

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
Chapter 9 – Ware	
Ware	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure unable to cope with new development. 2. Transparency needed on funding Council will receive for development and reasoning why it is on Green Belt high grade agricultural land. 3. Converting ancient market town into a new town. 4. No reason why Ware should not become a larger town, but better location for homes is needed. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient consultation on the Plan.
9.1 Introduction	
9.1.2	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ware Arts Centre should be detailed in the paragraph.
9.1.5	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceptional circumstances not proven for Green Belt release for housing.
9.1.6	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to explain how Ware’s infrastructure will absorb additional population and its requirements. 2. Traffic congestion issues. 3. Development will lead to loss of Ware’s unique historic character. 4. Infrastructure costings and timelines should be submitted for public consultation.
9.1.8	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No proof of demand for Travelling Showpeople’s accommodation.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	2. Water table and water runoff/flooding concerns
9.1.9	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Needs to be strong commitment to sympathetic design in keeping with local vernacular styles.
9.1.10	<u>Objection</u> 1. Insufficient school places for children with SEN/disabilities – EHC should work with Essex CC to meet demands of increased population.
9.1.11	<u>Objection</u> 1. Council must ensure that additional community infrastructure is provided. 2. Bus provision to hospitals should be provided. 3. Concern over provision of healthcare facilities and need for sufficient GPs and nurses. 4. Arts and crafts provision should be made in addition to sporting facilities and open spaces.
9.1.12	<u>Objection</u> 1. Traffic congestion concerns due to greater traffic flow/delays arising from development. 2. Link Road should be delivered before houses are provided. 3. Concern that the proposed link road will not offset the impact of the proposed development. 4. Concerns regarding impact of traffic generated on A10/A414/M25. 5. Railway already at capacity and there will not be enough spaces for London commuters. 6. Extra track is required at Station and the platform should be moved to the other side of the boom gate to facilitate this. 7. New train station required at top of Ware. 8. Insufficient parking at station. 9. Insufficient public transport provision. 10. Bus services in the town are sporadic and unreliable – unreasonable to expect people to use public transport. 11. Concern about the level of available parking in the town centre/station.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	12. More traffic modelling required. 13. Roads leading to development (New Road, High Oak Road and Musley Hill, etc) not wide enough to improve congestion and cycle paths also required. 14. Speed restrictions are required on High Oak Road, Musley Hill and Kingsway. 15. Improvements for traffic from the south of the town should be put in place.
9.1.13	<u>Objection</u> 1. Infrastructure (sewerage, electricity, schools, public services, including healthcare) must be provided prior to development. 2. Existing problems in the sewerage system should be addressed prior to any new development being constructed. 3. More green spaces required for sustainable drainage. 4. Concerns regarding water pressure in Ware. 5. Concern about effects on historic assets and wildlife (SSSI).
9.1.14	<u>Objection</u> 1. More car parking needed in the town centre to support shops.
9.1.15	<u>Objection</u> 1. Concern that trade diversion to new retail centre will impact negatively on existing shops in Ware. 2. Concern about loss of employment base in Ware – employment area in new development should be expanded. 3. Lack of leisure activities for the under 18s in Ware and indoor opportunities should be provided.
