

**APPENDIX 10 - 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  |
|--|-------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|
| <b>Q15. Do you think the Preferred Policy Option Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments is the right approach?</b> |                               |        |   |   |   |   |
| SC_00009_Sarratt Parish Council  | Sarratt Parish Council        |        | We support this policy and would request that it is enhanced to mention Combined Heat and Power (CHP) schemes. We also request that all developments of 4 units and above must consider shared energy options.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the policy but request mention to Combined Heat and Power (CHP) schemes</li> <li>Request that developments of 4 units and above must consider shared energy options</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Decentralised energy systems typically use renewable energy sources, including small hydro, combined heat and power (CHP), biomass, solar and wind power. Further wording to be added for clarification.</li> <li>Noted. This is unlikely to be viable and be unduly onerous on small home builders.</li> </ul> | Change to draft policy to include reference to CHP.<br><br>(1) Proposals for large-scale renewable energy developments, micro-renewables (such as, but not limited to, micro-wind turbines, micro-hydro and solar panels), or low and zero carbon and decentralised energy (such as, but not limited to Combined Heat and Power systems) will be supported subject to assessment of potential impacts on: |
| SC_00019_Watford Borough Council   | Watford Borough Council       | Yes    | The overall approach is supported.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support</li> </ul>   | Noted   | No action   |
| SC_00020_Chorleywood Parish Council  | Chorleywood Parish Council    |        | Water Resources Chapter 2 is not emphatic enough. Whilst the relevant points are mentioned, the actions required are subdued. Like, "needs to take into account ", "should seek to improve". There is more emphasis put on Flood Zone than resource protection. At the very least, they should share equal spotlight and urgency. The rivers, reservoirs, lakes and canals need more than protection. They need rehabilitation, conservation and progressive sustainability planning. Currently the policy is meaningless and needs to be quantified. It does not align with the Hertfordshire strategy   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Resources Chapter 2 is not emphatic enough. More emphasis put on Flood Zone than resource protection. At the very least, they should share equal spotlight and urgency. The rivers, reservoirs, lakes and canals need more than protection.</li> <li>Currently the policy is meaningless and needs to be quantified. It does not align with the Hertfordshire strategy.</li> </ul>   | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.   | No action   |
| SC_00023_Croxley Green Parish Council  | Croxley Green Parish Council  | Yes    | Croxley Green Parish Council considers the approach needs to be developed much further, with more specific and detailed targets, and become part of a fully sustainable strategy for any new residential or commercial developments. However, we support the approach in general.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support the approach in general but the approach needs to be developed much further, with more specific and detailed targets, and become part of a fully sustainable strategy for any new residential or commercial developments.</li> </ul>   | Noted   | No action   |
| SC_00024_Abbots Langley Parish Council   | Abbots Langley Parish Council | No     | Why not insist that all new housing has it own heat and power generation on site. If we can make all new housing as 'off grid' as possible, then we would be moving in the right direction.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestion as stated</li> </ul>  | Noted. This is unlikely to be viable and be unduly onerous on small home builders.  | No action   |
| SC_00026_HCC Growth and Infrastructure   | HCC Growth and Infrastructure |        | Preferred Policy Option 14, Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments<br>HCC supports the approach applied in this policy and have no comments on the policy wording. It is noted that building integrated renewables can contribute to a sense of place and we encourage TRDC to consider the positive visual impact that these can make when properly designed. The district council is encouraged to investigate suitable locations for renewable energy generation and propose these in the local plan. National Grid are an essential consultee in this as connections to a suitable network are required. It is considered that the district council should require viability assessments of decentralised heating and cooling networks on major developments over 100 homes, and larger mixed-use developments. We also encourage TRDC to carry out their own feasibility assessments for retrofitting decentralised energy systems in areas adjacent to urban extension sites. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support policy approach and have no comments on policy wording.</li> <li>The district council is encouraged to investigate suitable locations for renewable energy generation and propose these in the local plan. National Grid are an essential consultee in this as connections to a suitable network are required.</li> <li>It is considered that the district council should require viability assessments of decentralised heating and cooling networks on major developments over 100 homes, and larger mixed-use developments.</li> <li>Encourage TRDC to carry out their own feasibility assessments for retrofitting decentralised energy systems in areas adjacent to urban extension sites.</li> </ul> | Noted.  | TRDC to consider carrying out feasibility assessments for retrofitting decentralised energy systems in areas adjacent to urban extension sites.   |

| Q15 Should we have considered alternative options? |                               |     |  |   |        |   |
|--|-------------------------------|-----|--|---|--------|---|
