

Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This statement sets out the details of the consultation that has informed the preparation of this SPD.
- 1.2 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) provide guidance to supplement the policies and proposals in the District Plan. SPDs do not have to go through the formal examination process, but consultation with stakeholders and the wider community is still a vital part of the preparation process. The scope of consultation and decision on who will be consulted will reflect the nature of the SPD.

2. Town and Country Planning Regulations

- 2.1 The SPD is produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The relevant regulations relating to the consultation process are explained below.
- Regulation 12: Regulation 12(a) requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before adoption of the SPD, this must set out who was consulted, a summary of the issues raised, and how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD.
 - Regulation 12(b) requires the Council to publish the documents for a minimum 4 week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received and identify the address to which responses should be sent.
 - Regulation 35: Regulation 12 states that when seeking representations on an SPD, documents must be available in accordance with Regulation 35. This

requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps;

- Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
- Publish the document on the Council's website.

3. Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

- 3.1 The SCI explains how the council will involve the community in plan-making and in the consideration of planning applications. In October 2019 the Council adopted a new SCI to replace the previous SCI (adopted in 2013) and take into account changes to legislation and policy. This consultation will be undertaken in accordance with the SCI.
- 3.2 However, as a result of current advice from the Government on Covid 19, making hard copies of the consultation documents available at the Council's offices in Hertford and Bishop's Stortford, and at libraries across the district is not currently mandatory. In line with Government advice, the Statement of Community Involvement has been temporarily updated to clarify that whilst the Council offices and other deposit locations in East Herts remain closed, documents will be available on the website. If the offices and libraries are open at the time of the consultation, copies will be made available at these locations

4. Early consultation

- 4.1 As part of the scoping of the Sustainability SPD, a number of stakeholders have influenced the scope and content of the SPD. Planning and the Sustainability SPD were discussed in January 2020 at the Community and Stakeholder Climate Change Event. Feedback from stakeholders at the event and subsequently made it clear that development must be more sustainable and that planning has a key role

in ensuring that compulsory standards are introduced and enforced. Discussion about the SPD favoured covering a range of topics, with particular emphasis on energy reduction, and ensuring developers were held accountable. Flooding was also raised as an issue to consider. The topics addressed within this SPD have been informed by this feedback. Whilst, the SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets, clear implementation measures have been included.

4.2 Early feedback from developers suggests general support for the topics and themes identified in the SPD, but the following comments were raised:

- Flooding and drainage should be considered;
- Water efficiency is very difficult to enforce as it is not monitored;
- Water efficiency should be governed by building regulations;
- Rainwater harvesting can be associated with hygiene problems;
- Clear air pollution mitigation strategies should be set out;
- Generally flexibility is required to take account of local circumstances
- Guidance is required in relation to electric vehicle charging points, but it needs to include a flexible approach;
- Construction waste should be considered;
- Biodiversity net gain should be addressed.

4.3 These comments have been considered and have helped shape the scope and content of the SPD.

4.4 The emerging SPD has also been informed by a range of East Herts Council's officers and colleagues at Hertfordshire County Council, with expertise in the various topics.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 The draft SPD was published for consultation for four weeks between 10 September and 8 October 2020. Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Town and County Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the Statement of Community Involvement, which was temporarily updated in May 2020. In light of the Covid 19 restrictions, the draft SPD was not available for public inspection. All consultation documents were available to view on the East Herts Council website and advertised using social media. This included information about how to submit a representation.
- 5.2 In September, a presentation was given to the Environment and Climate Change forum via zoom, to inform the range of East Herts stakeholders about the consultation
- 5.3 Consultees were consulted by email; or post where no email address was provided. A list of consultees is provided in Appendix A. Representations could be made via the Council's consultation portal available on the Council's website. Alternatively representations could be emailed to planningpolicy@eastherts.gov.uk, or posted to; Planning Policy, East Herts Council, Wallfields, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8EQ.

6. Issues raised in the consultation

- 6.1 A total of 182 responses were received from 38 consultees. Most consultees were supportive of the purpose and scope of the SPD, with 20 comments expressly supporting the document. Thirty four representations raised objections to elements within the SPD and nearly 70% of the responses provided comments on various aspects of the SPD. Many of the comments and objections were seeking amendments.

- 6.2 The main issues raised in the responses are summarised below:
- Minor changes to the topic guidance- most of the comments seek additional detail or clarity about various aspects of the eight topic sections and propose minor amendments to the text.
 - Inclusion of mandatory targets- Some comments would like to see mandatory targets included in the SPD, although a number recognise why this is not possible.
 - Submission requirements are too onerous- Several developers are concerned that the carbon reduction template, sustainability checklist and air quality assessments require too much detail or exceed requirements in the District Plan, particularly for outline planning applications.
- 6.3 Officers have considered these issues in full and made amendments where they add value to the SPD. In a number of cases, changes to the SPD have been made to add detail or clarity about a technical sustainable design and construction principle or submission requirement. More information has also been added in terms of how and when to complete the checklist, to provide applicants with more clarity. Likewise, changes to the carbon template have been made to reflect the practicalities of calculating carbon reduction emissions.
- 6.4 A summary of the consultation responses is set out in the schedule below. This table outlines the comments by topic, the Council's response to these issues and any consequential changes to the SPD. If text is to be deleted from the draft SPD it is shown ~~struck through~~. If new text is to be inserted it is shown underlined.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
21- Dr A Rowe		Object	Believes District Plan is flawed and that the proposed number of houses cannot be built while also protecting the environment. Concerned rivers are already suffering from pollution and many rivers are already the lowest ecological status. Unclear how water will be supplied to new developments without damaging the river quality further.	<p>Outside the scope of this SPD to amend the District Plan because it was adopted in 2018. However, water quality and supply issues were considered as part of its development and advice was sought from relevant statutory consultees. The Environment Agency, water and sewerage companies support the Plan.</p> <p>District Plan policy WAT3 Water Quality and the Water Environment seeks to ensure that new development preserves or enhances the water quality and ecological value of rivers and Policy WAT4 Efficient Use of Water Resources seeks to reduce the demand for water in new development.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
40- Good Architecture/ Transition Hertford		Object	Believes the lack of mandatory standards and targets to be a flaw. Would like the SPD to have performance and verification requirements to increase its effectiveness. Section/ sub-section/ paragraph numbering system is confusing. Correct notation formula for carbon dioxide is subscript CO ₂ , not superscript CO ² .	<p>Whilst the Council recognises the value of mandatory targets, these cannot legally be introduced in a supplementary planning document. Targets and standards will be taken forward in the review of the District Plan in due course.</p> <p>The SPD is a large document, providing a significant amount of</p>	Amend references to CO ₂ to include correct subscript format.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
				<p>information about a range of topics. The paragraph numbering is generated automatically by the document creation software 'Objective'. The Council considers that the contents page, consistent headings and sub-headings and the logical structure for each section ensure that the document is sufficiently clear and easy to navigate.</p> <p>The references to CO₂ will be amended to the correct subscript format.</p>	
63-			National Grid has no comments to make.	Noted	No amendment in response to this issue
67-			Hertfordshire Property has no comments to make.	Noted	No amendment in response to this issue
52-			Numbering and paragraph system is unclear. Supports the idea of a checklist for developers.	<p>Support for the checklist is noted.</p> <p>The SPD is a large document, providing a significant amount of information about a range of topics. The paragraph numbering is generated automatically by the document creation software</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
				'Objective'. The Council considers that the contents page, consistent headings and sub-headings and the logical structure for each section ensure that the document is sufficiently clear and easy to navigate.	
62- F Kilburn		Object	Recommends stopping cutting down trees and building more houses which is increasing CO ₂ emissions and traffic congestion.	The scale of development proposed in East Herts is outside the scope of this document. The SPD emphasises the ecological value of trees and the benefits they have in helping to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Detailed decisions will be made at the planning application stage. Trees on development sites may be protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and/or by conditions attached to a planning permission.	No amendment in response to this issue.
64- T White			Supports the motivation behind the SPD, it appears to be well informed and thorough. Emphasised how effective proper design, south facing gardens, solar panels and rainwater use can be. Would suggest more is made of lower roof heights to make buildings less imposing and blocking out less light. Acknowledgement of the effects of climate change in terms of	Support for SPD and the emphasis on how effective simple changes to design can be, is noted. SPD section 4.2.1 Climate Change Adaptation acknowledges the effects of climate change, including drier summers and an increase and frequency of storms. There is currently limited research about the links between climate change and	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			long hot dry periods and more frequent storms is missing. Thinks developments have to have predominantly low height with tree borders to offer protection from strong winds, as well as empty barrier strips or wide roads designed in such a way as to prevent fire spreading through them.	<p>higher wind speed in the UK, so it difficult for the SPD to incorporate detailed advice. However, consideration of local context, including the need to avoid wind tunnels, should inform site design as set out in chapter 1 of the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD avoids being too prescriptive about roof heights as lower density development may not be appropriate in all locations, particularly where more efficient use of land may have other benefits to mitigating climate change. Proposed building design should reflect the site's location and context.</p>	
68- Braughing Parish Council		Support	<p>Supports the SPD and its sustainability goals. Agrees with the need for the District Plan to be reviewed and amended as soon as practicable.</p> <p>Welcome the introduction of new technology e.g. grey water, but questions how the expense of these will be weighed against affordability. Also queries if East Herts will offer incentives to improve carbon performance of existing builds. Believes that developers will use S106 instead of complying with</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The Council recognises that consideration of viability will need to be taken into account as part of the planning application process so allows for flexibility. However, the cost of new technologies in this area is likely to decrease as demand increases.</p> <p>The Council will use appropriate conditions to ensure developer compliance with commitments.</p>	No amendments in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			guidelines, would like rigorous conditions to apply to the use of the offset option to discourage developers from taking it.		
72- T Elmer		Object	The council cannot create a sustainable ecosystem at the current rate of population increase.	The scale of development proposed in East Herts is outside the scope of this document. The objective of the SPD is to provide sustainable design and construction guidance to improve the environmental performance of new development.	No amendment proposed in response to this issue.
81- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston NP Group			Missing section - Funding From the above you will see that we have a concern that the strategy asks developers to do or provide 'things' but there is no suggestion that they should have to provide for their long term maintenance. Matters are made worse by EHC's policy approach making new residents pay service charges to cover these requirements. It is equally reasonable to seek Landowners, who are making massive gains in land value, or developer funding. A new section needs to be added to address this.	Funding for schemes, for both initial provision and their maintenance, is largely achieved through specific mechanisms, such as Section 106 legal agreements attached to planning permissions, and it is clearly important that these achieve all that they are intended to. Policies DEL1 and DEL2 seek to ensure such arrangements are achieved and avoid the issues described in the representation. In Gilston, the HGGT ' <i>How to' Guide for Planning Obligations, Land Value Capture and Development Viability</i> sets out how the Councils in the Garden Town intend to ensure that a consistent approach is adopted to support growth and deliver the necessary infrastructure to ensure	No amendment proposed in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
				the sustainability and long term stewardship of the Garden Town as a whole is in line with the Garden City Principles and the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Vision. A Stewardship and Community Development Officer has also recently been appointed to take forward the delivery of this issue.	
91- Herts County Council			HCC welcome the Sustainability SPD and broadly endorse the policies that underpin the document. The SPD is a really good document which covers the relevant areas to ensure more sustainable development across East Herts. The checklists are an essential part of the SPD and present questions for applicants to respond to, given the officer valuable information to inform their consideration. Consideration for offsetting could be taken forward for carbon and biodiversity in the future.	Support for the objectives and content of the SPD noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
97- A Furnace			Believes the document covers the right areas but is concerned it will have no practical effect on developers. SAWB4 was let down by not enough mandated environmental and sustainability	The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally, the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			<p>requirements in the District Plan. The SPD should provide the opportunity to adjust policy to context rather than a 'nice to have' approach. Believes the SPD should be mandatory not advisory. There are no new requirements for CO2 reduction, and renewable technologies are merely "encouraged". It is confusing for developers – it lists four different construction standards as guidance; but mandates none. No guarantee is provided for ensuring that existing Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) are not made worse by housing development and the associated rise in traffic. Other local authorities are producing Sustainability SPDs with more force, for example the Greater Cambridge Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.</p>	<p>Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan. The requirement for submission of a qualitative checklist also provides a stronger implementation mechanism. Developers will have to consistently demonstrate how they have addressed each checklist criteria and submitted relevant evidence. This will provide greater transparency about if/how developments comply with, or exceed, policy across a range of environmental topics.</p> <p>With regards to AQMAs, the pollution section of the SPD outlines a robust process to mitigate any negative impact from new development.</p>	
98- East Herts Lib Democrat Cllrs		Support	<p>Believes the SPD is an excellent and comprehensive document. Strongly support the checklists which developers are required to submit for each planning application. Support the detailed and technical recommendations and requirements within the document, does however regret that they are only</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Recognise need for target based local plan policies and will take forward this approach in the review of the District Plan.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			recommendations, and would like to see them made compulsory and incorporated into the Local Plan.		
99- East Herts Green Party			Supports document and has a number of comments and corrections in relation to specific sections	Support noted and welcomed	
100- East Herts Green Party			Generally well written and constructed document that goes some way in an attempt to raise the sustainability standards of the East Herts District Plan. Supports the checklist approach. However the section/ paragraph numbering system needs refining so that each heading and paragraph has a unique reference.	Support for document and checklist approach noted and welcomed. The paragraph numbering is generated automatically by the document creation software 'Objective'. The Council consider that the contents page, consistent headings and sub-headings and the logical structure for each section ensure that the document is sufficiently clear and easy to navigate.	No amendment in response to this issue.
117- M Brady			Agrees with topics covered by the SPD and the promotion of sustainable construction standards. Considers sustainable energy sources (including renewable energy) and green infrastructure must be included in current developments.	Support for the topics covered is noted. The integration of sustainable energy sources and the importance securing on site green infrastructure are both addressed in the District Plan and the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
136- Hertford			Welcomes the SPD but feels it needs to be stronger and more persuasive.	The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally,	Insert a new sentence in paragraph 1.4 to strengthen

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
Town Council			<p>Suggests making the business case for sustainability stronger to help developers understand the competitive edge.</p> <p>Overall feels it is an advisory document but needs to be made more prescriptive and clearer for builders to follow.</p>	<p>the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan.</p> <p>Agree that that the SPD could make a stronger business case about the benefits of sustainable design and construction for developers.</p>	<p>the emphasis of economic and social benefits: ...environmental impact of new development and address climate change. <u>The true benefits of sustainable design and construction go well beyond simply cutting carbon emissions.</u> There are also economic and social benefits...</p> <p>Add a new paragraph in section 1.2, after paragraph 1.4: <u>For developers and homeowners, there is evidence that higher standards of environmental sustainability increases property values. As public awareness of climate change increases, sustainable design and construction measures can be used by developers as an effective marketing tool to sell properties. Equally, the capital cost of building sustainably is likely to fall due to increasing demand and consequently the availability of green technologies at</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		<u>lower costs.</u>
118- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac			<p>Strongly endorse the high-level aspirations in the SPD to deliver sustainable new development. Sustainability is a key design aspiration for Birchall Garden Suburb.</p> <p>Expresses concern that the level of information requested in the Sustainability SPD is too prescriptive and should be appropriate to the stage in the planning application process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is essential that the details required by any such sustainability checklist, are proportionate to what is deliverable at the Outline planning application stage. Due to the development gestation period of strategic sites, detailed design matters including those related to sustainability are most appropriately addressed at the Reserved Matters stage. • Sustainability matters for strategic sites are often confirmed by the masterplanning process • Strategic sites that submit an 	<p>The Council welcomes Tarmac's support for the concept of the SPD.</p> <p>The SPD and checklist set out the principles that <i>all</i> applications for new development should consider, to ensure that sustainable design and construction is promoted early in a development's evolution. The Council recognises that depending on the matters reserved, outline applications may not be able respond to specific requirements or principles. However, all issues should be considered and the applicant can demonstrate if a particular checklist criteria is not applicable to the stage of their application.</p> <p>The submission requirements for each topic area state that information submitted should be proportionate to the application. However, for clarity, additional guidance text will be added to Appendix A (Combined Checklist) to clarify the status of outline applications.</p> <p>Equally text will be added to the SPD to make clear that applicants do not</p>	<p>Add following text to Appendix A: <u>The sustainable design and construction submission checklist needs to be submitted with applications for all new development (that result in a residential net gain of 1 dwelling and above or an increase in non-residential floorspace) and can also be used as part of the pre-application process.. The purpose of this checklist is to explain and evidence how the proposed development complies with District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development. The checklist topics and criteria reflect the sustainable design and construction guidance set out in this SPD.</u> <u>The checklist should be used as a tool to provide an overview of how a scheme addresses different aspects of sustainability, although each application will be</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) should not be expected to replicate submission information.	<p>have to replicate existing information in the checklist, but include a brief summary and then signpost existing evidence and supporting document (such as masterplans and EIAs). The aim of the checklist is not to replicate existing information, but provide an overarching framework for assessing the environmental sustainability of a proposal.</p> <p>The SPD and checklist can also be used to inform pre-application discussions and masterplanning.</p>	<p><u>assessed on its own merit, taking account of local circumstances. It does not replace other application submission requirements, but aims to provide an overarching framework to help facilitate the assessment of different, often overlapping, strands of sustainability.</u></p> <p><u>Applicants should:</u></p> <p><u>Briefly summarise/ explain how their proposal complies with the relevant criteria, signposting to other relevant statements/ surveys as appropriate (for example, the transport assessment, biodiversity checklist and Sustainable construction, Energy and Water Statement). The checklist does not need to repeat detailed information submitted elsewhere, but should provide an overview of the approach taken in the scheme.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		<p><u>Ensure answers are explained and justified, not simply 'yes' or 'no' or 'not applicable';</u></p> <p><u>Use District Plan policies and the relevant sections in the SPD to inform responses;</u></p> <p><u>Ensure the level of detail submitted is proportionate to the type of application. For outline applications, the relevance of criteria will depend how many matters are reserved. Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD), the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
					<p><u>Ensure the level of detail submitted is proportionate to the scale of application. While major applications will require significantly more input than others, it is appropriate that all submissions should consider the sustainable design and construction issues raised and provide a response.</u></p> <p><u>Refer to the Council's website for further details about the submission requirements of particular applications:</u></p> <p><u>https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-building/make-planning-application</u></p>
139- Thakeham Homes		Support	Strongly supports the commitment to tackling climate change and promoting sustainability, and the approach taken within this Sustainability SPD to guide new development. Mirrors Thakeham's own commitments to sustainability, biodiversity and climate change across their developments, and would welcome the opportunity to work in partnership with the Council	Support noted and welcomed	No amendment proposed in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			to create benchmark zero-carbon communities.		
148- Pigeon			<p>Support the Council's aspirations for the delivery of high-quality sustainable developments and the general direction of travel set out within the SPD in respect of the more prudent use of natural resources, the protection of environmental assets, mitigating the impacts of climate change and adapting to its impacts. However, this needs to be balanced against the Council's growth requirements and the extent to which the SPD is focussed upon new build homes and buildings that are, on the whole, considerably more energy efficient than existing stock. Given the relatively small scale of new homes versus existing stock, there are therefore limitations to what the SPD can achieve.</p> <p>Focus on new buildings, means SPD also fails to recognise the role of Building Regulations in ensuring that</p>	<p>The Council disagrees that the SPD goes beyond the Policy requirements of the District Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 1.3 clearly sets out the purpose of the SPD and that it cannot supersede the policies in the District Plan. It does not introduce new mandatory targets, but provides additional guidance to help support the implementation of the District Plan policies relating to environmental sustainability. It encourages developers to go beyond the current policies but does not mandate it. Throughout the SPD, in each topic section, there are clear links to the District Plan policies. <p>The checklist requires applicants to consistently and transparently demonstrate how their proposals meet the plan policies. The SPD recognises that each application will</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.4 as follows: Government is considering proposing changes to legislation and policy that will promote lower carbon buildings. <u>Responding to its 2019 Future Homes consultation, the Government has committed to changes to building regulations by 2025 to ensure new homes will have CO₂ emissions at least 75% lower than those built to current regulations.</u>¹ improve the energy efficiency of new homes were recently subject to consultation in 2019. Plans for low carbon heating and high levels of energy efficiency will be introduced by 2025. To deliver a phased approach, regulations will be changed in December 2021, to introduce an interim CO₂</p>

