

APPENDIX 6 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Statutory Consultee Representations

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	Yes/ No	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S/ COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
Q18. Do you think the Preferred Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution is the right approach?						
SC_P1_Sport England	Sport England	No	It is requested that section 8 of the policy option on lighting is amended. The policy does not provide policy guidance on light sensitive developments proposed in locations where nearby existing land uses may have an adverse effect on the occupants of the development. For example, residential schemes proposed adjoining school or sports clubs sites that have floodlit sports facilities. In such scenarios, developments should submit lighting assessments including mitigation measures to address any identified impacts to help avoid residential amenity issues arising which may result in the uses that generate an impact being prejudiced. Sport England has had experience of sites with established floodlit community sports facilities coming under pressure to reduce the hours of use that the floodlighting operates in response to complaints from residents in new developments where there was inadequate consideration of the lighting impact issue. The inclusion of such policy guidance would help avoid such a scenario. It would also be consistent with the approach taken to noise sensitive development in section 5(c) of this policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 8- Policy does not provide guidance on where new development proposals might be subject to an adverse effect from existing developments such as existing sports facilities with flood lights. Sport England has had experience of sites with established floodlit community sports facilities coming under pressure to reduce the hours of use that the floodlighting operates in response to complaints from residents in new developments where there was inadequate consideration of the lighting impact issue. It would also be consistent with the approach taken to noise sensitive development in section 5(c) of this policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed. Paragraph 186 of the NPPF states 'Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.' 	<p>Additional wording to be added to policy justification:</p> <p>Under the agent of change principle, if new development or uses are to be introduced near a pre-existing business, such as a live music venue, or sports facility it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure solutions to address and mitigate noise and/or light are put forward as part of proposals.</p>
SC_00020_Chorleywood Parish Council	Chorleywood Parish Council	Yes	It appears that the approach put forward is appropriate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	No action
SC_00024_Abbots Langley Parish Council	Abbots Langley Parish Council	Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support 	Noted	No action
SC_00026_HCC Growth and Infrastructure	HCC Growth and Infrastructure		Preferred Policy Option 17, Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution. It is suggested that the following additional text is added to the list of criteria under paragraph (8): g) Light pollution will be minimised by following the latest guidance ² of the Institute of Lighting Professionals h) Appropriate technologies will be used to minimise the energy usage required and carbon generated. This may include the energy source, bulb, daylight or movement sensors, or timers.	Suggested additional text be included in the list of criteria under paragraph 8.	Agreed. Paragraph 186 of the NPPF states 'Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.'	<p>Additional wording to be added to policy justification:</p> <p>Under the agent of change principle, if new development or uses are to be introduced near a pre-existing business, such as a live music venue, or sports facility it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure solutions to address and mitigate noise and/or light are put forward as part of proposals.</p>
SC_00030_Highways England	Highways England		This policy relates to ground conditions, lighting, noise and vibration. This policy does not currently refer to the SRN, but is required for those sites that run up to or close to the SRN boundary. For sites positioned site close to the SRN carriageway and junctions, it will be necessary to ensure that the proposals mitigate appropriately the potential for ground conditions, lighting, noise and vibration impacts. In terms of noise, we would expect the site masterplan to be designed to minimise the exposure of noise-sensitive receptors to strategic traffic, using either or a combination of a landscape buffer and acoustic bund designed to shield the settlement from motorway noise. In addition to noise impacts, we would also draw attention to the importance of ensuring that drainage, landscaping, lighting and boundary treatment proposals for the proposals in accordance with the DfT Circular 02/2013 Annex A A1, which states that all noise fences, screening and other structures	Noted.	Paragraph 186 of the NPPF states 'Existing businesses and facilities should not have unreasonable restrictions placed on them as a result of development permitted after they were established. Where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development (including changes of use) in its vicinity, the applicant (or 'agent of change') should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.'	<p>Additional wording to be added to policy justification:</p> <p>Under the agent of change principle, if new development or uses are to be introduced near a pre-existing business, such as a live music venue, or sports facility it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure solutions to address and mitigate noise and/or light are put forward as part of proposals.</p>

			must be erected on the developers land, and far enough within the developers land to enable maintenance to take place without encroachment onto highway land. We would expect that these issues are considered when finalising the site layout and masterplan proposals. Impacts arising from any disruptions during construction, noise, vibration, traffic volume, composition or routing and transport infrastructure modification should be fully assessed and reported.		
--	--	--	--	--	--

Q18. Should we have considered alternative options?