| SC_00<br>019_W<br>atford<br>Borough<br>Council     | Watford<br>Borough<br>Council | Yes | To encourage sustainable development and contribute towards addressing the climate change emergency, is there a more positive approach that could be set out for renewable energy development in the Green belt? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comment</li> </ul> | Noted. | TRDC to consider carrying out feasibility assessments for retrofitting decentralised energy systems in areas adjacent to urban extension sites. |

| Q21. Should we have considered alternative options? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul> |  |  |
|   |  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul> |  |  |
|   |  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul> |  |  |

**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 |
|--|-------------|--------|---|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Q15. Do you think the Preferred Policy Option Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments is the right approach?</b> |             |        |   |  |  |                                      |
| P1_00<br>002_N<br>Lucey  |             |        | This is what is needed - correct  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>003_S<br>Cassidy  |             | Yes    | N/A   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>005_T<br>Foulkes  |             | No     | I agree with what is said but only when included in a development. We should not encourage or support wind turbines or solar cells being deployed which are not integrated into a development as non-integration would lead to the land being sub-optimally used. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not support wind turbines/ solar cells being deployed without being integrated into a development, not integrated not optimisation of land.</li> </ul> | Noted. There are other policies in the Plan which will ensure integration. For instance: Preferred Policy Option 23 Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping which All new development is required to achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character. | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>006_J<br>Humphrey   |             | Yes    | Over development is to be avoided and the Green Belt protected for the future.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>014_A<br>Samson   |             | Yes    | Makes logical sense but we wait to see how decisions are really made.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>017_M<br>McGuirk  |             | No     | Make it mandatory.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make it mandatory.</li> </ul>   | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>019_G<br>Houghton   |             | Yes    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |
| P1_00<br>020_T<br>Grewal   |             | Yes    |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted  | None                                 |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|  |     |  |  |   |      |
|--|-----|--|--|---|------|
| P1_00<br>021_R<br>Pawa                   | No  | It does not go far enough We need to mandate or offer free solar panels as an example Also infrastructure for electric cars it's just completely lacking                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not go far enough. Mandate/ offer free solar panels as an example.</li> <li>Infrastructure for electric cars lacking.</li> </ul> | Noted. Free solar panels would have budget implications. Infrastructure for electric cars are addressed by other policies including site-based policies   | None |
| P1_00<br>023_D<br>r K<br>Macleo<br>d     | Yes | Ok   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>024_C<br>Holme<br>s             | Yes | I think it is important to retain our green spaces   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>025_M<br>Beauje<br>ux           | No  | Will be detrimental to the character of the area   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detrimental to the character of the area.</li> </ul>  |   | None |
| P1_00<br>026_P<br>McCaff<br>rey          | Yes | Clear policy   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>028_J<br>Pochet<br>tino         | Yes | no knowledge of this but seems ok  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection to Policy</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>032_T<br>Smith                  | Yes | It's the right approach in respect of climate change   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>033_K<br>Li                     | Yes | It considers aspects including character of the area and also extracting the smallest ways of creating renewable energy.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>034_M<br>Richar<br>ds           | Yes | No Comment   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>038_P<br>Gibbs                  | Yes | Essential to enhance the biodiversity of the area by protecting and expanding local wildlife reserves.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach but enhance biodiversity</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>040_N<br>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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>   | 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<br>041_D<br>James-<br>Saund<br>ers | Yes | Makes Sense  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|  |     |  |  |   |      |
|--|-----|--|--|---|------|
