

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
7.0 Chapter 7 Hertford	
7.1 Introduction	
7.1.7	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan welcomed overall, subject to specific points. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development will exacerbate already congested road network in Hertford and insufficient mitigation identified. 2. Development in Green Belt contrary to policy. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Low density, high quality houses considered important as opposed to flats, in terms of housing mix.
7.1.8	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A414 congestion concerns. 2. Mangrove Road traffic increase safety concerns. 3. No reference to Primary/Junior/disabled school needs. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 950 dwellings proposed on the allocated sites in Hertford would require 1.9fe of school places.
7.1.9	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure of section to present the scale of issues present on the A414 and the need for a strategic intervention/bypass, the likely process for identifying potential solutions, the expected current timeframe for available capacity (2024) and the consequential likely timeframe for the strategic intervention/bypass (2021 onwards according the LTP Vision). 2. Failure of section to acknowledge the implications for the development strategy arising from the

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>uncertainty relating to the strategic intervention.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. A414 congestion concerns. 4. Tunnel should be created from London Road near to Hertingfordbury Road, west of the railway viaduct. 5. Concern regarding extra development exacerbating already congested road network and not enough weight placed on amelioration. 6. Need for additional car parking at the railway stations. 7. Air quality level concerns in Hertford, particularly areas close to the A414. 8. Noise pollution concerns in Hertford, particularly areas close to the A414. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A414 should be able to accommodate development up to 2024.
7.1.10	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about water supply in Hertford. 2. Concern about medical and healthcare provision in Hertford. 3. Acknowledgement that the Green Fingers would be protected but other green spaces within Hertford, such as at Sele Farm and beside County Hall, are equally important and should be retained.
7.2 Development in Hertford	
7.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Key Diagram refers to 'potential road improvements', with annotation relating route of A414 through town, implying (in conjunction DPS4) on-line improvements. However, off-line bypass currently forms potentially significant strand to major schemes emerging through Herts LTP process (expected delivery timeframe of 2021-2031).

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
HERT1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The word 'approximately' should be put before housing numbers for a, b, c and d. 2. Hertford Industrial Estate (Caxton Hill) should be allocated for residential development. 3. Density of sites in Hertford should be increased. 4. 306-310 Ware Road should be allocated in the Plan for residential development. 5. HERT2 site should be allocated for 400 dwellings. 6. Two discounted sites (76Ha North of Hertford and 48 Ha immediately South of Hertford) should be allocated in place of Birchall Garden Suburb to meet Hertford's housing need. 7. Policy amendment sought to include mixed-use allocation of the Dicker Mill site. 8. Deliverability of 150 homes from land north of Hertford questioned given allocation of neighbouring land for gravel extraction. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unclear whether the Plan takes account of development/planning approvals which have been implemented in Hertford since 2011 these should be included in total.
HERT2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 200 dwellings in the Mead Lane area considered sensible given brownfield site status, but further development not sustainable in this area without measures to improve traffic infrastructure, given already problematic road access to the site. 2. Development should proceed unless road network improved, especially for crossing the railway line. 3. Development should only comprise employment or leisure uses as site at risk of flooding. 4. Policy should include requirements for the sequential approach to inform site layout and an adequate FRA based on information provided within the level 2 SFRA, in addition to meeting requirements of flood risk policy WAT1. 5. Policy should reference Grade II listed Hertford East Railway Station and the need for

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>development to be sensitive to this building.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Allocation of 3000sqm at Mead Lane not justified as it exceeds the requirements set out in DPS1 and would limit the scope to provide much needed new homes. 7. The site is not appropriate for B1 development. 8. Infrastructure requirements not justified. 9. Requirement to meet housing mix and affordable housing, unless there was an exception to these, will need to be addressed in any case, so should be deleted. 10. Split of housing at Mead Lane should be a higher proportion of flats and smaller units due to the central location. 11. Dicker Mill should be allocated for 260 homes. 12. As site lies within the Sand and Gravel Belt (Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan, March 2007), additional wording sought as a commitment to consider 'opportunistic extraction' for use on site to prevent the mineral being sterilised where possible. 13. Mead Lane Industrial Estate appropriate for alternative uses (including residential) and could be available for redevelopment within the next five years. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recognition that sequential test and level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) have been undertaken. 2. In principle agreement of wastewater infrastructure capability.
HERT3	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for development 2. Support for minerals wording 3. Sustainable location 4. Well screened site ensuring minimal visual impact 5. Support for recognition of importance of wildlife sites/issues in policy.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt removal not justified. 2. Traffic impact concerns. 3. Concern that Hertford North Train station too overcrowded and development will add to issue. 4. Wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support this development. Local upgrades may be required. 5. Concern regarding potential badger presence and need for full ecological survey to be carried out. 6. As sites physically separated, a split into two allocations would be more effective. 7. Area to north of Welwyn Road should provide 350 homes (50 additional dwellings) at 27homes/ha. 8. Southern part of HERT3 for residential development runs counter to the Plan's protection and enhancement of the historic environment and of biodiversity Strategic Objectives. 9. Concern over impact of development on Grade II Panshanger Park and erosion of small rural buffer. 10. Light and noise pollution from development and loss of separation from the urban sprawl of Hertford would contribute to substantial loss of setting of Panshanger Park. 11. Concerns about effects of development on ecology, woodlands, noise, environmental impact and interfluvial issues. 12. Objection to loss of agricultural land.
7.2.9	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 150 homes would exacerbate B158 congestion.
7.2.10	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wording should be removed so that focus is solely related to sterilisation of potential mineral reserves at site. Due to close proximity of known mineral reserves in Preferred Area 2 (as

