

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
Introduction	
18.1.8	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More examples of modal shift initiatives required i.e. Smarter Choices, readily accessible public transport information, working from home, and car clubs. 2. Reference required re delivery/monitoring of Travel Plans and responsibility for provision. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Questioned whether travel plans fall within Developer Contributions (paragraphs 25.3 & 25.4 Monitoring), in terms of targets set, monitoring and delivery obligations.
Sustainable Transport	
18.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No clear District wide strategy to increase cycling.
18.2.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Point 6 should refer to wider air quality issues to accentuate health benefits of sustainable transport. 2. Point 6 should cross reference Policy EQ4. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Questioned how sustainable transport provision is being factored into development planning. 2. Details of Sustainable Transport (cycle paths/shared routes/cycle lanes) should be publically available.
TRA1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Content and approach of policy are supported, including recognition of the need to link up development with existing walking/cycling routes (in the interests of public health and sustainable travel).

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>2. Protection of existing public rights of way, cycling and equestrian routes, (including undesignated and informal routes) and need to provide suitable replacement routes if diversion is unavoidable.</p> <p>3. Inclusion of positive messages on sustainable travel and need for these to be in place as soon as occupation occurs on developments.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Policy adds nothing to NPPF and should be deleted.</p> <p>2. Inconsistent with national policy and would fail to promote the principles of sustainable development as required by paragraph 151 of the NPPF.</p> <p>3. Reference required to the need to reduce greenhouse gases.</p> <p>4. I (b) Policy should be amended to reflect not all development proposals relate to the provisions of the Transport Plan/Vision.</p> <p>5. Insufficient emphasis has been placed on the promotion of sustainable transport within the Plan and the economic advantages it can deliver to Hatfield, Hertford, St Albans, and Welwyn Garden City.</p> <p>6. Government led investment required in east-west public transport system (tram and rail initiatives) as part of improvements to east-west connections linking St Albans, Hatfield, Welwyn Garden City and Hertford.</p> <p>7. Policy should refer to encouraging innovative sustainable transport options.</p> <p>8. (c) Park and ride should be included among sustainable transport initiative options listed.</p> <p>9. Policy should include broad strategic statement regarding sustainable transport provision and the contribution it could make to the local economy.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. (c) S.106 funding towards Community Transport Schemes are difficult to gain.</p> <p>2. Improvements to existing public transport networks should take account of services that</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	provide access to the Lee Valley Regional Park at key or primary 'gateways' such as Stanstead Abbots, Ware and across District boundary with Roydon and Rye House.
Safe and Suitable Highway Access Arrangements and Mitigation	
TRA2	<u>Objection</u> 1. Policy adds nothing to NPPF and should be deleted.
Vehicle Parking Provision	
18.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Car parking provision should be higher in villages to reflect reliance on car travel in remote locations.
TRA3	<u>Objection</u> 1. Current 2015 parking standards are too onerous and not in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35, thereby not encouraging sustainable modes of transport. 2. Policy should be deleted as there are occasions when it may not be appropriate to insist upon minimum parking standards (e.g. when public transport is adequate).