| P1_00<br>046_S<br>Singer                       | Yes | All the above are important  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>047_P<br>Rees                         | Yes | The policy is correct. (However, the Draft Local Plan's desire to deliver hundreds of new homes on green field sites and on the Green Belt will obviously lead to higher carbon emissions and lead to a tragic loss of biodiversity.)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach but policy to develop Green Belt land will lead to a carbon increase</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>048_R<br>Symm<br>ons                  | Yes | No Comment   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>049_S<br>Harala<br>mbou               | Yes | Renewable energy should be one of the deciding factors when considering new developments   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>053_C<br>Anders<br>on<br>Bergda<br>hl | Yes | Yes  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>054_A<br>Wrangl<br>es                 | Yes | But concern about the cost for those on lower incomes  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>055_B<br>Pegg                         | Yes | Renewable energy needed.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>056_D<br>Luddin<br>gton               | Yes | WITH RESERVATIONS: Para 7.9.(2) should specifically refer to the risks of climate change impacts to reinforced concrete, and the need for mitigation in buiding designs.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>063_J<br>Putcha                       | Yes | Yes I agree.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>064_B<br>Patel                        | No  | Wind turbines should be permitted, even if they spoil the visual amenity.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should permit Wind Turbines</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>066_R<br>Franks                       | Yes | Agree  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>068_A<br>Clark                        | No  | I almost answered "yes" to this one! Mainly because the gist seems to be towards assessment rather than positively one way or the other. I feel that many of these zero energy contraptions are very inefficient and subject to expensive breakdown long before they pay back. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of zero energy sources are very inefficient and subject to expensive breakdown long before they pay back.</li> </ul>                   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>069_F<br>Esmar                        | No  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach but no reasons given.</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>074_I<br>Mercer                       |     | This is rather vague and toothless, "encouraging" developers will not get them to do very much. I can't believe that micro hydro power is even a possibility. Putting solar panels on all new houses would make a real impact.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy needs to be strengthened, need more than encouraging developers.</li> <li>Solar panels on all houses will have no impact.</li> </ul> | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed. | None |
| P1_00<br>076_L<br>Hull                         | Yes | Fine   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>077_G<br>Lean                         | Yes | Y  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>078_A<br>Prior                        | Yes | These are all necessary requirements   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>080_J<br>Brooks<br>-Martin            | Yes | Only if does not impact green belt. What's the point of building a wind turbine if it's on green belt land.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach as does not impact Green Belt Land.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>084_M<br>Hampt<br>on                  | Yes | To protect the Green belt land of why we moved to the countryside and air pollution  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>088_C<br>Green                        | No  | I am not convinced the story of these developments will stand up over the long term. The high impact on installation and then the de construction and lack of recycling when the engineering has   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High impact on installation, de construction and lack of recycling when</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|  |     |  |  |   |   |                      |
|--|-----|--|--|---|---|----------------------|
|  |     |  | reached its end of life is only just being understood. I think brakes should be applied whilst this is looked at more closely.   | the engineering has reached its end of life is only just being understood.  |   |                      |
| P1_00<br>089_S<br>Pettifer                         | Yes |  | Needs to work with environment to enhance not pollute it in any way.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>091_B<br>Cownle<br>y                      | Yes |  | Green power will improve the image of the county   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>094_L<br>Farma<br>n                       | No  |  | We (Sarratt Parish Council) generally support this policy but ask for the following enhancements to be considered to make this policy effective: * Request that it is enhanced to mention Combined Heat and Power (CHP) schemes. * Request that all developments of 4 units and above must consider shared energy options.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach;</li> <li>Enhance policy to mention combined heat and power;</li> <li>Should apply to 4+ unit developments.</li> </ul> | Noted.<br>Application of the policy to smaller development may be unviable and be unduly onerous on small home builders.                                | Add reference to CHP |