¹ The Future Homes Standard: 2019, Summary of responses received and Government response, January 2021:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-homes-standard-changes-to-part-l-and-part-f-of-the-building-regulations-for-new-dwellings>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			standards for energy efficiency, for example, are delivered in new buildings. Following the recent consultation on the Future Homes Standard we would strongly suggest that such matters should be controlled through Building Regulations, rather than local planning policy/ guidance. Suggest that the link between policies contained within the District Plan and guidance contained within the SPD should be more clearly set-out. The SPD seeks to introduce matters that go beyond the policies within the District Plan. There is no indication of what benchmark will be used to assess the various criterion set out in the checklist.	<p>be considered on its own merits and if a particular criteria or issue is not applicable then the applicant should demonstrate this in response to the checklist.</p> <p>The SPD recognises the role of building regulations and has updated text in section 2 accordingly. However the first phase of the energy efficiency improvements are not due to come into force for over a year and even when they do, they relate only to the buildings, not the wider site issues associated with energy and carbon reduction.</p> <p>It is considered proportionate to focus on new build not existing buildings in this SPD, given the resource implications of completing and assessing the checklist. The Council will explore policies for changes to existing buildings in the upcoming District Plan review, in light of decisions about changes to building regulations.</p>	<p>emissions reduction target of 31% . This will come into force in 2022 and regulations will be changed and in a phased approach to this change the government has consulted on a potential 20% or 31% reduction in carbon emissions from new homes by the end of 2020. The response to this consultation has not yet been published, but it will result in mandatory improvements to the energy performance of new homes. Similar proposals for new non-domestic buildings are also currently being considered (interim uplift target of an average 27% beyond current regulations in December 2021), alongside energy efficiency improvements to existing homes and buildings.² target proposed in due course. Likewise, another government consultation this year identifies the</p>

² The Future Buildings Standard, January 2021: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/the-future-buildings-standard>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
					importance of using heat networks to decarbonise heating in the UK and proposes regulations and guidance, which may impact planning policies and decisions.
161- S. Chapman			Overall aim of the document is laudable but much room for improvement, particularly in terms of enforcement. East Herts District Council is considered by many to be an easy touch for developers. Recommend energy emission targets are made mandatory.	The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally, the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan. The Council plans to include the sustainability checklist on its local validation checklist so that it will need to be submitted for the application to be registered.	No amendment in response to this issue.
176- Env Agency			Advise including the protection of groundwater via remediation of contaminated land, in line with Policy WAT3, within this document, perhaps in the pollution section. Makes up an important part of sustainable development and hence	Both the protection of groundwater and the consideration of waste water capacity are key considerations for securing sustainable development. However, it is considered that the District Plan and national policy the guidance provide a robust basis for	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			<p>reminding developers to check such constraints early on in their proposals would be beneficial for all. You may wish to integrate this into the pollution section.</p> <p>We would also advise making reference to waste water within the document. It would be beneficial to check whether the applicant is conforming to the relevant local plan policies (Policy WAT6) on waste water and to make sure that sufficient capacity in the network/local treatment works to accommodate the proposal has been established.</p>	addressing these issues. The Sustainability SPD has had to prioritise the topics it has focussed on.	
73/ 179- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston NP Group			<p>In general terms we support bringing together the many threads of Sustainability policy into a single document. As a community we have championed the cause that the Gilston development. This ambition needs to be carried through in sustainability policies and given the scale and duration of the project we are surprised that there are no mentions of Gilston and your Local Plan, Policy GA1/GA2 Policy Context –</p> <p>Understand that the Harlow Gilston Garden Town Board are also in the</p>	<p>General support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD applies across East Herts so does not generally refer to site specific policies. However, given its significance within the district, Gilston and the HGGT sustainability guidance is mentioned in para 1.16 and 3.41.</p> <p>This SPD and the HGGT guidance can be used together successfully. They are both underpinned by the same sustainability principles and the</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			<p>process of producing a similar document, if that is the case there seems to be an opportunity for cross boundary coordination to avoid having two sets of policy documents on the same subject?</p>	<p>completion of the Sustainability SPD checklist requires sustainability issues to be addressed (and evidence submitted), which is consistent with the HGGT Guidance. However, the Sustainability SPD provides more information about standards and submission requirements than the HGGT Guidance, particularly in some topics, such as biodiversity, air quality mitigation and waste. Therefore, it is important that development in the Gilston Area complies with the Sustainability SPD as well as the HGGT guidance.</p> <p>The SPD's primary focus is to ensure policy requirements are implemented, but it also encourages good practice and compliance with stronger energy targets. The HGGT Guidance will use incentives associated with the scale of development and Garden Town design process to encourage developers to meet the higher quantitative targets in the Guidance.</p>	
180- Hunsdon Parish Council			Fully endorse and support the Hundson, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group's responses to the Sustainability SPD	Endorsement and support of the Hundson, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group's responses is noted.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			consultation. (ref- see rep ids: 74-81, 179)		
181- Bishop's Stortford Climate Group			<p>We recognise the limits on what can be achieved through a Supplementary Planning Document, and hope that this draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will influence developers. Note that it places few absolute requirements on them to design to standards which achieve a step change to carbon emissions.</p> <p>The introduction and opening section Design-led approach are key to the whole guidance, but District's commitment to change is limp. In particular, the statement that new mandatory targets will be explored and progressed sounds non-committal (1.15).</p> <p>Chapter 2 does not set out clearly the link between the policies established in Chapter 1 and the requirements set out in Chapters 3-9 and comes across as making sustainability recommended and optional.</p> <p>Would like mandatory targets (specifically carbon reduction</p>	<p>Support for the checklist approach is welcomed and the Council recognises the need for mandatory targets in the District Plan review. The SPD does not include specific requirements because decisions about this approach need to be made on the basis or evidence and in light of the outcome of the white paper. However, the Council agrees that the commitment in paragraph 1.15 could be strengthened.</p> <p>As noted, the SPD cannot include mandatory targets and has tried to introduce legally compliant mechanisms that reduce emissions in the absence of specific targets-the sustainability checklist and carbon reduction target. It is noted that the proposed improved to energy efficiency in building regulations will help enforce a higher carbon emission benchmark than is in place currently (and indeed many currently in place at other local planning authorities).</p> <p>It is recognised that developers should explain their proposals in the</p>	<p>Amend the last sentence in paragraph 1.15 (now 1.16):</p> <p>This issue will be explored and progressed <u>taken forward</u> as part of the District Plan Review.</p> <p>Add guidance text to Appendix A Combined Checklist- see proposed amendment to rep 118.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			General comments		
			<p>targets) and stress the importance of reviewing the District Plan, but welcome checklist in the meantime. However, concerned that some of the criteria require 'yes' or 'no' answers so do not require an explanation. Also concerned that the approach to be proportionate to the scale of the application could be misused as a reason not to comply/explain. Allowing for a threshold for detail to be provided undermines the checklist.</p> <p>Typos: Some of which are crucial: 3.37-use of renewable technologies to 'increase', should be 'reduce' CO2 emissions. Climate 'adaption' should be 'adaptation'.</p>	<p>checklist and not use it as a tick box exercise. Additional guidance has been included in Appendix A to provide further clarity about a 'proportionate approach' and to ensure developers complete the checklist correctly.</p> <p>Typos noted and corrected.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
101- East Herts Green Party	Section 1.2 What is Sustainability? Para 1.4		Paragraph 1.2 refers to social and economic benefits of sustainability, but it comes across and afterthought.	Agrees that the SPD could make a stronger business case to developer about the economic benefits of sustainable design and construction. Additional text will be added after	Insert a new sentence in paragraph 1.4 to strengthen the emphasis of economic and social benefits: ...environmental impact of

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
			<p>There is no attempt in the SPD to present even a brief convincing economic argument to developers that there are good reasons to build in a more sustainable way. Suggest a new paragraph or section be added on the business case for sustainability:</p> <p>'The true benefits of sustainable design and construction go well beyond simply cutting carbon emissions. Building better insulated, properly ventilated homes also brings significant economic benefits, for the country, the district, for the home owner and for the developer. There is ample evidence that well insulated; better quality (i.e. air tight yet well ventilated using heat exchangers) attracts a premium from buyers'. (cites examples).</p>	paragraph 1.4.	<p>new development and address climate change. <u>The true benefits of sustainable design and construction go well beyond simply cutting carbon emissions.</u> There are also economic and social benefits...</p> <p>Add a new paragraph in section 1.2, after paragraph 1.4: <u>For developers and homeowners, there is evidence that higher standards of environmental sustainability increases property values. As public awareness of climate change increases, sustainable design and construction measures can be used by developers as an effective marketing tool to sell properties. Equally, the capital cost of building sustainably is likely to fall due to increasing demand and consequently the availability of green technologies at lower costs.</u></p>
83- Herts County	Section 1.2 What is		Welcomes the content and detail of SPD. Suggest that the concept of the	The Council recognises the value and importance of the circular economy	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
Council	Sustainability? Paragraph 1.4		circular economy could be introduced into paragraph 1.4.	and this is discussed in section 9 of the SPD, Waste Management. Paragraph 1.4 focusses generically on the role of sustainable design and construction. It does not refer in detail to particular concepts and measures. Therefore it is not necessary to raise the issue of the circular economy in this paragraph.	
33- Sworders	Section 1.3 Purpose and structure of the SPD	Object	Supports the intentions of the SPD however object because many cases set out targets that go beyond the District Plan.	The Council disagrees that the SPD goes beyond the District Plan. The purpose of this SPD is to support the implementation of District Plan policies by providing technical guidance on sustainable design and construction to improve the environmental sustainability of new development. It adds additional detail and clarity to the District Plan policies but it does not set new compulsory targets.	No amendment in response to this issue
41- Good Architectu re/ Transition Hertford	Section 1.3 Purpose and structure of the SPD, para 1.7		Are 'carbon neutrality' and 'zero carbon' the same thing?	Definitions can vary depending on the context. However, carbon neutrality means carbon emissions are reduced but outstanding emissions can be offset. Zero carbon means no carbon is emitted so there is no need to offset.	No amendment in response to this issue
42- Good Architectu	Section 1.4 Policy		Other organisations recognise the importance of zero carbon policies.	The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally,	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
re/ Transition Hertford	Context		Need mandatory targets now. Unclear what the timetable for District Plan review is.	<p>the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge.</p> <p>The aim is to start the District Plan review within the next year; However, the timescale will depend when the Government report on their response to the Planning White Paper, which was published for consultation in 2020.</p>	
53- Hertford & Ware Labour Party	1.4 Policy Context		The tone of the section does not sufficiently emphasise the economic benefits to developers of taking up sustainability measures. Buyers will increasingly demand eco-friendly homes as the deadlines for zero carbon emissions approach. Primary point of this section should be bringing developers on board.	Agreed the SPD could emphasise the economic benefits for developers more. Additional text has been included in section 1.2 to explain the economic benefits.	<p>Amend paragraph 1.4 as follows:</p> <p>.... more resilience to market fluctuations and climate change adaptation. <u>For developers and homeowners, there is evidence that higher standards of environmental sustainability increases property values. As public awareness of climate change increases, sustainable design and construction measures can be used by developers as an effective marketing tool to sell properties. Equally, the</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
					<u>capital cost of building sustainably is likely to fall due to increasing demand and consequently the availability of green technologies at lower costs.</u>
69- Braughing Parish Council	Section 1.4 Policy Context, para 1.16	Support	Support the wording that development should comply with relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.	Support noted and welcomed	No amendment in response to this issue
149- Pigeon	Section 1.5 How to use the SPD?		The checklist also appears to apply to both full and outline applications, as well as schemes of 1 dwelling or more (section 1.5, How to Use this SPD). We would strongly suggest that certain criteria within the checklist will not be applicable to outline planning applications (i.e. W.2 How has the internal and external design of the development factored in effective sustainable waste measurement measures?) where the level of detail required will not be available at the outline stage. Similarly, the requirements set out in the checklist require the same level of information regardless of the scale of the scheme. As such, we would suggest that the use of a one-size fits all approach is inappropriate. In addition, the tick-box nature of the checklist is unlikely	<p>The Council does not consider the checklist is a tick box exercise, applicants are meant to use it to explain and justify their approach to each of the sustainable design and construction criteria.</p> <p>It is recognised that it must be clear that developers should explain their proposals in the checklist. Additional guidance has been included in Appendix A to provide further clarity about a 'proportionate approach' and to ensure developers understand how to complete the checklist correctly.</p> <p>Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD); the Council thinks it is</p>	Add guidance text to Appendix A Combined Checklist- see proposed amendment to rep 118.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
			to be conducive to a holistic approach, despite this being advocated within the draft SPD.	important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.	
102- East Herts Green Party	Section 1.4 Policy Context		This section makes clear the international and national policies driving the move towards more sustainable design and construction. Suggests text should add that the design and construction business will change to supply the new market. Developers and builders should enter this new market as early as possible to gain a competitive edge. EHDC could add incentives for developers such as offering Building Futures awards or a new "quality mark" for developments of the highest sustainability, to aid developers in marketing their properties, it would provide a way to advertise the quality of East Herts housing. This should be stated up front in the SPD.	This section refers to the policy context, so it is not appropriate to discuss the business case for sustainable design and construction in this section. Clarity about the benefits for developers has been added to section 1.2. The SPD (section 2.4) refers to the Building Futures scheme and promotes the annual awards for exemplar developments in East Herts. Additional awards could be taken forward by the Council in the future, but commitment to such schemes is outside of the scope of the SPD.	See proposed amendment in response to reps 53, 101 and 136

