

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
<b>12.1 Introduction</b>	
12.1	<u>Objection</u> 1. Inadequate healthcare facilities to accommodate existing and new population 2. Stevenage has lost lots of employers so no longer thriving.
<b>12.2 Development East of Stevenage</b>	
12.2	<u>Objection</u> 1. No release of Green Belt should occur – no evidence of exceptional circumstances 2. Site breaches Gresley Way which is a clear boundary 3. Sets precedence for future development 4. Objection to Travelling Showpeople site 5. Reinstating the secondary school within Stevenage will have implications for other schools
12.2.3	<u>Objection</u> 1. Reinstating the secondary school within Stevenage will have implications for other schools 2. Required schools and community infrastructure will not come forward with development or at all 3. Secondary schools are too far for children to walk (safety concerns)
12.2.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Will cause congestion and rat running on rural road network and Stevenage road network 2. Impact on road network needs to be properly modelled and assessed 3. Limited public transport serving this area, including bus access to schools 4. Concern about the highway safety of Gresley Way 5. Increase in vehicles will cause impact on air quality 6. Site is too far away from town centre or station to walk or cycle

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	7. Site is disconnected from footpath and cycle network 8. Capacity concerns on the rail network 9. Travelling Showpeople vehicle movements will cause traffic problems
12.2.5	<u>Objection</u> 1. Proposed roundabouts will not mitigate traffic issues caused
12.2.6	<u>Objection</u> 1. Lack of healthcare provision and capacity of Lister Hospital
12.2.8	<u>Objection</u> 1. Will cause coalescence with neighbouring settlements and reduce gaps, impacting on the character of villages. 2. Unacceptable impact on the Beane valley – visual, environmental, light pollution and on the tranquillity of the valley, harm to wildlife such as Red Kites and Sky Larks. 3. Planting will not screen the site for many years, development will be visible from across the valley
Figure 12.1	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Diagram incorrectly shows land to south-west of the site as country park/green space – should be Green Belt and Local Wildlife Site.
<b>Policy EOS1 Land East of Stevenage</b>	
EOS1	<u>Objection</u> 1. Lack of transport modelling to support the Plan – cumulative assessment not considered. 2. No Green Belt study to support release of this site 3. Site was brought in following the preferred options stage to contribute to meeting first five years of development. 4. There has been no consultation on this site 5. No exceptional circumstances for this site

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Site does not meet East Herts' needs which is in the south and east of the District</li> <li>7. Infrastructure required is not costed, therefore question the deliverability of the development</li> <li>8. Masterplan does not address how pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians will cross Gresley Way.</li> <li>9. Site cannot be delivered within the first five years of the Plan – build out rate considered unachievable by other site promoters</li> <li>10. Site will not deliver necessary community facilities</li> <li>11. Site will not deliver highway mitigation</li> <li>12. Stevenage Bus 1 will not provide sufficient route options.</li> <li>13. A602/Gresley Way junction will need to be improved</li> <li>14. Existing Stevenage infrastructure cannot cope – impacts need to be assessed</li> <li>15. East Herts will need to determine if education needs can be met</li> <li>16. Land west of Stevenage is more appropriate</li> <li>17. Previous applications in location have been rejected</li> <li>18. Site cannot sustain a local centre or other facilities</li> <li>19. Object to travellers site – numerous anti-social issues raised and impact on ability to create a high quality urban extension</li> <li>20. Site is not big enough to accommodate traveller site – should not cut down trees to accommodate this use</li> <li>21. Aston Parish Plan has been ignored</li> <li>22. Site will be disconnected from existing community</li> <li>23. Site does not provide a sufficiently robust Green Belt boundary once Gresley Way is breached</li> <li>24. Will have a detrimental impact on Box Wood/New Wood</li> <li>25. Loss of trees to create access</li> <li>26. Construction stage will harm the Beane valley</li> </ul>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>27. Impact on water supply  28. Detrimental to reintroduction of water voles to the river Beane  29. Will increase flooding in Walkern  30. Badger sets may be disturbed  31. Horse riders and equestrian businesses will be negatively affected.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The North Herts District Plan does not make sufficient secondary education provision to serve development to the north of the town, which is required to meet the needs of the Stevenage Education Planning Area.</li> <li>2. A detailed drainage strategy will be required to assess the wastewater capacity in this area.</li> <li>3. Stevenage residents should have been consulted</li> <li>4. Stevenage Borough Council is pressurising East Herts Council</li> <li>5. Stevenage Borough Council has no dependency on East Herts</li> <li>6. Adjacent land owner recommends site should be expanded to include their land to provide total of 1,500 homes (900 up to 2033)</li> <li>7. Stevenage town centre needs regeneration</li> <li>8. New neighbourhood centre should be located on Gresley Way</li> <li>9. The site should meet Stevenage’s neighbourhood and design principles, and do not agree with the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel recommendations.</li> </ol>
Figure 12.3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The site boundary should be enlarged to deliver a greater quantum of development. Adjacent site 43/003 is also proposed to meet shortfall</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The diagram key is incorrectly labelled “enhancement to road network” – should be</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>“enhancement to rights of way network”</p> <p>2. Diagram key terminology needs to be consistent – refer to community facilities/neighbourhood centre consistent with figure 12.1.</p>