| P1_00<br>096_S<br>Carpen<br>ter                    | Yes |  | Seems sensible   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>097_N<br>Ross                             | Yes |  | Important to protect to visual environment and Green Belt whilst also developing renewables.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>098_A<br>Michae<br>ls                     | Yes |  | These should be prioritised above housing development in all cases and this does not indicate enough support. Again, consult with an expert on these projects as there are carbon credit (they can generate council funds over time) and carbon neutral approaches that have not even been touched upon.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise above housing in all cases, consult with an expert on these projects as there are carbon credit</li> </ul>                      | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>099_A<br>Michae<br>ls<br>(counci<br>llor) | No  |  | The wording doesn't go far enough. These should be worded more strongly and impacts should be watered down to encourage these, they are worth compromising the greenbelt for more than housing.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wording does not go far enough</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>102_K<br>Allen                            | Yes |  | Renewable energy developments are desperately required but they must not have a negative impact on their local environment.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>103_S<br>Cartag<br>ena                    | Yes |  | Renewables should be a priority  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>107_R<br>Webst<br>er                      | Yes |  | ..But let's rule out micro-wind turbines. They don't work in built up areas at all, and are an eyesore. Solar panels on the other hand are about to see large increases in efficiency, and are certainly worth encouraging, and probably subsidising. If every home had solar panels it would take some of the expected load from the national grid. Given the expected increase in demand from electric vehicles that can only be a good thing. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rule out micro wind turbines, do not work in urban areas.</li> <li>Need further explanation of solar panels</li> </ul>                     | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>108_J<br>Cahill                           | No  |  | You are thinking of building on green belt and destroying the nature and wildlife with which the area is blessed   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on Green Belt and destroying nature and wildlife.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>110_C<br>PRE<br>Herts                     | No  |  | No. The role of the Council in planning for and monitoring progress towards net zero across the district is insufficiently proactive. For example, in para 7.19 the Council's aim to 'encourage applicants' to integrate the use of renewable energy technologies into all proposals is inadequate; it should be mandatory.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role of planning and monitoring towards net zero is insufficiently proactive.</li> </ul>   | Noted.  | None                 |
| P1_00<br>112_L<br>Head                             | Yes |  | The more we can rely on this, the better. We have solar panels but I suspect that we are the only people who have been threatened with enforcement action by Dacorum Borough Council for installing them!  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>113_T<br>Foley                            | No  |  | Its all future facing. The flooding will flood current properties. What are you going to do about that?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much future facing, flood will flood current properties and what are the Council doing about this.</li> </ul>                          | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>114_D<br>Twinbe<br>rrow                   | Yes |  | Concur   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>116_P<br>Newin<br>g                       | Yes |  | I agree with the policy as stated.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>117_A<br>Hamilt<br>on                     | Yes |  | Keep countryside beautiful   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None                 |
| P1_00<br>119_J                                     | 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"> <li>Land is sanctuary for wildlife</li> </ul>  | Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to | None                 |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|                                |     |   |  |  |   |      |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|--|--|---|------|
| Lovear<br>d                    |     |   |  |  | submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment.<br>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<br>120_G<br>Nunn         | Yes | If large scale proposals are mooted, then the assessment of potential impacts is vital.   |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>123_D<br>Thoma<br>s   | Yes | OK, but the balance should be in favour of such developments  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>127_M<br>Clarke       | Yes |   |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>130_E<br>Ad           | Yes | It's a good approach  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>131_P<br>Harris       | No  | Consideration of use of new generation 'modular' nuclear reactors & large scale ground heat pumps.  |  | • Consider new modular nuclear power plants and large scale heat pumps   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>132_H<br>Sahota       | Yes | balance approach is best  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>135_W<br>Stephe<br>ns | No  | Developing a renewable energy project can be an expensive business, so policy can provide certainty and reduce risk will increase the likelihood of renewable energy projects coming forward. As part of its commitment to tackling the Climate Emergency, TRDC commits to assess options for decentralised renewable energy generation within council operations and the wider district, working either independently or in partnership. |  | • TRDC commits to assess options for decentralised renewable energy generation within council operations and the wider district, working either independently or in partnership. | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>137_S<br>Hall         | Yes | Yes the correct approach  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>140_M<br>Mavadi<br>a  | Yes | Agree on all points.  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>142_Y<br>Lloyd        | No  | .   |  | • Do not agree with approach but no reason given.  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>144_D<br>Thorpe       | Yes | We need green energy  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>147_N<br>Hoad         | No  | There needs to be greater focus on the development of positive energy buildings leveraging solar PV and solar thermal   |  | • Greater focus on positive energy buildings.  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>148_S<br>Dilwort<br>h | Yes | Clear cut   |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>150_G<br>Ansell       | No  | No, I do not agree with the approach. The Council do not go far enough. Instead of the Council's aim to 'encourage applicants' to integrate the use of renewable energy technologies into all proposals, the Council should make it a mandatory requirement.  |  | • Does not go far enough. Needs to be mandatory rather than 'encourage applicants'   | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.   | None |