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
43 - Good Architecture/ Transition Hertford	Section 2		All the sub-sections within this section are important.	Support noted and welcomed.	
119- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac	Section 2.1 Context		The design-led approach in Section 2 of the SPD and the reference to best practice in paragraph 2.1 is supported.	Support noted and welcomed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
182- Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group	Section 2.1 Context		Agree that sustainability requirements need to be considered from the outset in design for a site and that they cannot be bolted on afterwards. Likewise community engagement with proposals needs to be properly addressed from the outset and there is no reference to this. This needs to include transparency to the community of the factual evidence supporting any early design decisions put to the Council in principle such as not to include a district heat network	Agree that community engagement is important and should be referenced in Section 2.2.	Add a sentence to the end of paragraph 2.4: <u>Equally, capturing the views of the local community can positively shape emerging development proposals and enable a more efficient planning application process.</u>
103- East Herts Green Party	Section 2.2 Taking a Holistic Approach		Some of the references used are just generic links rather than links to specific documents. Could add the LETI design guide as one of the further guidance references: https://www.leti.london/cedg	Agree that reference to the LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide would be useful in this section.	Add the following reference under the further guidance heading after paragraph 2.5: <u>LETI Climate Emergency Design Guide</u> www.leti.london/cedg
85- Herts County	Section 2.2 Taking a		In reference to Figure 1, prior/opportunistic extraction of	In Figure 1, the policy requirements box refers to topic specific examples	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
Council	Holistic Approach		mineral resources is an opportunity for a site. The reduced need to import materials can increase the sustainability of a project. Therefore, another policy requirement could be included: The Minerals Local Plan.	or guidance. This category applies to the Mineral Local Plan, which is part of the development plan in East Herts. It is not necessary to specifically list it as an example.	
17- C Rowe	Section 2.3 Historic Environment , para 2.6	Object	Suggested wording was too weak. Proposals MUST not damage the historic environment	Agreed that the word should be replaced with the word must to emphasise the importance of preserving the historic environment.	In paragraph 2.6 amend the text as follows: Proposals should <u>must</u> seek to avoid harm to historic assets...
22- Dr A Rowe	Section 2.3 Historic Environment . Para 2.6	Support	The NPPF defines sustainable development as having 3 objectives: economic, social and environmental. Tree planting is considered an important aspect of environmental objective, but care should be taken within historic parks and gardens as they often contain rivers and streams that were modified in the past. The appearance and biodiversity of these important water features are reliant upon a good flow of clean water in our natural watercourses together with a water table at the level typically enjoyed in the past. Suggests that a priority for achieving sustainable development is to restore a flow of clean water to rivers and streams.	Support noted and welcomed. District Plan Policy HA8 Historic Parks and Gardens aims to protect these assets. Section 2 of the SPD emphasises the importance of taking into account local context and paragraph 2.6 specifically reiterates the importance of considering the historic context when making decisions about sustainability. The importance of preserving and enhancing water quality is addressed by District Plan Policy WAT3 Water Quality and the Water Environment and will be taken into account when assessing proposed development.	No amendment in response to this issue.
44 - Good	Section 2.3 Historic	Object	Modern movement in architecture in 1920s-30s produced a shift in design	Section 2.3 focusses on the balance between addressing sustainable	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
Architecture/ Transition Hertford	Environment		of buildings away from traditional construction techniques; this would not have been possible if today's policies were in place then. In order to meet net zero targets design of new development might not conform to traditional forms and previous construction techniques. Does East Herts Council have the imagination and design review skills in-house that could contemplate the notion that 'non-conformist' design can make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness (as required by NPPF paragraph 192[c]?)	design and construction and protecting the historic environment. It does not mean that new development must be 'traditional and conformist' but that it must consider its local context. This approach still allows for innovative, high quality design and innovation and excellence is encouraged throughout the SPD and demonstrated in the case studies.	
49- Hertford- shire Historic Gardens Trust	Section 2.3 Historic Environment , paragraph 2.6	Support	<p>Outlines that East Herts has many registered parks and gardens and other sites of importance, these are vulnerable to flooding and drought. Likewise ornamental water bodies are affected by changes to water supply due to climate change and housing developments, with low water levels, drying out and other issues.</p> <p>Concerned that park trees are vulnerable with species being affected by new pests and diseases as well as direct impact from climate changes. There needs to be</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>District Plan Policy HA8 Historic Parks and Gardens aims to protect these assets. Section 2 of the SPD emphasises the importance of taking into account local context and paragraph 2.6 specifically reiterates the importance of considering the historic context when making decisions about sustainability. This includes consideration of historic parks and gardens.</p> <p>The importance of preserving and enhancing water quality is addressed</p>	<p>Add text to the last sentence of paragraph 2.6:</p> <p>Where applicable, advice should be sought from the Council's conservation team or <u>other expert bodies such as Historic England, Hertfordshire County Council and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
			awareness that new tree planting in historic parks to act as a carbon capture measure could compromise the special character of parks and advice needs to be sought from Historic England or Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.	by District Plan Policy WAT3 Water Quality and the Water Environment and will be taken into account when assessing proposed development. Agrees it would be useful to clarify that advice can be sought from key bodies.	
65- Historic England	Section 2.3 Historic Environment , paras 2.6 and 2.7		<p>Pleased with section on Historic environment however do not think the SPD does enough to address the risks posed to the historic environment.</p> <p>Climate change can impact the historic environment and equally climate change mitigation and adaption responses can have negative impacts such as damage to historic fabric through poorly designed energy-saving measures. A sustainable approach should secure a balance between the benefits that such development delivers and the environmental costs it incurs. . The SPD should therefore seek to limit and mitigate any such cost to the historic environment.</p> <p>Many built heritage assets are given exemptions for compliance with Building Regulations (Part L), where compliance would unacceptably alter</p>	<p>The Council agrees that more information could be included in Section 2.3 about how to balance the delivery of sustainable design and construction and the protection of the historic environment.</p> <p>Additional text is included in the SPD to provide more detail. Also specific Historic England guidance, explaining how to tackle climate change and sustainability effectively, is signposted as further information.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.6 and divide in to two separate paragraphs for clarity as follows:</p> <p>East Herts' historic environment is one contextual issue that should <u>must</u> be taken into account to preserve the district's character and distinctiveness. <u>Climate Change can have a range of direct impacts on the historic environment, for example, accelerated weathering to building fabric, erosion of archaeological sites through severe weather and flooding and harm to historic landscapes or changes in vegetation patterns. Equally climate change mitigation and adaptation responses can also have unwelcome impacts</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
			<p>their character and appearance.</p> <p>Suggests using additional Historic England guidance to inform the SPD.</p>		<p><u>on the historic environment, such as damage to historic fabric through poorly designed energy-saving measures, or erosion of historic character through inappropriately located micro-generation equipment.</u></p> <p>East Herts has numerous listed building and conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, <u>areas of archaeological significance</u> and scheduled monuments. In accordance with national <u>legislation and policy</u> and the District Plan, proposals should... changing climate are <u>vital, but need to be balanced with measures to protect the likely to have important implications for the historic environment.</u> Yet the <u>significance and integrity of historic assets can be threatened by poorly designed interventions.</u> Where a historic asset or its setting may be affected, <u>careful consideration of the heritage context throughout</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		<p><u>the design process is key and the selection of and high quality design of measures is therefore fundamental...</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 2.7 as follows:</p> <p>Further guidance <u>Further information on climate change and the historic environment is available from Historic England-Historic England have further advice on how heritage assets can effectively mitigate and adapt to climate change. Further information is set out below:</u></p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/</p> <p><u>Energy efficiency and historic buildings:</u></p> <p>https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/</p> <p><u>Climate change and sustainability:</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
					https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/statements/statement-on-climate-change-and-sustainability/
74- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston NP Group	Section 2.3 Historic Environment		Support the statement on the historic environment. In Gilston historic landscapes are under threat and specific opportunities are not being recognised. Consider that given the importance of the Gilston GA1 policy, these should have a specific mention.	<p>The protection and enhancement of historic landscapes is addressed in District Plan policies HA1 Designated Heritage Assets, HA8 Historic Parks and Gardens and specifically in relation to Gilston in criteria o) of GA1 The Gilston Area.</p> <p>Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration, so will inform the decision-making process at Gilston. However, the SPD provides district-wide guidance about sustainable design and construction. It is not site specific so it would be inappropriate to mention specific landscapes at Gilston.</p> <p>Further consideration of landscape issues will be taken forward in the strategic and village masterplaning of the Gilston area.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
90- Herts County Council	Section 2.3 Historic Environment		The paragraph relates to visible, above ground, heritage assets, and in the main, to designated assets	Agreed that reference to assets of archaeological interest contribute to the character and distinctiveness of	Text inserted into paragraph 2.6 as follows:

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
	, para 2.6		<p>(listed buildings and conservation areas, historic parks and gardens and scheduled monuments are mentioned).</p> <p>East Hertfordshire also contains numerous below ground non-designated assets of archaeological interest, which equally contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the district. Some of these below ground historic assets are very significant and of equivalent importance to scheduled archaeological remains, such iron age, roman and saxon sites.</p> <p>Therefore recommend the guidance should also recognise explicitly that development, however well designed, may have an unsustainable impact on non-designated heritage assets. Should a development have potential to impact on any such remains an appropriate archaeological investigation should take place, as per NPPF para 189, and appropriate steps should be taken to mitigate the impact of development on the identified asset.</p>	the district and should be mentioned.	East Herts has numerous listed building and conservation areas, historic parks and gardens, <u>archaeological sites (scheduled and unscheduled)</u> and scheduled monuments.
105-	Section 2.3		Recommend adding links to specific	Agreed that reference to specific	Insert reference to specific

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
East Herts Green Party	Historic Environment , para 2.7		guidance, instead of Historic England generally, to make the guide more user friendly. Also suggest adding more case studies – there are lots of good examples in the district... e.g. Passivhaus in Tewin, playgroup building at St Joseph’s Catholic Primary School, Hertford.	guidance would be more user-friendly. The SPD is already lengthy and includes a number of case studies so further examples are not considered necessary.	Historic England guidance in paragraph 2.7 as follows: Further guidance Further information on climate change and the historic environment is available from Historic England-Historic England have further advice on how heritage assets can effectively mitigate and adapt to climate change. Further information is set out below: https://historicengland.org.uk/ Energy efficiency and historic buildings: https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/ Climate change and sustainability: https://historicengland.org.uk/whats-new/statements/statement-on-climate-change-and-sustainability/
45-	Section 2.4		Of the standards listed, Passivhaus is	The Council acknowledges the	No amendment in response

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
Good Architectu re/ Transition Hertford	Construction Standards, paragraph 2.8		the only realistic way to achieve zero carbon without massive renewable energy expansion coupled with significant investment in grid capacity. Furthermore, 'unregulated' energy used by appliances, etc., is accounted for, unlike the other standards listed.	benefits of Passivhaus, but wants to ensure the guidance is comprehensive and flexible. Therefore it is considered appropriate for a range of different construction standards to be listed.	to this issue.
54- Hertford & Ware Labour Party	Section 2.4 Construction Standards		The section rightly emphasises the need for consultation at an early stage with landscape, ecology, heritage, drainage, and transport professionals. Landscape advice should be incorporated into the planning process to inform the orientation of housing, rather than a condition agreed later. The proper use of tree shading to moderate temperatures cannot be usefully addressed at the end of the process.	Agreed, the SPD makes it clear that decisions about layout and landscaping should inform the sustainability of the scheme and not 'added on' at the end. Planning legislation allows the of use conditions. However, the requirement for applicants to submit a checklist will ensure the issues that inform the sustainability of a scheme will be considered up front, increasing transparency.	No amendment in response to this issue.
84- Herts County Council	Section 2.4 Construction Standards, Para 2.8		Paragraph 2.8: Suggest that BRE SMARTSite and SMARTWaste tools aid construction sites achieve their overall site performance and environmental site monitoring and should be referenced in the SPD. In particular, the SMARTWaste software is a great tool for construction site to report how they manage and reduce resource use,	The Council recognise these tools have value as possible standards to use and agree reference could be added in paragraph 2.8.	Add a bullet point to the end of paragraph 2.8 as follows: <u>BRE SMARTsite and SMARTwaste - online construction site monitoring and reporting tools that aim to improve environmental performance, by helping to manage and reduce resource use and waste outputs.</u>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			Design led approach		
			waste outputs. Will guide developers when delivering a Site Waste Management Plan or Circular Economy Statement, which will be a requirement within the Draft Waste Local Plan.		Further details are available on the BRE website: www.bregroup.com/products/bresmartsite/
140- Andrew Martin on behalf of Countryside Properties	Section 2.4 Construction Standards, Para 2.8	Object	<p>Countryside supports the broad purpose and topics set out in the SPD. And supports the commentary at paragraph 1.6 of the document which confirms the SPD cannot introduce new targets or standards that superseded the policies in the District Plan.</p> <p>However, in this context objects to paragraph 8 because it appears to impose a development management policy, against which future planning applications could be refused.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.8 should be amended to recognise that these construction standards are not mandatory: 'The Council encourage high quality sustainable development and recommend the use of construction standards to demonstrate excellence in sustainable development. <u>Where an applicant chooses to use such standards</u>, the latest version should be consulted</p>	<p>Whilst the SPD supports the use of construction standards, particular for large-scale new developments. The paragraph does not state the standards are mandatory because the Council recognises this is not legally compliant. Rather, the text states the Council <i>recommend</i> the use of construction standards.</p> <p>However, for clarity the words 'When used' will be added to the start of the second sentence.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.8 as follows: 'The Council encourages high quality, sustainable development and recommends the use of construction standards to demonstrate excellence in sustainable development. <u>When used</u>, the latest version of standards should be applied used and appropriate evidence must be submitted to demonstrate compliance.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
18- C Rowe	Section 3 Energy and Carbon Reduction	Object	Suggests wording is too weak. Guidance must be much more direct and backed up by clear targets stated as requirements.	<p>The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally, the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan.</p> <p>The Government commitment to increase energy efficiency using building regulations will help reduce the carbon emissions of new development. The requirement for submission of a qualitative checklist also provides a stronger implementation mechanism. Developers will have to consistently demonstrate how they have addressed each checklist criteria and submitted relevant evidence. This will provide greater transparency about if/how developments comply with, or exceed, policy across a range of environmental topics.</p> <p>However it is acknowledged that the wording could be strengthened in some places to emphasise the</p>	<p>Amend the text in the following paragraphs to strengthen the wording:</p> <p>Para 3.5: There are no mandatory targets included within the policy but <u>a reduction in emissions is required and achieving standards requirements</u> beyond the requirements of Building Regulations is encouraged.</p> <p>Para 3.37: <i>The use of onsite renewable technologies is <u>strongly encouraged to increase decrease</u> CO₂ emissions, particularly for those developments seeking to achieve net zero carbon developments.</i></p> <p>Para 3.42: <i>Another means of reducing <u>the</u> carbon emissions of buildings is considering <u>reducing</u> the carbon locked in construction materials</i></p> <p>Para. 3.47: <i>'...benchmarks that applicants are advised to <u>should work towards to</u></i></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
				importance of reducing carbon emissions and delivering renewable energy.	<i>address the national and local pledges to move towards net zero carbon'.</i>
46 - Good Architecture/ Transition Hertford	Section 3.1 Policy Context, para 3.5		Concerned that the District Plan Policies are too weak: -The lack of mandatory targets in Policy CC2 and 'encouragement' to achieve requirements beyond the requirements of Building Regulations is a fundamental flaw. -The lack of definition in policy DES4 of what constitutes zero and low carbon development and sustainable construction. Notwithstanding the reference to the RIBA Plan of Work in section 2.2 of the SPD, construction methods and 'procurement' will not often have been determined by the end of work stage 3, the point at which a planning application is made.	Note comments about the District Plan policies. The Council are committed to strengthening these in the District Plan review. It is recognised construction methods will not always have been determined at the planning stage, but commitment and opportunities for sustainable construction methods should be considered earlier in the process to enhance the sustainability of the scheme, even if details need to be confirmed at a later stage.	No amendment in response to this issue
86- Herts County Council	Section 3.1 Policy Context , para 3.13		A mention to Circular Economy Statements here would be welcomed as this covers the whole building life cycle. The district council could consider asking developers to provide life cycle assessments to ensure that sustainability is thought of throughout the whole development; during construction and operational phases.	Circular economy statements are referred to in sub-section '3.2.6 Sustainable Construction' (3.42) of this chapter and also in Section 9 of this SPD: Waste Management.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
47- Good Architectu re/ Transition Hertford	Section 3.2 Topic Guidance, paras 3.9- 3.50		<p>Sets out detailed topic comments to a number of paragraphs:</p> <p>- 3.9 Will East Herts Council ban the use of gas in new buildings?</p> <p>-3.10 The usefulness of the 'Energy Hierarchy' diagram (Figure 2) is limited by the lack of mandatory targets that define minimal energy use.</p> <p>- Supports text on passive solar gain but the diagrams are unnecessarily dogmatic. Seeks design to Passivhaus standards.</p> <p>-3.19 reference 'Provide thermal mass and storage' is dangerous because it could cause overheating. Supports mechanical ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) and natural ventilation.</p> <p>-3.21 Is there any evidence that green roofs and green walls reduce energy required to cool buildings? Fabric first approach.</p> <p>-3.22 Orientation and layout and a fabric first approach are equally important to reduce heating and</p>	<p>The Council cannot ban the use of gas in new buildings as this cannot be enforced by the planning system. However paragraphs 3.33 and 3.51 refer to the Government's intention to ban gas boilers.</p> <p>The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally, the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets or standards such as Passivhaus or a target for zero carbon, which would change District Plan policy requirement; otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan.</p> <p>The diagrams are to simply explain how the orientation of buildings affects solar gain. They are an illustration to portray a concept, but in practice many issues will inform orientation.</p> <p>Reference to thermal mass is caveated by risk of overheating, which makes it clear that this issue needs to be considered. Further</p>	<p>Add the following reference to paragraph 4.26:</p> <p><i>Green roofs and walls:</i> https://livingroofs.org/</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			<p>cooling energy demands.</p> <p>-3.23 and 3.28 The weakness here is that Building Regulations are not fit-for-purpose. Planning policy and the SPD would be more effective if the Passivhaus standard could be mandated.</p> <p>-3.24 and 3.27 are important</p> <p>Concerned that 'Low carbon' is not the same as 'zero carbon'. Burning fossil fuels in new development should not be allowed. The transition towards zero carbon should be mandatory.</p> <p>Adopting the approach set out in the LETI (2020).</p> <p>Climate Emergency Design Guide with performance and verification requirements would be much more effective.</p>	<p>detail about avoiding overheating is set out in Section 4 of the SPD Climate Change Adaptation.</p> <p>The SPD outlines in Section 3 and 4 that there are many design factors that influence heating and cooling. National and international research suggests that green roofs have cooling effects, particularly at combatting the heat Island effect. However, recognise a link to detail further guidance could usefully be added to the SPD.</p> <p>Building Regulations is a metric well understood by the industry, carbon reduction is commonly used by local planning authorities.</p>	
55- Hertford & Ware Labour Party	3.2 Topic guidance paras 3.48 and 3.50		<p>3.48 Landscape advice should be properly incorporated into planning rather than a condition to be agreed later.</p> <p>3.50 The statement that it is not a requirement to submit a reduction in household applications undermines the aim of the SPD. It is better to</p>	<p>The checklist should help ensure that decisions about how landscape design can help minimise and adapt to climate change, will be made earlier in the planning process.</p> <p>It is important for the SPD to explain household applications do not have</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.50 as follows: It is not a requirement to submit evidence of carbon reduction in household applications, but Retrofitting is important to ensuring all buildings contribute to</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			state what is encouraged first, then information that it is not a requirement.	to submit the checklist and statement because it provides clarity. However paragraph has been re-worded better for clarity.	carbon neutrality. <u>Submitting evidence of carbon reduction in household applications.</u> As such, applications to improve the sustainability of existing buildings/ extensions are encouraged, although it is not a requirement to do so. <u>As such, applications to improve the sustainability of existing buildings/ extensions are encouraged.</u>
66- Historic England	Section 3.2 Topic Guidance		<p>The SPD should mention that when considering energy efficiency measures the benefits of alternative options should be weighed carefully against the impact upon historic building, their character and their setting. Significant energy savings can be achieved in historic buildings without damaging alterations but the SPD does not make this clear. Small scale changes can result in improved Performance.</p> <p>A balanced well-informed approach is essential to upgrading historic buildings to reduce energy consumption. It is crucial that proposals are based on a 'whole</p>	The Council agrees that the SPD could include more detail about how sustainable design and construction should be considered in relation to the historic environment. Additional text has been included in section 2.3 of the SPD.	<p>Insert additional text to section 2.3 of the SPD as follows:</p> <p><u>Climate Change can have a range of direct impacts on the historic environment, for example, accelerated weathering to building fabric, erosion of archaeological sites through severe weather and flooding and harm to historic landscapes or changes in vegetation patterns. Equally climate change mitigation and adaptation responses can also have unwelcome impacts</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			house' approach. Would advise SPD makes reference to the need to understand historic fabric and make clear that standardised approaches or products may not always be suitable. Energy efficiency measures can have the opposite effect if inappropriately applied to historic buildings. It is important that historic assets are not seen a constraining factor, but as a valuable aid to achieving sustainable development. Encouraging the reuse of existing historic buildings and spaces can help achieve sustainable development. The SPD could recognise that the beneficial re-use of existing buildings is a sustainable approach in its own right.		<u>on the historic environment, such as damage to historic fabric through poorly designed energy-saving measures, or erosion of historic character through inappropriately located micro-generation equipment.....</u> Actions required to limit further damaging emissions and adapt to a changing climate are <u>vital and can be successfully achieved, but need to be balanced with measures to protect the likely to have important implications for the historic environment. Yet the significance and integrity of historic assets can be threatened by poorly designed interventions.</u> Where a historic asset or its setting may be affected, <u>careful consideration of the heritage context throughout the design process is key and the selection of and high quality, appropriate design of measures is therefore fundamental.</u> Where

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
					applicable, advice should be sought from the Council's conservation team or <u>other expert bodies such as Historic England, Hertfordshire County Council and Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.</u>
71- N. Cox	Section 3.2 Topic Guidance, paras 3.31- 3.39		Document fails to take into account high global warming potential (GWP) of the refrigerants commonly used in heat pumps and cooling equipment. UK government recommendations on the use of low GWP refrigerants are generally ignored. Please add the following refrigerant selection policy: 1. Only products with natural refrigerants (hydrocarbon, ammonia, CO2 or other natural refrigerants) will be selected. In cases where RAC products do not exist with natural refrigerants but with various low GWP refrigerants based on HFCs and HFOs, the selection criterion is: 2. Only products using refrigerants with a GWP of 675 or lower will be selected.	The level of refrigerants within technology is outside the requirements of planning permission so beyond the scope of this SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
87- Herts County	Section 3.2 Topic		Biomass Boilers are a useful source of renewable energy and tackle the	The Council acknowledges biomass boilers could have benefits but have	Insert the following text in Table 1, next to biomass

