Oxhey and surrounding area. Due to the lack of information about whether site actually is a current or former playing field in practice, objection is made to the allocation due to the potential implications that the loss of the site may have if it is or was a playing field. If it could be satisfactorily demonstrated that the site is not (and has not in the past) been marked out for a playing pitch then prepared to withdraw this objection. However, if the site is a current or former playing field, Sport England would object to its loss for the same reasons set out above with respect to site allocation H(37).
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Bus stops on Prestwick Rd are over 400m, development size not sufficiently large to make diversion of bus service viable.
SCO/0009 (LB Harrow)	<p>Would harm openness of already narrow and elevated Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey. Existing residential development Heysham and Wentworth Drives already extend urban area of South Oxhey to boundary, but somewhat isolated elements within openness provided by surrounding land, including H41 and H42. H41 and H42 would create continuous urban edge along ridge line and reduction in perception of openness and visual amenity of this part of Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey provides access to countryside. Sections 14+15 of London Loop pass through area and part of section 14 immediately rear of H41.</p> <p>PPG2- Green Belt should be several miles wide allowing appreciable open zone round built up area. Visual amenity of Green Belt should not be injured by proposals within/conspicuous from Green Belt.</p> <p>Connects Prestwick Rd LNR to Harrow Green Belt (contains designated SNCI). Widens southern tip of LNR from <20m to >170m. Wider juncture between LNR and Green Belt better conduit for wildlife migration than tip of the reserve alone. H41 will lead to inc biological islandisation of LNR reducing viability (PPS9).</p>
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Sale of site for residential will assist the County Council in provision of services in the county.

H(42) Rear of Lytham Avenue, South Oxhey

Do you support the allocation of this land for housing?

81% yes (22 responses)

19% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Further loss of close by open space.
00658	In close proximity to Thrive Homes existing stock. Strong arguments in terms of management efficiency for Thrive Homes to be closely involved in taking proposals forward for any affordable housing within this scheme.
01764	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation in situ, are present. Because the presence of such remains could be a reason for refusal of any planning application, it is necessary that an archaeological assessment take place before the application is submitted. The details of the scope of any archaeological assessment will be dependant upon the nature of any development

	proposal. We would also recommend that a rapid archaeological assessment is undertaken of all the sites listed below before being allocated for development, in order to determine if the importance and extent of archaeological remains are such that they might affect the principle of development on the site. Such assessments normally comprise desk-based studies and carefully targeted archaeological test-pitting or trail trenching and are relatively inexpensive.
03644	Should not build on open land.
04115	Selling land adjacent to schools short sighted.
CU/0133	Would have an adverse effect on area already built up and suffering deprivation.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site likely to be within 400m of bus stops on Little Oxhey Lane, with bus services giving access to nearby railways stations and central Watford.
SCO/0009 (LB Harrow)	<p>Would harm openness of already narrow and elevated Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey. Existing residential development Heysham and Wentworth Drives already extend urban area of South Oxhey to boundary, but somewhat isolated elements within openness provided by surrounding land, including H41 and H42. H41 and H42 would create continuous urban edge along ridge line and reduction in perception of openness and visual amenity of this part of Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey provides access to countryside. Sections 14+15 of London Loop pass through area and part of section 14 immediately rear of H41.</p> <p>PPG2-Green Belt should be several miles wide allowing appreciable open zone round built up area. Visual amenity of Green Belt should not be injured by proposals within/conspicuous from Green Belt.</p>

Policy SA2: Employment Site Allocations

Do you support this policy?

95% Yes (40 responses)

5% No (2 responses)

Reference	Comment
00643	Supported in part.
00649 (HBRC)	No direct ecological implications within the Policy itself, unless affects sites with significant ecological interest.
03191	Policy is supported but with the caveats referring to Site E(e) Maple Cross and the Association's concern that the policy would see the steady near elimination of employment opportunities in Rickmansworth.
03905	As part of the South Oxhey Initiative, a new employment site has been earmarked on Prestwick Road. I hope this suggested site is really given a go.
04015	Local businesses and employment are a way of building a sustainable development and community. Lets encourage this.
04147	Beaufort Court should be identified as a location for employment development linked to the existing use and occupier to accommodate the growth of the RES business. Any proposals must be of the highest standards of sustainability, linked to the existing occupation of Beaufort Court, and not have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Proposals should also be subject to a robust sustainable travel plan to reduce the use of the private car and to maximise the use of smarter transport options.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Hertfordshire County Council as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority supports the retention of employment site E(b) Tolpits Lane. This site has been identified in the Pre-Submission Waste Site Allocations document as an employment land area of search (ELAS212) as it contains B2 and B8 uses that may be compatible with a waste management use.

E(a) Croxley Business Park

Do you support the allocation of this land for employment?

87% yes (46 responses)

13% no (7 responses)

Reference	Comment
CU/0232	With the additional benefit of the new rail link allied to the loss of the PO Sorting Office to retail as well as the change in use of many units to Car Showrooms, the remaining light industrial uses on Watford and Croxley Business Parks should be preserved and/or the area allocated enlarged.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Opening of the new railway station on the Croxley Rail Link at Ascot Road in 2016 will give even better access to this area from Rickmansworth and all points west as well as Watford to the east.
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Supports these employment designations, which have provide significant employment areas in proximity to Watford.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	If the site is redeveloped in the future we will require a minimum 8m undeveloped buffer strip adjacent to the River Gade and a minimum five metre undeveloped buffer strip around the ponds on the site. We would object to the loss of any of the ponds on the site. Any redevelopment will need to be mindful of proximity to Croxley Common Moor SSSI and should be designed to avoid any negative impact on the

	biodiversity of the area. The sustainable drainage scheme should incorporate methods to improve water quality benefits as well as achieve greenfield rates.
SCO/0057 (Natural England)	Immediately adjacent to a SSSI and LNR (Croxley Common Moor). Any development proposed should give careful consideration to potential impacts on this SSSI. Permission should be refused if adverse impacts are anticipated.

E(b) Tolpits Lane

Do you support the allocation of this land for employment?

100% yes (48 responses)

0% no (0 responses)

Reference	Comment
01764	Some risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation in situ, may be present. However, in some parts of the sites listed below, it is likely that the archaeological potential has been reduced by previous development. It is therefore necessary that an archaeological site impact assessment should be produced before any development proposal is submitted. The objective of such an assessment is to determine the extent to which any previous development on the site has affected its archaeological potential. Such assessments normally comprise desk-based studies, augmented by geotechnical information as appropriate. Further archaeological field evaluation may be required before determination of any application (and preferably before submission of an application), if it is considered that the site still retains significant potential for archaeological remains worthy of preservation in situ.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Access by bicycle afforded via the Ebury Way running along disused railway line on the northern edge of the site. HCC supports Watford Borough Council aspiration to improve access across the Ebury Way between the Wolsey Business Park (on Dwight Road) and the Watford Enterprise Centre (on Caxton Way).
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Supports these employment designations, which have provide significant employment areas in proximity to Watford.
SCO/0057 (Natural England)	Immediately adjacent to a SSSI and LNR (Croxley Common Moor). Any development proposed should give careful consideration to potential impacts on this SSSI. Permission should be refused if adverse impacts are anticipated.

E(c) Junction Park

Do you support the removal of the allocation on this land for employment?

93% yes (25 responses)

7% no (2 responses)

Reference	Comment
NSO/0054	British Waterways is supportive of new development adjacent to the River Gade /Grand Union Canal however would wish to be involved at an early stage of master planning to ensure that the Canal environment is not adversely affected and the proposal fully addresses and maximises the proximity to a waterside location.
SCO/0023	Site is within FZ3. It would be most appropriate for use as open space or

(Environment Agency)	other water compatible uses as set put at table d2 of PPS25. We would not support the future use of this site for residential or other more flood risk sensitive uses, as set out in Table D.2, given the potentially high risk of flooding to the site.
----------------------	--

E(d) Carpenders Park West/ Delta Gain

Do you support the allocation on this land for employment?

83% yes (29 responses)

17% no (6 responses)

Reference	Comment
00643	<p>Support identification of north of site as residential as planning permission. Object to allocation of south of site as employment.</p> <p>Site is inappropriately allocated for business due to past decisions. Unsuitability demonstrated by difficulties since 80s in attracting occupiers.</p> <p>Core Strategy seeks to retain employment on site despite market conditions that show not a sustainable employment location. 2010 Employment Study based on outdated 2009 data. Comment that 'buildings well occupied with only few suites available' not a true reflection. Owners occupy majority of space themselves and letting units to third parties is difficult.</p> <p>Oversupply of office space increased. Site has no local significance as employment location.</p> <p>Sites unsuitable for employment should not be forced to meet unrealistic view of market situation. Core Strategy recognises opportunity for relocation or mixed use development on sites where this would not harm overall economic performance of District. Site is an opportunity for a mixed use scheme. Objection to commercial redevelopment from consultation in January 2012.</p> <p>Propose southern part of site identified for mixed development with the majority of that use being residential.</p>
01764	Archaeological implications of development on the following sites can be mitigated by a condition/s requiring a programme of archaeological work on any planning permission the LPA is minded to grant.
01948, 03842, 04009, 04015	Should be kept as employment/commercial.
01948	Only employment site for South Oxhey and Carpenders Park.
03974	Support promotion of employment rather than unneeded extra housing which infrastructure cannot support.
03976, 04009	Not enough infrastructure to use land for housing.
03976	Flood plain.
04015	Employment encourages self sustaining local community and reduces need to travel.
04093	Oppose construction of 5 storey block of flats. Should not be above height of existing neighbouring buildings.
CU/0195	The boundaries should not be changed, so that this land remains for employment use. Whilst Kebbell Homes may claim that some of the existing offices on the site are unlet, Core Strategy is addressing needs for

	employment land to 2026 i.e. well beyond the present economic problems. Carpenders Park definitely does not need more housing but would benefit from future employment facilities in Delta Gain.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Site is within flood zone 2. As no Sequential Test has been submitted with the Site Allocations we currently find this allocation unsound. In order for us to find this allocation sound the site will need to pass the flood risk Sequential Test. The site is constrained by the presence of the culverted Herts Bourne Main River which runs the length of the site. Any future redevelopment within this allocated site would have to make adequate provision for maintenance access to the culvert as well as ensuring its stability by avoiding any further building above or in close proximity to the culvert. We consider it appropriate to remove the northern part of the site from the employment allocation as pp has been granted for residential use here.

E(e) Maple Cross/Maple Lodge

Do you support the allocation on this land for employment?

76% yes (34 responses)

24% no (11 responses)

Reference	Comment
00403	Site is located within the Colne Valley Regional Park. Expansion of the employment allocation at Maple Cross/Maple Lodge would conflict with the objectives of the Colne Valley Park. If new Employment Allocation is included in the Site Allocations, there must be a contribution made to the Colne Valley Park Community Interest Company towards implementation of the objectives of the Colne Valley Park for local benefit (e.g. Woodoaks farm Black Barn and Historic Farmland Landscapes project). This should be through a planning obligation on the developers and a levy/charge per square metre on the owner or occupier.
01764	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation in situ, are present. Because the presence of such remains could be a reason for refusal of any planning application, it is necessary that an archaeological assessment take place before the application is submitted. The details of the scope of any archaeological assessment will be dependant upon the nature of any development proposal. We would also recommend that a rapid archaeological assessment is undertaken of all the sites listed below before being allocated for development, in order to determine if the importance and extent of archaeological remains are such that they might affect the principle of development on the site. Such assessments normally comprise desk-based studies and carefully targeted archaeological test-pitting or trail trenching and are relatively inexpensive.
03191	Document should be flexible enough to permit, if appropriate, the establishment of a Free School in commercial premises within Site E(e). Possibility should not be excluded by terms of final policy.
03659	Increased employment area would not be compatible with potential secondary school site.
CU/0024, CU/0203, CU/0204	Space needed for new school.
NSO/0054	British Waterways is supportive of new development adjacent to the River Gade /Grand Union Canal however would wish to be involved at an early

	stage of master planning to ensure that the Canal environment is not adversely affected and the proposal fully addresses and maximises the proximity to a waterside location.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Most, although not all, of the site likely to be within 400m of bus stops on A412. Type of employment placed here and amount of employment generated in terms of staffing has important relationship to its accessibility.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	The new employment floorspace allocation is within floodzone 2. As no sequential test has been submitted with the site allocations we currently find this allocation unsound. In order for us to find this allocation sound the site will need to pass the flood risk Sequential Test. We do not have any concerns with regards to the removal part of the employment allocation or the retention of part of this allocation. The minimum of an 8m underdeveloped buffer strip must be provided adjacent to the Maple Lodge Farm Ditch and a minimum 5m underdeveloped buffer strip provided to any ordinary watercourses on the site. This buffer zone is necessary to allow access to the river during a flood event and for maintenance. The buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit.

E(f) Kings Langley Employment Area

Do you support the allocation on this land for employment?