9.1.16	<u>Objection</u> 1. Lack of detail regarding how leisure/sports facilities will be provided – at Wodson Park, which is at 93% capacity, parking already inadequate. 2. Plan eradicates the walking networks and bridleways to the North of Ware, removing the

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>opportunity to exercise in relative safety.</p> <p>3. Section unclear around 'may be shared use' of recreational facilities – if uncertainty this should not be included in the Plan.</p>
9.1.17	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Some areas covered by the proposed development are used for dog walkers and events such as fireworks – amenity should be replaced.</p>
9.1.18	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Need to ensure trees (especially those covered by TPOs) are not removed before development.</p>
9.1.19	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Creating small open spaces will not compensate for the accessible green spaces lost through the development.</p> <p>2. Proximity of Lea Valley Regional Park does not make it acceptable to lose other green spaces.</p>
Development in Ware	
WARE1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support for 1,000 homes.</p> <p>2. Satisfaction that no existing homes between Kingsway and Wodson Park will be demolished.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Based on site promoters' highways modelling, sufficient highway capacity is likely to exist within the Plan period to accommodate the additional 500 dwellings envisaged by Policy before the end of 2033.</p> <p>2. Heritage impact assessment should be undertaken for Hanbury Manor, Poles Park and Fanhams Hall.</p> <p>3. Development of a new town either between Widford and Spellbrook or between Bennington and Westmill should be considered instead.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>4. Concern at proposed scale of the expansion of Ware with range proposed between 200 and 3,000 homes. Development towards the higher end of the scale would have a hugely adverse impact on the nature of the town.</p> <p>5. More certainty required over the windfall allowance, providing a maximum figure.</p> <p>6. Inclusion of the Nun's Triangle sought for development.</p> <p>7. Crane Mead should be released from Green Belt and allocated for 150-200 dwellings within first five years of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. If development proceeds, construction of a ring road required from the A1170, across the river and railway and around the East and North of Ware to the A10 junction north of Ware to alleviate existing traffic difficulties before further construction considered.</p>
9.2.5	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Development a positive step for Ware and the surrounding area.</p> <p>2. Development will provide work for local people during construction and increased population will encourage more businesses and provide more jobs.</p> <p>3. Commitment to Green Infrastructure as recommended in the HRA report is commended.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Council trusted to ensure that local services such as schools, health services, transport links, etc will be provided.</p>
WARE2	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Impressed with the competent and professional preparation of Plan, particularly sections on flooding, water supply, drainage and sewerage.</p> <p>2. Support for Part V (q) requiring outdoor sports facilities, including football pitches.</p> <p>3. Support for minerals wording.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to Criteria I and II wording because of long-term highway capacity limitation assumptions and the resultant limit placed on dwelling numbers in the Plan period. Transport Authority's view (HCC) that there will be insufficient highway capacity throughout the plan period on the local and wider strategic road networks not accepted. Sufficient capacity will exist for up to 1,500 dwellings to be delivered. 2. Given high level of unmet housing need, development should not be prematurely restrained – could potentially commence on this site as early as 2020. 1,000 dwellings likely to be completed by 2027 so full development could be unnecessarily delayed for over five years, despite acknowledged shortfall of 1,460 dwellings in the total dwelling supply sources shown under Policy DPS 3. 3. Exceptional circumstances for removing site from Green Belt have not been demonstrated. 4. Urban sprawl. 5. Development doesn't reflect findings of Green Belt review. 6. Allocation of a site for Travelling Showpeople in the Green Belt is deemed inappropriate by the NPPF. 7. Inclusion of the Nun's Triangle site sought as part of allocation. 8. Brownfield sites should be used before development on this scale in historic countryside. 9. Braziers Gravel Pit should be built on instead of arable land. 10. Land to the south of Ware should be considered instead (better access to A10 and A414). 11. Development of a new town on the opposite side of Watton-at-Stone or further north on the train line should be considered instead. 12. Building north of Ware will cause Thundridge, Wadesmill and Cold Christmas to inevitably merge. 13. Area understood to be a Conservation Area.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Site will be visible from the village of Thundridge. 