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
Council	guidance, Table 1 and para 3.51		<p>issue of energy alongside waste. It is felt as if they are displayed as a non-preferred option in a negative way. Although not suitable in some instances, perhaps the positives could be focused on?</p> <p>Suggest Site Waste Management Plans be included as a submission requirement?</p>	<p>reservations about air quality impacts. Will change the table to make it clear they are an option if air pollution issues can be overcome.</p> <p>Site Waste Management Plans are discussed in Section 9 of the SPD, so it is considered repetitive to discuss them in this section or include as a submission requirement.</p>	<p>boilers: <u>Yes. However....</u></p>
106- East Herts Green Party	Section 3.2 Topic guidance		<p>Set out a number of detailed comments: -3.2.3 Para 3.17: Site layout and building orientation- Advice is sound, but it highlights a contradiction in the local planning process: that at present details of the Landscape design are usually left as a condition at the approval stage of an application. However, for sustainable design – particularly in relation to controlling solar gain, optimal siting of renewable solar PV, use of shade for cooling spaces and use of trees or landscape to shelter buildings from prevailing wind - the design of the landscape should be considered in parallel to the building design and not left as a condition to be agreed later. The two must be designed together.</p> <p>Typos:</p>	<p>Noted that landscape is often dealt with by condition. However, the requirement to submit the sustainability checklist, which includes criteria which raise the importance of layout, orientation and landscaping for sustainable design (notably criteria En.2, CA.1, CA.2), should ensure that these issues are addressed earlier in the planning process.</p> <p>Noted other dense vegetation may also help with CO₂ absorption and trapping particles, but consider it is unnecessarily detailed to provide specific figures.</p> <p>Typos noted and will be corrected.</p> <p>The Passivhaus fact box references the Passivhaus website, this is</p>	<p>Para 3.18- replace eve with eave</p> <p>Para 3.37- replace increase' with 'decrease'</p> <p>Insert following text with paragraph 3.21: <u>Trees and other vegetation</u> can also help...</p> <p>Amend para 3.48 as follows: The zero carbon agenda is an evolving area which future planning policies will need to address in order to address the Council's declaration to aim for carbon neutrality across the district by 2030. <u>Future planning policies will need to address the reduction in carbon</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			<p>-3.18 'eve' misspelt – eave? 3.37 'increase' CO2 emissions -3.21 Most vegetation, not just trees as stated, trap particles of pollution. Should provide specific figures to convince developers. Section 3.28: Could add a reference to The Passivhaus Handbook, Janet Cotterell and Adam Dadeby, (Green Books). 3.24 para 3.30 could provide examples of "Low carbon technologies" 3.2.7 Para 3.48 opening sentence is confusing - the words 'agenda' and 'evolving' don't aid clarity. Suggest wording "This council has a declared aim to be carbon neutral by 2030, a policy that is matched by most other councils in the UK, and follows the UK Government's own declaration of Climate Emergency and of its own aggressive carbon reduction goals. To meet these goals nationally and locally, future planning policies will need to address the reduction in carbon emissions. "</p> <p>3.48 wording is confusing, would be clearer to say: "The definition of net zero carbon is evolving ⁽¹⁷⁾ - from</p>	<p>considered sufficient to signpost applicants to further information.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.31- 3.36 refer to specific low carbon technologies, e.g. CHP or heat pumps (although heat is renewable often require a pump to operate the system so can still have carbon emissions).</p> <p>Agree wording of paragraph 3.48, 3.49 and 3.50 could be refined to provide clarity.</p> <p>Agree the definition of operational energy in paragraph 3.48 is confusing, propose amended wording.</p>	<p><u>emissions. This Council has a declared aim to be carbon neutral by 2030, a policy that is matched by most other councils in the UK, and follows the UK Government's own declaration of Climate Emergency and of its own carbon reduction goals.....</u></p> <p><u>Proposed changes to building regulations will significantly help reduce emissions. However, the definition of net zero carbon varies is evolving, but there is a growing direction of travel⁽¹⁷⁾ from looking at net zero carbon- considering it simply in terms of emissions controlled regulated by building regulations at during the construction of a building stage, towards achieving to net zero carbon in terms of the whole life carbon of a building's carbon emissions over its whole life-cycle, which effectively includes... Operational energy- Energy required to run a building during its entire design life</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<p>Energy and Carbon reduction</p> <p><i>considering it simply in terms of emissions controlled by building regulations at the construction stage, to net zero in terms of a building's carbon emissions over its whole life-cycle, which includes:"</i></p> <p>3.49 confusing wording - "In light of this emerging agenda" should be replaced with "<i>in light of growing efforts to cut carbon emissions</i>"</p> <p>3.50 better not to begin "Retrofitting is important to ensure all buildings contribute to carbon neutrality. Submitting evidence of carbon reduction in household applications to improve the sustainability of existing buildings/ extensions is strongly encouraged, although it is not a requirement to do so."</p> <p>In the Operational Energy para, the definition used is confusing. Should say: "Operational Energy - energy required during the entire service life of a structure such as lighting, heating, cooling, and ventilating systems; and operating building appliances.</p>		<p>buildings are supplied 100% renewable energy and operate fossil free (including all unregulated energy such as lighting and appliances)</p> <p>Amend para 3.49 as follows:</p> <p>However, in light of this emerging agenda <u>growing efforts to cut carbon emissions.</u></p> <p>Amend para 3.50 as follows:</p> <p>It is not a requirement to submit evidence of carbon reduction in household applications, but <u>Retrofitting is important to ensuring all buildings contribute to carbon neutrality. Submitting evidence of carbon reduction in household applications As such, applications to improve the sustainability of existing buildings/ extensions are strongly encouraged, although it is not a requirement to do so.</u></p>
120- David Lock on	3.2 Topic guidance		Support the approach in para 3.4, that mandatory carbon reduction	Support for text noted and welcomed.	Amend paragraph 3.37 as follows:

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
behalf of Tarmac	paragraphs 3.4, 3.10, 316, 3.37		<p>targets should be guided by government policy/ legislation and reference to the energy hierarchy in paragraph 3.10.</p> <p>Support approach to Passive design: and the promotion of on-site renewable technologies as part of new development (at paragraph 3.37) However, the use of renewable technologies should be considered on a site-by-site basis and potentially on a phased basis, for strategic sites delivered over a long period of time, where technological changes and innovation are inevitable. Their use should also be considered in the context of wider visual and ecological impacts which could result from their use. The use of such technologies should not compromise the deliverability of site allocations Tarmac consider that reference to the Hertfordshire Renewable and Low Carbon Study (2010) in paragraph 3.37 and Table 1 is outdated and should be deleted.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that applications are determined on a site-by site basis so local context is important. Paragraph 3.39 of the SPD acknowledges that renewable are not always feasible and viable.</p> <p>The information in the Hertfordshire and Low Carbon Study is still relevant, so the evidence has value. However, the Council recognise that innovation in this industry means that new technologies and approaches are constantly evolving and reference to the study shouldn't restrict the approach that applicants' progress. As such additional text is added to reiterate that all technologies and innovation will be considered.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that <u>the suitability of technologies may change over time and</u> new technologies may also be developed, so the Council will also consider all proposals on their merit. alternative proposals if relevant.</p>
141- Andrew Martin Planning on behalf	Section 3.2 Topic guidance, para 3.31		Draft SPD encourages the use of alternative heating systems to gas boilers. However, it also places considerable emphasis on heat pumps as a generally more energy	The Council agrees that the SPD should avoid being too technology specific so will amend text accordingly.	Amend paragraph 3.31 as follows: Gas boilers make a large contribution to the 14% of UK

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
of Countryside			<p>efficient method of heating. Countryside objects to the emphasis placed on heat pumps on the basis that the SPD should not be or seek to be technology specific. Other alternative heating systems, such as electric boilers or solar thermal panels, may be appropriate or preferable on new development sites.</p> <p>To avoid being technology specific, the third sentence in paragraph 3.31 should be amended to read: 'Alternative heating systems are therefore encouraged, which could include (but are not limited to) electric boilers, solar thermal panels, heat pumps or other energy efficient systems'</p>		<p>greenhouse gas emissions from homes. <u>The Government intend to exclude gas boilers from new homes by 2025.</u> Alternative heating systems are therefore encouraged, such as heat pumps, <u>which could include (but are not limited to) electric boilers, solar thermal panels, heat pumps or other energy efficient systems.</u></p>
166- S. Landon	Section 3.2 Topic Guidance		<p>The Council's policies to promote zero and low carbon development are to be welcomed. However more needs to be done to ensure policies are not just a wish list that can be ignored or side tracked. As far as possible mandatory legislation must be introduced to ensure compliance. In just a few years there has been a massive increase in new developments in East Herts, there is little evidence that the majority of</p>	<p>The Council recognises the value of mandatory targets. However, legally, the SPD is subordinate to the adopted District Plan (2018). It cannot introduce new compulsory targets that would change District Plan policy requirement otherwise the Council could be at risk from legal challenge. Targets and standards will be considered in the review of the District Plan.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			<p>this has been built sustainably. Concerned that most of these rely on infrastructure in existing villages, encouraging car dependency. Concerned about the lack of solar panels on new developments in East Herts</p> <p>Policies 3.16 - 3.53 and Passive House standards are not just desirable, they're essential and no planning permissions should be granted for anything less.</p>	<p>The Government commitment to increase energy efficiency using building regulations will help reduce the carbon emissions of new development. The requirement for submission of a qualitative checklist also provides a stronger implementation mechanism. Developers will have to consistently demonstrate how they have addressed each checklist criteria and submitted relevant evidence. This will provide greater transparency about if/how developments comply with, or exceed, policy across a range of environmental topics.</p>	
172- Env Agency	Section 3.2 Topic Guidance, para. 3.38		<p>Welcome the principle of contacting the Environment Agency to check if a permit/licence is needed (or if the site is indeed suitable in the first instance) for water and ground source heat pumps has been established.</p>	Support noted and welcomed	No amendment in response to this issue.
34- Sworders	Section 3.3 Submission Requirements	Object	<p>Considers the requirement to complete a carbon reduction template and provide detailed emission rate excessive and unreasonable. It is considered unreasonable for the SPD to require detailed emission calculations that go above and beyond Building</p>	<p>Policy CC2 states that all new development should demonstrate how carbon dioxide emissions will be minimised across the development site and encourages standards above building control. The carbon template is one of the tools (alongside the checklist and</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.51 as follows (from the third bullet point): <u>Full and reserved matters planning applications</u> evidence this reduction with a summary of the calculations should submit the carbon</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			Regulation standards.	<p>sustainable construction, energy and water statement) for demonstrating compliance with policy CC2.</p> <p>A percentage reduction in CO2 emissions from existing building regulations is a standard metric used frequently across the industry and by many local planning authorities to measure the energy performance of new buildings. The Council recognises the SPD cannot introduce new, mandatory targets so does not require applicants to secure a particular level of improvement above building regulations. Therefore it is not onerous. Rather the template provides a transparent way of reporting how a building relates to building regulations (which is already submitted by many applicants already) and therefore shows how it is minimising energy in line with Policy CC2. It is one part of a wider overview of how an applicant is minimising emissions in line with the energy hierarchy, so helps the Council assess the scheme. Each application will be judged on its own merits and it is accepted in some circumstances simply meeting current regulations is acceptable.</p>	<p>reduction template in Appendix B, as an appendix to <u>part of the ScEW Statement. This must: Whilst there is no mandatory target in Policy CC2, developers are expected to minimise carbon emissions. Comparison to existing building regulations is a common metric used in the industry and is a useful tool for quantifying how a development performs in terms of its carbon emissions (see table 2 of this SPD for examples). Alongside details about proposed measures in the checklist and the statement, it will help increase transparency and provide the Council with more understanding of how a development is addressing carbon reduction. The carbon reduction template should:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Be applied to each unit type or residential building envelope proposed as part of a development. -Use the Target Emission Rate (TER) and Dwelling Emission Rate (DER)/ Building Emission

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
				<p>However, given that in 2022 the current regulations will be updated to reduce emissions by 31%, it is becoming increasingly important that applicants need to be looking beyond the current regulations.</p> <p>The Council does agree that the submission of data for all units is onerous, so proposes the template is only completed for building/ dwelling types for full/ reserved matter applications. Only major development needs to submit samples of data.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.51 will be amended to explain the role of the carbon reduction template and to clarify when/ how it should be used.</p>	<p>Rate for non-domestic (BER), derived from the calculations carried out for Building Regulations compliance (Part L).</p> <p><u>-Major development should include sample or estimates of Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP)³ calculations appended to the Carbon Reduction template as evidence of compliance. It is recommended that SAP 10 carbon intensity figures are used, to take account of the decarbonisation of electricity. Applicants should be mindful of Government's intention to ban gas boilers in new homes from 2025.</u></p> <p>-Calculations should be shown relative to existing Part L regulations, so it is clear <u>if, and</u> how well, the development performs above building regulations.</p>
121- David Lock on behalf of	Section 3.3 Submission Requiremen		Consider that the requirement for outline planning applications to be accompanied by a Sustainable	On reflection the Council agrees it is onerous for outline applications to submit the carbon reduction	Amend paragraph 3.51 as follows:

³ SAP is the assessment procedure required by Part L of Building Regulations.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
Tarmac	ts.		Construction, Energy and Water Statement, which includes a completed carbon reduction template is unduly onerous and the template is inappropriate at the outline application stage. This level of detail will simply not be available at this stage in the planning process. The wording of the last bullet point to paragraph 3.51 should therefore be amended as follows: The Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement <u>and checklist must be submitted for outline applications. Detailed and Reserved Matters applications should be supported by a (including carbon reduction template) and checklist must be submitted for outline applications.</u>	template when all the detail may not be available at that stage.	<u>Full and reserved matters planning applications evidence this reduction with a summary of the calculations should submit the carbon reduction template in Appendix B,.....</u> <u>-Outline applications do not need to submit a carbon reduction template but in the Sustainable construction, Energy and Water Statement should set out the level of carbon reduction the scheme is aiming for and how this will be achieved. A carbon reduction template will then be required at the reserved matters stage.</u> -
183-Bishop's Stortford Climate Group	Section 3.3 Submission Requirements		Will look to see that the following provisions stick through into the final SPD and are then complied with: The requirement for developers to submit a Sustainable construction, Energy and Water (ScEW) Statement, including carbon calculations using SAP emission factors, which should provide complete clarity over the carbon emissions consequences of their design choices, which can then be compared to the advisory	Noted. Both provisions remain within the SPD	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction benchmarks in Table 2. The expectation that developers should provide evidence of the costs of the design options appraised (3.13); justification for any statement that renewable and low carbon technologies are not possible on site (3.39); and consideration of the technical feasibility of site-wide approaches to energy provision (3.40).		
107- East Herts Green Party	Section 3.3 Submission Requiremen ts		The use of the checklist approach is excellent and strongly supported, as is the requirement for better clarity in energy efficiency improvement over Part L.	Support noted and welcomed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
142- Andrew Martin Planning on behalf of Countryside	Section 3.3 Submission Requiremen ts, Para 3.51		Countryside supports the objectives behind the submission requirements however objects to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The checklist should be added to the validation checklist. East Herts Council will need to update and republish its Local Validation Requirements list. On large residential-led sites, where a particular house type may be used on multiple plots, there is no benefit in requiring the carbon reduction template to be applied to each unit. 	The Council is planning to update its local validation checklist to add the sustainability checklist. Support for the principle of the checklist and carbon reduction template is welcomed. The Council acknowledges that the template is onerous in its current form and should be simplified to apply to unit type and only require sample or estimates of SAP calculations.	Amend paragraph 3.51 (and appendix B) as follows: -Be applied to each unit or unit type or residential building envelope proposed as part of the development Be applied to each unit or unit type or residential building envelope proposed as part of a development. -Use the Target Emission Rate (TER) and Dwelling Emission

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<p>Energy and Carbon reduction</p> <p>Instead it would be more appropriate to require the carbon reduction template to be applied to each unit type.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirement to produce Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) calculations at the planning application stage is onerous, given that these would normally be completed later on in the design process. It would be more appropriate to request that samples or estimates of SAP calculations are provided at the planning stage. <p>Paragraph 3.51 of the draft SPD also should be amended to read: 'Be applied to each unit type or residential building envelope proposed as part of a development Include samples or estimates of Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) calculations appended to the Carbon Reduction template as evidence of compliance.'</p>		<p>Rate (DER)/ <u>Building Emission Rate for non-domestic (BER)</u>, derived from the calculations carried out for Building Regulations compliance (Part L). Major development should include samples <u>or estimates</u> of Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) calculations appended to the Carbon Reduction template as evidence of compliance.</p>
183-Bishop's Stortford Climate Change	Section 3.3 Submissions requirements		<p>Will keenly look to see that the following provisions remain in final SPD and are complied with:</p> <p>-The requirement for developers to</p>	Comments noted. The references mentioned remain in the SPD	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
Group			<p>submit a Sustainable construction, Energy and Water (ScEW) Statement, including carbon calculations using SAP emission factors, which should provide complete clarity over the carbon emissions consequences of their design choices, which can then be compared to the advisory benchmarks in Table 2.</p> <p>-The expectation that developers should provide evidence of the costs of the design options appraised (3.13);</p> <p>- justification for any statement that renewable and low carbon technologies are not possible on site</p> <p>-consideration of the technical feasibility of site-wide approaches to energy provision (3.40).</p>		
108- East Herts Green Party	Section, 3.4 Checklist, para 3.53		<p>Concerned that the following phrase is unclear: "The level of detail submitted needs to be proportionate to the scale of application."</p> <p>Could lead to confusion in what is required. Can it be stated more clearly what precisely is required?</p>	<p>The requirement for detail to be proportionate to the scale of application means that the amount of information submitted with a planning application should reflect the scale and significance of the application.</p> <p>The Council does not want to be overly prescriptive to allow flexibility to take account of the site specific circumstances. However, it is agreed that 'proportionate' could be</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.51 as follows:</p> <p>The level of detail submitted needs to be proportionate to the scale of application. <u>This statement is explained in Appendix A: the combined checklist. Is included in Appendix A.</u></p> <p>Add guidance text to Appendix A- see proposed</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
				explained in more detail. More guidance about how to complete the checklist has been included in Appendix A and para 3.51.	amendment to rep 118
151- Pigeon	Section 3.4 Energy and Carbon Reduction Checklist		<p>Concerned about the distinction between requirements for an outline and detailed application. Raises a number of comments about checklist criteria:</p> <p>En.1 – Carbon reduction calculations should be addressed at the Reserved Matters stage of the process. The SPD, as currently drafted, seeks a level and detail of information that is unnecessary, inappropriate and disproportionate to the requirements of an outline application submission.</p> <p>En.2- The local validation requirement in relation to a Sustainable Design and Construction Statement is considered proportionate in relation to the Council's adopted policies as referenced. The draft SPD, in contrast, seeks a far greater level of detail and places a higher demand of standards to be achieved than adopted policy requires. Should not be applicable to outline applications.</p>	<p>The checklist requires applicants to consistently and transparently demonstrate how their proposals meet the plan policies. The SPD recognises that each application will be considered on its own merits.</p> <p>Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD); the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.</p> <p>En.1- The Council acknowledges that the template is more applicable to full and reserved planning applications. Therefore outline applications will not need to submit a carbon reduction statement.</p>	<p>Amend the last bullet of para 3.51 as follows:</p> <p>The Sustainable construction, Energy and Water Statement (including carbon reduction template) and checklist must be submitted for outline applications. Outline applications do not need to submit a carbon reduction template but in the Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement should set out the level of carbon reduction the scheme is aiming for and how this will be achieved. A carbon reduction template will then be required at the reserved matters stage.</p> <p>Delete checklist criteria En.3:</p> <p>What proportion of the total number of buildings, are orientated to secure optimum solar gain? (East-</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			<p>En.3- Provides no indication about what proportion is acceptable to the Council. The SPD should be clearer on how it will assess detailed schemes and what its quantum expectations are in respect to the orientation of buildings to secure optimum solar gain.</p> <p>En.4- Matters for detailed applications, not outline proposals. Notwithstanding, it is considered that this requirement lies outside of the scope of policies contained within the East Herts District Plan 2018 and covered by Building Regulations</p> <p>En.5- Needs to be a distinction between what is required at detailed and outline stage. Also need to provide clearer guidance as to what the Council considers to be successful integration. Perhaps a worked example(s) in the SPD would be helpful?</p> <p>En.6- is to be a requirement of a detailed planning application submission then the SPD needs to provide clearer guidance as to what</p>	<p>En.2- The Council disagrees that the SPD goes beyond the Policy requirements of the District Plan. It does not introduce new mandatory targets, but provides additional guidance to help support the implementation of the District Plan policies relating to how to reduce carbon emissions in new development. It encourages developers to go beyond the current policies but does not mandate.</p> <p>En.3 – Agree delete- too simplistic and not clear how officers will be able to determine an appropriate proportion in practice. More effective and logical to consider solar orientation as part of criteria En.2</p> <p>En.4- Relates to requirements of District Plan Policy CC2 to minimise carbon dioxide in accordance with the energy hierarchy.</p> <p>En.5 and 6- The SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets so does not set out a prescriptive approach. The applicant should use the principles, case studies and references to demonstrate how their proposal can help address the issue</p>	West Axis)

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Energy and Carbon reduction		
			the Council considers to be an acceptable level of reduction of the energy embodied in construction materials.	and meet the requirements of District Plan Policy CC2.	