| P1_00<br>151_A<br>Peat         | Yes | It's the only way to achieve the objectives of a lower carbon future  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>155_C<br>Sears        | Yes | I think it is important that any renewable energy developments don't adversely affect the environment or biodiversity that they are designed to protect but we do need to find ways to create access to renewable energy sources so we need to be creative in ensuring that any new developments can go ahead whilst still considering the aesthetic impact   |  | • Agree with approach, ensure renewable energy sources are creative in ensuring new developments go ahead while considering aesthetic impact                                     | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>157_A<br>Ansell       | No  | The Council does not go far enough. It should make the use of renewable energy technologies mandatory, rather than its aim to 'encourage applicants'.   |  | • Does not go far enough. Needs to be mandatory rather than 'encourage applicants'   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>162_E<br>Foulke<br>s  | Yes | This seems fair   |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|                                       |               |  |  |   |      |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--|--|---|------|
| P1_00<br>163_J<br>Dickins             | Yes           | For the reasons you give   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>164_S<br>Morrill             | No            | I think that b (visual) and d (environment) and e and g will, between them, give opponents of, say, wind turbines a huge armoury of weapons with which to oppose any such developments. Opens up too many ways of opposing a development.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will give opponents of wind turbines plenty of reasons to oppose, opens up too many ways to object.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>166_T<br>Turner              | Yes           | You really need to consider impacts on green belt land and our country side  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach but consider impacts on Green Belt Land</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>169_M<br>Drummond            | No            | There is a likelihood of a change in the visual amenity of the environment we live in if we are to make the required changes to a more renewable world. Take for example off and onshore wind farms that now deliver significant % of the country's electricity                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likelihood of change in visual amenity of the environment, for example wind turbines.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>170_N<br>Hutchinson          | Yes           | Agree with micro-renewables such as, micro-wind turbines, micro-hydro panels for personal power & heat generation.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>174_E<br>Nathan              | Yes           | We should do all we can to support zero-carbon energy generation in the District so long as it is not to the detriment to the points listed in a to h. This supports the Council's declaration of a climate emergency well.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>181_C<br>Hiltearn<br>Society | Not Specified | Whilst we consider that this technology is essential for society to survive, great care must be taken with large developments such as solar farms and wind turbines as they have potential to cause significant harm to the local landscape. They should be avoided in the AONB and its setting. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care must be taken with large developments such as solar farms and wind turbines as they can to cause significant harm to the local landscape;</li> <li>Should avoid in AONB and its setting.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>183_M<br>Allum               | Yes           | As above   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>184_M<br>Mitchell            | No            | This policy needs to be developed further and become part of a fully sustainable strategy for any new residential or commercial developments.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop further to become part of a fully sustainable strategy for new residential or commercial developments.</li> </ul>   | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.               | None |
| P1_00<br>186_J<br>Parkhurst           | No            | This development will have a significant impact on the environment   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will have a significant impact on the environment</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>187_C<br>Mitchell            | No            | This policy needs to be developed further and become part of a fully sustainable strategy for any new residential or commercial developments.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop further to become part of a fully sustainable strategy for new residential or commercial developments.</li> </ul>   | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.               | None |