82% yes (27 responses)

18% no (6 responses)

Reference	Comment
00304	Should include all the land as shown in the allocation in the housing chapter. As drafted on page 33 of the draft plan, it excludes land north of Masters Yard (SHLAA ref BP3) which was suitable and achievable in the SHLAA. In one ownership and can come forward independently of BP5 and this is more likely. Well positioned and will provide a very attractive and sustainable housing development overlooking the lake to the north. Lawful use as parking and hardstanding and so a large proportion is previously developed land. Unfortunately and despite positive management by the owners, it has had a chequered history of nuisance to local residents, primarily due to the activities of the tenant and so there is an environmental benefit from a closure of the existing operations on the site and a move over to housing.
03877	Not appropriate or realistic to promote Imagination Technologies site for use other than employment given commitment to the site that Imagination Technologies has. Home Park is long established employment site currently subject to redevelopment works to improve business function. If site redeveloped as envisaged will be no potential or surplus space for any additional uses such as housing therefore draft designations have no realistic prospects of coming forward. Imagination Technologies is a high tech company that require high security levels on site so not appropriate for mixed uses. Imagination Technologies are sole owner of land and no interest in promoting residential or mixed use. Should not reallocate to mixed use as site and existing use are not appropriate for this use.
04104	Mixed use supported in principle but object to lack of reference to innovative housing solutions being supported.
CU/0377	Area always congested and will need more thought.

NSO/0054	British Waterways is supportive of new development adjacent to the River Gade /Grand Union Canal however would wish to be involved at an early stage of master planning to ensure that the Canal environment is not adversely affected and the proposal fully addresses and maximises the proximity to a waterside location.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Access to bus services from these sites is good, with regular bus service running along Station Road and Primrose Hill and along the A4251. Kings Langley station is also located at the southern end of the built up areas close to the M25.
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	Cross reference to related housing allocation would be helpful as this sets out the potential land parcels where housing development might occur. Greater clarity is important as the amount and location of housing and employment will impact on the immediate environment around the allocation and on Kings Langley as a whole.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	This site falls into floodzones 1,2,3a and 3b. We do not have any concerns with regards to the removal part of the employment allocation. However we do not support the allocation of land in Flood Zone 3b for any land uses that are considered incompatible with this flood zone as set out in Table D.3 of PPS 25. Parts of the site allocation lying within flood zones 2 and 3a would need to pass the Sequential Test before any future mixed use development could be allocated here. Following the sequential approach set out in PPS 25, all development should be located outside the floodplain wherever possible, with the most vulnerable uses located in the areas at lowest risk of flooding.

Policy SA3: Education Site Allocations

Do you support this policy?

60% Yes (160 responses)

40% No (107 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269	HCC have considered recreation grounds, if feasible, recreation grounds around Watford should be considered.
00269	Langleybury rejected but was suitable for a school before. Should be looked at again.
00543, 00837, 01390, 01995, 02025, 02106, 02301, 02455, 02469, 02587, 02588, 02631, 02668, 03119, 03151, 03184, 03904, 03922, 04115, 04149	Need for new secondary school caused by closing down schools and building homes.
00543	Plenty of school places in the area, but schools are largely selective and take children from outside Hertfordshire so no places for local children of average ability.
00543, 00916, 01965, 02106, 02432, 02701, 03072, 03128, 03617, 03644, 03814, 03988	Change admissions policies to get more places for local children.
00544, 02620, 04095	As representatives of the local community, Three Rivers District Council would be failing in its duties if it did anything else but cooperate fully with Hertfordshire County Council to provide the educational needs identified for the district.
00649 (HBRC)	No direct ecological implications within the Policy itself, unless affects sites with significant ecological interest.
00795	Too much development.
00795	Watford cannot cope with its children, problem should not be transferred elsewhere.
00916, 01053, 02839, 04151	Support new school in the District, but not in Croxley Green.
00941	Enough schools in the area of Watford, including Garston, Woodside and Kingswood, Croxley and Rickmansworth.
01218, 01783, 01860, 02279, 02367, 03355, 03396, 03426, 03432, 03617, 03632, 03659, 03798, 03821, 03912, 03914, 03930, 03975, 04014, 04062, 04110, 04121, 04124, 04136,	Need for new schools.

04156, 04171, NSI/0175, NSI/0262	
01218, 03037, 04115, NSI/0179	Langleybury school should be used.
01264	Within 12 months of previous plan, why the need for an additional school?
01350	Sites should be considered in relation to neighbourhood needs.
01350	School places should be limited to those living in Hertfordshire.
01367	Policy that Council will work with County to identify most appropriate sites supported, but Council has failed to identify most appropriate Primary school and proposed HCCs preferred site at Woodside Road.
01762	Concerns about HCC site selection and change in requirement from 1 to 2 sites. Has WBC been asked to review site options and recommend its preferred sites? County Council should require consultants to investigate new requirement for 2 schools by specifically looking for 2 sites in SW Herts.
02002	Need for places would not be so high without building on Green Belt land.
02089	Allocation of sites is not looking for the best sites for children who require them.
02089	Primary classes will be needed in more areas- schools in Croxley already full and housing being built.
02176	Provision must be made for high quality education.
02667	Understand the need for a secondary school (but not two). This is due to the overdevelopment of the surrounding areas
02669, 03919	If in the right place.
02711	It is right that Three Rivers works together with Herts County Council to provide for the local education needs of the increasing number of children in the area due to an increase in new housing.
02754, 03659, 03821	There should be two schools built, both in Maple Cross and Croxley Green to support growing number of children within both areas.
02976, 03304	Croxley Green in need of secondary school.
03090, NSI/0170	Has Ascot Road site been considered for new secondary school?
03090	If need for secondary school in WD3 area, surely a need for primary schools.
03191	Association is strongly in favour of the speedy provision of new secondary schools to replace those irretrievably lost over the past two decades through short-sighted policies. Concerned that a final decision may be taken to select a site in the Maple Cross area when there are still many unanswered questions about the two sites. It is noted that much more detailed work is needed on transport for each of the sites and the Association doubts some of the more sweeping statements about the impact of the schools on rush hour traffic that are given in the HCC reports. There should have been an economic impact assessment for each of the sites; the agricultural impact assessment is naive as it totally ignores the impact of the loss of economies of scale and the effective increase in the cost of capital due to the reduction in the farm's income base.
03230	Further provision of secondary school places vital.
03239	Support the need for another secondary school.
03300	Why are two sites which will only be 3-4 miles apart required?
03304	HCC have done technical evaluations of all sites and TRDC should listen to this advice and not pursue site B any further.

03307, 03826, 03928, 04129	All sites on Green Belt land which should be retained.
03307, 03826	Should identify a non-green belt plot.
03327	Site should be in Maple Cross or Oxhey.
03355	Need for one or more non-selective secondary school serving Rickmansworth area.
03454	Only one local school does not operate selective admissions policy, contributing to traffic.
03454, 03798, 03874, 04003, 04021, 04110, 04120, NSI/0170, NSI/0245	Local schools should take local children.
03531	Have not taken notice of previous consultation which showed majority of residents voted for sites in Mill End and not Croxley Green.
03552	Need schools in Middlesex, Bucks and Hillingdon to relieve pressure on Hertfordshire schools.
03644	If capacity needed for west Watford, school should be sited there to reduce congestion.
03652	Two schools closed in area in last 20 years.
03847, 04101	Durrants should not have been closed and demolished.
03905	Residents desire a secondary school in South Oxhey which would allow children to leave for school and return at a reasonable time. Would also increase the sense of community.
03928	Unnecessary blight on areas.
03946	Sites should be well consulted with the local areas.
04027	Not sure these are best sites for the area.
04062	As schools will be academies of free schools, will be paying bills while private providers make profits.
04063, NSI/0219	A school in Croxley will not deal with problems in Mill End/Maple Cross.
04074	Schools should be built at the same sites where housing is being built.
04074	Current infrastructure cannot support more traffic.
04088, 04089	Expand existing schools.
04113	Secondary school needed in Watford, not Rickmansworth.
04116, NSI/0204, NSI/0233, NSI/0257	School needed in Mill End/Maple Cross area.
04149	No more schools in Croxley Green.
04153	Schools recently closed in Baldwins Lane area.
CU/0061	Would be more sustainable to use a brownfield site.
CU/0061	Once greenfield built on, unlikely to ever revert to open land, even if no longer needed for education.
NSI/0204	Need one more secondary school. Additional requirement should be through expansion of existing schools.
NSI/0204	Not clear why South Oxhey excluded for secondary school.
NSI/0241	Alternative site in Croxley at Dickinson Sports field.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	Council should ensure that only sites which are not important as part of the ecological network or of notable value for wildlife are allocated. Should be established through ecological surveys of all sites. If any sites of importance to wildlife/ecological network are allocated, must be ensured that harm to ecological interests is minimised, mitigated (based on robust

	and up to date ecological surveys) and compensated for from the earliest stages of planning through to completion and long-term habitat management. If sites adjacent to important sites for nature conservation are allocated, must contain impacts on these sites including by limiting density, planning sensitive layouts and providing adequate, robust mitigation and enhancement for biodiversity as an integral part of the development.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	No proposed sites are areas of search for permanent facilities for re-use, recovery, transfer and recycling of waste. Areas anticipated to be occupied by the building's footprint not considered to have significant, workable mineral reserves that could be extracted prior to development taking place so no mineral sterilisation issues.
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	Would be helpful for supporting text to refer to sensitivities of cumulative housing growth in Three Rivers on the borders with Kings Langley on provision of schooling in the village. Spatial issue that the DPD should make reference to.
SOC/0014 (Watford BC)	Acknowledge identified demand and shortfall of school provision and keen to work with HCC, TRDC and other neighbouring authorities to deliver in a positive manner.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	<p>Given the overall level of need and the requirement to achieve a geographical spread of secondary education places, recommend two reserve secondary education sites, one in the east and one in the west.</p> <p>Primary school needs based on housing allocations: Chorleywood and Sarratt have minimal housing proposed and local schools have some capacity. Croxley Green has a small margin in the short term and capacity to increase provision by 1fe sufficient to meet anticipated need. Rickmansworth, Loudwater, Mill End and Maple Cross would produce a need for 1fe, further feasibility work being undertaken to assess whether achievable by expansion. Prudent to allocate a reserve site for 1fe capable of expansion to 2fe. Abbots Langley, Leavesden and Bedmond would be prudent to plan for 2fe capacity which should be allocated. Kings Langley need for primary places in Kings Langley that cannot be met by expansion of Kings Langley primary. Working with DBC to allocate site. Oxhey Hall and Moor Park not necessary for reserve capacity in area but expansion potential very limited. South Oxhey allocation of south of St Josephs for reserve school land, further reserve not necessary, though may reconsider if pupil numbers continue to rise. Carpenders Park no need from allocation. Bricket Wood and Garston any development needs to be carefully considered as part of wider area.</p>
SCO/0018 (Abbots Langley PC)	Support primary school policy. With sale of Langleybury, need for a secondary school site in Abbots Langley parish becoming pressing.

S(d) Croxley Green - Land North East of Baldwins Lane

Do you support the allocation on this land for education?

16% yes (99 responses)

84% no (527 responses)

Reference	Comment
-----------	---------

00267, 00451, 00835, 00916, 00951, 00961, 00981, 00999, 01010, 01031, 01183, 01295, 01344, 01618, 01620, 02045, 02184, 02204, 02277, 02287, 02301, 02351, 02417, 02432, 02437, 02469, 02581, 02622, 02627, 02708, 02732, 02822, 02885, 03030, 03106, 03119, 03128, 03215, 03273, 03300, 03319, 03372, 03376, 03473, 03474, 03497, 03632, 03841, 03861, 03861, 03886, 03913, 03919, 03925, 03927, 03929, 03939, 03955, 03967, 03972, 03975, 03988, 04021, 04036, 04053, 04061, 04081, 04122, 04124, 04125, 04129, 04134, 04158, 04171, CU/0081, CU/0166, CU/0232, CU/0247, NSI/0179, NSI/0188, NSI/0195, NSI/0233, NSI/0249	Enough schools in Croxley Green area.
00267, 00277, 00278, 00451, 00835, 00899, 00903, 00912, 00916, 00941, 00950, 00951, 00961, 00999, 01005, 01010, 01041, 01053, 01059, 01061, 01076, 01092, 01098, 01111, 01112, 01121, 01132, 01136, 01156, 01162, 01171, 01179, 01179, 01183, 01218, 01234, 01235, 01264, 01295, 01302, 01324, 01340, 01342, 01344, 01467, 01575, 01618, 01620, 01793, 01806, 01965, 01989, 02002, 02009, 02012, 02025, 02033, 02038, 02045, 02089, 02101, 02195, 02204, 02219, 02222, 02228, 02231, 02259, 02261, 02273, 02275, 02276, 02277, 02279, 02287, 02296, 02298, 02301, 02335, 02381, 02396, 02402, 02403, 02410, 02417, 02455, 02466, 02469, 02517, 02631, 02641, 02641, 02648, 02666, 02667, 02668, 02674, 02681, 02701, 02708, 02732, 02761, 02762, 02778, 02788, 02797, 02822, 02838, 02875, 02885, 02901, 02943, 02996, 02997, 03021, 03055, 03066, 03072, 03119, 03128, 03184, 03215, 03216, 03273, 03300, 03311, 03373, 03400, 03410, 03454, 03473, 03474, 03531, 03543, 03562, 03590, 03632, 03843, 03845, 03848, 03859, 03861, 03874, 03904, 03916, 03924, 03926, 03927, 03929, 03938, 03954, 03955, 03957, 03958, 03967, 03968, 03972, 03979, 03985, 04003, 04014, 04021, 04036, 04038, 04044, 04046, 04053, 04054, 04056, 04061, 04080, 04081, 04124, 04125, 04129, 04134, 04142, 04151, 04156, 04158, 04161, CU/0059, CU/0079, CU/0166, CU/0218, CU/0222, CU/0232, CU/0247, NSI/0161, NSI/0168, NSI/0170, NSI/0172, NSI/0177, NSI/0196, NSI/0204, NSI/0219, NSI/0233, NSI/0245, NSI/0248, NSI/0257, NSI/0259	Croxley Green/Baldwins Lane already congested.
00269	Requirement for one school in the east and one in the west makes farce of consultation as only one potential site in the east.
00269	Previous consultation which proved Croxley Green not suitable for a school ignored.
00269, 00899, 00909, 00910, 00946, 01009, 01050, 01059, 01111, 01235, 01270, 01793, 02002, 02012, 02025, 02038, 02219, 02236, 02237, 02255, 02260, 02279, 02496, 02997, 03021, 03121, 03339, 03562, 03843, 03856, 03874, 03922, 03924, 03938, 04077, 04086, 04151, 04153, NSI/0170, NSI/0245, NSI/0248	Croxley already has 7 secondary schools within 2 miles.
00269	No geographical need for a new school in Croxley Green.
00269	Document biased towards S(d)- Baldwins Lane is a residential road (as Long Lane).
00269, 01264, 01680, 02089, 02213, 02466, 02581, 02641, 03072, 03454, 03868, 04023, 04062, 04063, NSI/0237	Loss of parking for shops.
00269	Off site playing fields are some distance away with no lighting and would