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
56 Hertford & Ware Labour Party	Section 4.1 Policy Context		No mention of the Council's aim to be carbon neutral in nine years. Should be addressed immediately.	The Council's aim to be carbon neutral by 2030 is set out at in the first paragraph of the SPD.	No amendment proposed in response to this issue
57- Hertford & Ware Labour Party	Section 4.1 Policy Context		Pushes changes into the future. No acknowledgement that weather hazards mentioned are continuing to increase, this distancing language does not bring change urgently.	Agree wording could be more proactive.	Amend paragraph 4.1 as follows: The changing climate means the UK will <u>needs</u> to adapt to extreme rainfall events, warmer, wetter winters and hotter, drier summers.
109 East Herts Green Party	Section 4.1 Policy Context, para 4.1		This part of the sentence is unclear and inaccurate. For increased clarity it should say: "The incidence of dangerous events such as heatwaves, flooding and droughts is already increasing..."	Agreed wording add clarity.	Amend paragraph 4.1 as follows: <u>incidence of</u> hazards such as heatwaves, flooding and droughts is will increasing and it is essential the built

4.					
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Climate Change Adaptation Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
					environment is adapted to increase resilience to such events.
137- Hertford Town Council	Section 4.1 Policy Context		Change the wording from 'will increase' to 'is already increasing'. Section on green roofs and walls referred to 'certain standards to be met'. It would be helpful if the document listed these.	Agreed word should be changed from will to 'is'. Unclear what the 'certain standards to be met' comment is referring too. Reference to living roofs has been added to paragraph 4.24 for additional guidance.	Amend paragraph 4.1 as follows: <u>incidence of hazards</u> such as heatwaves, flooding and droughts is will increasing and it is essential the built environment is adapted to increase resilience to such events.
48- Good Architectu re/ Transition Hertford	Section 4.2 Topic Guidance, 4.2.2 overheating, paras. 4.12- 4.15		Raises a number of detailed comments about the overheating section: -Promotes the Passivhaus standard as it ensures minimal cooling energy demands avoiding conventional air conditioning. -Questions if green roofs aid cooling, except if construction below is inadequately insulated. Asks about evidence -Passive stack ventilation as described in para 4.15 should not be necessary, and would likely result in	The Council recognises the value of Passivhaus and promotes it in sections 2 and 3 of the SPD. However, it cannot be included as a mandatory target. A range of design options are discussed, to allow for flexibility. Passive stack ventilation is simply discussed as one potential. The SPD outlines in Section 3 and 4 that there are many design factors that influence heating and cooling. National and international research	No amendment proposed in response to this issue

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			<p>an unacceptable heat loss in the heating season through thermal bridges and air leakage.</p> <p>Further guidance.</p> <p>- agree CIBSE TM52 and TM59 provide very useful guidance.</p>	<p>suggests that green roofs have cooling effects, particularly at combatting the heat Island effect.</p> <p>Living roofs is a useful source of information.</p>	
75- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston Neighbour-hood Plan Group	Section 4.2 Topic Guidance, 4.2 Green Infrastructure, paras 4.21 and 4.24, Section 4.2.4 SuDs		<p>Welcomes the importance of green infrastructure but would like mention of green infrastructure being managed in the future. Green infrastructure should be transferred to the community with a suitable endowment, would like this omission addressed.</p> <p>Welcomes green walls and roofs but they need to be planted to increase pollinators.</p> <p>SuD's value as green infrastructure is not made clear. Needs a developer funded endowment to ensure they are maintained. Amendments should be made accordingly.</p>	<p>The Council recognises that the maintenance of green infrastructure is an important issue so has included reference</p> <p>However detailed discussion about management arrangements are outside the scope of this SPD. See the officer response to rep 81 for more detail on this issue</p> <p>Paragraph 4.20 refers to the multi-functional nature of green infrastructure. The ecological value of green walls/ roofs and SuDs are addressed in section 7 (biodiversity) of this SPD</p>	<p>Insert a new sentence at the end of 4.20: <u>For Green Infrastructure to function effectively in the long-term, it is also essential that an appropriate management strategy is put in place.</u></p>
122- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac	Section 4,2 Topic Guidance, 4.2.1 Green Infrastructure, para 4.21		<p>Support reference to the importance of multifunctional greenspace but express concern regarding the proposed selection of new tree planting solely based on their ability to provide benefits for climate</p>	<p>Agree that the suggested amendment effectively promotes biodiversity and climate change resilience.</p> <p>Support for green roofs and walls</p>	<p>Amend para 4.21 as follows: <u>effects of sunlight. The choice of planting stock should seek to promote biodiversity and reflect local provenance as</u></p>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			<p>adaptation, as proposed at paragraph</p> <p>4.21. Consider paragraph 4.21 should be amended as follows to reflect benefits to biodiversity as well as climate change: effects of sunlight. <u>The choice of planting stock should seek to promote biodiversity and reflect local provenance as well as resilience to the predicted effects of climate change in the locality, utilising adaptation measures, such as those evidenced by the Forestry Commission. The preference will be to, where it is essential....</u></p> <p>The SPDs encouragement towards the use of green roof and walls, where possible is supported, where this would not unduly impact the deliverability of development.</p>	welcomed.	<u>well as resilience to the predicted effects of climate change in the locality, utilising adaptation measures, such as those evidenced by the Forestry Commission. The preference will be to, where it is essential....</u>
92- Herts County Council	Section 4.4 Checklist		There are a number of questions in the checklist that are presented as 'closed' questions, such as: CA2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? It would appear that the applicant can simply answer yes and not demonstrate the	<p>Agreed with that checklist CA.2 should be amended to an open question.</p> <p>Open questions are generally preferred unless the checklist criteria, is asking if particular</p>	Amend checklist criteria CA.2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? <u>How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to address it?</u>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			conclusions of such a study. Perhaps these questions should be presented as How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to tackle/combat?	information, such as SuDs details have been submitted.	
110- East Herts Green Party	Section 4.2 Topic Guidance, 4.2.2 Overheating		<p>Sets out the following minor wording changes:</p> <p>-Para 4.8 The SPD states what's happening now but doesn't give any idea of the magnitude of the issue going forward: You could add the fact that the: "UK Government's Committee for Climate Change predicts that without action, the number of people dying as a result of heat is expected to reach 7,000 a year by 2040."</p> <p>4.9 should say: "The 'urban heat island effect' is a phenomenon whereby urban temperatures are higher than the surrounding rural areas due to heat being stored <u>within the solid materials of urban areas, such as concrete, tarmac, and slate, during daytime and then released slowly.</u>"</p> <p>4.13 should read: "use of green roofs, and trees and vegetation for shading and evaporative cooling."</p> <p>4.14 should say: ""Figure 6 shows how roof design and planting of vegetation can reduce solar glare</p>	<p>It is considered that paragraph 4.8 outlines the significant impact of overheating and additional text is unnecessary.</p> <p>Agrees with other proposed wording changes, except with regard to para 4.24- information about panels heating up is too detailed.</p> <p>In terms of reference to the passivhaus book and landscaping condition, see the officer response to rep106.</p>	<p>Amend para 4.9 as follows: <u>stored within the solid materials of urban areas, such as concrete, tarmac, and slate, during daytime and then released slowly. And 'trapped' within building structures.</u></p> <p>Amend 4.13 as follows: use of green roofs, <u>and trees and vegetation for shading</u> and evaporative cooling</p> <p>Add to para 4.14: <u>and heating by direct sunlight</u></p> <p>Add text to para. 4.17: <u>Mechanical ventilation with Heat Recovery systems</u></p> <p>Amend 4.22: <u>sunlight (HR)</u></p> <p>Amend 4.23: integral <u>integrated</u></p>

4.	Climate Change Adaptation				
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			<p><u>and heating by direct sunlight</u>, whilst still allowing in daylight and warmth from the sun.”</p> <p>4.15: “natural air” – presumably this means “fresh air”</p> <p>4.17 There is no mention of Mechanical ventilation with Heat Recovery systems.</p> <p>4.19 References: could add The PassivHaus Handbook, J Cotterell and A Dadeby 2012 (Green Books)</p> <p>4.20 Advice is sound but highlights a contradiction in the local planning process that at present details of the Landscape design and green infrastructure are usually left as a condition at the approval</p> <p>4.22 should state “protect from sunlight (IR)” since the predominant heating in sunlight is not UV light, it is from infrared portion of the spectrum.</p> <p>4.23 should read “or integrated”</p> <p>4.24 Add that solar panels efficiency falls as they heat up, since this explains why a green roof nearby can help keep them efficient even on hot days.</p> <p>‘biosolar roofs’ means “green planting” – wording should be swapped for clarity. Could add a reference to explain biosolar roofs:</p>		<p>Add reference to: <u>Green planting and www.livingroof.org</u></p> <p><u>Amend 4.27: Climate change will is increasing</u></p>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			eg https://livingroofs.org/ Para 4.27 should read "Climate change is already increasing..."		
124 - DLA on behalf of Tarmac	Section 4.2 , 4.2.4 SUDs		Tarmac support the promotion of sustainable urban drainage (SuDS) systems to manage surface water run-off, as set out in section 4.2.4 of the SPD. The illustrative masterplan for BGS has been informed by a sustainable design-led approach, incorporating a range of SuDS.	Support noted and welcomed	
123- DLA on behalf Tarmac	Section 4.3 Submission Req		<p>Tarmac supports the requirement for all applications to be accompanied by a Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement, in principle. However, consider that the level of detail contained within any such Statement should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the application.</p> <p>Tarmac considers that any overheating assessments should only be required where necessary and in support of detailed and Reserved Matters applications. Any requirement for such an assessment to be submitted as part of an outline planning application is considered by Tarmac to be inappropriate. Tarmac suggest that the SPD should provide the following clarification within</p>	<p>The Sustainability SPD sets out that the level of detail should be proportionate to the scale and type of application.</p> <p>Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD); the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD requires that overheating is assessed in line with</p>	<p>Amend checklist criteria CA.2:</p> <p>Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? <u>How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to address it?</u></p>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			<p>paragraph 4.29 and the checklist criteria CA.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant checklist criteria below relating to climate change adaption have been considered and explained. Any overheating assessments and Green Infrastructure plans and proposals are explained. • <u>Full applications or reserved matters applications for major development (10 dwellings and over) should submit an overheating assessment.</u> 	<p>District Plan Policy CC1 but it does not mandate a heating assessment for a particular scale or type of development. As such checklist CA.2 will be changed to an open question so that applicants have to explain and justify their approach.</p> <p>A formal overheating assessment may be appropriate. The good home checklist in paragraph 4.19 is recommended as a useful tool for assessing overheating risk.</p>	
143- Andrew Martin on behalf of Countryside	4.2 Topic Guidance, 4.2.3 Green Infra		To be consistent with Policy CC1 of the District Plan, paragraph 4.24 should be amended to read: 'Where feasible and appropriate, the Council encourages the integration of green roofs and walls into buildings, as they have many benefits that enhance resilience to climate change'. While paragraph 7.31 should be amended to read: 'Where feasible and appropriate, the Council encourages the incorporation of green or brown roofs into development'.	It is recognised green roofs and walls are not always appropriate so agree with suggested amendment.	Amend para. 4.24 as follows: <u>Where feasible and appropriate, the Council...</u>
162- S. Chapman	Section 4.2, Topic guidance,		Suggests that hedges as well as trees trap particles. They are also homes to many species of bird. The loss of	The retention of existing green infrastructure is supported in paragraph 4.21 and checklist criteria	Add hedgerows to paragraph 3.21:

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
	4.2.3 Green Infra		hedgerows is significant in many existing developments (with mature hedges replaced by fencing) and some attempt should be made to quantify this loss and to put in place measures to combat it. Why not find ways to encourage provision of hedges? There should also be a focus on existing mature trees and shrubs, developers should be mandated to keep them.	CA.4 Agree reference to hedgerow should be added to para 3.21	Trees <u>and hedgerows</u> can also help with CO ₂ absorption
163- Sue Landon	Section 4.2, Topic guidance, 4.2.4 SuDs		Climate change causes extremes of weather resulting in both drought and flooding conditions. It is vital that flood alleviation schemes, SUDs, and water harvesting systems can collect and store quantities of excess water during times of flooding so it can be used in times of drought. Natural woodland, ancient trees and vegetation do contribute hugely to managing and stabilizing the climate. They also play an essential role in protecting soil structures from erosion. It is vital therefore that our countryside and natural existing environment is given full protection and new development can enrich it further. No mature trees should be felled since their contribution cannot be replaced with younger trees.	The importance of SUDs is acknowledged in the SPD and water harvesting systems are promoted in section 5 of the SPD. Paragraph 4.21 seeks to retain mature trees and this is reiterated in the checklist: CA.4- How have existing features such as trees / woodlands and hedgerows been protected and incorporated within a green infrastructure network?	No amendment in response to this issue

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2-V Glover-Ward	Section 4.2.4 SUDs	Support	Concerned the SPD does not reference that developments should not be built on existing flood plains or that developments should not be increasing the risk of flooding in existing buildings due to additional drainage requirements.	<p>The role of flood risk in the site allocation process is outside the scope of this SPD. District Plan Policy WAT1 Flood Risk and East Herts Strategic Flood Risk Assessment direct development away from areas of the high risk.</p> <p>Policy WAT1 Flood Risk Management is referenced for context in paragraph 4.4.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.28 outlines the importance of SuDs for ensuring development will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.</p>	No amendment proposed in response to this issue
173- Env Agency	Section 4.2 Topic guidance		<p>We would advise that Policy WAT1 is also included within the District Plan policies here. Rivers and fluvial flood risk should be taken into account and included as an important facet of climate change adaption.</p> <p>4.2.3 – We would advise that you make reference to blue infrastructure as well as green infrastructure.</p> <p>4.7 – We are pleased to see that tackling flood risk in collaboration with the Environment Agency and</p>	<p>The SPD recognises in paragraph 4.7 that fluvial flood risk is an impact of climate change. District Plan Policy WAT1 is referenced for context in paragraph 4.4, but could also be included in paragraph 4.27 for clarity.</p> <p>However, the Council considers this is adequately addressed by the District Plan and East Herts Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Therefore it was not a priority to incorporate detailed</p>	<p>Amend para 4.27 as follows:</p> <p>Applicants should take account of <u>District Plan Policy WAT1 Flood Risk Management</u> and the East Herts Strategic Flood risk Assessment</p> <p>Amend para 4.20 as follows: <u>Multi-functional green and blue infrastructure</u></p>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			<p>delivering Sustainable Drainage Systems are identified as key issues (but as above we advise you expand on the former further).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 – Sustainable Urban Drainage should be Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)</p> <p>Paragraph 4.28 – We are pleased to see you advise that pre-application advice with regards to fluvial flooding should be sought from the Environment Agency. Our charged pre application advice service could also be mentioned in regard to other areas of our remit e.g. Biodiversity.</p>	<p>guidance in the SPD.</p> <p>The Council recognises the value of blue infrastructure, and ‘water’ is referenced in paragraph 4.21 of the SPD. For clarity, include wording: blue infrastructure in para 4.20.</p>	
184-Bishop's Stortford Climate Group	Section 4.2 Topic Guidance		<p>Concerned thermal modelling is only recommended so developers won't undertake assessments early enough to inform the design. Concerned that Herts SuDs guidance is strong enough, given that examples here are often poor compare to Cambridge example. Will wait to see if provisions for green infrastructure remain in the SPD.</p>	<p>Concerns noted. Although thermal modelling is not mandatory the requirement to demonstrate how overheating has been assessed is set out in the SPD. Checklist criteria CA.2 has been amended to an open question so that applicants have to explain and justify their approach. The SPD encourages the use of the checklist at pre-application stage, which will help to ensure issues are addressed early in the design stage.</p> <p>The County Council is the SuDs approval body so the Council has</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
				limited control over the design of SuDs. However, the guidance about the multi-function nature of SuDs and the good practice examples aim to positively enhance the provision of SuDs in East Herts.	
178- Affinity Water	Section 4.2 Topic Guidance, 4.2.3 Green infrastruct ure, paras. 3.21, 4.24		Green walls and roofs need to be managed very carefully particularly on multi-story buildings, as they can become a fire risk if they are allowed to dry out. Where possible they should be watered using rainwater or greywater harvesting systems.	Recognise that green roof and walls may not always be appropriate.	Amend para. 4.24 as follows: <u>When possible Where feasible and appropriate</u>
126- DLA on behalf of Tarmac	Section 4.4 Checklist		In light of Tarmac's consideration that any overheating assessments should only be required where necessary and in support of detailed and Reserved Matters applications, amend checklist CA.2 as follows: <u>For full applications or reserved matters applications has an overheating assessment been undertaken?</u>	Checklist criteria CA.2 has been amended to an open question so that applicants have to explain and justify their approach.	Amend checklist criteria CA.2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? <u>How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to address it?</u>
92- Herts County Council	Section 4.4 Checklist		There are a number of questions in the checklist that are presented as 'closed' questions, such as: CA2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? It would appear that the applicant can simply answer yes and not demonstrate the conclusions of such a study. Perhaps	Agreed with that checklist CA.2 should be amended to an open question. Open questions are generally preferred unless the checklist criteria, is asking if particular information, such as SuDs details	Amend checklist criteria CA.2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? <u>How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to address it?</u>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			these questions should be presented as How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to tackle/combat?	have been submitted.	
152-Pigeon	Section 4.4 Checklist		<p>Comments on a number of the checklist criteria:</p> <p>CA.1 - Whilst the general principle of minimising overheating is understood and supported, there needs to be an acknowledgement that there are many (often competing) factors that will influence site layout and orientation of buildings. Each site is different and has its own constraints and opportunities and whilst important this aspiration needs to be balanced against others as part of a holistic design approach for each site.</p> <p>CA.2- Needs to clarify under which circumstances an overheating assessment / modelling is required. This would not be appropriate for outline applications and would surely be unduly onerous for non-major developments.</p> <p>CA.5- Needs to be greater acknowledgement of the maintenance and structural issues associated with green roofs and that they will not be suitable in all</p>	<p>The Sustainability SPD requires that overheating is assessed in line with District Plan Policy CC1 but it does not mandate a heating assessment for a particular scale or type of development. As such checklist CA.2 will be changed to an open question so that applicants have to explain and justify their approach.</p> <p>A formal overheating assessment may be appropriate. The good home checklist in paragraph 4.19 is recommended as a useful tool for assessing overheating risk.</p> <p>The integration of green roofs and walls is not a mandatory requirement and the Council recognises it may not always be feasible or appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend checklist criteria CA.2 Has an overheating assessment been undertaken? <u>How has overheating been assessed and what measures are proposed to address it?</u></p>

4.			Climate Change Adaptation		
Rep	Section/ para. Number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
			instances, particularly for residential dwellings. It should be encouraged but not a requirement.		