--	--	--	--	--	--

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Non- Statutory Consultee Representations

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	Yes/ No	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S/ COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
Q18. Do you think the Preferred Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution is the right approach?						
P1_00002_N Lucey		Yes	But there are no criteria. Terms like significant or reasonable need clarification. Documentation incomplete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but no criteria. Terms like significant or reasonable need clarification Documentation incomplete. 	Noted.	New text to be added in reasoned justification for clarity
P1_00003_S Cassidy		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_00005_T Foulkes		No	I think development of contaminated land should be phrased in a positive way as this would be an opportunity to remove or control the contamination rather than just hope that the existing position will not cause a problem. The developers should be encouraged to clean contaminated land so that they can develop (and profit) from it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be phrased in a positive way in that is an opportunity to remove the contamination rather than hoping the existing problem goes away. 	Noted	New text to be added in reasoned justification for clarity
P1_00006_J Humphrey		Yes	The vicinity of Three Rivers to both M1 and M25 motorways makes Air Pollution a very important issue. By maintaining the Green Belt near to the motorways will assist the aim of re addressing air pollution. It is essential that woodland and farmland be protected to provide a balance between the provision of extra housing but not to the detriment of the whole local environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain Green Belt near motorways will assist addressing air pollution. Balance between extra housing and woodland/ environment and local environment is essential. 	Noted	None
P1_00014_A Samson		Yes	Makes logical sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None
P1_00017_M McGuirk		No	Mandatory requirements. This is lip service, any increase in traffic will increase pollution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make requirements mandatory 	Noted. Mandatory requirement for all development will be unduly onerous.	None
P1_00019_G Houghton		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None
P1_00020_T Grewal		Yes	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None
P1_00021_R Pawar		Yes	Seems good.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None
P1_00023_D r K		Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

Macleod						
P1_00 024_C Holmes	Yes	Pollution in all its forms have the capacity to affect an individual's health and quality of life.		• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_00 025_M Beaujeux	No	Increase traffic		• Will lead to an increase in traffic	Noted	None
P1_00 026_P McCaffrey	Yes	Clear policy		• Support	Noted	None
P1_00 027_N Murtagh & C Gregory	Yes			• Support	Noted	None
P1_00 028_J Pochettino	Yes	the less light pollution the better		• Support	Noted	None
P1_00 032_T Smith	Yes	This policy is necessary to preserve the environment both for wildlife and for existing residents		• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_00 033_K Li	Yes	It includes all types of pollution.		• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_00 034_M Richards	Yes			• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_00 038_P Gibbs	Yes	Essential to reduce light pollution, and protect against developments that would negatively impact on the environment.		• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_00 040_N Brew	No	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.		• Do not develop Green Belt Land	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00 041_D James-Saunders	Yes	All forms of pollution must be avoided.		• Support	Noted	None
P1_00 045_L	Yes	No Comment		• Agree with approach	Noted	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

Fitzpatrick					
P1_00046_S Singer	Yes	All the above is very important		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00047_P Rees	Yes	The policy is correct. (But of course the Draft Local Plan proposal to build hundreds of homes on Green Belt would of course lead to the problems re light pollution, odour, 'unacceptable adverse impact on wildlife, habitats etc' that this policy tries to prevent.)		• Agree with policy. Plans to build hundreds of new homes would lead to light pollution and other adverse effects	Noted. There are sufficient safeguards in the policy to ensure lighting pollution is mitigated None
P1_00048_R Symmons	Yes	No Comment		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00049_S Haralambou	Yes	Good systems highlighted above		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00053_C Anderson Bergdahl	Yes	How come a site has been suggested at Flower House, DIRECTLY under the M25. It's crazy it's even considered based on the above policy		• Query why a site at Flower House, directly under the M25, is being suggested.	Noted – See Part 2 response for further details None
P1_00054_A Wrangles	Yes	Agree		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00055_B Pegg	Yes	Important to preserve light and existing countryside		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00056_D Luddington	Yes	Recognises importance to local communities.		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00057_J Pankhurst	No	Protect against noise pollution, light pollution. Protect wildlife.		• Protect against all forms of pollution.	Noted None
P1_00063_J Putch	Yes	Agree		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00064_B Patel	Yes	xxx		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00066_R Franks	Yes	Agree		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00068_A Clark	No	Don't make me laugh! I've been in large construction half my life - I KNOW how these things work! I read the no doubt very expensive and carefully crafted Wildlife Assessment for the Free Reach School which included Environmental Impact (oh god that word again!) The firm that compiled that pack of lies ignored my several letters and emails - my case rests.		• Do not agree with approach. The Free Reach School produced all the statements and ignored respondent's letters yet still allowed to build school.	Noted None
P1_00069_F Esma	No			• Do not agree with approach but no reason given.	Noted None
P1_00074_I Mercer	Yes			• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00076_L Hull	Yes	This sounds considerate of local residents.		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00077_G Lean	Yes	Y		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00078_A Prior	Yes	All necessary requirements.		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00080_J Brooks-Martin	Yes	N/A		• Agree with approach	Noted None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