	encroach on farmland.	
00269	No reference to congestion requiring drop off zone (as P(a)).	
00269	Site is Green Belt buffer between Watford and Croxley – strong reason against S(a) but not mentioned.	
00269, 00961, 00910, 01009, 01111, 01218, 02002, 02057, 02255, 02287, 02403, 02466, 02581, 02667, 02942, 02943, 02997, 03184, 03215, 03222, 03408, 03848, 03856, 04075, 04078, 04129, 04151, NSI/0237, NSI/0248		Area home to horses.
00269	Weighting of pros and cons in favour of S(d) invalidate consultation.	
00277, 00278, 00847, 01270, 01400, 01618, 02298, 02335, 02942, 03181, 03327, 03531, 04014, 04062, NSI/0241		Site has problems with flooding.
00277, 00278, 00561, 00847, 00899, 00903, 00916, 00951, 01038, 01098, 01141, 01234, 01302, 01400, 01467, 01491, 01618, 01762, 01786, 01813, 01965, 02040, 02064, 02089, 02213, 02275, 02298, 02301, 02437, 02666, 02667, 02701, 02885, 02901, 02942, 02976, 03090, 03119, 03300, 03327, 03408, 03410, 03432, 03454, 03531, 03549, 03590, 03843, 03865, 03930, 04003, 04016, 04023, 04038, 04062, 04063, 04118, 04156, 04157, CU/0247, NSI/0188, NSI/0237, NSI/0241, NSI/0242, NSI/0257		Site not large enough.
00277	Playing field would need to be a distance away from site making more traffic problems when parents drive along residential roads.	
00277, 02089, 02335, 03454, 03531, NSI/0237, NSI/0257		Site needed for Watford children so should be in Watford.
00278, 00837, 01571, 02176, 02335, 02641, 02648, 02778, 03319, 03497, 03624, 03913, 03975, 04044, 04118, 04171, NSI/0179, NSI/0195, NSI/0196, NSI/0233, NSI/0237, NSI/0249		School should be in Mill End/Maple Cross.
00278, 00292, 00451, 00561, 00823, 00835, 00847, 00877, 00895, 00899, 00910, 00912, 00916, 00927, 00950, 00951, 01009, 01010, 01041, 01050, 01053, 01059, 01061, 01073, 01076, 01092, 01098, 01111, 01112, 01132, 01136, 01139, 01141, 01156, 01183, 01205, 01229, 01234, 01270, 01295, 01302, 01304, 01340, 01344, 01350, 01368, 01400, 01418, 01467, 01491, 01571, 01575, 01618, 01620, 01621, 01786, 01793, 01806, 01995, 02002, 02009, 02025, 02033, 02040, 02045, 02057, 02064, 02089, 02184, 02187, 02192, 02195, 02202, 02213, 02218, 02219, 02228, 02231, 02236, 02237, 02255, 02256, 02261, 02275, 02276, 02277, 02279, 02285, 02287, 02296, 02301, 02305, 02306, 02308, 02336, 02361, 02362, 02402, 02410, 02417, 02432, 02437, 02466, 02469, 02517, 02581, 02587, 02588, 02641, 02659, 02667, 02669, 02674, 02681, 02732, 02761, 02762, 02778, 02788, 02797, 02822, 02838, 02875, 02885, 02901, 02942, 02943, 02996, 03021, 03030, 03055, 03072, 03090, 03106, 03121, 03128, 03150, 03181, 03184, 03247, 03300, 03311, 03319, 03320, 03327, 03330, 03339, 03372, 03376, 03400, 03454, 03474, 03531, 03562, 03574, 03590, 03841, 03843, 03844, 03845, 03848, 03849, 03859, 03868, 03870, 03871, 03872, 03874, 03886, 03891, 03893, 03900, 03903, 03904, 03913, 03918, 03922, 03923, 03929, 03938, 03939, 03947, 03954, 03955, 03968, 03972, 03979, 03980, 03984, 03985, 03988, 03989, 04014, 04021, 04023, 04035, 04036, 04037, 04041, 04055, 04056, 04057, 04059, 04062, 04063, 04074, 04077, 04078, 04079, 04080, 04081, 04082, 04086, 04090, 04095, 04118, 04122, 04124, 04145, 04149, 04152, 04153, 04154, 04156, 04157, 04161, 04163, 04170, CU/0059, CU/0222, NSI/0172, NSI/0188, NSI/0196, NSI/0204, NSI/0219, NSI/0242, NSI/0245, NSI/0248, NSI/0257, NSI/0259		Will create too much traffic/congestion in the area.

00282, 00561, 00909, 01050, 01053, 01092, 01350, 01418, 02009, 02089, 02228, 02236, 02237, 02256, 02287, 02667, 03066, 03222, 03632, 03845, 03957, 03979, 03988, 04023, 04035, 04063, NSI/0249, NSI/0262	Will be combined with impact of CRL.
00292, 00795, 00835, 00899, 00927, 00934, 00961, 00999, 01006, 01061, 01098, 01162, 01229, 01264, 01467, 01680, 01762, 01786, 01965, 02038, 02057, 02089, 02187, 02228, 02255, 02276, 02279, 02287, 02351, 02361, 02362, 02466, 02667, 02708, 02885, 02942, 02943, 03021, 03090, 03150, 03151, 03181, 03184, 03215, 03247, 03273, 03474, 03871, 03873, 03891, 03893, 03903, 03926, 03927, 03938, 03939, 03958, 03972, 03984, 03989, 04054, 04056, 04061, 04061, 04077, 04080, 04129, 04158, 04170, CU/0240, NSI/0139, NSI/0245, NSI/0248, NSI/0249	Green Belt land which should be protected.
00451, 00795, 00951, 02038, 02641, 02648, 02839, 02939, 03222, 03316, 03408, 03410, 03928, 03986, 03988, 04037, 04044, 04058, 04116, 04156	No more schools needed in this area.
00544, 02620, 02711, 02754, 02976, 03617, 04090, 04092, 04095	Support site in the east of the District.
00544, 02620, 02711, 04090, 04095	Pupils could walk, cycle or catch bus to school.
00561, 01041, 01053, 01171, 01270, 01793, 02045, 02277, 02305, 02469, 02581, 02997, 03330, 03922, 04038, 04054, 04055, NSI/0219, NSI/0249	Already development going on in area.
00649 (HBRC)	Significant impact on uninterrupted open space between settlements and along river corridor. Will require buffering and landscaping on west of canal, possibly at expense of wooded area.
00748	Should be mixed use for housing and school. Could deliver 6-8fe secondary school, playing fields, 50-60 residential units and a park accessible to the local community. Residential currently being directed to other sites which are less desirable. Site offers opportunity to create a green network, linking through residential area maximising opportunities presented by site's existing landscape features linking to green spaces and wider green belt beyond.
00795	School would only be built to address Watford's problem.
00795, CU/0240, NSI/0204	Site has archaeological interest (Cassiobridge House and Snells Hall)
00806	Site has a central location with high density of local population so accessible.
00806	Many children would be able to walk to school.
00823	Site too near main road.
00835, 01762, 02012, 02045, 02219, 02496, 03121, 03339, 03562, 03865, 04122, NSI/0245, NSI/0248	Site is tranquil.
00835	Rail link will add to area being too built up.
00847, 01009, 01762, 02231, 02942, 03913	Noise from railway/CRL which will require mitigation.
00847	Huge impact on local housing.

00847, 02256	Overdevelopment of area.
00847	No easy access to site without further destruction of the area.
00877, 00916, 01098, 01304, 01400, 01467, 01618, 01762, 01965, 02064, 02228, 02260, 02261, 02276, 02335, 02336, 02885, 02996, 03121, 03150, 03327, 03408, 03432, 03454, 03531, 04038, 04062, 04063, NSI/0170, NSI/0242, NSI/0257	Site too steep/undulating.
00877, 01050, 01111, 01264, 02089, 02255, 02666, 02875, 03215, 03300, 03874, 03913, 03972, 03994, 04075, 04081, 04154	Visual impact
00895, 02089, 02708, 04023	Safety issue with children having to cross main road at dangerous point.
00899, 01005, 01009, 01111, 01270, 01302, 02002, 02219, 02236, 02237, 02255, 02403, 02587, 02588, 02667, 03021, 03128, 03150, 03151, 03222, 03311, 03844, 03856, 03922, 03955, 03979, 04080, 04129, 04134, NSI/0245	Protected species on the site (bats, badgers)
00899, 00951, 01038, 01304, 01467, 01762, 01813, 02040, 02089, 02228, 02255, 02261, 02279, 02301, 02336, 02367, 02581, 02587, 02588, 03150, 03319, 03355, 03432, 03531, 03549, 03621, 03872, 03913, 04016, 04063, CU/0166, NSI/0237, NSI/0241, NSI/0242, NSI/0257	Concern that detached playing fields required.
00899, 00910, 00946, 01010, 01050, 01059, 01111, 01270, 01793, 02002, 02025, 02038, 02204, 02219, 02279, 02581, 02701, 02839, 03316, 03339, 03376, 03432, 03624, 03841, 03972, 03984, 04038, 04081, NSI/0170, NSI/0248	No schools in Mill End/Maple Cross area.
00909, 01350	Land gives Croxley a great / semi-rural character.
00909, 00927	Land environmentally important.
00910, 00934, 01005, 01076, 01092, 01111, 01270, 01620, 01786, 02002, 02089, 02213, 02260, 02276, 02287, 02466, 02496, 02581, 02587, 02588, 02648, 02669, 02762, 02885, 02942, 02943, 02997, 03090, 03121, 03184, 03300, 03339, 03373, 03408, 03410, 03562, 03848, 03861, 03865, 03870, 03874, 03913, 03922, 03926, 03958, 03972, 04074, 04075, 04077, 04078, 04081, 04122, 04134, 04145, 04156, 04158, 04170, NSI/0237, NSI/0245, NSI/0248, NSI/0262	Wildlife area.
00912, 02213	Noise will impact on residents.
00917	Roads are not wide enough to cope with traffic.
00941, 01324, 01575, 02403, 02587, 02588, 03400, 03886, 03954, 03957, 04156, 04170, NSI/0257	Traffic would be dangerous/lead to accidents.
00950, 01304, 02089, 02213, 03181, 03972, 04056, NSI/0204	Loss of views.
00951, 01234, 01302, 01762, 01786, 01813, 02040, 02255, 02336, 02667, 03090, 04016	No room for expansion.
00961, 02641, 03072, 03574, 03886, 04153, CU/0059	Parking for shops already difficult/dangerous.
01005, 02219, 03408, 04129	Moving horses from the site would be cruelty.
01005, 01340, 02218, 04057	Land of great natural beauty.
01009	Side estate roads would be used as rat runs.

01009, 01264, 01680, 02089, 02231, 02336, 02455, 02622, 03222, 03320, 03376, 03632, 03947, 03994, 04151	Site access restricted/inappropriate.
01009	Railway adjacent will add to costs.
01009, 02466	Lanes and footpaths used by walkers and riders.
01010	Croxley will have little Green Belt land remaining.
01031, 03316, 03408, 04156	A school in Maple Cross would release places for local children.
01031, 03222	Access would be dangerous.
01038, 01762, 01813, 04016	Least worst of Croxley sites
01038, 01762, 01813, 04016	Will need to be set back from road for vehicle flow in and out.
01038, 01264, 01762, 01813, 04016	Document does not identify specific off-site playing fields.
01038, 01762, 01813, 04016	Only positive for site that London Underground would be a willing seller.
01059, 01680, 02228, 02667, 03247, 03913, CU/0240, NSI/0204, NSI/0245	Site is important buffer between Croxley and Watford that should be retained.
01061, 04151	Proximity of canal would add dangers to children
01076, 01098, 01111, 01270, 01304, 01762, 02089, 02885, 03184, 03215, 03408, 03410, 03913, 04080, 04134, 04158, NSI/0204, NSI/0245	Impact on mature trees.
01076	Risk of flooding as bottom of hill.
01076, 02732, 02822, 03373	Loss of greenspace.
01098	Provision must be made for on-site car parking.
01098, 02009	Parking in Links Way and adjoining roads would be unacceptable.
01098	Development would impact on Links Way property values.
01132	Traffic in Baldwins Lane restricted to single lane by parking.
01156	Site would cause danger to pedestrians.
01179	Will increase likelihood of accidents.
01185	Site needed as Croxley pupils struggle to get into Rickmansworth schools.
01185, 01860, 02074, 03386, 03821, 03987, 04027, 04110	School needed in this area.