15. Need for development to be reconsidered in light of Brexit and effect on the economy 16. No evidence why alternative sites were rejected in favour of this site. 17. Objection to loss of grade 2 agricultural land/use of land contrary to bequest. 18. Concern that development of 1,000 dwellings would not be viable. 19. Size of the development (approaching 50% of the current size of Ware) represents massive over development of the town (12% – 19%) in population. 20. Ware circa 8,000 households (2011 census), on which basis there could be up to 4,000 new homes built on allocation, yet only 1,000-1500 are planned – extravagant use of green belt land/hidden plan to add a lot more houses in future. 21. Site area is the same as that previously identified for 3,000 homes yet proposed number is half. 22. Concern over level of development compared to Hertford dwelling numbers. 23. Policy does not take into account 90 homes recently built in the town. 24. Concern about impact on local roads and public services/infrastructure unable to cope. 25. Relief road will not assist congested routes to the train station. 26. Need for link road questioned/not enough detail on route. 27. Link road will cut Ware from Great Amwell. 28. Plans of development not detailed enough. 29. Traffic impact on A414 and need for Hertford bypass before development in Ware. 30. A10 capacity concerns. 31. Station (and vehicular access to it) capacity issues. 32. Strategic rail strategy required as no plans to make rail improvements. 33. Bus service funding for development questioned given cuts in other bus services. 34. Concern re importance of ensuring extension to the town is suitably connected to the rest of

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>the community and not isolated.</p> <p>35. Concern about how this additional population will be able to access an already heavily congested town centre.</p> <p>36. Increase in noise and air pollution in Ware.</p> <p>37. Concern about electricity supply to new homes.</p> <p>38. Sewage and drainage capacity/flooding concerns.</p> <p>39. Policy at Part V (m) should be amended to refer to the provision of 3FE primary school to include early years provision and delete reference to catchment areas.</p> <p>40. Policy at Part V (n) should be amended to refer to the provision of a site for 6FE Secondary school (with room to expand to 8FE) and delete 'Schools Planning'.</p> <p>41. Schools are oversubscribed – one school not enough to ease pressure.</p> <p>42. Concern over the lack of Nursery and Pre-School places</p> <p>43. Concerns about local health provision capacity and wider access to existing hospitals.</p> <p>44. Hospital required to support development.</p> <p>45. No indication Police and Fire departments will operate efficiently to support large development.</p> <p>46. Concern that Jackson Wood will be destroyed.</p> <p>47. Concerns about wildlife and existing green infrastructure.</p> <p>48. Net loss of biodiversity</p> <p>49. Effects on the greenbelt and the Amwell nature reserve would be irreversible.</p> <p>50. This area of Green Belt used for recreation purposes e.g. walking, dog walking, cycling and horse riding.</p> <p>51. Concerns about sporting facilities provision.</p> <p>52. Ware already lacking in Accessible Natural Greenspace and development of this scale will further reduce ANG.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>53. Burial space required.</p> <p>54. Concern that part of site has been sold to Haringey Council so will not meet East Herts' housing needs.</p> <p>55. Garden City principles not possible to achieve as site is on the edge of a community contributing to urban sprawl.</p> <p>56. Concern over the type of employment provided as may result in too many HGVs.</p> <p>57. Concern that congestion from additional development would make the town less desirable and dissuade Glaxo from remaining.</p> <p>58. Development will destroy the setting of the Japanese Gardens/pose threat to historic landscape at Fanhams Hall.</p> <p>59. Concern over impact on Round House.</p> <p>60. Heritage impact assessment should be carried out for Hanbury Manor, Poles Park, the Round House and Fanhams Hall.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Travelling showpeople location not clear – should not be provided within residential area.</p> <p>2. No more flats/starter homes needed – more family homes required.</p> <p>3. Infrastructure to be provided before development.</p> <p>4. Coherent and viable highways plan for Ware is essential before this scheme can be considered, both in relation to access to the A10 and into and out of Ware itself.</p> <p>5. If development proceeds, construction of a ring road required from the A1170, across the river and railway and around the East and North of Ware to the A10 junction north of Ware to alleviate existing traffic difficulties before any further construction is considered.</p> <p>6. Wastewater network capacity in the area may be unable to support this development and local upgrades may be required – detailed drainage strategy should be submitted with planning application.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. 3FE primary requirement could be met by a new 2FE on site and expansion of Priors Wood School by 1FE. However, this would require a new access to Priors Wood School through the proposed development. 8. The secondary school will require access to main roads and should be located close to the A10 junction (north of Wodson Park). 