P1_00 084_M Hampton	Yes	Protects the current levels of air pollution populated and noise, vibration and lighting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 088_C Green	Yes	Sounds sensible but I have no confidence that this will be for filled. There is already huge contamination of our water ways and areas for nature.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but little confidence it will be implemented. Already water contamination issues. 	Noted	None
P1_00 089_S Pettifer	Yes	We need to make sure any planning developments are in the right area for the community and environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Ensure developments are in right area for community and the environment. 	Noted	None
P1_00 091_B Cownley	Yes	It covers all the problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 096_S Carpenter	Yes	Seems sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 097_N Ross	Yes	A range of issues have been considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 098_A Michaels	No	This is not strong enough. You cannot enforce it, so people will abuse it. Unless you have someone monitoring the impacts on wildlife, this is useless.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is not worded strongly enough and cannot be enforced. Need to have a monitoring officer on impacts of wildlife. 	Noted.	None
P1_00 099_A Michaels (councillor)	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 102_K Allen	Yes	New development should never have a negative impact in any of these areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 106_L Crosby	No	Development would have impact on everything, noise, air pollution etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will have an impact on noise and air pollution. 	Noted. Some impact is inevitable but there are policies in the Plan to minimise their impact.	None
P1_00 107_R Webster	No	Increasing population, and reduction of green spaces by definition means a decrease in the quality of life. It will inevitably mean an increase of all sorts of pollution. This will only be mitigated to any degree by keeping development down to an absolute minimum, and at low densities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing population and reduction of green space will inevitably increase pollution, can only mitigate with minimum development at low density. 	Noted	None
P1_00 108_J Cahill		who knows, not my area of expertise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment 	Noted	None
P1_00 110_C PRE Herts	Not Specified	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_00 112_L Head	Yes	It's the sensible approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 113_T Foley	Yes	No reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 114_D Twinberron	Yes	lighting should state use of lowest energy technology as exists (currently LED)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting should state use if lowest energy technology that exists. 	Noted	None
P1_00 116_P Newington	No	I agree with the policy as stated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 117_A Hampton	Yes	Avoid Poisoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 119_J Loveard	No	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is sanctuary for wildlife 	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