01205	Question safety of site so near to CRL.
01235, 01965	Would be better to enlarge existing schools.
01368	Site takes a lot of water through to water table.
01400, 03373, 03872, 03913, 04153	Will lead to parking problems
01400	No guarantee that Croxley children will be given places.
01762	Consultation document site comments limited and omit information that would enable informed logical choice about site suitability.
01762	Parts of Lodge Lane would have to be significantly modified for coach and lorry traffic.
01762	If bridle path application successful will restrict/prevent vehicular access.
01762	Site ticks all PPG2 boxes for retention.
01762	Site security fence would be highly visible with negative impact.
01762	Would remove horse riding from Croxley Green, TRDC has no contingency to provide alternative.
01764 (HCC Historic Environment)	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation in situ, are present. Archaeological assessment must take place before application submitted.
01793	Coaches will park in the road.
01965, 01995, 02627, 04021, 04122, 04149, NSI/0195	Insufficient infrastructure for more development.
02033	Would mean a concentration of schools in Croxley and students would have to travel a long way.
02089	Parents will stop in neighbouring residential roads.
02089	Will increase traffic on Winton Drive which is a steep residential road with tricky bends- danger.
02089, 02641, 03072, 03454, 03868, 04023, 04078, NSI/0262	Negative impacts on shops.
02181, 02682, 02737, 02773, 03239, 03240, 03307, 03793, 03826, 04120	Site more central to area of need.
02181, CU/0347	Site better supported by public transport, especially with new Croxley Rail Link station.
02192	Will link urban Watford to Croxley
02213	Light pollution from buildings and sports facilities.
02218	Rousebarn Lane used to access woods and canal.
02228	School overwhelmingly large compared to other schools in area.
02228	Litter will be a problem.
02228	Kids will go into woods after class.
02235	Site would have least impact on residential area of the three sites.
02236, 02237	No offsite pick up and drop off available.
02236, 02237, 02336, 02432, NSI/0257	Not enough parking available.
02260	Would be a shame to lose avenue of trees.
02276	Site would be very close to residential area.

02287	Lodge End is not a made up road.
02367, 03793, 03798, 04113	Good location.
02367, 03355	Concern that London Underground ownership will impact acquisition of site.
02496, 03900	Loss of countryside.
02581	Bus stop or vehicles turning in to site will cause traffic to back up.
02701, 03955	On the boundary so would take Watford children.
02885	Parking must be provided on the site.
03090	Would not meet Rickmansworth education needs.
03090	Part of site should be play area to compensate for play area lost to CRL.
03181, 03454, 03848, 03904, 03930, 03933, 03938, 03954, 04145	Impact on residents' quality of life.
03191	New CRL station could lead to significant pedestrian traffic across roundabouts from station to school affecting traffic.
03215	Riding and caring for horses beneficial to health.
03239, 03240, 03552, 04115, CU/0061	Good access to public transport.
03247	Would not improve spread of school provision.
03273, 03473, 03861, 03886	School should be built where none to reduce need to travel.
03330	Nowhere for coaches to turn
03355	Good location.
03793, 03798, 03821	Site would have less impact on traffic.
03847	Bus stop on Baldwins Lane/Links Way should be retained in current position.
03872	Cost of landscaping for football/rugby/hockey pitches and Astro turf.
03913	Site away from area of need.
04023, NSI/0257	Traffic data from hot clear day at end of June when no reported incidents- lower than on a wet/cold day and no yr 11/13 pupils.
04023	Large proportion of pupils from Watford so would turn right from Baldwins Lane.
04023	Assumption that traffic would turn into site to drop off pupils unrealistic.
04023	Limited drop off/collection space will increase stopping on roads which is dangerous
04023	1 space per 8 pupils over 17 is too low and will lead to parking in surrounding areas.
04023	Increased traffic on Winton Drive will increase risk of RTCs as infant school on steep road with bends.
04110, NSI/0156	Site would reduce traffic.
04115	Would attract a good socio-economic mix of pupils.
04152	Access to golf course will be impossible.
CU/0061	Horse grazing far less sustainability value than food production.
CU/0222	Out of character with surrounding development.
NSI/0204	Site contains attractive hedges.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site. Low lying areas prone to surface water flooding.
NSO/0054	Would wish to be included in detailed site discussions to ensure that any

(British Waterways)	proposals have a positive impact on the Grand Union Canal and the impact of potential increases in the number of users of the towpath is considered.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>Bounded to east by GUC (83/016). Beyond the canal is Cassiobury Park (83/038). To the north of the site, on the other side of Rousebarn Lane is 83/002 Jaccott's Hill/West Herts GC. Has been reported that site itself important for local wildlife. Currently open land, with wooded areas, grassland, hedgerows and scattered trees.</p> <p>Must fully consider the potential impact of allocation on the local ecological network, and whether in accordance with policy in the CS.</p> <p>If allocated, comprehensive ecological survey will be required to assess the ecological interest of site and surrounding areas. Should then feed in to planning and design of the dev to ensure that dev is sensitive to the surrounding habitats; retains and protects areas and features of greatest importance to wildlife and the local ecological network; provides robust mitigation and compensation for harm; and includes management and enhancement of habitats and habitat features on the site to improve ecological value.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Nearest bus stops are close to the site on Baldwins Lane and there are further stops on Watford Rd all within 400m with frequent services. The opening of the new railway station on the Croxley Rail Link at Ascot Road in 2016 will give even better access to this area from Rickmansworth and all points west as well as Watford to the east.
SCO/0014 (Watford Borough Council)	Support the site to come forward for a secondary school. Would like to see good communication linkages provided into Watford, and ensure that the Croxley Rail Link and proximity to Ascot Road station is taken into consideration at the detailed planning stage of the school development.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Although some constraints that affect site capacity, comparatively suitable and deliverable for a secondary school subject to development design and potential requirement to provide detached playing fields (possibly at former Durrants school playing field owned by HCC).
SCO/0017 (HCC Service Provider)	County Council requires the allocation of a site in the area as a reserve secondary school site to meet the rising demand for secondary school places in the plan period. Further information will be submitted by HCC's consultants in respect of the secondary school sites.
SCO/0020 (CGPC)	Strongly object as site (at 12.3ha) was inappropriate as it is too small. There would be problems with access and egress and there were other sites more local to the demand from other areas.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	<p>Parts of this site lie within Floodzone 3b. Following Sequential Approach in PPS25, buildings should be located outside floodplain. Would currently find this allocation unsound as the building zone is shown in Flood Zone 3b. If the building zone was moved out of Flood Zone 3b we would support this allocation.</p> <p>Providing a minimum eight metre undeveloped buffer strip can be provided adjacent to any Ordinary Watercourses on the site, we would support the development of this site for educational use. As part of any future redevelopment may be possible to include measures to restore or enhance existing river environment for biodiversity benefit. Such enhancement measures should be explored.</p>

S(b) Mill End/Maple Cross – Froghall Farm and Adjoining Land

Do you support the allocation on this land for education?

85% yes (509 responses)
15% no (89 responses)

Reference	Comment
00267, 03311	Would free up school places for Croxley children
00269	Part of this site allocated for retail
00277, 00278, 02158, 03473, 03482, 03531, 03813, 03924, 04079, 04121	Children could walk to school/acceptable for pedestrian access
00403	Conflict with objectives of Colne Valley Regional Park
00403, 03307	Detrimental to landscape, countryside and biodiversity
00403	Development will be prominent and highly visible
00403	Detriment to openness
00403	Removes buffer zone between Mill End and Maple Cross
00451, 00916, 00999, 01009, 01010, 01050, 01053, 01092, 01136, 01218, 01235, 01350, 01575, 01620, 02002, 02074, 02089, 02184, 02228, 02255, 02279, 02410, 02437, 02469, 02496, 02525, 02587, 02588, 02627, 02669, 02732, 02797, 02822, 02901, 03021, 03072, 03090, 03106, 03128, 03191, 03215, 03311, 03327, 03372, 03376, 03408, 03410, 03426, 03543, 03632, 03821, 03843, 03861, 03870, 03874, 03886, 03893, 03903, 03924, 03926, 03928, 03972, 03984, 03986, 03988, 04002, 04014, 04036, 04055, 04058, 04062, 04124, 04129, 04134, 04136, 04151, 04156, 04157, 04170, 04171, CU/0081, CU/0166, CU/0247, NSI/0179, NSI/0188, NSI/0233, NSI/0248, NSI/0257, NSI/0257, NSI/0262	School needed in this area
00544, 02620, 02711, 04090, 04095	Support as a contingency site if (a) undeliverable
00544, 02176, 02620, 04090, 04095	Insufficient space
00544, 02180, 02620, 02711, 03239, 03304, 03432, 03552, 03577, 03814, 04090, 04095	Contamination issues
00544, 01038, 01762, 01813, 02176, 02367, 02620, 02711, 03304, 03355, 03432, 03454, 04016, 04090, 04095	Separation of playing fields from school site not ideal
00544, 02180, 02620, 02711, 02773, 03304, 03577, 04090, 04095	Difficult/expensive to acquiring site with 5 owners
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095	WWtW vehicular access between playing fields.
00544, 02180, 02367, 02620, 02711, 03355, 03432, 04090, 04095	Odour/proximity to sewage works
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095	Impact of M25 unlikely to be different from Site (a)
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095	Need to provide access across A412
00544, 01038, 01136, 01762, 01813, 02106, 02180, 02367, 02620, 02711, 03239, 03304, 03355, 03432, 03552, 03577, 03621, 03814, 03930, 04016, 04059, 04090, 04095, NSI/0168	Objection to development on flood zone
00544, 02620, 02711, 04090, 04095	Highways impacts/proposed roundabout issues
00561, 00847, 00895, 00951, 01009, 01141, 01179, 01229, 01786,	Adequate space and

02009, 02012, 02236, 02237, 02279, 02298, 02301, 02336, 02587, 02588, 02666, 02667, 02669, 02732, 02822, 03021, 03090, 03119, 03121, 03150, 03216, 03239, 03300, 03372, 03400, 03410, 03543, 03652, 03796, 03967, 03971, 04003, 04014, 04058, 04062, 04120, 04121, 04136, CU/0166, NSI/0139, NSI/0257,	for expansion
00649 (HBRC)	This site includes a Wildlife Site although this would not be affected by the playing fields. This may have degraded due to inappropriate management in recent years. It is strategically important being next to the River Colne, but the former sludge beds have destroyed the original valley pastures and we have no details on the remainder, although the Phase 1 survey suggested that the rest of the grasslands were semi-improved or improved. Whilst there are components of the historic landscape they are relatively degraded. There may be bat interest within the farm buildings, and reptile interest elsewhere, depending on the condition of the grassland or ruderal habitats present. There would need to be some landscape buffer adjacent to the Colne itself to retain a semi-natural river corridor.
00835, 01179, 01212, 01229, 01783, 02009, 02025, 02279, 02373, 02773, 03072, 03150, 03151, 03191, 03230, 03474, 03652, 03893, 03900, 03954, 03971, 04037, 04076, 04113, 04124, 04156, CU/0133, NSI/0177, NSI/0204	Most suitable site for school
00877, 00909, 00910, 02002, 02235, 02276, 02667, 02732, 02773, 02822, 03090, 03150, 03151, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03230, 03300, 03617, 03798, 03812, 03852, 03893, 03938, 04003, 04170, 04171, 00899, 03198, 03199, 03205	Least detrimental impact to local area at this site
00909	Most appropriate Green Belt site
00909	Not currently used for agriculture
00941, 00951, 01009, 01995, 02009, 02231, 02236, 02237, 02279, 02298, 02336, 02402, 02455, 02466, 02587, 02588, 02666, 02732, 02822, 02875, 03106, 03191, 03215, 03216, 03300, 03304, 03400, 03410, 03426, 03482, 03632, 03652, 03796, 03813, 03883, 03912, 03914, 03939, 04014, 04027, 04041, 04055, 04062, 04121, 04157, NSI/0156, NSI/0172, NSI/0245,	Good accessibility/road network
00981, 01038, 01156, 01762, 01813, 02045, 02711, 03079, 04016,	Second choice site to Site (a)
00999, 01141	Ease stress on Rickmansworth School
01053, 03473, 03590, NSI/0156	Will reduce congestion
01053	Existing schools not easily accessible for Three Rivers children
01059	Initial response indicated strong favour for Mill End site
01092, 01218, 02668, 03151, 03300, 04120, NSI/0161, NSI/0172, NSI/0245	Little congestion around the site at present
01141	Enough space to accommodate Rickmansworth/Mill End children
01179, 03912	Safe site for school traffic/children
01264	Sites (a) and (b) will not be considered together as they are opposite each other
01368, 02668, 04151	The people of Mill End and Maple Cross want this development
01575, 02038, 02089, 02627,	Would reduce need to travel