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
19- C Rowe	General comments	Object	<p>Suggested that due to climate change any additional houses will see water shortages that will cause ecological damage. Chalk streams are already suffering from over-extraction which needs to be reversed.</p> <p>Developments should not be allowed without significant reductions in water use. Suggests using stronger words to direct developers to adopt techniques to reduce water extraction from aquifers to zero.</p>	The water companies and Environment Agency are statutory planning consultees so will advise at the site allocation stage if locations for development are appropriate. District Plan policy WAT4 and this SPD recognises that East Herts is a water stressed area, which is why higher water efficiency targets have been adopted. The Council considers the language used is appropriate	No amendment in response to this issue
27- Dr A Rowe	General comment	Support	EHDC should be concentrating on increasing the efficient management and use of water in the existing housing stock in order to reduce and mitigate existing damage	The Council recognises the importance of improving the sustainability of existing buildings. Many of the sustainability principles set out in the SPD are applicable, but it is outside the scope of this SPD and will be considered as part of the District Plan review.	No amendment in response to this issue
167- S,	General		Fully support the policies for water	Support noted and welcomed	

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
Landon	comment		efficiency. Rainwater and Grey water harvesting should be mandatory in all new buildings. Many developers currently promote an opulent lifestyle that encourages wastefulness and high water use. This should be stopped.		
58- Hertford & Ware Labour Party	Section 5.2 Topic Guidance		Table under 5.6 advises dual flush toilet cisterns should be used, it has been reported that frequent leaks from these are making them less desirable.	<p>The Council recognises that alternative fittings may be suitable, but it is too detailed for the SPD to refer to alternative technologies, especially as these cannot be enforced by the planning system.</p> <p>The dual flush fitting is only referred to in table 5 as an example because it is referenced in the building regulations and Housing Quality Mark Standard.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
164- S. Chapman	Section 5.2, section 5.2.1 Water Efficiency in East Herts	Object	Rivers in East Herts are at critically low levels. We may well lose such iconic rivers as the Rivers Ash and Stort. This will be made incrementally worse by development. What plans have you in place to deal with this?	The water companies and Environment Agency are statutory planning consultees so will advise at the site allocation stage if locations for development are appropriate. District Plan policy WAT4 and this SPD recognises that East Herts is a water stressed area, which is why higher water efficiency targets have been adopted.	No amendment in response to this issue
111- East Herts	5.1 Policy Context,		Support strong limits on water use in new builds but how is this monitored	The target is enforced with a planning condition.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
Green Party	para 5.13		after construction? This requires proper monitoring to implement limits. Can the SPD make recommendations for this?	Recognise it is difficult to monitor post construction as the LPA has no control over how the fittings are used by the building occupant.	
112- East Herts Green Party	5.2 Topic Guidance, 5.2.1 Water Efficiency in East Herts		5.4 is correct but ignores the impact of shortages on drinking water supplies, which is another key consideration. 5.6 New and growing evidence from Thames Water, and Waterwise charity, shows that newer dual flush cisterns are being found to have significant issues with leaks compared to older siphon designs. In light of this, should the SPD recognise the issue and recommend fitting siphon cisterns with water reduction measures in the cistern. Section 5.2.4 Para 5.11 – worth stressing that grey water or rainwater recycling can be especially useful for schools and public buildings with high-use toilets.	Noted. However, the Council considers the text adequately sets out the context in light of guidance from the Environment Agency and the water companies. The Council recognises that alternative fittings may be suitable, but it is too detailed for the SPD to refer to alternative technologies, especially as these cannot be enforced by the planning system. The dual flush fitting is only referred to in table 5 as an example because it is referenced in the building regulations and Housing Quality Mark Standard. Likewise the SPD highlights the value of grey and rainwater recycling to residential and non-residential development. Specific reference to particular building types is unnecessarily detailed,	No amendment in response to this issue
138- Hertford	Section 5.2 Topic		In the section regarding water and installation of toilets, it was	The Council recognises that alternative fittings may be suitable,	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
Town Council	Guidance, Table 5		suggested to promote use of siphon type flushes over dual flushes which have ongoing maintenance issues	but it is too detailed for the SPD to refer to alternative technologies, especially as these cannot be enforced by the planning system. The dual flush fitting is only referred to in table 5 as an example because it is referenced in the building regulations and Housing Quality Mark Standard.	
174 -Env Agency	Section 5.4 Checklist		Pleased to see that the 110 litre consumption target, in line with Policy WAT4, has been included here.	Support noted and welcomed	
177- Affinity Water	Section 5.2 Topic Guidance		Note and welcome the water consumption target (110 litres or less per head per day) and the promotion of rain and grey water harvesting systems. Seeks the inclusion of the following text: <u>Information on which appliances are water efficient can be accessed via websites such as, www.europeanwaterlabel.eu/. This website provides one label for all water using bathroom products and covers both water and energy use. It also contains a Water Calculator which provides a working example of the calculator used for Part G of the</u>	Support for the approach noted and welcomed. Inclusion of text before paragraph 5.7 is agreed. Mandatory targets cannot be introduced in the SPD so the suggested threshold cannot be included. However the checklist asks applicants to explain and justify if they have incorporated rain and grey water harvesting approaches. The Council expects a proportionate response, so larger schemes so there is more emphasis on larger schemes to take forward these systems.	Insert the following text before paragraph 5.7: <u>Information on which appliances are water efficient can be accessed via websites such as, www.europeanwaterlabel.eu/. This website provides one label for all water using bathroom products and covers both water and energy use. It also contains a Water Calculator which provides a working example of the calculator used for Part G of the Building Regulations and information on water consumption for hundreds of</u>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
			<p><u>Building Regulations and information on water consumption for hundreds of products</u></p> <p>We would like the last sentence in paragraph 5.10 to be re-worded as follows: <u>The Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement should include the following techniques discussion of how the following techniques have been incorporated into developments of 5 units or more, and how it has been considered for all other development</u></p>		<u>products</u>
185-Bishop's Stortford Climate Group	Section 5.2, Topic guidance		<p>Do not think compliance with the efficiency standard is sufficient to ensure that the lowest possible levels of mains supply water use are built into the fabric of new residential developments, in light of the fact that BREEAM standards show it is possible to design to improve upon the building standards</p> <p>The Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement should include consideration of rainwater harvesting and grey water use. Have typically seen developers simply dismiss such suggestions saying it is not economic, without providing any</p>	<p>The SPD has to comply with the wording within the District Plan, so cannot exceed the water efficiency standard in WAT4.</p> <p>However, the guidance in the SPD encourages the developer to improve upon building standards. The checklist asks developers if they have incorporated water recycling systems and requires applicants to justify their approach. This should ensure more detail is included in the Sustainable construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
			<p>evidence to support such statements.</p> <p>It has been reported recently that the drop valve dual flush toilet systems in use do not deliver the water use reductions intended, because they are poorly designed and so do not achieve the intended behaviour change and because they leak. The Council should press developers to use the most modern siphon systems</p>		
135- Thames Water	Section 5.3 Submission Requirements		<p>Support the policies on surface water drainage and water efficiency. Welcomes reference to 110 litres per person per day standard, however is unclear how this is implemented and enforced. 110 litre requirement is only required under the Building Regulations when there is a planning condition requiring that the optional requirement set out in Regulation 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations must be complied with.</p> <p>It is not clear whether such conditions are applied to planning permissions in the district. If the standards are to be delivered and enforced through the Building Regulations then planning conditions</p>	<p>Planning conditions are used to enforce compliance with the target in East Herts. The condition requires that prior to the first occupation of residential units, measures shall be incorporated within the development to ensure that a water efficiency standard of 110 litre (or less) per person per day is achieved.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
5.			Water Efficiency		
			are necessary on all permissions for new homes to ensure that the requirement is achieved.		
153-Pigeon	Section 5.4 Checklist		<p>Wa.1- Whilst requirement accords with Local Plan policy WAT4 is not a matter that can be properly addressed at outline stage and this should be clarified in the document</p> <p>Wa.2- The SPD should set out what standard would be acceptable, if requirements in excess of Building Regulations are required.</p> <p>Wa.3- The SPD should set out what standard would be acceptable, if requirements in excess of Building Regulations are required.</p>	<p>Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD); the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.</p> <p>In reference to criteria Wa.2 and 3, the SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets but sections 5.2.3 and 5.2.4 provide examples and benchmarks that can be used to inform compliance with the checklist criteria.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
35- Sworders	General comment	Object	Section 6.1.2.2 sets out minimum standards in relation to air quality. However there are no standards specified in the adopted District Plan. The minimum standards set out in paragraph 6.19 should therefore be described as recommended or guidelines instead, and the checklist amended accordingly.	The second sentence in 6.18 does state that these are <i>recommended</i> minimum standards. It is agreed that the checklist should be amended to reflect this.	Insert the word recommended into checklist criteria AQ.1
59 - Hertford and Ware Labour Party	General comment		Questions why the use of gas-powered boilers is being recommended at this late stage in the process of decarbonisation.	It is not considered practical or reasonable to ban gas boilers, when they are currently permitted by building regulations and the SPD can't introduce mandatory targets. However, the SPD sets out the national intention to ban boilers by 2025 in both the pollution and the energy and carbon sections. Instead the SPD encourages the use of alternative fuels and where gas is used, high standards should be met.	No amendment in response to this issue
76 - Hunsden, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group	General comment		Welcome the general approach but fail to understand why the council does not champion this when it comes to a flagship policy like Local Plan GA1/2 where it is proposed to extend the A414 through the middle of an existing community without providing the community with the sort of information the Policy champions. Can the Council make it clear that it will from now onwards	The Council will assess the air quality implications of each site on its merits, taking account of the District Plan policy, guidance in this SPD, the local context and submitted assessments	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			not support any schemes which are not clear to residents on the impact on air quality?		
97 Annelise Furnace	General comment		No guarantee is provided for ensuring that existing Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA's), including in Sawbridgeworth, are not made worse by housing development and the associated rise in traffic; or how these areas will be monitored and remedial action taken should they get worse.	The measures laid out in this SPD ensure that mitigation for any increases in air pollution within or near to AQMA's must be mitigated against.	No amendment in response to this issue
168- Sue Landon	General comment		Transport contributes greatly to poor air quality. New developments should discourage car use by providing local schools, health centres, welfare and leisure facilities, within easy walking/cycling distance of all residents or a reliable bus service is made available to access facilities elsewhere.	Comment noted.	No amendment in response to this issue
70- Braughing Parish Council	Section 6.1 Air Quality, section 6.1.2 Topic guidance, Para 6.1.7	Object	Do not feel that this is ambitious and we would recommend that a stretch goals is established supporting the improvement of air quality	It is considered that the aspiration for air quality positive developments is ambitious.	No amendment in response to this issue
113- East Herts	Section 6.1.1- Air		The SPD states: "Planning decisions should ensure that any new	It should be noted that both applications are still awaiting S160	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
Green Party	Quality, Policy Context, para. 6.3		<p>development in Air Quality Management Areas and Clean Air Zones is consistent with the local air quality action plan.”</p> <p>How approval of two recent sites – Manor Links, and North of Sawbridgeworth – consistent with this policy? The Council is breaking its own policies in approving these sites without providing proper mitigation of air pollution from the increase in cars and houses, at the AQMA site nearby. Claims in policies are not matched with actions that are carried out. How is this circle squared by the SPD?</p>	<p>agreements to be signed, so are not formally approved as yet.</p> <p>In relation to SAWB4 the development has been identified as likely to impact on air quality in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). However, these figures do not take into account the impact of the proposed travel plan, contributions towards improvements to walking and cycling and provision of electric vehicle charging points. A condition is suggested to secure further information and if necessary to identify further mitigation measures to ensure that there is no worsening of air quality as a result of the development.</p> <p>No objections were raised by Environmental Health officer in relation to Manor Links, so the EV charging and construction management plan were sufficient mitigation measures in this case.</p>	
60-Hertford & Ware Labour Party	6.1.2 Air Quality Topic Guidance, 6.1.2.6		<p>How and when, is any financial contribution, to offset failure to meet requirements going to be used? There are no statements on this matter. Will they be used in other</p>	Each case will be judged on its own merit and the use of contributions will be governed by s106 legislation.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
	Offset		areas, on other developments or for something else entirely?		
94-Herts County Council	6.1.2 Topic Guidance		<p>HCC would fully support infrastructure for modes of transport with have a low impact on air quality, as reflected by East Herts Local Plan, policies TRA1 and TRA3.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.33 – HCC supports prioritising transport such as cycling and walking which is zero carbon and improves local air quality and encourages healthy communities. The SPDs strong emphasis on the provision of new bus, cycle and pedestrian transport routes and networks is positive. Requiring developers to extend and strengthen community-led transport schemes should continue.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.34 – The overall principles as set out in the SPD, of providing cycling facilities, car and EV car clubs, infrastructure for low emission vehicles, encouraging public, cycling and walking, as well as the restriction of traffic to minimise exposure to emissions from traffic is supported.</p>	Support noted and welcomed	
114 -East Herts	6.1.2 Air Quality		Provides a number of technical comments on the following number	Whilst the SPD acknowledges the move away from gas, CHP is	Amend errors in para 6.47: within the third and fourth

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
Green Party	Topic Guidance, para 6.19-6.57		<p>of aspects of the topic guidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Para 6.19 – does not think SPD should recommend gas-fired CHP and considered green infrastructure advice is sound but highlights a contradiction in the local planning process: that at present details of the Landscape design and green infrastructure are usually left as a condition at the approval stage of an application. However, for sustainable design, the design of the landscape should be considered in parallel to the building design • 6.27 -in relation to mechanical ventilation states: “This may involve sealed windows/triple glazing with trickle vents and a forced ventilation system” presumably that should read “without trickle vents” since with them present, forced ventilation will be less effective. • 6.35: states “Defined ‘engine off’ areas, such as bus stands, taxi ranks and tourist coach parking and outside of schools” This is positive but surely the SPD should go further and add any areas where people congregate 	<p>currently still a potential technical solution so prudent to include emission guidelines.</p> <p>Comment in relation to para 6.27 is too detailed, each application will assessed on its own merits, do not want to restrict technology.</p> <p>6.35- These are examples, not a definitive list</p> <p>Typos are noted and changed.</p>	<p>sentences, the word ‘sure’ should be ‘use’ and be-needs to be-deleted.</p> <p>6.57: add co-working to first bullet point Replace LEV with low emission vehicle.</p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p>outside – i.e. outside local shops, by neighbourhood centres, by day centres, nurseries, hospitals...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.47 – two typos within the third and fourth sentences, the word ‘sure’ should be ‘use’ and there should be deleted. 6.57: add ‘co-working space in or close to residential building’ to the measures that reduce the need to travel section? Under third sub-heading, should reference to LEV be EV? 		
76 Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston Neighbour- hood Plan Group	6.1 Air Quality		Welcomes air quality approach (6.10) but does not understand why EHDC does not champion it when it comes to GA1/2. Would like the Council to make it clear they will not support schemes where residents are not clear on the impact on air quality.	The Council will assess the air quality implications of each site on its merits, taking account of the District Plan policy, guidance in this SPD, the local context and submitted assessments	No amendment in response to this issue
127 -DLA on behalf of Tarmac	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.2 Topic Guidance		Tarmac endorse the importance of air quality especially in the context of a garden suburb but do not support the proposed blanket requirement for an Air Quality Neutral (emissions) Assessment (or damage cost assessment) to be required for all developments. Currently, this is a Greater London-based requirement for tackling air pollution, particularly	<p>Clean air is critical to health and well-being and quality of life and is an important issue in East Herts.</p> <p>In accordance with the NPPF and District Plan Policy EQ4, the SPD takes a proactive approach to ensuring that new development (on its own or cumulatively) mitigates against any detrimental impacts on</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p>associated with Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), of which transport is a significant source of emissions.</p> <p>Within the context of the Capital, the balance of priority needs, and opportunity is different to East Hertfordshire where a more nuanced approach should be considered balancing wider transport, infrastructure and sustainability objectives.</p> <p>Tarmac consider that an Air Quality Neutral Assessment should only be required for development proposed in or near to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and where it can be demonstrated that this would not compromise a development's deliverability. Therefore, the SPD should be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>6.19 It is expected that planning applications for development in or near to an AQMA will comply with these recommended minimum standards unless it can be demonstrated this is not feasible or viable. To ensure development is in line with national and local policy.</i></p>	<p>air quality.</p> <p>It is therefore considered proportionate for all major development to submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment which include as air quality neutral assessment. Paragraph 6.87 states that where benchmarks cannot be met developers must undertake mitigation in discussion with the Council's air quality officer or make a contributing to offsetting their emissions. Specific caveats about viability are not necessary because the planning application process considers each application on its own merits. Any feasibility or viability concerns will be considered as part of the decision-making process.</p> <p>In terms of the requirement that assessments should only be carried out at detailed / reserved matter application stages, the Council recognises that it may be difficult to fully mitigate the air quality impacts if detailed design issues are not addressed in the application. However, given the variation in the scope of outline applications, the</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p><i>6.20 Applications will need to be accompanied by additional submissions as set out in the submission requirement of this chapter. All development will need to submit the air quality checklist in Appendix A. Development above the minor classification will need to submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment which must include an Air Quality Neutral Assessment. In addition to this, any Any development in or near to an AQMA must also submit an Air Quality Neutral Assessment at the detailed or Reserved Matters application stage. See the submission requirement section below and Figure 9 for further details.</i></p> <p><i>6.56 Many developments will require a mix of design and mitigation measuresThe design and mitigation package should be presented with the planning application with an Air Quality Neutral Assessment required only for development proposed in or near to an AQMA.</i></p> <p><i>6.59 An emissions assessment should be carried out at the detailed/ Reserved Matters application stage for any development in or near to an AQMA, to</i></p>	<p>SPD favours a flexible approach and does not definitively exclude outline applications. The Council does not want miss opportunities to address air quality early in the decision process, if appropriate. The applicant should use the guidance and checklist to consider the appropriateness of measures in relation to their application and liaise with the Council.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p><i>demonstrate how the development is compliant with the requirement to be air quality neutral and included as part of an air quality neutral assessment, <u>unless it can be demonstrated this is not feasible or viable</u>. It should: ...</i></p> <p><i>6.63 All development <u>in or near to an AQMA above a minor classification at the detailed/ Reserved Matters application stage</u>, will be required to provide an emissions assessment as part of the Air Quality Neutral requirement outlining the emissions produced and what mitigation is being applied, <u>unless it can be demonstrated this is not feasible or viable</u>. If the mitigation is not deemed adequate, developers must provide the rest in financial contributions.</i></p>		
191 - DLA on behalf of Tarmac	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.2 Topic Guidance. Para 6.19		Tarmac support the Council's proposed requirement (at paragraphs 6.19 and 6.53) for new development to be designed to minimise public exposure to pollution sources, for example, by locating habitable rooms away from busy roads. This is consistent with the approach taken at BGS, in relation to adjacent land uses.	The Council recognises that more clarity is needed about the definition of busy roads and this should be included in the SPD.	Insert the following reference to paragraph 6.19: ¹ <u>A busy road is defined as a road with an AADT of 10,000 or > as defined in Defra's Local Air Quality Management; Technical Guidance TG16 (2018).</u>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p>Tarmac support the general intention of draft paragraph 6.19 in siting sensitive development (such as equipped play areas for children) away from busy roads, in the interests of minimising public exposure to pollution sources. However, Tarmac consider the proposed requirement for such sensitive development to be sited at least 100m away from busy roads to be unreasonable and impracticable. The proposed 100m requirement is not evidence-based, and the SPD provides no definition as to what is implied by a 'busy road' in this context and is therefore not justified.</p> <p>Uses such as schools and hospitals require adequate vehicular access, particularly in providing bus accessibility, which would typically be provided by a primary road within a new development. This proposed requirement could have the unintended consequence of creating unsustainable new communities which are not adequately served by sustainable transport.</p> <p>Suggests the Play areas should be</p>		