| P1_00<br>190_I<br>Starr               | Yes           | Sensible   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>191_J<br>Shindler            | Yes           | Covers the basics  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>201_A<br>Green               | Yes           | It's important but shouldn't be done on the Green belt   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>206_D<br>Worrell             | Yes           | NA   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>209_G<br>Bown                | No            | This plan destroys the visual amenity of the local area, local natural resources, including air and water quality, the natural environment, biodiversity and public access to the countryside. IT IS GOING TO ACHIEVE THE EXACT OPPOSITE TO WHAT YOU SUGGEST YOU ARE TRYING TO ACHIEVE.          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan destroys visual amenity of the local area, local natural resources, including air and water quality, the natural environment, biodiversity and public access to the countryside;</li> <li>Opposite of what plan is trying to achieve.</li> </ul> | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>211_J<br>Pummell             | No            | More interrogation and explanation are needed as to what renewable energy developments would be acceptable and where (for example, solar farms and water power). The Council should be designating sites for renewable energy projects in the Local Plan   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More interrogation/ explanation are needed as to what renewable energy is required, Council should designate sites for renewable energy projects.</li> </ul>  | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. The policy is designed to be flexible with locational requirements | None |
| P1_00<br>213_K<br>Brightwell          | No            | As already explained above   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|   |     |   |   |   |      |
|---|-----|---|---|---|------|
| P1_00<br>215_L<br>Horne                             | Yes | Anything to reduce the impact on this planet is a good thing.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>218_M<br>Chabre<br>I                       | No  | No it sounds very resident led, but projects like this need to be led by / initiated by local experts. The rivers of Three Rivers are not on a par with the Lune of Lancashire near Halton / Skerton and the Rivers Sett and Goyt of New Mills, Derbyshire, so micro-hydro is much less likely to be worth pursuing, whereas, the independence of the solar villages of rural India has much more applicability as we have so many hours of good quality insolation. Could the local council act as a broker or promoter of solar products, so that we become a solar district "on existing and new buildings". Council buildings, bus-stops, residential buildings can all be used.                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects need to be led by experts;</li> <li>Micro-hydro not worth pursuing due to poor quality of the rivers;</li> <li>Council could act as a broker/ promoter of solar products, to become a solar district "on existing and new buildings". Council buildings, bus-stops, residential buildings can all be used.</li> </ul> | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed. | None |
| P1_00<br>219_S<br>Talbot                            | Yes | Appropriate   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>222_T<br>Three<br>Rivers<br>Green<br>Party | No  | Developing a renewable energy project can be an expensive business, so policy can provide certainty and reduce risk will increase the likelihood of renewable energy projects coming forward. As part of its commitment to tackling the Climate Emergency, TRDC commits to "assess options for decentralised renewable energy generation within council operations and the wider district, working either independently or in partnership." More interrogation and explanation are needed as to what renewable energy developments would be acceptable and where (for example, solar farms and water power). The Council should be designating sites for renewable energy projects in the Local Plan. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TRDC assess options for decentralised renewable energy generation within council operations and wider district, independently or in partnership.</li> <li>More interrogation/ explanation are needed as to what renewable energy is required, Council should designate sites for renewable energy projects.</li> </ul>         | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed. | None |
| P1_00<br>223_D<br>Green                             | Yes | It covers the safeguards needed.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>224_J<br>Ford                              | Yes | as long as the environment and community does not suffer  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>227_K<br>Gallagher                         | No  | The approach needs to be developed much further, with more specific and detailed targets, and become part of a fully sustainable strategy for any new residential or commercial developments  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop further to become part of a fully sustainable strategy for new residential or commercial developments.</li> </ul>  | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed. | None |
| P1_00<br>233_A<br>Limerick                          | Yes | I agree that the Preferred Policy Option for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments is the right approach   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>234_A<br>O'Sullivan                        | Yes | I agree that the Preferred Policy Option for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Developments is the right approach   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>235_C<br>Maclean                           | Yes | VG  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>236_E<br>Talbot                            | Yes | Stipulations make sense   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>240_K<br>Butler                            | Yes |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>244_P<br>Phillips                          | Yes | It is the right approach.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>256_M<br>Withington                        | Yes | Seems reasonable  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>262_L<br>Mead                              | No  | Visual amenity of the local area, including landscape character should not be considered above renewable power production.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual amenity should not be considered above renewable energy.</li> </ul>   | Noted. There are other policies in the Plan to address visual amenity.  | None |