02641, 03072, 03215	
01764 (HCC Historic Environment)	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation in situ, are present. Because the presence of such remains could be a reason for refusal of any planning application, it is necessary that an archaeological assessment take place before the application is submitted
01786, 03652,	Minimum adverse impacts on local area
01860	Unsuitable site due to location and land layout
02106, 02180, 03307, 03826	Objection to building on Green Belt
02106, 02180, 03273, 03432, 03454, 04113	Poor access
02153	Support development proposals for land adjacent to client's as client currently building a high quality hotel adjacent to the land. Once completed will significantly enhance vibrancy and economic stability of the area generating c400 jobs. Large proportion of the land historically been used for commercial purposes but lain idle for many years. Development will result in remediation of land and improvement in area's overall amenity. Development would provide for further improvements to the transport infrastructure. Wish to develop adjacent land for commercial purposes which will be of benefit to the local community.
02158	Further from main road so less pollution and less noise traffic.
02158, CU/0133	Adjacent nature reserve a useful education tool.
02158, 03121, 03912, 04027, 04121	Good bus route service
02176	Higher development costs than Site (a)
02180	Will resist at Site Allocations and CPO. Fundamental requirement for allocations to be deliverable. Given opposition, multiple ownerships and tenants, site is not deliverable. HCC evidence does not provide any justification for S(b). Site important Green Belt between Maple Cross and Mill End. Flood plain means only area available for building is A412 frontage which would create continuous ribbon between Maple Cross and Mill End. No Very Special Circumstances as better alternative site. Within Colne Valley Park where reduction in impact of existing structures sought. School contrary to policies. Will harm nature conservation. Would create congestion on A road. Access unsuitable. Loss of housing contrary to policy H10. Flood plain reduces area for building. Development contrary to SW Herts Landscape Strategy. Buffer to wildlife sites to South. School would have adverse effect on flora and fauna. Noise issues reduce area available for building. NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ elevated. Odour from WwTw. Adjacent contaminated landfill site. Would extinguish agricultural holding. Alluvium deposit require groundwork costs. Split site create dangers and conflict with WwTW traffic.
02192	Better opportunities/improved growth area
02231, 03845,	Would not have huge impact on road congestion
02235, 03191, 03239, 03652,	Landscape is of low quality
02275, 02279, 02301, 02432, 02455, 02666, 02668, 02875, 03150, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03300, 03630, 03796, 03912, 03924, 04027, 04077	Acceptable site
02367, 03355	Hotel would overlook this site

02466	Little impact on Green Belt
02466	Better location for Rickmansworth/Maple Cross
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	2 cautions listed for the land
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	Highways will not consider site and associated highways impacts where alternatives are possible
02627	Site will cater for Rickmansworth children reducing travel through Croxley
01053, 02668	William Penn School previously lost
02682, 02737	Site has less issues than Site (a)
02682, 02737	Careful development could provide excellent vehicular access to the site
02682, 02737	Too remote from intended Hertfordshire population
01280, 02682, 02737, 03079, 03240, 03307, 03826, 04091, 04102, 04110, 04113, CU/0281	Increased traffic congestion
02711	Keen to avoid delays in opening of a new school
02773	Should be possible to provide safe access
02773	No issue with detached playing fields as this will not be for break time but for sporting activities only
02976	Would prefer a secondary school in Croxley Green
03037, 03660	Second choice site
03079	Disruption to 2 families living there
03119	Prefer Site (a) because of easier access
03128	Area needs school but need to consider public transport costs
03150	Careful planning could provide effective pick-up/drop-off service
03184, 03307, 03617, 03798,	Good alternative to Site (a)
03239	Site requires improved bus service
03240	Site would require considerable adjustment for access, safety and transport
03240, 03552, CU/0061,	Poor local public transport
03240, 03273	Loss in wildlife/biodiversity
03273, 03305	Difficult site to develop
03432	Not as accessible on foot as Site (a)
03552	Current farm lived and worked on
03621	Unsuitable for school use
03632, CU/0222	Fewer traffic problems than Croxley site
03793	Need is greater in Croxley and Watford
03793, 04113	Location would encourage out-of-county admissions and would not assist local people
03796	Option should not be discounted because of relatively high costs
03812	If access done correctly, impact on traffic congestion far less
03814	Concerns for children's safety/health
03821	Croxley site should be built first
03828	End of school day traffic will be high but roundabout will assist
03852	Less strain on local services and resources
03852, 04022, 04120	Less strain on productive farmland/business
03861	More countryside here than in Croxley Green
03874, 03975	Development would blend into landscape

03893	Bridges gap between Clement Danes and Harefield Academy
03912, 03914, NS1/0161	Already up for sale/land is available
03930	Smaller than site (a)
03930	Water table problems
03938, 04038, 04063, NSI/0196, NSI/0219	Would serve Rickmansworth Mill End and Maple Cross
03939	Positive effect on choice of schools
03945	Sewage works does not generate odours
03971, 04027	Further from motorway
03987	Too far for children to walk
04079	Croxley site is better.
04102	Children will increase noise level in street
04149	Objection to building on farmland
04156	Do not consider motorway to pose issues to children
04171	Develop (a) & (b) and not Croxley Green
CU/0061	Development would be heavily car dependent
CU/0061	If necessary and no other alternatives, site (b) better then Site (a).
NSI/0172	Away from densely built up areas
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	Close to Sewage Treatment works so a full assessment must be done on odour, noise and lighting and potential impact. If any proposal is acceptable, any proposed mitigation is controlled using a planning condition. Thames Water is a part-landowner and is willing to cooperate with LPA for potential uses for the site.
NSO/0077 (CPRE Herts)	No adequate justification for site as a school. Development would be detrimental to Green Belt and infill Maple Cross & Mill End. Alternative sites that would cause less harm have not been identified. Only land that is required for the school and its functions should be included in the allocation.
NSO/0082 (HMWT)	<p>Site incorporates area designated as LWS 88/008 – Maple Lodge Grassland (wet, rough neutral grassland which supports areas of species-rich marsh habitat). The River Colne runs along much of the eastern boundary with Springwell Lake beyond. Site is currently agricultural and open land. It is noted that only the northern section is foreseen as the building zone. Playing fields are demarcated bordering the Colne and adjacent to the area comprising LWS 88/008.</p> <p>Council must fully consider potential impact of this site allocation on the local ecological network, and whether it is in accordance with policy in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>In the event that site is allocated, comprehensive ecological survey work will be required to assess the ecological interest of the whole site and surrounding areas. These should then feed in to master planning and design of the development, from the earliest opportunity, to ensure that the development is sensitive to the surrounding habitats; retains and protects those areas and features of greatest importance to wildlife and the local ecological network; provides robust mitigation and compensation for harm; and includes as an integral part of the ongoing operation of the development management and enhancement of habitats and habitat features on the site (including the LWS) to improve its ecological value.</p>
SCO/0006 (HCC)	Access by vehicle to this site will be difficult to achieve safely and without causing local congestion. The site is bounded along its northern edge by

Environment)	the A412 Denham Way/ Uxbridge Road with the M25 at its junction 17. Denham Way is a wide single carriageway as befits its earlier status as part of the London North Orbital road. It is subject to a 40mph limit. Uxbridge Road which has a 30mph limit and the status of main distributor. Both are classified as Principle Roads. The farm that currently occupies the site is accessed from the A412 just west of the roundabout with the M25 junction 17 link road. This would have to be closed were the site to be developed.
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Site (b) much more expensive to develop than Site (a). Disagree that Site (a) is less favourable than Site (b). Limited impact on farm viability does not overcome significant development constraints and costs of developing which make it unsuitable and undeliverable. TRDC have not taken account of background facts in considering alternative sites and considerable uncertainty about deliverability of Site (b) so challenge soundness of allocating (b) at examination.
SCO/0017 (HCC as service provider)	Object because site will incur abnormal development costs. The required new access will not be approved by Highways whilst the alternative (a) would not require a new access directly onto principal road.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Parts of site within Floodzone 3b, 3a and 2. Following the Sequential Test approach in PPS25, all buildings should be located outside floodplain. Site will need to pass both the Sequential Test and the Exception Test. Part C requires that a Flood Risk Assessment be submitted with the planning application for the school at this site. Would currently find allocation unsound as the building zone shown in Floodzone 3b and site has not passed Sequential Test. If building zone moved out of Floodzone 3b and site passes the Sequential Test would support. Would require development to be set back from the River Colne to provide 8m buffer zone and 5m buffer zone from the ordinary watercourses. Necessary to allow access to the river during a flood event and for maintenance. Buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit. Could provide unique learning opportunities for the school and improved amenity space. Would object to development on the Maple Lodge Marsh Wildlife Site.

S(a) Mill End/Maple Cross – Land East of A405/North of A412

Do you support the allocation on this land for education?

79% yes (506 responses)

21% no (136 responses)

REF	COMMENT
00267, 00544, 00999, 01141, 03311, 02627, 02667, 04095, 03432,	Would free up places for Croxley children at local schools.
00277, 00278, 01218, 02038, 02400, 02668, 03410, 03531, 03886, 03924, 03986, 04058, 04124, 02089, 02620, 02711, 03072, 03273, 03432, 03473, 03814, 04079, 04090, CU/0081, NSI/0219	Local children will be able to walk to school/travel less distance
00403	Site is in Colne Valley Regional Park,
00403	Will conflict with proposal for a vibrant and sustainable rural economy.
00403, 00543, 00544, 00619, 02206, 02158, 02181, 02620, 03037, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03230, 03248, 03552, 03652, 03801, 03805,	Object to loss of farmland/ impact on

03816, 03823, 03825, 03826, 03851, 03852, 03878, 03912, 03932, 03971, 03975, 04004, 04005, 04022, 04029, 04036, 04095, 04113, 04120, 04127, 04131, 04146, CU/0024, CU/0061, CU/0068, CU/0133, CU/0203, CU/0204, NSI/0204	viability of farm
00403, 02206, 02158, 02682, 02737, 02773, 03037, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03239, 03248, 03617, 03630, 03652, 03798, 03800, 03801, 03802, 03804, 03805, 03807, 03816, 03822, 03823, 03824, 03825, 03829, 03851, 03932, 04004, 04005, 04088, 04089, 04115, 04117, 04146, 04171, CU/0068	Loss of habitat and impact on wildlife
00403, 00544, 02106, 02158, 02177, 02181, 02620, 02682, 02737, 03072, 03239, 03248, 03617, 03652, 03798, 03800, 03801, 03805, 03806, 03807, 03816, 03819, 03823, 03825, 03829, 03851, 03852, 03902, 03912, 03914, 03937, 03945, 04004, 04005, 04022, 04037, 04067, 04090, 04095, 04110, 04112, 04115, 04121, 04131, 04171, CU/0068, CU/0347,	Loss of agricultural land/countryside
00403, 00543, 02524, 02682, 02737, 03230, 03630, 03796, 03801, 03805, 03806, 03808, 03932, 04113, 04115, 04126, 04128, CU/0133,	Adverse visual impact
00403, 00544, 02620, 03037, 03617, 03798, 04090, 04095, 04115,	Reduced openness between Mill End and Maple Cross
00431, 00916, 00999, 01009, 01050, 01053, 01092, 01132, 01218, 01235, 01620, 01762, 01813, 01995, 02002, 02012, 02025, 02038, 02045, 02057, 02074, 02081, 02089, 02178, 02184, 02228, 02255, 02275, 02279, 02410, 02437, 02466, 02469, 02496, 02525, 02587, 02588, 02627, 02666, 02668, 02669, 02732, 02797, 02822, 02875, 02901, 03021, 03090, 03119, 03128, 03184, 03215, 03300, 03311, 03327, 03376, 03396, 03408, 03410, 03426, 03432, 03543, 03590, 03632, 03814, 03821, 03843, 03861, 03870, 03874, 03900, 03903, 03924, 03926, 03938, 03939, 03967, 03972, 03984, 03986, 03988, 04014, 04016, 04038, 04055, 04058, 04060, 04063, 04092, 04124, 04129, 04134, 04136, 04149, 04151, 04156, 04157, CU/0081, CU/0166, CU/0247, NSI/0179, NSI/0188, NSI/0196, NSI/0233, NSI/0245, NSI/0248	No schools in this area currently
00543, 02106, 02158, 02201, 02206, 02682, 02737, 03037, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03248, 03307, 03548, 03617, 03630, 03636, 03652, 03798, 03801, 03802, 03804, 03805, 03807, 03808, 03815, 03816, 03820, 03822, 03823, 03825, 03826, 03829, 03851, 03852, 03932, 03937, 04004, 04005, 04029, 04037, 04088, 04089, 04115, 04117, 04126, 04128, CU/0068, CU/0204, CU/0347, NSI/0262	Object to building on Green Belt/loss of Green Belt land
00543, 00604, 00619, 02158, 02206, 02624, 02682, 02737, 02773, 03037, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03239, 03240, 03307, 03548, 03617, 03630, 03798, 03801, 03802, 03803, 03804, 03805, 03807, 03808, 03810, 03812, 03813, 03816, 03819, 03820, 03822, 03823, 03824, 03825, 03826, 03828, 03829, 03851, 03852, 03853, 03883, 03902, 03912, 03932, 04004, 04005, 04027, 04088, 04089, 04091, 04110, 04111, 04112, 04113, 04115, 04121, 04126, 04128, CU/0347	Increased traffic congestion
00543, 00619, 02206, 02235, 02158, 02624, 02682, 02737, 02773, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03230, 03248, 03307, 03617, 03636, 03796, 03798, 03800, 03801, 03802, 03804, 03805, 03806, 03807, 03812, 03819, 03822, 03823, 03824, 03825, 03826, 03829, 03851, 03852, 03878, 03883, 03902, 03912, 03932, 04004, 04005, 04088, 04089, 04111, 04112, 04113, 04115, 04117, 04126, 04128, CU/0024, CU/0068, CU/0133	Adverse impact on residents/amenity/quality of life
00543, 02158, 02206, 02682, 02737, 02773, 03037, 03198, 03199,	Adverse impacts on