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<i>sited away from busy roads, without restricting the ability of such green spaces from being accessible by sustainable modes of transport. Sensitive development (such as schools, hospitals and play grounds) must be sited at least 100m away from busy roads.</i>		
144- Andrew Martin on behalf of Countryside Properties	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.2 Topic Guidance. Para 6.19	Object	<p>Paragraph 6.19 in the Draft SPD requires all gas-fired boilers to have low NOx emissions and meet a minimum standard of 40 mgNOx / kWh.</p> <p>Wherever feasible, Countryside will seek to comply with this approach and standard, including at its site to the north of Sawbridgeworth. However, a blanket may not be appropriate on all sites, in all locations and for all suppliers. Instead, it would be prudent to allow for some flexibility and to apply the above figure as a 'target'.</p> <p>Countryside submits that paragraph 6.19 would be more appropriate and flexible if amended to read:</p> <p><i>"... All gas fired boilers must have low NOx emissions and should seek to meet a minimum standard of 40</i></p>	<p>Paragraph 6.18 states that the minimum standards are <i>recommended</i>, so the SPD is not introducing mandatory targets</p> <p>However it should be noted these are not onerous but best practice standards this is minimum best practice that has been advised for years in national air quality guidance</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<i>mgNOx / kWh, where feasible..."</i>		
165- S. Chapman	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.2 Topic Guidance		<p>Car use is the main cause of air pollution. A huge increase in building such as is proposed will inevitably increase the amount of cars on our roads without drastic measures. Weakly hoping to achieve a modal shift in transport use will make no difference unless strong and concerted efforts are made to reduce car use with the provision of higher and better public transport such as buses combined with penalties for car use. Relying on individuals to change their behaviour without putting in the necessary infrastructure combined with a carrot and stick approach to getting people out of their cars, simply will not work.</p> <p>Overall, there is little joined up thinking going on between relevant departments here. The county council is intending to put a huge quarry right next to an existing development in Stanstead Abbots, which in combination with the vast development close by of Gilston East (with all the concomitant increase in car use) which is likely blow all your attempts to achieve better air quality</p>	<p>The Council acknowledge the need to reduce car use in East Herts to lower emissions from transport, as stated in paragraph 6.32- 6.35 of the air quality section of this SPD. Further detail is set out in Section 8 of the SPD: Sustainable Transport</p> <p>This text, in combination with District Plan Policy TRA1 (c) and other national and local policies will help promote new development that is designed to reduce reliance of the car.</p> <p>All applications will consider transport implications as part pf the decision making process.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			out of the window.		
186-Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.2 Topic Guidance		<p>Will look to see that the provisions for developments to be quality neutral and, where possible, to improve local air quality (air quality positive) are retained in the final SPD and are then fully complied with (6.9).</p> <p>The air quality assessment provisions and damage cost calculations are key to demonstrating delivery and so should be referenced at the beginning of the Air Quality section.</p> <p>Concerned that the provisions, including the transport provisions in the separate section, will not deliver the overarching policy. There is confusion between the mitigation requirements and offsetting requirements. We support the commitment that proposals will be recommended for refusal, which have not been suitably redesigned or mitigated (6.58). All development sites involving buildings accommodating more people/business users are likely to add to air quality pressures it is unlikely that 100% of occupants will</p>	<p>The approach taken is considered a proportionate approach to address air quality in accordance with national and local policy. The SPD proactively prioritise the design and mitigation measure which will be used to reduce the impact of new development on air quality. Offset will only be used as a last resort, on the basis on the local circumstances.</p> <p>Air quality positive is supported and as outlined in the SPD will be encouraged. It could be achieved prioritising design and mitigation measures in sect 6.1.2. However, it goes beyond the policy requirements of the District Plan.</p> <p>Will add two new case studies to demonstrate exemplar schemes</p>	Add examples of best practice at Duns fold Park in Surrey and Northstowe in Cambridge- see section 6.2 in Proposed Modification version of the SPD

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p>only walk or cycle. This is recognised in the Damage Cost Calculations and needs to be fully mitigated to deliver air quality neutrality. The proposal to allow offsetting undermines this and should be omitted.</p> <p>Consider that development in, an impacting on AQMAs should be air quality positive, not neutral. There is no discussion about what can be done to deliver air-quality positive. Diesel generators should be banned.</p>		
128 - Tarmac	6.1.3 Submission Requirements		<p>Tarmac consider that an Air Quality Neutral Assessment should only be required for development proposed in or near to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) and where it can be demonstrated that this would not compromise a developments deliverability. Therefore, the SPD should be amended as follows:</p> <p>.</p> <p>6.84 Within the application process, major developments <u>at the Outline planning application stage must submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment. Any development in or near to an AQMA should must</u> submit an air quality neutral assessment as part of an Air Quality Impact Assessment. Minor</p>	See response to rep 127 above	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			developments in or near to an AQMA must submit an Air Quality Neutral Assessment <u>at the detailed/ Reserved Matters application stage, unless it can be demonstrated this is not feasible or viable</u> (they will not be required to submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment). The assessment should take into account the following elements and compare them to the Air Quality Neutral Benchmarks provided in Appendix B.		
154-Pigeon	6.1 Air Quality. 6.1.4 Checklist		<p>Raise a series of concerns about the air quality checklist criteria:</p> <p>With regard to the sustainability checklist, the level of detail required to demonstrate compliance with the minimum standards cannot be provided at outline planning stage. The SPD needs to make clear this should only to be addressed as part of a Full or Reserved Matters Application.</p> <p>AQ.3 A summary of potential measures as part of the 'Emissions from transport' element will be outlined as part of a 'Framework Travel Plan', with the full travel plan being conditioned. The sustainable</p>	In terms of the requirement that assessments should only be carried out at detailed / reserved matter application stages, the Council recognises that it may be difficult to fully mitigate the air quality impacts if detailed design issues are not addressed in the application. However, given the variation in the scope of outline applications, the SPD favours a flexible approach and does not definitively exclude outline applications. The Council does not want to miss opportunities to address air quality early in the decision process, if appropriate. The applicant should use the guidance and checklist to consider the appropriateness of measures in	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			<p>energy elements of this section will be considered as part of The Building Regulations emergence of the 'Future Homes Standards' in the near future will set higher standards ensuring compliance with this element.</p> <p>AQ.6- 6.1.3 (6.79) states an AQIA is required for all development above a minor scale. It is excessive for this to be required for all sites of 10+ dwellings / a site area over 0.5 Hectares or with a floorspace of over 1,000sqm / an area of 1 hectare. A higher threshold should be considered linked to vehicle trip generation and whether or not the site is within an AQMA's.</p> <p>AQ.7 - 6.1.3 (6.83) states all development above a minor scale and all development adjacent an AQMA must be 'air quality neutral' and provide an Air Quality Neutral Assessment (AQNA). As part of this, emissions need to be calculated and reviewed against the benchmarks included within Appendix C If these figures are exceeded mitigation is required. Whilst 'air quality neutral' is acceptable it encourages</p>	<p>relation to their application and liaise with the Council.</p> <p>In accordance with the NPPF and District Plan Policy EQ4, the SPD takes a proactive approach to ensuring that new development (on its own or cumulatively) mitigates against any detrimental impacts on air quality.</p> <p>It is therefore considered proportionate for all major development to submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment which include as air quality neutral assessment. Paragraph 6.87 states that where benchmarks cannot be met developers must undertake mitigation in discussion with the Council's air quality officer or make a contributing to offsetting their emissions. Specific caveats about viability are not necessary because the planning application process considers each application on its own merits. Any feasibility or viability concerns will be considered as part of the decision-making process.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			development to be 'air quality positive'. The SPD should identify the appropriate stage for information to be provided relative to the stage in the planning application process. Whilst mitigation may be provided at outline application stage via a framework for the delivery of the necessary measures, detailed commitments will not be possible without a fixed layout (i.e. at the Full or Reserved Matters stage).		
129 Tarmac	6.1.4 Checklist		Amend checklist criteria AQ.5 and AQ.7 as follows: <i>AQ5. For any development in or near an AQMA, has Has an Emissions Assessment been carried out as part of ...</i> <i>AQ7. For any development in or near to an AQMA, has Has an Air Quality Neutral..... This must be submitted if the proposal meets the criteria listed in section 6.1.3 of this SPD, unless it can be demonstrated this is not feasible or viable</i>	See response to rep 127	No amendment in response to this issue
Pigeon	Appendix C		The criteria set out in Appendix C are directly extracted from the 'London Plan' SPD based upon an assessment of what is considered neutral for buildings and transport. Developments that are brought	Air quality is a key issue in East Herts. In accordance with the NPPF and District Plan Policy EQ4, the SPD takes a proactive approach to ensuring that new development (on its own or cumulatively) mitigates	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.1			Pollution: Air Quality		
			forward are air quality neutral or better and do not degrade air quality in areas where EU limit values (or air quality objectives) are not currently achieved. It is therefore inappropriate to apply these criteria as blanket approach to all development within East Herts, the implication being that all developments should improve air quality.	<p>against any detrimental impacts on air quality.</p> <p>It is considered proportionate for all major development to submit an Air Quality Impact Assessment which include as air quality neutral assessment against benchmark targets. Paragraph 6.87 states that where benchmarks cannot be met developers must undertake mitigation in discussion with the Council's air quality officer or make a contributing to offsetting their emissions. Specific caveats about viability are not necessary because the planning application process considers each application on its own merits. Any feasibility or viability concerns will be considered as part of the decision-making process.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
---------	----------------------	-------------------	-------	------------------	--------------------

6.2		Pollution: Light			
36- Sworders	Section 6.2 Light Pollution		Paragraph 6.102 refers to the need for a Light Impact Assessment; however neither the District Plan nor the current Local Validation Requirements checklist set out any such requirement. The Local Validation checklist will also need to be updated in relation to the Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement as this currently only refers to Policies CC1, CC2 and WAT4 in relation to a few specific matters. It makes no reference to other relevant policies	Noted. Changes to the validation will be made in due course in light of the requirements in this SPD	No amendment in response to this issue.
77- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston NP Group	Section 6.2 Light Pollution		Supports light pollution points as it is important for the Gilston Project and the aim to create seven small villages without light pollution linking them. Would like indication of how light pollution will be controlled post development.	Lighting standards are required on planning applications in order to try and prevent nuisance and disturbance to both the built and natural environments. Should disturbance be found after the development is in place, providing all the planning conditions have been met then disturbance to other properties with respect to light can be investigated under the statutory nuisance legislation.	No amendment in response to this issue.
115- East Herts Green Party	6.2 Light Pollution, para 6.94		6.94: states "the behaviour of nocturnal animals and birds". Add insects.	This section is summarising the policy context in the District Plan. As such it is considered that specific reference to insects in this context does not add value to the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
150- Pigeon	6.2 Light Pollution		Considers that there is inconsistent referencing in the document. This section makes reference to the Institute of Lighting Professionals but	Hertfordshire County Council's approval of public street lights does not inform this Council's assessment of a development's light impact.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.2			Pollution: Light		
			provides no reference to Highway Authority standards who will be responsible for approving street lighting design, which in reality will account for a high proportion of external public lighting.	Therefore it is not considered necessary to reference the highway authority standards in this case	
155-Pigeon	6.2 Light Pollution, 6.2.4 Checklist		<p>For the checklist criteria there needs to be a distinction in the SPD as to what details are required to support an outline application in contrast to a detailed submission.</p> <p>The SPD needs to advise that County Council public street lighting design standards satisfy the requirements of the SPD.</p> <p>There needs to be a distinction in the SPD as to what details are required to support an outline application in contrast to a detailed submission.</p> <p>LP.3- If 'Does the proposal minimise potential glare and spillage?' is to be a requirement of a detailed planning application submission then the SPD needs to provide clearer guidance as to what light design is considered</p>	<p>Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD) the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide details about the lighting proposals. If this is the case the applicant simply needs to explain and justify this in the checklist.</p> <p>As street lighting is approved by the County Council and not a matter assessed at the district level, compliance with Herts County Council would be an appropriate. It does not need to be reiterated in the checklist</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
---------	----------------	-------------------	-------	------------------	--------------------

6.3		Noise Pollution		
130- DLA on behalf of Tarmac	6.3 Noise Pollution	<p>Tarmac support the Council's requirement for all residential developments to be required to comply with BS:8233 noise standards, as proposed at paragraph 6.105 of the draft SPD. With regards to BGS, a noise assessment has been undertaken which demonstrates compliance with BS:8233 standards, with respect to both internal and external amenity.</p> <p>Tarmac also support the proposed wording of the SPD which requires all developments involving industrial or commercial noise sources to undertake an assessment, in line with BS:4142 guidance. However, the wording contained at paragraph 6.105 of the draft SPD should be amended as follows, to clarify that BS:4142 is a method of assessment, rather than providing standards for a development to comply with:</p> <p><i>... All developments involving industrial or commercial noise sources will be required to <u>undertake an assessment, in line comply with BS:4142 standard.</u> Consideration must also be given to sufficient ventilation and the prevention of overheating.</i></p> <p>Tarmac reserves the opportunity to provide further comment on emerging noise guidance, as part of any future consultation on the</p>	Agree the wording should be changed for clarity.	<p>Para 6.105 should be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>All developments involving industrial or commercial noise sources will be required to <u>undertake an assessment, in line comply with BS:4142 standard.</u> Consideration must also be given to sufficient ventilation and the prevention of overheating.</i></p>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.3			Noise Pollution		
			anticipated forthcoming Hertfordshire noise guidance being developed jointly by several the Hertfordshire local authorities.		
78 - Hunsden, Eastwick and Gilston NP	6.3 Noise Pollution		Believe that this should be addressed in this draft SPD rather than deferred with the vague promise that "noise guidance will be available for applicants in due course. Hertfordshire noise guidance is being developed jointly by a number of Hertfordshire local authorities".	The Council has committed to the production of joint guidance on noise with a number of Hertfordshire local authorities. Joint-working is beneficial both in term of sharing knowledge and resources. It would inappropriate to pre-empt this work and address noise in the SPD at this stage.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
1- Dr B Lovell	General comment	Support	Welcomes the biodiversity section but would like guidance strengthened to enhance protection of wildlife corridors. Concerned that Hertford's green fingers are being eroded by adjoining development.	Hertford's green fingers are designated as Local Green Spaces by Policy CFLR2 of the District Plan so protected from development. In terms of the guidance in this SPD, If new development is built adjacent to the green fingers biodiversity net gain could help create connectivity However, the Council has no control	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
				if the encroaching development is permitted development.	
3 V Glover-Ward	General comment	Support	Would like incorporation of hedgehog highways and bee bricks.	Support noted and welcomed. Agree hedgehog highways and bee bricks could be included in SPD to promote good practice.	Amend para 7.28 as follows: Integration of nest boxes for species such as birds, bees and bats, particularly in locations/ buildings adjoining open space. <u>These can be integrated into the brickwork.</u> Amend the 7 bullet point in para. 7.28 as follows : Contribution to wider ecological networks and green and blue infrastructure corridors. <u>Consider connectivity of the landscape, enabling species to move around freely, for example creating hedgehog highways</u>
79- Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston NP Plan Group	General comment		Supports this section however feels that the Gilston area, Stort Valley, and its floodplain should be identified as priority areas for attention, they represent opportunities to make positive and strategic gains, including supporting pollinators who are in serious	The SPD provides district-wide guidance so it not appropriate to refer to specific areas. The guidance in this SPD will however be relevant to development at Gilston, alongside the green infrastructure and landscaping work being taken forward by HGGT.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			decline – ‘green’ alone does not address the needs of reversing pollinator decline.	Section 7.2.5 refers net gain initiatives supporting pollinators e.g. wildflower meadows and reference to bee bricks	
82- A Burgess	General comment		Noted the work done as leader of Roydon parish council as well as original masterplan drawing for Harlow as sources. Original Harlow surveys noted preservation of local area which could only be carried out on the ground opposed to from a desk. In Roydon indigenous species of tree were planted. Suggests that oak, hornbeam, ash, wild cherry and field maple are suitable for new developments instead of fast growing trees which could be short-lived. Recommends that trees should have a management plan. The principle of net gain in biodiversity should be respected with some areas left to grow wild with the correct minimal management. Effort must be made to lessen the impact on the surrounding land. The main way to achieve this is by substantial tree planting, not just a boundary hedge or a single row of trees but by the introduction of shaws, a relatively local feature.	Noted. Sections 4 and 7 outline the importance or retaining existing green infrastructure and of using indigenous species where possible.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
93- Herts County Council	General comment		With regard to Biodiversity Net Gain – EHDC may wish to wait for the Environment Bill or state that an early review may be required, similarly in relation to the Planning White Paper and any subsequent amendments to the building regulations	<p>Section 7.2.5 of the SPD expands on the District Plan policy context by setting out the approach to net gain and specifically refers to the use of the Defra metric (or the latest version as revised by Natural England). Paragraph 7.37 states ecological surveys should include a 10% biodiversity net gain using a biodiversity metric.</p> <p>However, the Council recognises that the SPD is unable to provide further clarity about the process until it has more information from Herts Ecology's about how it will be progressed and resourced, in light of the emerging Environment Bill.</p> <p>The implications of other national policy and legislation will be kept under review</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
169- S. Landon	General comment		Concerned about the devastating loss of the natural environment in East Herts in recent years. Large scale developments and massive road building schemes, such as the Little Hadham Bypass, have obliterated vast swathes of countryside, including many ancient trees and hedgerows. This has resulted in a terrible loss of habitat.	<p>In order to meet the district's Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing via the delivery of the District Plan's strategic sites, it is inevitable that there will be an impact on the natural environment.</p> <p>However, all schemes have had to mitigate their impact on local biodiversity, taking account of the</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			Such destruction cannot be mitigated. You cannot replace 300 year old trees. Recent research has found that ancient oak trees can support over 2000 species, while new young trees will not for many decades. East Herts is home to many rare and protected species, such as the barbastelle bat. Their habitats must be protected, no mitigation schemes can safeguard their existence. Policies 7.28 /7.29 The suggested schemes for 'Net Gain ' are very encouraging but what requirement does the home owner have to maintain/ retain the proposed habitat enhancements?	<p>local context and particularly in relation to protected species and habitats. New developments will need to demonstrate in the sustainability checklist how they have addressed biodiversity holistically.</p> <p>Welcome support for the net gain approach. Maintenance is key, hence the reference about management in the checklist (criteria 7).</p>	
4- Herts Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.1 Policy Context	Object	States that the list of submission requirements for the biodiversity section should be amended to include the need for a biodiversity net gain assessment using the Defra biodiversity metric.	<p>The policy box refers to the submission of ecology surveys. Paragraph 7.37 details the information that need to be submitted within these surveys- including a net gain assessment.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to list it as a separate requirement in the policy box</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
5- Herts Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.1 Policy Context, para 7.5	Object	The link to the requirement for a Defra metric net gain assessment must be made more explicitly. Amend para 7.5 to include: ... East Herts at various scales, on	The District Plan policies do not refer specifically to the Defra biodiversity metric, but NE1 and NE2 do refer to a 'locally approved biodiversity metric' but the Council agree this	Amend paragraph 7.5 as follows: Policy NE2 Sites or Features of Nature Conservation