					and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment. Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.	
P1_00 120_G Nunn	Yes	Sensible approach but who is to manage, measure and review the assessments to make judgements on what is acceptable?	• Agree with approach but who will manage, measure and review the assessments.	Noted. The Plan will include indicators and monitoring arrangements	None	
P1_00 123_D Thoma s	Yes	Ok	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 127_M Clarke	No		• Do not agree with approach but no reason given.	Noted	None	
P1_00 130_E Ad	No	This will substantially contaminate the land	• Will substantially contaminate the land	Noted	None	
P1_00 131_P Harris	No	'Proposals which have the potential to cause or exacerbate noise and vibration impacts on land uses or occupiers in the locality, or which may be affected by existing sources of noise or vibration, must fully assess such impacts'. And then what? An impact assessment doesn't stop noise etc.!!! Lighting - on use of low energy light sources (e.g. LED). Also, road lighting should make allowance for on road electric car charging facilities, where required.	• An impact assessment does not stop noise pollution; • Road lighting should make allowance for on road electric car charging facilities, where required.	Noted. New criteria to be added to curb lighting pollution	None. New criteria to be added	
P1_00 132_H Sahota	Yes	need analysis of history and known issues	• Need analysis of history and known issues.	Noted. Text under reasoned justification offers additional contextual information	None	
P1_00 133_A Stanle y	Not State d	Many of the Policy Options are expressed in the negative ...where is would not...etc. Proving a negative is always tricky, would it not be better to prove a positive...where is will....and thus shift the onus of accountability to the developer.	• Many policy options expressed in a 'negative' would be better to have the policies expressed in a 'positive' light.	Noted	None	
P1_00 135_W Stephe ns	Yes	Fine	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 137_S Hall	Yes	I agree with all the above	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 140_M Mavadi a	Yes	No option but to agree as when development is forced in areas where little can be done to prevent it, the point of air pollution noise pollution becomes irrelevant. Development is naturally going to have an impact on wildlife and air quality.	• Development will always have an impact on air pollution and noise pollution.	Noted. Some impact is inevitable but there are policies in the Plan to minimise their impact	None	
P1_00 142_Y Lloyd	No	.	• Do not agree with approach but no reason given.	Noted	None	
P1_00 144_D Thorpe	Yes	I agree	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 145_C Bessan t	Not Specif ied	As to air pollution 'quote:' 'Air pollutants (including dust and odour) have been shown to have an adverse effect on both health and the environment and it will be important to consider emissions arising from development including indirect emissions.' but areas that already are bad for pollutants, ie close to the M25, the area to the south of the district that suffers not just from ground traffic pollution, but also air traffic (Heathrow and Northolt) and from odour pollutants given out by TW Sewage Treatment Site. Surely for these reasons these areas should also be avoided for building purposes.	• Air pollution has been shown to have an adverse impact on health and the environment; • Ensure developments are located away from areas of air pollution such as M25 but also Heathrow airport.	Noted	None	
P1_00 147_N Hoad	Yes	Seems fine	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 148_S Dilwort h	Yes	Essential to protect pre-existing residents	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	
P1_00 155_C Sears	Yes	Glad that this covers not just ground and air pollution but also light pollution, feel that all adverse impacts have been included and considered	• Agree with approach, feel all points have been covered.	Noted	None	
P1_00 162_E Foulke s	Yes	This is well thought through	• Agree with approach	Noted	None	

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

P1_00 164_S Morrill	Yes	Certain developments - Clement Danes School springs to mind - turn the whole night sky white with their up lighting - glass sphere lighting poles with no attempt at all to stop light going up to the sky. Good if we at least try to reduce this. My school site has no external lighting on at all after about 2200 - Just sensor operated lighting. All car park lighting is movement detector operated and remains on for just a few minutes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to have sensor operated lights, as certain developments, such as Clement Danes School, have their lights on all evening. 	Noted	None
P1_00 166_T Turner	Yes	Supportive to local communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 167_J Passingham	Not State d	I would challenge whether TRDC is actually prepared to stand up behind these objectives, as so far this has proven not to be the case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query whether TRDC will fully support these objectives. 		None
P1_00 170_N Hutchinson	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 174_E Nathan	Yes	I agree with this policy, but is there an appendix document that can be referenced to highlight what constitutes poor/disruptive lighting? Many other councils have a supplementary document which covers this in a simple, accessible way.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need an appendix document to reference what makes poor lighting, other councils have SPD's on this. 	Noted. More details to be provided	More details to be provided
P1_00 181_C Hiltearn Society	Not Specified	This broadly covers what we would expect.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. 	Noted	None
P1_00 183_M Allum	Yes	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 184_M Mitchell	Yes	No comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 186_J Parkhurst	No	The impact that such a significant development will have on the local area should not be underestimated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact a development has on a wider area should not be underestimated. 	Noted. Some impact is inevitable but there are policies in the Plan to minimise their impact	None
P1_00 187_C Mitchell	Yes	No comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 190_I Starr	Yes	Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 201_A Green	Yes	Fine but make sure to consider the impact of more motorists on the roads and how that will effect air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but ensure impact of more motorists on the road is taken into account. 	Noted. Some impact is inevitable but there are policies in the Plan to minimise their impact	None
P1_00 206_D Worrell	Yes	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 209_G Bown	No	I cannot comment on the real approach re contaminated land rather than that listed for the purposes of gaining acceptance of the local plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot comment on real approach to contaminated land rather than that listed for purposes of the local plan. 	Noted	None
P1_00 211_J Pumell	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 215_L Horne	Yes	I am unsure how it would work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 218_M Chabreil	Yes	No comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 219_S Talbot	Yes	Appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 222_T Hree Rivers	Yes	No Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