03205, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03307, 03548, 03617, 03630, 03636, 03652, 03798, 03801, 03807, 03810, 03815, 03826, 03829, 03851, 04004, 04005, 04088, 04089, CU/0068	Long Lane
00544, 00619, 00847, 00899, 00951, 00981, 01038, 01141, 01229, 01762, 01813, 02081, 02176, 02276, 02279, 02301, 02336, 02367, 02373, 02587, 02588, 02620, 02667, 02669, 02732, 02822, 03021, 03090, 03119, 03191, 03215, 03216, 03300, 03355, 03400, 03432, 03814, 03923, 03930, 04014, 04016, 04090, 04095, 04136, CU/0166, NSI/0139	Site large enough for playing fields and future expansion.
00544, 01038, 01762, 01786, 01813, 02009, 02276, 02373, 02620, 03300, 03432, 03874, 04016, 04090, 04095, 04116	Flat site
00544, 02178, 02620, 02682, 02737, 04090, 04095,	Least problematic/ expensive site to build
00544, 00604, 02158, 02620, 02624, 02773, 03239, 03248, 03548, 03617, 03630, 03652, 03798, 03800, 03802, 03819, 03829, 03852, 03902, 03932, 04090, 04095, 04112, 04113, 04117,	Noise and air pollution
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	Low flooding risk
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095	Good access for pupils from surrounding area
00544, 02620, 03432, 04090, 04095	No contamination issues
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	Wildlife site could be protected by landscape planting and management
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	Preferred Mill End site
00544, 02620, 04090, 04095,	Same ecological value as Site (b)
00604, 02106, 02158, 02682, 02737, 03198, 03239, 03482, 03548, 03617, 03630, 03636, 03652, 03798, 03801, 03803, 03805, 03807, 03810, 03822, 03823, 03825, 03829, 03851, 03853, 04004, 04005, 04027, 04088, 04089, CU/0068	Difficulty accessing//exiting Long Lane
00619, 00981	Space for parking
00649 (HBRC)	Ecologically there would be a limited impact given the agricultural (arable) nature of the land, for which we have no ecological data. The Wildlife Site strip along the southern edge should be buffered and managed, so this can be secured. The most damaging impact is to the viability of the farming enterprise, which the loss of 20% of the arable farm recognised as being a significant effect. This is one of the last dairy farms in Hertfordshire, and one of about three working farms left in Three Rivers District. The viability of the whole farm enterprise needs to be considered when assessing the impact, which is, overall, will impact on 10% of the holding. This is considered to be a moderate adverse affect, although the long term viability of the farm is not considered to be threatened. According to the HCC Consultants, this loss will have a detrimental effect on the farm, but 'insufficient to 'undermine the farm to the extent of putting the existing enterprise s in any imminent danger of collapse'. There is no information from the existing farmer to confirm this view – that a loss of £15,000 pa to the enterprise can be accommodated. Consequently, unless alternative land can be provided to retain this resource, it would appear that the viability of this farm will be reduced and its working practices modified. I consider, in these circumstances, that the land should only be developed if this aspect can be satisfactorily compensated by obtaining replacement land, consistent with the objectives of sustainable development.
00835, 00837, 01136, 01762, 01860, 02176, 02275, 02287, 02367, 02373, 02681, 02711, 03304, 03305, 03355, 03432, 03474, 03577,	Most suitable site

03621, 03659, 03660, 03789, 03930, 03941, 03954, 04076, 04077, 04116, 04136, CU/0222, NSI/0168, NSI/0170, NSI/0177, NSI/0259,	
00847, 01786, 02009, 02351, 03930, 03938	Minimum adverse effects on local area/residents
00847	Local shops could be set up.
00877, 00910, 02279, 02455, 03072, 03150, 03151, 03893	Second choice to S(b)
00899	Must not upset wildlife
00899, 03273,	Wildlife could remain/use as education tool
00951, 00981, 01132, 01156, 01995, 02009, 02025, 02045, 02231, 02236, 02237, 02275, 02279, 02287, 02301, 02336, 02367, 02466, 02587, 02588, 02666, 02732, 02822, 03184, 03215, 03216, 03273, 03300, 03400, 03410, 03426, 03432, 03574, 03923, 03939, 03941, 04014, 04055, 04060, 04116, 04157, NS1/0161, NSI/0259	Good access to site
01053, 01092, 01218, 01229, 02009, 03983, 04003, NSI/0245	Less congestion in this area
01059	Initial consultation response overwhelmingly in favour of a Mill End site
01264	Sites a and b will not be considered together as opposite each other
01350	Build two 800 pupil schools in Maple Cross rather than one for 1600
01762, 01813	Is HCC favoured site
02045, 03184	Site is easy to develop
02045, 03184	Loss of agricultural land no worse than other Green Belt/agricultural sites
02106, 03239, 03240, 03248, 03552, 04115	Inadequate transport links
02106, 03230, 03793, 03826, 04117, CU/0347	School at edge of District will encourage out of county admissions.
02158	Loss of historic field pattern
02158	More expense for crossings
02158, 03240, 03307, 03826,	Flooding concerns
02173	This site should be built before one in Croxley Green
02177, 3819, 03945, 03971	Site (b) more suitable
02181	Disagree with any change of use to this land
02206, 02158, 02201, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03801, 03805, 03813, 03822, 03823, 03829, 03851, 03852, 03853, 03902, 04088, 04089, 04146, CU/0068	Concern for children's safety near busy roads and traffic
02206, 02158, 02624, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03548, 03652, 03801, 03804, 03813, 03815, 03822, 03823, 03825, 03828, 03829, 03851, 03914, 03932, 03937, 03945, 04004, 04005, 04113, 04117, 04126, 04128, CU/0068	Overspill of car parking/drop off on residential roads
02206, 02158, 03248, 03652, 03825, 03851, 03852, 03932, 04004, 04005, 04117	Increased insurance/devalued house prices due to associated crime/mischief/vandalism
02206, 03826,	Will leave remaining GB land in isolation and vulnerable to development
02206	Proven resistance to previous proposed development
02231	More open site
02235	Least acceptable of the sites.

02351	Improved bus services could reduce traffic in morning/afternoon
02367, 03273, 03632, 03813, 03814	Reconsider access to site via roundabout
02410, 02667, 03454	Good site
02466, 02667,	Little Green Belt impact
02682, 02737, 03037, 03198, 03199, 03205, 03548, 03630, 03652, 03801, 03823, 03824, 03852, 03853, 03912, 03932, 03945, 04088, 04089, 04126, 04128, CU/0068	Concern for road safety
02773, 03191	Alterations required to ensure safe and easy access with increased site access
02773	Increased use of alleyways would increase crime/mischief
02976, 03793, 04126, 04128	School should be in Croxley/Watford where greater need
03128	Revise bus travel costs
03239	Site too open and exposed
03240	Various owners
03240, 03307, 03826	Contamination on site
03248	Utilities overloading
03248	Adverse impact on local trade
03273	Tree planting to protect open space
03307	Site is uneven
03432, 03621, 03820	Need for school outweighs concerns
03454	Substantial road improvements needed
03454, 03482, 03652, 03800, 03816, 03975, 04027, 04113, 04117, 04171	Site impacted on by M25
03543	Needs plentiful parking/room for manoeuvre
03577	Little additional cost to provide access
03632, 03845, CU/0222	Fewer traffic problems than Croxley site
03652	Underground watercourses run from Swillett to Drayton Ford
03796, 03829, 04088, 04089, 04115, 04117	Insufficient existing transport infrastructure
03800	Insufficient space
03812, 03815	Traffic surveys unrealistic/incorrect
03813	Vehicular access from Long Lane probably violates terms set out by Percy Bilton by Council in 1960 and held in trust by Slough Estates plc.
03814	Air quality same for Sites (a) & (b)
03821	Croxley site should be built first
04079	Neither (a) or (b) good choices
04113	Loss of trees/hedgerows/vegetation
04115, NSI/0170	Improvement in public transport needed
04171	Would affect pedestrian access
CU/0061	Proposal coincides with Lottery application for funding to preserve barn
CU/0061	Existing educational opportunities would be lost
CU/0133	Worst of the 3 sites

CU/0133	Impact on sustainability
NSI/0259	Less impact than in Croxley
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding Waste Water capability in relation to this site.
NSO/0082 (HMWTrust)	<p>Site adjacent to Local Wildlife Site 88/009 – Uxbridge Road Verge, which is the only County site for the plant Lesser Calamint, a UK Vulnerable species. Site is currently agricultural land. It is noted that the southern part is demarcated as the building zone, which is adjacent to the LWS 88/009.</p> <p>If site allocated, ecological survey work should be undertaken to assess the ecological interest of the site. Council should ensure measures taken to protect, restore and enhance habitats on or adjacent to the proposed site as part of development planning and delivery. On ecological grounds alone, Site S(a) appears preferable to Site S(b).</p>
01764 (HCC Historic Environment)	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important, and thereby worthy of preservation <i>in situ</i> , are present. Because the presence of such remains could be a reason for refusal of any planning application, it is necessary that an archaeological assessment take place before the application is submitted.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site S(a) is preferred due to its better location and proposed vehicular access point in relation to the local bus stops. Long Lane may need to be widened depending on exactly where the access is to be as it very quickly becomes narrow after its junction with the A412. The junction also needs to be designed so school buses can access the site from either direction. At both sites consideration needs to be given as to how vehicles from the site can rejoin traffic on the A412. This is a busy area traffic-wise and both sites are close to the roundabout junction, particularly Site S(b).
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Further technical studies commissioned in Jan 2012 indicate abnormal costs to development of S(b) compared to S(a). Do not concur with TRDC view that (a) less desirable because of impact on GB, landscape, farm viability and public opposition to previous compound proposal. Will be less coalescence impact on GB, landscape impacts same as (b) (slight adverse, declining over time). Acknowledge impact on arable use of wider farm on (a) but unlikely to result in holding becoming unviable. Limited impact on farm viability does not outweigh significant development constraints, operational constraints and costs of developing (b) which render it unsuitable and undeliverable. TRDC have not taken account of background facts in considering alternative sites and considerable uncertainty about deliverability of (b) so challenge soundness of not allocating (a) at examination.
SCO/0017 (HCC service provider)	The County Council requires the allocation of a site in the area as reserve secondary school sites to meet the rising demand for secondary school places in the plan period. Further information will be submitted by HCC's consultants in respect of the secondary school sites.
SCO/0058 (Highways Agency)	Concerns regarding proposed site allocation for a secondary school in the west of the District. Concerned of the likely traffic impact on the M25 motorway J17 during morning peak hour periods. If the site does come forward, then the detailed assessment work must include a transport assessment focussing on the nearby motorway junction with appropriate mitigation measures in place, if considered appropriate.

P(a) Ashfields/Aerodrome Way, Leavesden

Do you support the allocation on this land for education?

86% yes (90 responses)

14% no (15 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Green Belt should not be developed.
00649 (HBRC)	No current ecological information to enable an assessment of the site. Survey information of the Leavesden Aerodrome site suggested some local interest but this may have changed considerably. Site should be assessed with a view to compensatory works if required, if it is to be developed.
01218, 03119, 03967, 04055	Ideally located to provide school places for all the new houses being built.
01367	Not the most appropriate site in the area. Woodside Road is HCCs preferred location to serve the Abbots Langley area. Site is on the very south of Abbots Langley/Leavesden with part of the site in Watford so remote from the area it should serve. Woodside Road is better located with larger catchment. The catchment for P(a) overlaps with five other schools so better distribution is required. There is some capacity within the catchment of P(a) but a deficit at Woodside Road. Surrounding roads have high traffic flows, much lower at Woodside Road. Potential air and noise quality impacts and unsuitable as a result of proximity to roads carrying large traffic volumes. Potential road safety issues and likely to exacerbate congestion. Uncertainty over deliverability demonstrated by HCC reservations and no fall-back.
01764 (HCC Historic Environment)	Risk that archaeological remains that are nationally important and thereby worthy of preservation in situ are present. Archaeological assessment to take place before application
02127	Allocation is not deliverable as will not be made available for such a use by WBSL. Site required by WBSL as a future expansion site for the studios to accommodate a film and media technology park and associated studio related uses. Will not be developing site for education or looking to dispose of site for such a use.
02158	Good site for Watford pupils.
02285	Plenty of space.
02410	Too isolated.
02455	Good area for additional school places.
02901	Site would not serve WD3.
04074, NSI/0175	Already traffic congestion around Aerodrome Way.
04074	Enough schools in this area.
NSO/0015 (Thames Water)	On the information available to date, we do not envisage infrastructure concerns regarding waste water capability in relation to this site.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	Site is surrounded by roads on all sides and does not appear to have a particularly good relationship with the surrounding residential areas. The closest bus stops are close to the site on Ashfields (before the roundabout junction with High Road) and on Aerodrome Way.
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	School site poorly located in relation to the catchment that it is intended to serve (Abbots Langley and Leavesden) which would result in access to the school being largely by car which is unsustainable and would result in increased congestion and impacts on air quality and quality of life of North Watford residents. Site is in the Green Belt and fulfils the purpose of preventing neighbouring settlements from merging into each other. It is close to the County owned BECC sites which is in the urban boundary should be fully explored before

	a Green Belt site is considered.
SCO/0017 (HCC Service Provider)	Site would be suitable in terms of size, provided that access could be achieved and the site is suitable. HCC is currently undertaking highways and ground condition surveys on the site. However it is to the south of the main settlement and not ideally located to serve Abbots Langley. Green Belt site which makes securing planning permission more difficult. Site straddles the border with WBC which may make deliverability risky and more complicated. Unclear whether WBC will support allocation. Landowner objection therefore not deliverable. Woodside Road would be well located to serve the community and is of suitable size. Feasibility studies by the owners have shown no major constraints to development and are willing to consider joint development which would allocate part of the site for a school. Therefore site would be deliverable on its own or as part of residential/open space development and should be reconsidered for primary education purposes.

