

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
6.1 Introduction	
6.1.6	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggestion that wording should be amended to reflect a ‘considerable’ loss of employment in the town. 2. Reference should be made to the findings of the Buntingford Employment Study.
6.1.7	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure of 1,100 dwellings is incorrect; this should be amended to 1,328 dwellings having been approved or built in the town.
6.1.9	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Query as to in what context the word ‘additional’ is being used. 2. Retirement and sheltered housing is required to support the ageing population.
6.1.10	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of new playing fields at Freman College has not definitely been secured through the S106 agreement for the development to the north of the town. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not clear how expansion of Edwinstree Middle School can take place as it is surrounded by land designated as open space. 2. Clarification sought as to what form the expansion plans would take and how expansion would be funded.
6.1.11	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ability of village schools (eg. Hormead CE First and Nursery School) to assist in meeting the educational need in Buntingford has not been considered. 2. The expansion of Layston School should be secured before a new first school is delivered.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not clear how expansion of Millfield and Layston schools can take place without encroaching onto land designated as open space.
6.1.12	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The reference to ‘financial contributions towards the implementation of a Community Transport project have been secured’ is inaccurate; only two of the permitted developments have contributed through S106 legal agreements. 2. Reference to cycle track links within the town is idealistic; there is no space in the town for upgraded cycle links. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reference needs to be made to the congested roads in the Buntingford area and poor links to major roads (A1, M11). 2. Reference needs to be made to the fact that Buntingford has no rail link. 3. Dualling of the A10 is essential to accommodate the level of committed development. 4. Bus provision from Buntingford needs to be vastly improved.
6.1.13	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest the word ‘may’ should be changed to ‘will’. Evidence provided by Thames Water in response to the Neighbourhood Plan states that the wastewater network will not cope with the level of development already permitted.
6.1.14	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Undeveloped designated employment land will remain unsold unless employment land is proactively sponsored in the Plan.
6.1.15	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Buntingford Library should be included as a key facility which could be developed for additional uses to benefit the community.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	2. Location of the Buntingford Library should be protected.
6.1.16	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support new facilities to the north of the town.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. The current evidence is not up to date and the Plan may not have a justified strategy for dealing with open spaces.</p> <p>2. There is no significant provision for newly created open space within the town.</p> <p>3. There is no Green Infrastructure allocation in the IDP for Buntingford.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Unclear where the large open space and new playing pitches will be provided as part of the development to the north of the town.</p> <p>2. There is a critical requirement for health facilities in Buntingford.</p>
6.1.17	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. This paragraph is meaningless and does not reflect what is happening in the town.</p>
6.2 Development in Buntingford	
BUNT1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support expressed for inclusion of school sites within the settlement boundary.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Query as to why no allocations have been made in one of the 5 towns within East Herts.</p> <p>2. Buntingford lies outside of the Green Belt so should be a priority for growth.</p> <p>3. Policy restricts development in a sustainable location.</p> <p>4. Land west of Buntingford should be allocated for development of 400 homes and provision of a first school site.</p> <p>5. Land west of London Road should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>6. Policy wording should be amended to read 'settlement boundary' instead of 'town boundary'.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>7. The settlement boundary should be amended to align with the settlement boundary identified in the Buntingford Community Area Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>8. Policy needs more flexibility to allow development to be permitted where it would facilitate community benefits.</p> <p>9. The policy should clarify that development is only appropriate where it protects or enhances the historic environment.</p> <p>10. Further windfall development should not be permitted in Buntingford.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Consideration is being given to whether the Buntingford Cougars playing pitch could be developed for housing to generate funds for improved football facilities nearby.</p>
6.2.7	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support the dual use of the proposed school's playing pitch facilities with the wider community.</p>
BUNT2	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support expressed for allocation of a new 2FE first school site on land west of London Road.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Policy is currently unsound as delivery of a new school by 2019 is not certain.</p> <p>2. Site selection study needs to be revisited to select the most appropriate site for a new school.</p> <p>3. Site has multiple landowners which may prohibit delivery.</p> <p>4. Such a large increase in school place provision in Buntingford will impact on local village schools and may make some financially unviable.</p> <p>5. Settlement boundary should be amended to include the site.</p> <p>6. Site is considered to be more appropriate for residential development.</p> <p>7. Residual area of site not developed as a school or designated as open space should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>8. Site is not in a sustainable location; a central site would be more appropriate to reduce car</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>journeys.</p> <p>9. Site is currently in recreation use by the football club and the loss of community facilities should not be allowed.</p> <p>10. Location adjacent to petrol station could cause health issues.</p> <p>11. Criterion (d) of the policy should also make reference to the replacement of the pitch as this may be necessary to facilitate the development of the school.</p> <p>12. The policy wording does not appropriately reflect the need for the school's playing pitch facilities to be for dual community use.</p> <p>13. The existing football pitch is a dedicated pitch and dual use of this facility would compromise its quality. Only the new pitch should be provided as a dual use facility.</p> <p>14. Land west of Buntingford should be allocated for provision of a new first school.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Unclear whether the retention of a playing pitch is referring to the existing Cougars pitch or a new pitch created in addition to the Cougars pitch.</p> <p>2. Improvements to the highway infrastructure will be required to reduce congestion.</p> <p>3. Speed limit on London Road should be reduced to 30mph or less.</p> <p>4. Access to this site would need to be extensive and mitigation would be costly.</p> <p>5. Clarification required that the retained or replaced playing pitch is required to be of equivalent size and quality.</p> <p>6. Wastewater network capacity may be unable to support this development and local upgrades may be required.</p>
6.3 Employment in Buntingford	
BUNT3	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support expressed for policy.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Watermill Industrial Estate should not be developed any further. 2. The northern part of Watermill Industrial Estate should be removed from the employment land designation and allocated for residential uses. 3. Policy should be expanded to have regard to the additional future employment needs of the town. There is no allowance or flexibility for further employment growth and the need to replace any loss of employment land to other uses. 4. Land opposite the Sainsbury's depot roundabout (south west of Buntingford) should be allocated for employment use. 5. Objection to the designation of Park Farm Industrial Estate beyond the existing developed part of the employment site.
6.5 Leisure and Community Facilities in Buntingford	
6.5	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should be plans for more new sport and leisure facilities in Buntingford. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Query as to why no up to date assessment of recreational open space has been prepared. 2. This section should be amended prior to examination once the emerging strategies for both indoor and outdoor sports facilities have been completed.