Green Party					
P1_00 223_D Green	Yes	It covers most things		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 224_J Ford	Yes	as long as it is followed through!		• Agree with approach as long as it is implemented.	Noted None
P1_00 227_K Gallagher	Yes	No comment, the proposal seems adequate		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 232_A Britton	Yes	All Good		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 233_A Limerick	Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution is the right approach.		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 234_A O'Sullivan	Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Ground Conditions, Contamination and Pollution is the right approach.		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 236_E Talbott	Yes	Stipulations make sense		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 240_K Butler	Yes	Yes		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 244_P Phillips	No	No specific reference to road transport - including speed limits.		• No reference to road transport made, including speed limits	Noted None
P1_00 253_J Daniels	Not Stated	We support the policy text at part (2) of PPO17 which accords with national policy. Whilst policy text states that opportunities should be taken to improve local environmental conditions and/or to remediate or mitigate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land, we believe policy text should recognise that remediation of contaminated land is a costly undertaking and there are circumstances where contaminated land will not come forward for development unless there is incentive or encouragement to do so. Therefore, we propose that additional policy text should be added stating that the council will support proposals for the remediation of contaminated land when taking planning decisions and give weight to this benefit in the decision making exercise.		• Should recognise remediation of contaminated land is a costly undertaking and are circumstances where it will not come forward for development unless incentive to do so;	Noted None
P1_00 256_M Withinington	Yes	Seems reasonable		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 262_L Mead	No	Light pollution from inside buildings should be controlled by fining commercial tenants who do this such as the Imagine building which leaves its lights on constantly all night.		• Light pollution inside buildings controlled through fines for commercial tenants who leave lights on all night	Noted None
P1_00 266_C Weston	Not Stated	The warehouses in Maple Cross prove beyond doubt that words that have been copied from the last local plan policies to the new one do not work, yet they remain. No solely desk topped modelling data will be accepted by TRDC. Every aspect in this section needs to be more clearly defined e.g. all development of x size or 10+ residential dwellings must produce a formal air quality monitoring report.		• Wording has just been copied from last local plan, old policies don't work; • Section needs to be clearly defined e.g. all development of x size or 10+ residential dwellings must produce a formal air quality monitoring report.	Noted. Policy takes account of the updated available guidance. None
P1_00 271_S Wallace	Yes	Seems sensible		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 282_A Jenkins	No	Enough. Too many questions not enough time before the deadline!!		• Too many questions.	Noted None
P1_00 287_A Edwards	Yes	Totally agree with this - see my previous comment on sewage and flooding		• Agree with approach	Noted None
P1_00 301_C Chiltern	Not Stated	The Chilterns Conservation Board generally supports Preferred Policy Option 17.		• Policy could be enhanced by specific references to noise and air pollution;	Noted. There are other policies in the Plan which will address some of the comments made. For instance: Preferred Policy Option 23 None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

s Conser vation Board			We consider that the policy could be enhanced by specific reference to the impacts of (especially) noise and light pollution on the tranquillity of the Chilterns AONB, and that careful attention should be paid to these issues within the AONB and its setting. In this respect, we recommend the following two changes to the policy itself: • Replace (5)(b) with "Have an unacceptable adverse impact on the Chilterns AONB or its setting, or other countryside areas of tranquillity which are important for wildlife and countryside recreation; or", and • Add a new criterion (9): "Development that adds to light pollution in the Chilterns AONB or its setting will be resisted. The Council will actively seek opportunities to remove or replace existing inappropriate external lighting in and close to the Chilterns AONB in order to restore dark skies at night."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace (5)(b) with "Have an unacceptable adverse impact on the Chilterns AONB or its setting, or other countryside areas of tranquillity which are important for wildlife and countryside recreation; or", and • New criterion (9): "Development that adds to light pollution in the Chilterns AONB or its setting will be resisted. The Council will actively seek opportunities to remove or replace existing inappropriate external lighting in and close to the Chilterns AONB in order to restore dark skies at night." 	Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping; Preferred Policy Option 21 Biodiversity, Trees, Woodlands and Landscaping	
Q18. Should we have considered alternative options?						
P1_00 005_T Foulke s		Yes	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be phrased in a positive way in that is an opportunity to remove the contamination rather than hoping the existing problem goes away. 	Noted	None
P1_00 014_A Samso n		Yes	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support 	Noted	None
P1_00 017_M McGuir k		Yes	See Above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make requirements mandatory 	Noted.	None
P1_00 020_T Grewal		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No alternatives suggested 	Noted	None
P1_00 023_D r K Macleo d		Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No alternatives suggested 	Noted	None
P1_00 025_M Beauje ux		Yes	How is traffic flow going to be addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is traffic flow to be addressed? 	Noted. There are other policies in the Plan to address traffic flow	None
P1_00 040_N Brew		Yes	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not develop Green Belt Land 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00 041_D James- Saund ers		Yes	What are the alternatives? How can we comment if we're not told?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the alternatives? Cannot comment if not told? 	Noted	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