Policy SA4: Retail Allocations

Do you support this policy?

94% Yes (46 responses)

6% No (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
00795	Need to retain numerous shopping parades in Croxley- Scots Hill, Baldwins Lane (2), Watford Road and New Road all important.
03632	Could Tudor Parade, Berry Lane be added as a secondary location?
CU/0204	Tudor Parade and the new Tesco Express should be a Local Centre as it contains Mill End's only post office.
CU/0232	Integral with designating retail frontages in existing shopping areas should be resistance to new convenience retail development outside the designated areas.
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	We note there are no significant allocations proposed that are likely to impact on the retail hierarchy in Dacorum.

R(a) Rickmansworth Town Centre

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

90% yes (47 responses)

10% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
03191	The stretch of Station Road from High Street to Northway should be primary retail.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Future redevelopment of the primary and secondary frontages on North Way/Church Street would require a Flood Risk Assessment and Sequential Test as within Flood Zones 2 and 3a. Redevelopment adjacent to the Town Ditch should seek to reduce flood risk. This could be achieved by reducing overall development footprint in the floodplain and providing mitigation measures such as raised floor levels to protect dev from flooding. If the site were to be re-developed we would require the minimum of 5m undeveloped buffer zone adjacent to Town Ditch. Necessary to allow access to river during a flood event and for maintenance. The buffer zone should be used to restore or enhance the

	existing river environment for biodiversity benefit.
--	--

R(b) South Oxhey

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

84% yes (26 responses)

16% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00492	Designated secondary frontages should be primary.
03998	Barclays support the promotion of retail development within South Oxhey District Centre in line with Policy SA4. We are aware that further to recent rounds of public consultation events regarding the potential redevelopment and/or refurbishment options for the South Oxhey Redevelopment Initiative, the TRDC Executive Committee decided on 30 January 2012 to pursue the "complete redevelopment" option.
CU/0203, CU/0204	Post office should protect post office which should be primary frontage.

R(c) Abbots Langley

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

93% yes (25 responses)

7% no (2 responses)

No Comments.

R(d) Chorleywood

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

95% yes (36 responses)

5% no (2 responses)

No Comments.

R(e) Watford Road, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

85% yes (51 responses)

15% no (9 responses)

Reference	Comment
02009	Local shopping centres are a valuable part of the community, features such as benches, bike racks, rubbish bins and noticeboards make them a focal point
04086	Use these shops regularly.
CU/0240	Croxley is atypical and it has a number of shopping parades. These should be protected. We do not want one large shopping area.
NSI/0204	I agree with the designation of part of New Road as well as Watford Road, Croxley Green as local shopping centres. There are other shops in New Road which are not covered by the designation. The Council should

	encourage their retention too.
--	--------------------------------

R(f) Moneyhill Parade, Rickmansworth

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

88% yes (37 responses)

12% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
02009	Local shopping centres are a valuable part of the community, features such as benches, bike racks, rubbish bins and noticeboards make them a focal point
02181	Money Hill Parade is fast becoming an increasing fast-food outlet, I believe we have over 10 in a very short stretch of road. We believe the council should consider that enough is enough and not allow any more in to this area.

R(g) New Road, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

93% yes (65 responses)

7% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
00274, 01264, 01813, 04016	New Road is the geographical centre for retail in Croxley Green and contains more retail than the two Watford Road parades.
00277, 00278, 03531	New Road the hub of shopping in Croxley Green and should be re-designated as the main centre.
00280	Object to inclusion of 166-178 New Road. Would prefer deletion of local centre designation from 170-172 which are an estate agent and funeral directors and do not perform an A1 user function. If not removed from allocation, SA4 to be reworded in respect of local centres and local shops to permit alternative uses. Likely that 166-172 may be redeveloped to provide extended surgery. Objection to inclusion of 170 and 172 within Local Centre which would mean policy objection to provision of improved health centre for the area.
01491	Should include shops to the east of those shown including CARRS and the dry cleaners etc.
02009	Local shopping centres are a valuable part of the community, features such as benches, bike racks, rubbish bins and noticeboards make them a focal point
02040	New Road already well served and very busy road.
02279	Not enough accessibility in New Road to be a primary frontage.
03916	New Road is a quiet and largely residential area. Expansion of retail not needed or justified.
04086	Use these shops regularly.
CU/0232	Fragmented so allocated frontage could be condensed to a smaller area.
NSI/0204	Other shops in New Road not covered by the designation. Council should encourage their retention too.

R(h) Maple Cross

Do you support the proposed retail allocation?

92% yes (34 responses)

8% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
CU/0281	Maple Cross needs more facilities.

Policy SA5: Publicly Accessible Open Space Allocations

Do you support this policy?

100% Yes (67 responses)

0% No (0 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	The wording to maintain open spaces could be stronger, e.g. Sites identified as Publicly Accessible Open Space will be safeguarded unless it can be demonstrated that the need for alternative land uses are considered to outweigh the local need and availability of an identified Publicly Accessible Open Space.
00795	We need to retain as much open space as possible and quality of life is extremely important.
00837	An 'open' space exists in Mill End, at the junction of Shepherds Lane and Chiltern Drive. Why is this ignored for 40 years. It could be housing or retail.
03454	Open space is good for the soul and stops the never ending [housing] developments leading to characterless sprawling towns.
03793	Yorke Mead School could be rebuilt and perhaps better planning of building could utilise the space more efficiently
CU/0281	Cannot see the Community Wildlife area on the open space plan (junction of Springwell Avenue and Fotherley Road.) We are only small, but we work hard on it. Perhaps it is there, just can't be seen.
NSI/0175	Need open spaces for many reasons.
NSI/0204	Additional areas that should be classified as publicly accessible open spaces include Croxley Green, owned by the Council and Harrocks Wood (north of Croxley Green including Merlins and Dell Woods) owned by the Woodland Trust.
SCO/0057 (Natural England)	<p>Welcome the inclusion of the proposed publicly accessible open space locations within the SAPD. They will help contribute to the delivery of Green Infrastructure (in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CP9) as well as providing opportunities for biodiversity enhancement and linking up of habitats. This should be emphasised.</p> <p>We would request that potential impacts of increased visitor pressure/ disturbance on habitats and species on the proposed publicly accessible sites are fully assessed and mitigated if necessary, particularly where they encompass or fall close to designated sites. Long term management measures for the sites (in the form of a management plan or similar document) should be formulated.</p>

OS(a) The Grove Woodland, Plaitford Close/The Byeway, Rickmansworth

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

100% yes (57 responses)

0% no (0 responses)

No comments.

OS(b) Chorleywood House Estate, Chorleywood

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

97% yes (65 responses)

3% no (2 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Why not build homes in Chorleywood rather than Abbots Langley/Leavesden where already too much.
00649 (HBRC)	Will include ecologically valuable livestock-grazed areas of grassland which must not be compromised by this designation.
03839	There is already adverse impact on the sensitive ecology of the river Chess from people who trespass from the public footpath on this site.
NSI/0170	Very much welcome the extension of publicly accessible open space.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Parts of this site lie within the floodplain. We support the use of this site as POS as this use is compatible with a site that is at risk of flooding. It may be possible to restore or enhance the existing river environment for biodiversity benefit. Such enhancement measures and management plans should be explored. A min 8m undeveloped buffer zone must be provided adjacent to the River chess.

OS(c) Land North of South Way (Horsefield/Furtherfield), Leavesden

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

91% yes (42 responses)

9% no (4 responses)

Reference	Comment
03881	Furtherfield would provide a natural area to extend Residential areas from the North and West given that services, facilities and public transport are to hand. This should be preferred to encroaching on the Rural Green Belt in Langleybury where the conditions for Urbanisation are not present to make it sustainable.
NSI/0170	Welcome extension of publicly accessible open space.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Due to the site's location within an outer SPZ and Furtherfield's historic use as a landfill, redevelopment of the site may risk pollution of the underlying aquifer. We would require a Preliminary Risk Assessment be submitted as part of any planning application to build on the site (including facilities for the public using the open space). This is in accordance with PPS23.

OS(d) Middleton Road, Mill End

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

90% yes (47 responses)

10% no (5 responses)

Reference	Comment
03644	Please safeguard all open land/woodland for the public. Back gardens should not be allowed to creep into open spaces.

OS(e) South Oxhey Playing Fields (rear of Hayling Road, Frinton Close and Sidmouth Close)

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

94% yes (48 responses)

6% no (3 responses)

No comments.

OS(f) Baldwins Lane Recreation Ground, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

96% yes (76 responses)

4% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
02089	It is nice to see these very important areas given more protection and greater recognition.
04052	In the last few years Croxley Green has been subject to over development and the risk of destroying Croxley Green altogether is imminent. It used to have a rural feeling to it. It is now like one big housing estate with barely enough open space for residents
NSI/0170	Very much welcome the extension of publicly accessible open space.

OS(g) Croxleyhall Wood, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

96% yes (78 responses)

4% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
02089	It is nice to see these very important areas given more protection and greater recognition.
04052	In the last few years Croxley Green has been subject to over development and the risk of destroying Croxley Green altogether is imminent. It used to have a rural feeling to it. It is now like one big housing estate with barely enough open space for residents
NSI/0170	Very much welcome the extension of publicly accessible open space.

OS(h) Buddleia Walk, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

96% yes (76 responses)

4% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
00837	Are Village Green and Public Open Space compatible or does one exclude the other?
02089	It is nice to see these very important areas given more protection and greater recognition.
04052	In the last few years Croxley Green has been subject to over development and the risk of destroying Croxley Green altogether is imminent. It used to have a rural feeling to it. It is now like one big housing estate with barely enough open space for residents
NSI/0204	Should be referred to as Long Valley Wood and Buddleia Walk
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Due to the historic use as a landfill, redevelopment of the site may risk pollution of the underlying aquifer. Would require a PRA be submitted as part of any planning application to build on the site (including facilities for

	the public using the open space). This is in accordance with PPS23.
--	---

OS(i) Pheasant's Wood and Solomon's Wood, Chorleywood

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

95% yes (53 responses)

5% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Why not build homes in Chorleywood rather than Abbots Langley/Leavesden where already too much.

OS(j) Croxley Common Moor, Croxley Green

Do you support the proposed publicly accessible open space allocation?

96% yes (81 responses)

4% no (3 responses)

Reference	Comment
00649 (HBRC)	Will include ecologically valuable livestock-grazed areas of grassland which must not be compromised by this designation.
02040	Should keep as many open spaces as possible.
02089	Nice to see these important areas given more protection and greater recognition.
04052	In the last few years Croxley Green has been subject to over development and the risk of destroying Croxley Green altogether is imminent. It used to have a rural feeling to it. It is now like one big housing estate with barely enough open space for residents
04133	Friends of Croxley Common Moor would like to formally record its support for the proposal to designate Croxley Common Moor as public open space, if that designation will give additional protection to Croxley Common Moor against any future proposal for development on it.
SCO/0023 (Environment Agency)	Parts of this site are within the floodplain. We support the use of this site as public open space as this use is compatible with the flood risk. It may be possible to include measures to restore or enhance the River Gade and existing SSSI environment for biodiversity benefit. Such enhancement measures should be explored. Access at this site must be managed to prevent degradation of the SSSI. This can be done through creation of formalised footpaths to encourage visitors towards certain areas, thus allowing other areas to be left as an undisturbed refuge.

Policy SA6: South Oxhey

Do you support this policy?

80% Yes (33 responses)

20% No (8 responses)

Reference	Comment
00643	Area has one of the highest unemployment rates in the county and yet there is no employment site allocated here. We would propose that apart from the retail jobs that are forecast additional local employment is proposed.
00749	School is very ready and willing to contribute to the implementation of the policy.
01948	Would prefer area to be refurbished.
03998	<p>Barclays support the promotion of South Oxhey District Centre as a Key Centre within Three Rivers and strongly support the aims of Policy SA6 to deliver the following regeneration benefits to South Oxhey: “improved access to services, improved housing quality and access to housing, better quality leisure and community facilities, improved shopping facilities, reduced levels of deprivation, facilitate improved access to employment, and facilitate improved access to education, skills and training”. Barclays are strongly committed to maintaining their presence within the regenerated District Centre in order to contribute to these goals.</p> <p>We are aware that further to recent rounds of public consultation events regarding the potential redevelopment and/or refurbishment options for the South Oxhey Redevelopment Initiative, the Three Rivers District Council Executive Committee decided on 30 January 2012 to pursue the “complete redevelopment” option.</p>
04052	Not if Green Belt.
CU/0204	Policy should improve cycle routes as well as everything else in the transport field.
NSI/0063	<p>Proposed site area not an allocation and not suitable for this document. Has not identified precise parcels suitable to accommodate 210 dwellings. Sites are windfall development and will be provided for within a subsequent SPD. Should not be in SA without specific sites.</p> <p>No explanation of how the quantum of development calculated, whether sites identified and whether landowners willing to release land. If the redevelopment proposals were for area of undeveloped or unused land within 1 ownership, a development which includes a considerable number of dwellings would be achievable, however not realistic in this location. Likely delivery problems as fragmented ownership, existing uses which may not wish to be relocated or redevelopment, likely Compulsory Purchase Order required which may take years and status of various leasehold arrangements is unknown.</p> <p>Not provided evidence that the site is developable for 210 dwellings in accordance with PPS3 paragraphs 54 to 56.</p>
NSI/0204	Support the general direction of policy to reduce deprivation and regenerate the town. However, details will be crucially important.
SCO/0010 (Hertsmere BC)	Support the overall approach to SO as a Key Centre and the proposed initiative for regeneration here.
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Support the initiative to regenerate South Oxhey and due to its proximity to Watford, any proposals should be consistent with Watford’s spatial strategy and that; ‘new development protects residential amenity and protects and enhances the character of the area.’