| P1_00<br>267_D<br>Lewis                             | Yes | I would have thought that this would be part of sustainable adaptation anyway. Note: I notice that you do not write that you will give these renewable energies 'proactive support' here, as you did earlier for urban development.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach;</li> <li>TRDC did not specify renewable energies will be given 'proactive support' here, specified earlier for urban development.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>271_S                                      | Yes | Seems sensible  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|  |     |  |  |  |   |      |
|--|-----|--|--|--|---|------|
| Wallac<br>e  |     |  |  |  |   |      |
| P1_00<br>275_R<br>Kotech<br>a                              | Yes | We needs green sustainable development without green space being post  |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>282_A<br>Jenkin<br>s                              | No  | Enough. Too many questions not enough time before the deadline!!   |  | • No Comment   | Noted   | None |
| <b>Q15. Should we have considered alternative options?</b> |     |  |  |  |   |      |
| P1_00<br>005_T<br>Foulke<br>s                              | Yes | See comments above   |  | • Do not support wind turbines/ solar cells being deployed without being integrated into a development, not integrated not optimisation of land. | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.   | None |
| P1_00<br>006_J<br>Humph<br>rey                             | Yes | We moved away from coal fired homes which facilitated the Clean Air Acts of the 1960s and we must ensure that renewable energy is used in new homes too.                               |  | • Ensure renewable energy is used in new homes.  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>014_A<br>Samso<br>n                               | Yes | As before.   |  | • Agree with approach  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>017_M<br>McGuir<br>k                              | Yes | See above.   |  | • Make it mandatory.   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>020_T<br>Grewal                                   | Yes |  |  | • No alternatives suggested  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>021_R<br>Pawa                                     | Yes |  |  | • No alternatives suggested  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>023_D<br>r K<br>Macleo<br>d                       | Yes | Ok   |  | • No alternatives suggested  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>025_M<br>Beauje<br>ux                             | Yes | Less impact on local area  |  | • Less impact on local area.   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>040_N<br>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<br>054_A   | Yes | We need conserve more water  |  | • Conserve more water  | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|  |     |   |  |   |   |      |
|--|-----|---|--|---|---|------|
| Wrangl<br>es                                       |     |   |  |   |   |      |
| P1_00<br>055_B<br>Pegg                             | Yes | Renewable energy needed.  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>056_D<br>Luddin<br>gton                   | Yes | WITH RESERVATIONS: Para 7.9.(2) should specifically refer to the risks of climate change impacts to reinforced concrete, and the need for mitigation in building designs.                       |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Para 7.9.(2) should refer to risks of climate change impacts and the need for mitigation in building designs.</li> </ul> | Noted. The policy is applied in conjunction with other policies in the Local Plan. It is considered that comments raised are addressed.   | None |
| P1_00<br>063_J<br>Putcha                           | Yes | I agree   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>064_B<br>Patel                            | Yes | Visual amenity should not be a governing limitation. We should consider efficiency and practicality of implementation.  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual amenity should not limit renewables;</li> <li>Consider efficiency and practicality of implementation.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>066_R<br>Franks                           | Yes | Agree   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>068_A<br>Clark                            | Yes | After the first part of The Local Plan is put in force there won't be any Green Belt to protect so you're off the hook on that one.   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Won't be any Green Belt left to protect if implemented</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>078_A<br>Prior                            | Yes | Again the need to consider transports role.   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to consider Transport roles</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>080_J<br>Brooks<br>-Martin                | Yes | Location  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No alternatives suggested</li> </ul>   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>098_A<br>Michae<br>Is                     | Yes | There are thousands, you shouldn't have to ask me. This is the hottest topic and the resources are simple to find.  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are thousands, resources are simple to find.