P1_00 045_L Fitzpatrick	Yes	The policy should make specific comment with regard to foul water and sewerage. These are areas of responsibility for the council to control and should be reflected in the policy. Proposed developments should be challenged on the basis of their likely waste water volumes and the ability of local infrastructure to cope with their marginal impact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should make specific to foul sewage and water; Developments should be challenged on their likely waste water volumes 	Noted. Policy on waste management and recycling addresses some of the issues raised	None
P1_00 047_P Rees	Yes	The policy should be far tougher and prevent the desecration of all woodlands and wildlife habitats in Three Rivers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should be far tougher 	Noted	None
P1_00 048_R Symmons	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_00 053_C Anderson Bergdahl	Yes	See Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query why a site at Flower House, directly under the M25, is being suggested. 	Noted – See Part 2 responses for more detailed response to this policy	None
P1_00 057_J Pankhurst	Yes	Protect existing resident's well-being, and quality of life. Protect wildlife and rural green belt, so minimise pollution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect existing residents well being; Protect wildlife and rural Green Belt; Minimise pollution 	Noted	None
P1_00 068_A Clark	Yes	Come out and say what really happens - if folk want houses and roads - everyone will have to put up with the dross! You live in a concrete house, go to work on a concrete road, use petrol, diesel - even electricity isn't clean. Get used to it - unless you want the population thinned? Starting where?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will just have to put up with it if people want to live in houses. 	Noted	None
P1_00 078_A Prior	Yes	Lighting needs to have a zero sky pollution condition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighting has zero sky pollution impacts 	Noted	None
P1_00 098_A Michaels	Yes	Again, hire an expert. Pay them to monitor. If you cannot, it is irresponsible to move forward with any development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hire an expert to review. 	Noted	None
P1_00 107_R Webster	Yes	Don't build on greenbelt, don't build more than you absolutely have to. 15 years is a long time, and our Country's population actually fell last year. Are you really going to embark on building plan that will destroy greenbelt only to find it wasn't necessary?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't develop Green Belt Land; Don't build more than Council has to. 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00 119_J Loveard	Yes	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land is sanctuary for wildlife 	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment. Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.	None
P1_00 131_P Harris	Yes	See Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An impact assessment does not stop noise pollution; 	Noted	None

GROUND CONDITIONS CONTAMINATION AND POLLUTION

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road lighting should make allowance for on road electric car charging facilities, where required. 		
P1_00 132_H Sahota		Yes	risk based approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need risk based approach 	Noted	None
P1_00 142_Y Lloyd		Yes	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	None
P1_00 144_D Thorpe		Yes	Any development must finance flood prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any develop must finance flood defences. 	Noted	None
P1_00 209_G Bown		Yes	It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For councillors to consider alternative options. 	Noted	None
P1_00 215_L Horne		Yes	There is no option for a no alternative suggestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives or options suggested by TRDC 	Noted	None
P1_00 244_P Phillips		Yes	Even with a projected increase in the number of electric powered vehicles, the impact of road transport on both the built-up and countryside areas of Three Rivers will remain acute. Instead of talking about 'no increase' in pollution (noise, smell, etc.) there should be an ambition to significantly reduce it. Wildlife and habitats are continuing to be decimated by the continued growth in road transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be ambition to reduce climate road pollution, not just stopping increases. 	Noted	None
P1_00 262_L Mead		Yes	light pollution from inside buildings should be controlled by fining commercial tenants who do this such as the Imagine building which leaves it's lights on constantly all night.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fine commercial tenants who leave lights on in developments. 	Noted	None
P1_00 282_A Jenkins		Yes	See above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many questions. 	Noted	None