SCO/0057 (Natural England)	The planning parameters plan identifies areas around South Oxhey for landscape and wildlife enhancement. We would suggest that this is mentioned in the preceding text as it will benefit the local community as well as biodiversity.
----------------------------------	--

Policy SA7: Langleybury and The Grove

Do you support this policy?

38% Yes (27 responses)

62% No (44 responses)

Reference	Comment
00269, 01389, 01390, 01679, 01727, 03454, 04115	Site should be a secondary school.
00649 (HBRC)	Locally there are important biodiversity resources which should also be taken into consideration on both Estates, and this should be reflected within the Policy e.g. Opportunities for securing and enhancing biodiversity and landscape resources on both sites will be taken where appropriate. I support the continuation of the agricultural use of the land at Langleybury.
03839	I would prefer to see more residential development on the Langleybury site as it has excellent access and would be a great place to live.
00837	How about access from The Grove to Langleybury House? Over or under M25 sliproad.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03969, 04066, 04141, 04150, NIS/0110	Generally supportive of the majority of the policy and the Development brief.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03969	Agree 'that the future restoration and enhancement of the Langleybury Estate is best linked to the use and operation of The Grove'.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03892, 03935, 03936, 03940, 03907, 03948, 03950, 03969, 04032, 04040, 04066, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072, 04141, 04150, NIS/0108, NSI/0110	Object to inclusion of 25 houses.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936, 03940, 03948, 04048, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072	Restoration and maintenance of the Langleybury House should be required from the outset of the project.
03880, 03881, 03887 (CCRA), 03935, 03936,	Any new floorspace granted at The Grove should require the demolition of all or part of the old school buildings, with any remaining to be demolished before any works to the Langleybury Estate.

03940, 03948, 04048, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072	
03892, 03895, 03950, 04084, 04085, 04140, NSI/0110	Concern about traffic on Langleybury Lane.
03892	Limited access to residential development.
03895, 03908, 03950, 04066, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072, 04084, 04085	25 houses should not be developed on rural Green Belt.
03948, 03950	There are no very special circumstances for Green Belt development.
03948, 03978, 03997, NSI/0110	Poor access to services and public transport. Residential development unsustainable.
03948, 04048, 04066, 04068, 04069, 04070, 04071, 04072	RTL not interested in building houses.
03950	Would create accident hot spot on Langleybury Lane.
03956	50% of houses should be low cost for workers.
03956	Infill between this site and Watford/Abbots Langley should not be allowed.
03997	Excessive noise pollution in area.
04028	Home Farm one of few remaining livestock units in Herts. Without client's cooperation, brief not deliverable as a large and important part of the land will not be made available. Brief tries but fails to link Langleybury and The Grove. Sites are severed and will function independently. Proposals introduce significant buildings and built form within Green Belt which is inappropriate. No justification of very special circumstances required for departure from Green Belt policy. No evidence on agricultural viability, ecology, highways, ecology, archaeology. Issues have not been addressed and would impact upon what is achievable.
04039	Buildings should be sympathetic in keeping with Green Belt.
04052	Overpopulation of area.
04084, 04085	Houses would create an opening for caravan site.
04150	Langleybury and The Grove should be developed simultaneously.
CU/0377	Public affordable golf course would be nice.
NSI/0204	Something needs to be done with site.
NSI/0204	Proposed mix of residential/leisure/farming makes sense.
NSO/0054	British Waterways would wish to be included in detailed site discussions to ensure that any proposals have a positive impact on the Grand Union Canal and the impact of potential increases in the number of users of the towpath is considered.
SCO/0014 (Watford BC)	Support the policy as long as the Green Belt location of development and accompanying restrictions on replacement floorspace are handled with care - with regard to the quantity of floorspace allowed, limiting the height of development and careful consideration of the location of the new floorspace with regard to the landscape, topography and views into the area.
SCO/0026 (English	Langleybury House Grade II* listed building at risk. Clear opportunity to achieve repair and re-use of Langleybury House, setting of which has been

Heritage)	<p>degraded by adjoining, dominant and poorly designed modern school. Demolition of the modern building, and provision for replacement within curtilage of The Grove could enable mutually beneficial development. Believe 'trading' of development on Green Belt is justified by exceptional circumstances pertaining to the highly graded historic building at risk. In addition, relocation consistent with aims and purposes of Green Belt in PPG2, in terms of enhancing the openness of the Green Belt in a sensitive position and re-placing such development where this purpose not infringed.</p> <p>Concerned that proposal includes 'around 25 homes' within Langleybury site. Understand that The Grove requires new development to allow expansion of that business. This should be all the replacement development required to ensure that the future of historic building at risk is secured. Would therefore object to this aspect of the proposal in terms of the advice contained in PPS5, policies HE3.1, 3.4 and 5.1.</p>
-----------	---

Sustainability Appraisal	<p>Given part of the site houses woodlands and wildlife site on Heath Wood, development and operations may affect biodiversity at the site, dependent on the design details and location of habitats/species. Proposed landuse will secure future use of Langleybury 'Building at Risk', however the restoration details will determine if cultural heritage objectives will be achieved. Design details will be required to determine effect on landscape and townscape objective but cumulative positive effect likely with DM Policies. Parts of site are on flood zone 3a and 3b. Proposal will help achieve housing targets and will help inward investment, increasing job opportunities so aiding local economic growth.</p>
---------------------------------	---

Green Belt

Reference	Comment
00304	As well as the changes to the Green Belt boundary that are already proposed which are supported, there also needs to be a minor consequential change to the Green Belt boundary in the location of site BP3 to acknowledge the development of the site.
01762	Surely having two school sites on GB will remove these sites from GB. Will this be noted in DPD?
04147	Should identify a modification of the Green Belt boundary to exclude the built footprint of Beaufort Court including the site for future expansion. The remainder of the site should remain open and managed for nature conservation, amenity and recreational value.
NSO/0061	As at The Roughs, the Leavesden site is surrounded on three sides by built development and the fourth by a road. The Council consider the road to be a defensible boundary, with the site not considered to contribute to Green Belt objectives. We feel that these factors reflect the site at The Roughs, and as such the Green Belt boundary should be reconsidered to exclude The Roughs.
NSO/0077	<p>Concerned at inconsistent treatment of Green Belt which is unsound, and could lead to difficulty preventing inappropriate development in many Green Belt locations in future.</p> <p>Where a site is allocated, should be subject of Green Belt review (Core Strategy paragraph 5.103 and 5.104). Should ensure resulting boundary permanent and defensible, as required by national policy.</p> <p>Some Green Belt boundaries at some sites allocated will not be defensible and, therefore unsound.</p> <p>Green Belt chapter misinterprets PPG2 and confused advice on need for general review of Green Belt with need for minor amendments to correct anomalies and address needs for small scale release of Green Belt for development.</p> <p>The most striking example is H(10) where allocating site for 425 dwellings but not proposing to amend Green Belt. Only explanation is that many sites in sensitive locations and retaining Green Belt will enable Council to maintain greater control over future development. Very unlikely any greater control could be exercised than could be exerted through planning obligations, conditions, and site development briefs. Concerned devaluation of status of Green Belt would arise with proposed approach.</p>
SCO/0017 (HCC Property)	Noted limited change proposed to Green Belt. Flexible policies in respect of education sites would assist County Council in adjusting provision of school places without need to demonstrate very special circumstances in each case. Where school sites on periphery of a settlement, would be reasonable to adjust boundary to exclude built area of school.
SCO/0040 (Veolia Water)	In tandem with other GB releases, propose that H30 deleted from GB as proposal for more than 50 units, brownfield, limited impact on openness and highly sustainable.

GB(1) Leavesden

Do you support this Green Belt proposal?

74% Yes (37 responses)
26% No (13 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Should be no removal of land from Green Belt without additional allocation from elsewhere or Green Belt is meaningless.
02127	Object to failure to accord with CS PSP2 and CP11 as fails to recognise current and future role of the site as a source of employment and nationally important economic activity. Therefore draft policy not sound and not justified as fails to remove developed area of studios or Island site from GB.
03454	Developments in GB(1) should not have gone ahead without challenging the green belt boundary.
03826	Essential that Green Belt is protected in its undeveloped state. The development of schools on these areas is unacceptable to the local residents.
04051, 04052	Green Belt should not be eroded.
CU/0079	Strongly disagree with making changes to the Green Belt.
CU/0079	Will be the thin end of the wedge.
SCO/0022 (Watford Rural PC)	Would object to any erosion of Green Belt.

GB(2) South of Heysham Drive, South Oxhey

Do you support this Green Belt proposal?

52% Yes (23 responses)
48% No (21 responses)

Reference	Comment
00498	Do not agree with any encroachment of the Green Belt.
00649 (HBRC)	Whole of the proposed area for removal from the Green belt should not be developed given the damaging impact this will have on the link that the LNR has with open land to the south – it will all be severed by the proposals. Already a significant area with reptile interest has been lost to development at the southern end of the site. An appropriate layout will be needed to retain a viable width of link to avoid further fragmentation and isolation.
01948	No more Green Belt should be taken for development.
03454	Can't get rid of a playing field.
04051, 04052	Green Belt must not be eroded.
CU/0079	Strongly disagree with making changes to the Green Belt.
CU/0079	Will be the thin end of the wedge.
NSI/0175	Support changes in the Green Belt, in some areas should be updated.
SCO/0009 (LB Harrow)	<p>Would harm openness of already narrow and elevated Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey. Existing residential development at Heysham and Wentworth Drives already extend urban area of South Oxhey to boundary, but somewhat isolated elements within openness provided by surrounding land, including sites H41 and H42. H41 and H42 would create continuous urban edge along ridge line and reduction in perception of openness and visual amenity of this part of Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt between Hatch End/Pinner and South Oxhey provides access to countryside. Sections 14+15 of London Loop pass through area and part</p>

	<p>of section 14 immediately to the rear of H41.</p> <p>PPG2 sets out that Green Belt should be several miles wide allowing appreciable open zone round built up area. Visual amenity of Green Belt should not be injured by proposals within/conspicuous from Green Belt.</p> <p>Connects Prestwick Rd LNR to Harrow Green Belt which contains designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance. Widens south tip of LNR from <20m to >170m. Wider juncture between LNR and Green Belt is a better conduit for wildlife migration than tip of the reserve alone. H41 will lead to increased biological islandisation of LNR reducing viability (PPS9).</p>
SCO/0017	Logical extension of the built area and realignment of the settlement edge will form a strong and defensible GB boundary.
SCO/0022 (Watford Rural PC)	Would object to any erosion of Green Belt.

Policy SA8: Maple Lodge Waste Water Treatment Works

Do you support this policy?

73% Yes (35 responses)

17% No (13 responses)

Reference	Comment
00373	Should be no removal of land from Green Belt without additional allocation from elsewhere or Green Belt is meaningless.
00795	Green Belt should be kept. Once developed, can never be reclaimed.
04051, 04052	Green Belt should not be eroded.
04087	Green Belt should always be kept as Green Belt.
04136	Keep Maple Cross Lodge.
CU/0203	Should be extra landscaping/green corridor along west bank of River Colne.
CU/0232	Green Belt boundary around Maple Lodge WwTW should more closely follow current precise line of built structures.
CU/0240	Green Belt should not be developed unless really compelling necessity.
SCO/0006 (HCC Environment)	<p>Maple Lodge sewage treatment works continues to be safeguarded by the county council for their current waste use and is listed as a safeguarded site in the most recent Minerals and Waste Annual Monitoring Report. The aims of Policy SA8 are therefore supported as they do not contradict Waste Policy 18 in the Waste Local Plan and Policy 5: Safeguarding of Sites in the Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies-Proposed Changes document.</p> <p>Significant improvement to the access road and supporting transport infrastructure and services would be required to allow this site to be developed for any more intensive use.</p>
SCO/0008 (Dacorum BC)	Welcome the continued designation of the Maple Lodge Waste Water Treatment Works as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt (Policy SA8). This is a key facility serving west Hertfordshire and Dacorum, and should be given flexibility to allow for infilling for operational purposes where necessary.

Monitoring

Reference	Comment
04147	Policy SA9 Monitoring should be amended to recognise that sites will come forward to meet the needs of growing businesses during the life of the SADPD. Proposals that will secure local employment and achieve growth in employment particularly in high tech based activities should be encouraged.