</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>099_A<br>Michae<br>Is<br>(counci<br>llor) | Yes | The wording doesn't go far enough. These should be worded more strongly and impacts should be watered down to encourage these, they are worth compromising the greenbelt for more than housing. |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs to be worded more strongly</li> </ul>  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>102_K<br>Allen                            | Yes | Ensure that all new housing developments include solar panels or other forms of renewable energy sources.   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All new housing needs to include solar panels and other forms of renewable energy.</li> </ul>                            | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>107_R<br>Webst<br>er                      | Yes | You can't build on greenbelt land and at the same time increase access to the countryside, unless you're planning on providing a bus service?   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can't develop Green Belt Land and increase access to countryside at same time unless providing a bus service.</li> </ul> | 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<br>108_J<br>Cahill                           | Yes | A complete ban on building on green belt. Stick up for your principles  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>  | The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|                            |  |     |  |  |   |   |      |
|----------------------------|--|-----|--|--|---|---|------|
|                            |  |     |  |  | 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". |   |      |
| P1_00<br>113_T<br>Foley    |  | Yes | No idea  |  | • No alternatives suggested   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>119_J<br>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.  |  | • 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.<br>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<br>131_P<br>Harris   |  | Yes | See above  |  | • Consider new modular nuclear power plants and large scale heat pumps  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>132_H<br>Sahota   |  | Yes | collaborate with other councils  |  | • Collaborate with other Councils   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>135_W<br>Stephens |  | Yes | More interrogation and explanation are needed as to what renewable energy developments would be acceptable and where (for example, solar farms and water power). The Council should be designating sites for renewable energy projects in the Local Plan.  |  | • More information needed on what renewable energy is acceptable.   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>137_S<br>Hall     |  | Yes | Yes - the infrastructure of Chorleywood with its narrow roads, amenities that will struggle with the demand of increased population - schools, doctors surgeries, station parking and higher numbers of commuters into London, parking issues within the local area which is becoming more difficult and resulting in more parking restrictions being considered, external commuters parking in Chorleywood making their journeys into London more affordable. demands on sewerage is also a concerning factor when land is developed. A new 'town' needs to be planned where all the essential amenities are put into place to accommodate these increased numbers. |  | • Chorleywood cannot cope with more housing;<br>• New 'town' needed where all essential amenities are put in place to accommodate these increased numbers.  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>142_Y<br>Lloyd    |  | Yes | .  |  | • No alternatives suggested   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>144_D<br>Thorpe   |  | Yes | Communal energy schemes are coming. See Hebrides Island and forthcoming Government, or at least majority of all MP proposals. Provision for local energy generation and sharing  |  | • Need communal energy schemes like on Hebrides Islands   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>147_N<br>Hoad     |  | Yes | Encourage the development of local solar and solar thermal on residential homes  |  | • Encourage development of local solar and solar thermal on residential homes   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>164_S<br>Morrill  |  | Yes | See above – omit some of the grounds a to h  |  | • Will give opponents of wind turbines plenty of reasons to oppose, opens up too many ways to object.   | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>174_E<br>Nathan   |  | Yes | In 7.19, the aim to 'encourage applicants' to integrate the use of renewable energy technologies into all proposals is quite weak; it should be mandatory at this stage of the climate crisis.   |  | • 'Encourage applicants' under Para 7.19 too weak, make mandatory.  | Noted   | None |
| P1_00<br>191_J             |  | Yes | There is a remarkable lack of detail in the fundamentally important area of planning. The transition to low carbon is critical to "saving the planet" and much greater detail on what is or is not permissible should warrant more planning  |  | • Lack of detail, need more detail on transition to low carbon.   | Noted   | None |

RENEWABLE LOW ENERGY DEVELOPMNETS

|                               |     |   |  |       |  |      |
|-------------------------------|-----|---|--|-------|--|------|
| Shindler                      |     |   |  |       |  |      |
| P1_00<br>209_G<br>Bown        | Yes | It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options   | • Councillors to consider the options.   | Noted |  | None |
| P1_00<br>215_L<br>Horne       | Yes | There needs to be more local ownership of helping individuals acquire renewable energies. And also programs to encourage the use of recyclable containers or bring your own containers. | • Needs to be more ownership of helping individuals obtain renewable energy;<br>• Encourage use of recyclable containers or bring your own containers. | Noted |  | None |
| P1_00<br>218_M<br>Chabre<br>I | Yes | local government led energy generation  | • Need local government led energy generation.   | Noted |  | None |
| P1_00<br>236_E<br>Talbot      | Yes | Stipulations make sense   | • No alternatives suggested  | Noted |  | None |
| P1_00<br>282_A<br>Jenkins     | Yes | See above.  | • No Comment   | Noted |  | None |