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>identified in the Minerals Local Plan 2007), likely that HERT4 also contains sand and gravel and material should not be needlessly sterilised and may also be used in the construction phase of development.</p> <p>2. Commercial viability questioned.</p>
HERT4	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support for minerals wording.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic impact concerns. 2. Traffic access concerns. 3. Public transport (buses) inadequate to cope with development. 4. Exceptional circumstances for Green Belt removal not justified. 5. Education capacity concerns. 6. Concern about topography limiting cycling and pedestrian access. 7. Density too high. 8. Deliverability questioned adjacent to gravel extraction. 9. Concern about effects of mineral extraction. 10. Concern regarding impact on Waterford Heath. 11. Concern about effect on Green Fingers. 12. Concern regarding effects on wildlife. 13. Loss of open space. 14. Loss of local landscape. 15. Concern about light pollution. 16. Objection to loss of agricultural land. 17. Concern that site would become isolated/segregated. 18. Insufficient local services to serve development.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19. Concern regarding juxtaposition with conservation area. 20. Paragraph I – ‘the satisfactory previous phased extraction of mineral deposits on the neighbouring site’ should be removed. 21. Wastewater network capacity in this area may be unable to support this development. Local upgrades may be required. 22. Part 1 should state ‘approximately 150 homes’, for consistency with HERT1. 23. Part 1 “the satisfactory phased extraction of minerals deposits on the neighbouring site”. It should clarify that this applies only to the first phase adjacent to the northern edge of HERT4. 24. Policy should allow for northern part of site to come forward prior to 2022 if mineral extraction and restoration is completed before that date.
7.2.11/ Figure 7.6	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The treed area is marked incorrectly and should be amended.
HERT5	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for minerals wording. 2. In principle agreement of wastewater infrastructure capability. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concern about proposal to remove area from Conservation Area, largely to protect the number of trees. 2. Site should be allocated for 65 homes rather than 50. 3. Traffic impact concerns relating to congestion on Mangrove Road and A414. 4. Concerns over the safety of children because of added traffic congestion. 5. Concerns over the protection of the Green Finger at the western part of the site. 6. Air pollution concerns. 7. Proposed upgraded pedestrian and cycle way will make an already narrow Mangrove Road

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>narrower.</p> <p>8. No clear definition or minimum requirement of expectations on range of dwellings, highway mitigation measures, improvements to walking and cycling routes, enhanced transport measures, and outdoor play and fitness spaces.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. "Building line" on the Western boundary of the housing site should be consistent with the adjoining existing properties on either side.</p>
7.3 Employment in Hertford	
HERT6	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support for protection of employment areas.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Objection to inclusion of County Hall site within the employment area. If the County Hall site is to remain within this employment area, the boundary should be amended to exclude Leahoe.</p> <p>2. Pegs Lane should not be designated as an employment area as County Hall and the open space could be converted to residential use.</p> <p>3. Plan allocates HERT2 for 200 dwellings as part of a mixed use development, it therefore should not also be located in a designation where land is reserved for class B1, B2 and B8 use, as these two policy objectives conflict.</p> <p>4. Mead Lane Industrial Estate is appropriate for alternative uses (including residential) and could become available for redevelopment within the next five years.</p> <p>5. Caxton Hill employment designation should be removed and identified as residential allocation.</p> <p>6. Caxton Hill employment designation should be removed and identified as residential allocation.</p> <p>7. No strong case to roll forward previous employment allocations, especially where evidence is available to suggest they will increasingly become commercially unviable for commercial purposes.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>8. Listed employment sites are not sufficient to meet new job requirements.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hertford has lost significant employment land in recent years and lacks small business units. 2. Concern that Hertford has already lost substantial employment land to residential development. If this continues this will leave an imbalance of population and employment in the town. 3. Evidence that older industrial areas in the town are being allowed to run down by their owners. landowners of the Caxton Hill Employment Area are intent on selling the land for residential development and short term leases mean that the future of the established business and others on the estate are in jeopardy.
7.4 Retail in Hertford	
7.4	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retention of the historic character of the town centre is important and quality facades and associated advertising should be encouraged and enforced where necessary.
7.5 Leisure and Community Facilities	
7.5	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the acknowledgement of the under-provision of football pitches. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan makes reference to the need for junior football pitches but there is also a requirement for full size pitches in Hertford. 2. Hertford is severely lacking in sports stadium resource. 3. Current evidence regarding provision of football pitches is not up to date so the Plan may not have justified strategy for dealing with open spaces and pitch provision. Modifications should be made to section 7.5 before EiP, when emerging strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities are completed, to address needs in Hertford.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Changing facilities lacking on Hartham Common.