9. The Cow Fields/fireworks field is an important community asset and should be retained as open space. 10. Archaeological dig should be undertaken before building begins 11. Preservation of existing trees and hedgerows sought. 12. Development should incorporate sensitive architecture, with no flat roofs permitted. 13. Land on the edge of the site at Fanhams Hall Road (not submitted through the SLAA process), currently leased to local football club, should be included within WARE2 as part of the Masterplan process with consideration of re-location of the FC. 14. While the site lies within Wareside parish, the impact of development would be on the town of Ware. This boundary issue will need to be resolved. 15. Service providers will incur upfront costs before development takes place – questioned whether these costs will be passed onto the existing community. 16. Important that the first 200 homes built do not impede creation of the relief road. 17. Traffic calming measures will be required during and post the development. 18. Adequate parking required/avoidance of displacement parking. 19. New cycleways needed. 20. Park and Ride service to the town should be provided rather than development of large car parks in the town centre. 21. Concern regarding the potential impact of this development and the associated infrastructure requirements on the Regional Park but strengthening of other policies elsewhere in the plan

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>should ensure the Park's assets are protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.</p> <p>22. Noted that HOU 3 allows for lower levels of Affordable Housing provision subject to the demonstration that there are sound viability reasons for doing so, such as the need to secure other infrastructure priorities.</p>
9.3 Employment in Ware	
9.3.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Housing should be located on existing employment sites, such as Crane Mead before green belt land considered for development.</p>
WARE3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Using Green Belt designated land to create employment areas to support unsustainable and inappropriate residential development on other Green Belt designated land is not positively prepared, unjust and against National Policy</p> <p>2. Employment Areas should be retained and expanded. Object to loss of employment land for residential development.</p> <p>3. Land at Presdales Pit, Hoe Lane should be allocated as an employment site.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Crane Mead is changing usage from employment into housing.</p>
9.4 Retail in Ware	
9.4	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Town centre parking already at capacity.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Plan should ensure new shops are viable.</p>
9.4.3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Providing only local shopping facilities in new development will increase traffic driving to the town centre.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	2. Providing too many shops in the new development will sever the town by splitting trade.
9.5 Leisure and Community Facilities in Ware	
9.5	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Leisure facilities should include arts and craft.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Need for high quality football facilities as many of the existing pitches are of poor quality.</p> <p>2. already an under-provision of playing pitches in Ware (particularly 9 and 11 a side)</p> <p>3. plan should make it clear additional pitches will be for community use.</p> <p>4. where shared use facilities are available these need to be able to ensure long term access for community clubs.</p> <p>5. Current under provision of synthetic turf facilities, which could be provided as part of the new school (including community use).</p> <p>6. Council should be more explicit in terms of how it will ensure sufficient S106 funding is sought and then spent, which covers total costs of provision rather than the remaining funds being sought from the taxpayer.</p>
9.5.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Footpaths in the area are a vital recreational and fitness resource – only way to maintain this is not to allow massive over development.</p>
9.5.3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. While reference to the under-provision of football pitches and other sports facilities is supported, in advance of the emerging strategies for both indoor and outdoor sports facilities being completed, it is premature and inappropriate to make specific requests for sites to be allocated for meeting particular needs or to suggest the content of new or amended policies in the Ware chapter to address such needs.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
9.5.5	<p data-bbox="414 311 571 343"><u>Objection</u></p> <ol data-bbox="414 343 2027 518" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="414 343 2027 430">1. Expanded hospital services should be included as part of the proposals through restoration of A&E at WGC QEII and expanded services at Hertford County Hospital.<li data-bbox="414 430 2027 518">2. Insufficient healthcare provision planned to cope with existing failing health and hospital services. These should be planned for and timescales for delivery stated.