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			designated and undesignated sites. <u>Net gain must be verified by using the Defra biodiversity metric which must show a 10% gain in biodiversity units.</u> Policy WAT3 Water Quality and the Environment aims to preserve or enhance the ecological value of the watercourses..... Policy NE2 Sites or Features of Nature Conservation recognises that there is biodiversity value throughout East Herts, even on non-designated sites. <u>Applicants should assess the ecological value of development by using the Defra biodiversity metric and aim to increase the biodiversity unit score by 10% to demonstrate net gain.</u>	should be mentioned in the SPD's policy context text for clarity. Paragraph 7.25 of SPD specifically refers to using the Defra biodiversity metric (or the latest version as revised by Natural England).	(Non designated) recognises that there is biodiversity value throughout East Herts, even on non-designated sites <u>Applicants should measure net the ecological value of development, by taking into account a locally approved biodiversity metric.</u> Policy NE3 Species and Habitats focuses specifically on.... and ecological connectivity. <u>Where appropriate biodiversity value of a site pre and post development will be determined using a biodiversity metric.</u>
7- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.2 Topic Guidance, para 7.14	Object	Considers measurable net gain by reference to the Defra biodiversity metric is a requirement of the local plan and the NPPF. EHDC should not wait until the environment bill has been produced to provide a structure for the delivery of biodiversity net gain. It must provide a procedure now to help developers and planners understand the process that is required to deliver net gain. HMWT have produced a SPD that shows this process	It is acknowledged that the District Plan promotes the use of a biodiversity metric to measure biodiversity net gain. Section 7.2.5 of the SPD expands on the policy context by setting out the approach to net gain and specifically refers to the use of the Defra metric (or the latest version as revised by Natural England). Paragraph 7.37 states ecological surveys should include a 10% biodiversity net gain	Amend the last sentence of paragraph 7.14 as follows: For further clarity about the compensation process, will be provided one the Environment Bill and associated government guidance is finalised seek advice from Hertfordshire Ecology, the Council's ecological advisors.

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			<p>As such, amend section 7.14 as follows:</p> <p>7.14 Finally, if this is not possible on-site, compensation measures will be needed off-site to achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity - a biodiversity offset. This must be a measurable and fully accountable system that provides the necessary number of biodiversity units and management to achieve a 10% net gain in perpetuity. Further clarity about the process is available on request from EHDC ecological advisors.</p>	<p>using a biodiversity metric. It is unnecessary to reiterate this guidance again in paragraph 7.14.</p> <p>However, the SPD is unable to provide further clarity about the process because it will pre-empt the decisions by Hertfordshire Ecology. East Herts Council relies on Hertfordshire Ecology Advisory Service to provide them with specialist ecology advice, to inform the planning process, as has been the case with this SPD. Further detail about the process and delivery of biodiversity net gain will be informed by Herts Ecology's operational decisions as soon as possible. As such paragraph 7.37 should refer to the need to seek further clarity from Herts Ecology.</p> <p>It is agreed reference to the Environment Bill in paragraph 7.14 is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Amend the first bullet point of paragraph 7.37 as follows:</p> <p>A biodiversity impact assessment calculation using the <u>Defra (version 2 updated by Natural England, or as amended) locally approved biodiversity metric, unless advised otherwise by Herts Ecology</u> and demonstrate a minimum 10% net gain in ecological units.</p>
8- Herts Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.2 Topic Guidance, para 7.18 and 7.19	Object	<p>Raises a number of minor corrections to the topic guidance:</p> <p>7.18 In accordance with District Plan Policy NE3 Species and Habitats.... The mitigation hierarchy should be used in all proposals to prevent</p>	Proposed minor corrections to the text agreed.	<p>Amend paragraph 7.18 as follows:</p> <p>The mitigation hierarchy should be used in all proposals to prevent harm to all priority and non-priority species and habitats.</p>

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity harm to all priority and non-priority species and habitats. Development adjoining rivers or streams will be required to preserve or enhance the water environment in accordance with Policy WAT3. 7.19 There are a number of species protected by European and national law....The main pieces of legislation protecting species are the European Habitats and Bird Directives, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Section 41 lists priority species and habitats), the Wildlife and Countryside Act, the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 2017 (as amended) and the Badgers Act 1992.....		Amend text in paragraph 7.19 as follows: the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 2017 (as amended) and the Badgers Act 1992
9- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.2 Topic Guidance, para 7.24	Object	Proposes a small amendment to paragraph 7.24: Biodiversity is not limited to designated sites or priority habitats. Biodiversity is also found on non-priority habitats. As outlined in Policy NE2, all proposals should seek to secure a measurable net gain for biodiversity <u>by using the Defra biodiversity metric</u> , and to enhance ecological networks across the District.	It is repetitive to refer to the biodiversity metric in paragraph 7.24. Paragraph 7.5 has been amended (see response to rep5) to make the policy intention clear and paragraph 7.25 sets out that securing net gain should use the Defra/ Natural England biodiversity metric.	No amendment in response to this issue.
10-	Section 7.2	Object	Propose amendments to paragraph	The Defra metric has been amended	Biodiversity net gain should

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Topic Guidance, para 7.25		<p>about the Defra biodiversity metric 7.25:</p> <p>'Biodiversity net gain should be assessed by a trained ecologist, using the Natural England Defra biodiversity metric (v2 <u>or as amended</u>), unless advised otherwise by Herts Ecology <u>EHDC ecological advisors</u>. Using a metric demonstrates compliance with the biodiversity hierarchy and informs compensation of all habitats the metric <u>provides an objective, consistent and transparent mechanism for assessing net gain on a development site</u>. The metric is not designed to measure impacts on species.... Further details about the process for securing measurable net gain will become more certain once the Environment Bill (2020) achieves royal ascent and the Government provides additional clarity. on how to provide a net gain offsite are available from EHDC on request*.'</p> <p>(*HMWT can provide EHDC with a SPD which explains the whole process. EHDC should provide this procedure now because of its existing net gain policy. It should not</p>	<p>by Natural England hence the reference in paragraph 7.25 of the SPD to Natural England. However for clarity, the text will also refer to Defra.</p> <p>It is useful to clarify the at the metric is a mechanism for assessing net gain, but it is not considered the other changes are requires. Paragraph 7.25 positively promotes the use of the biodiversity metric.</p> <p>As outlined in response to rep Id 7, the SPD is unable to provide further clarity about the process because it will pre-empt the decisions by Hertfordshire Ecology. Reference to the Environment Bill should be revised but is still important context.</p>	<p>be assessed by a trained ecologist, using the Defra biodiversity metric (version 2, <u>as updated by Natural England, or as amended</u>), unless advised otherwise by Hertfordshire Ecology. Using the a <u>metric provides a mechanism</u> for demonstrating compliance with the biodiversity hierarchy and informs compensation of all habitats.</p> <p>The process of securing measurable net gain will become more <u>be a certain legal requirement once</u> if the Environment Bill (2020 <u>2019-21</u>) achieves royal ascent <u>in its current form, and the details for planning are finalised.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			wait for the environment bill to be passed because it has a measurable net gain policy requiring the use of the Defra metric in place now. HMWT can help by providing this procedure in a SPD which is based on national best practise)		
11- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.2 Topic Guidance, para 7.28	Object	<p>Proposes the bullet points in para 7.28 are amended for clarity:</p> <p>Integration of bird and bat boxes into the brickwork of <u>all</u> buildings adjoining suitable open space (<u>see above</u>).</p> <p>Sustainable urban drainage systems with deliberate biodiversity benefits <u>e.g. over-deepened flood retention areas to hold water all year</u></p> <p>Soft landscaping to promote biodiversity</p> <p>Tree planting- consider tree health to future proof biodiversity</p> <p>Prioritisation of native species</p> <p>Habitat creation - e.g. ponds, wildflower meadows</p> <p>Contribution to wider ecological networks and green and blue infrastructure corridors. Green and brown roofs</p> <p><u>Hedgehog highways</u></p>	<p>The Council agrees reference to integration of bird and bat boxes in the brickwork is useful, although it is not necessary to refer to the photo as it is above the text. It is also useful to add reference to hedgehog highways.</p> <p>Reference to the SUDs example is not included. The SPD should not be overly prescriptive about which SUDs provide the best ecological benefit, given that the County Council is the SUDs approval body.</p>	<p>Amend the following bullet points of paragraph 7.28 and add an additional bullet as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integration of nest boxes <u>for species such as</u> birds, <u>bees</u> and bats, particularly in locations/buildings adjoining open space. <u>These can be integrated into the brickwork.</u> Contribution to wider ecological networks and green and blue infrastructure corridors. <u>Consider connectivity of the landscape, enabling species to move around freely, for example creating hedgehog highways.</u>
175- Env Agency	Section 7.2 Topic		Paragraph 7.18 - Note and are pleased to see that development	Support welcomed and noted	

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
	Guidance, para 7.18 and 7.25		<p>adjoining rivers or streams will be required to preserve or enhance the water environment in accordance with Policy WAT3.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.2.5 - We are pleased to see the Natural England biodiversity metric referenced here (Biodiversity Metric 2.0) in regard to net gain. It would be useful to keep this under review as the field evolves and develops.</p>		
187-Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group			<p>Concerned that the application of net gain is diluted by reference to scale of development. We think that the statement that major developments offer the greatest opportunities (7.26) followed in 7.27 by the suggestion that there is opportunity for all scales of developments might make smaller scale developments consider the focus is only for large scale developments.</p> <p>Welcome in principle the hierarchy "Avoid, mitigate, compensate" but are concerned that there needs to be more precision to ensure that this does not undermine the requirement to deliver net gain in biodiversity from development. In</p>	<p>On the basis of scale, larger developments do tend to offer greater opportunities for net gain. But that statement does not undermine the contribution of smaller sites and paragraphs 7.27-7.30 provide guidance and options for integrating biodiversity into all scales of development.</p> <p>Net gain should be measured using a biodiversity metric but the Council recognises that more detail and clarity is needed about the process. However, the SPD is unable to provide further clarity about the process because it will pre-empt the decisions by Hertfordshire Ecology. East Herts Council relies on Hertfordshire Ecology Advisory</p>	<p>Amend the 7 bullet point in para. 7.28 as follows :</p> <p>Contribution to wider ecological networks and green and blue infrastructure corridors. <u>Consider connectivity of the landscape, enabling species to move around freely, for example creating hedgehog highways.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			<p>particular there needs to be much more precision around: the definition of the baseline from which net gain is to be measured and how it will be assessed; whether there is a reasonable likelihood of protected habitats being present; and whether any proposed mitigations and compensations need to be assessed by professionals.</p> <p>The Council's Development Committee will also need independent assurance that the measures proposed are sufficient. Hedgehog highways should be included in the list of biodiversity measures in 7.28</p>	<p>Service to provide them with specialist ecology advice, to inform the planning process, as has been the case with this SPD. Further detail about the process and delivery of biodiversity net gain will be informed by Herts Ecology's operational decisions as soon as possible. This will be informed by the progress and final details of the Environment Bill, which is planned to introduce mandatory requirements for the delivery of biodiversity net gain.</p> <p>Reference to Hedgehog highways can be added to the SPD.</p>	
12- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.3 Submission Requirements, para 7.36	Object	<p>Proposes paragraph 7.36 should be amended to add an additional criteria for when an ecological survey(s) will be required:</p> <p>If without avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures the development would result in a net loss to biodiversity</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.36 seeks to advise when an ecological survey is required and paragraph 7.38 clarifies that advice from Hertfordshire Ecology can be sought. It is considered too prescriptive for the SPD to include this additional criteria. If there are specific circumstances when an ecological survey is needed Herts Ecology will advise on a site by site basis.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
13- Herts and Middlesex	Section 7.3 Submission Requirements	Object	<p>Suggests a number of amendments to the details about ecology surveys in paragraph 7.37</p>	<p>The Council recognises that ecology surveys need to include mitigation and compensation and this is</p>	Amend paragraph 7.37 as follows:

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
Wildlife Trust	ts, para 7.37.		<p>Analysis of likely impact on protected species, if applicable, <u>with mitigation or compensation strategies if required.</u></p> <p>A <u>full</u> biodiversity impact assessment calculation <u>using the Defra biodiversity metric</u>, which must demonstrate a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity units.</p> <p>An analysis of the impacts of the development on fauna, <u>with measures required to mitigate or compensate these impacts.</u></p> <p>Definitive avoidance, mitigation or compensation measures sufficient to demonstrate a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Enhancement measures definitively proposed and marked on plans.</u></p>	<p>specified in the last bullet point of para 7.37. It is not necessary to repeat for each bullet point criteria.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that enhancement measures on plans, would be a useful addition. Could also refer to Defra biodiversity metric for consistency with paragraph 7.25 of the SPD.</p>	<p>A biodiversity impact assessment calculation using the <u>Defra (version 2 updated by Natural England, or as amended) locally approved biodiversity metric, unless advised otherwise by Herts Ecology)</u></p> <p>Insert an additional bullet point: <u>Enhancement measures definitively proposed and marked on plans.</u></p>
14- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.4 Checklist, bio 2	Object	Amend checklist criteria Bio 2 –I is missing from the word In	Agreed typo needs to be changed.	Amend the typo in criteria bio.2: <u>In</u>
15- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.4 Checklist, bio 5	Object	Amend checklist criteria Bio 4 as follows: 'Has the mitigation hierarchy been applied to minimise adverse impacts on <u>biodiversity priority habitats and species?</u> If impacts are unavoidable, has the	The word biodiversity is consistent with discussion of the biodiversity hierarchy in the NPPF and NPPG.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			impact been mitigated or compensated?'		
16- Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Section 7.4 Checklist, bio 6	Object	Small changes needed for accuracy and clarity: 'Has a Defra biodiversity net gain metric calculation been submitted and a 10% biodiversity net gain achieved? Please explain	Not necessary to refer to the Defra metric again, the criteria asks the applicant to demonstrate how net gain has been achieved.	No amendment in response to this issue
29- Dr A Rowe	Section 7.1 Policy context, paras 7.5 and 7.6	Support	7.5 Policy WAT3 Water Quality and the Environment aim to preserve or enhance the ecological value of the watercourses. Supports the objectives however believe that before this can be achieved watercourses need to be restored to a natural state; this could be achieved by a reduction in water being taken from the Lea catchment area. Major schemes should not be undertaken until there is surplus capacity. 7.6 Tree planting in historic settings should be historically appropriate and not negatively impact the historic landscape.	Decisions about the water quality and abstraction of the Lea catchment are informed by the Water Framework Directive and Thames River Basin Management and the Lea catchment plans The Council recognises the important of preserving the Lea catchment area and will continue to work with the Environment Agency and other partners to deliver these objectives. The importance of taking account of historic context is outlined in Section 2.3 of this SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue
37 - Sworders	Section 7.3 Submission Requirements, para 7.37	Object	10% net gain in ecological units considered unreasonable. Policy NE2, The caveat 'where it is feasible and proportionate to do so' should be included within the SPD, and references to a minimum percentage	The District Plan, as the Development Plan, is the primary consideration in the determination of planning applications, so the caveat in Policy NE2 'where it is feasible and proportionate to do so'	Add the following text to paragraph 7.5: Policy NE2 Sites or Features of Nature recognises that there is biodiversity value

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity requirement should be deleted.	<p>will be taken into account. For clarity the sentence has been added into the policy context section 7.1, when Policy NE2 is discussed.</p> <p>Therefore it is not necessary to repeat in paragraph 7.37. Likewise reference to 10% net gain is not unreasonable, it is the standard industry reference and has been included in the validation checklist for the last two years. Will add a link to the validation checklist for clarity. The policy allows flexibility if applicants can demonstrate it is not possible to achieve.</p> <p>As it stands, once it achieves royal ascent and is implemented, the Environment Bill will make a net gain of 10% mandatory on most new developments. As outlined in the SPD further site specific guidance can be sought from Herts Ecology.</p>	<p>throughout East Herts and even on non-designated sites applicants should assess the ecological value and aim to enhance it. <u>All proposals should achieve a net gain in biodiversity, where it is feasible and proportionate to do so by taking into account a locally approved biodiversity metric.</u></p> <p>Add the following text to para 7.37:</p> <p><u>Details of submission requirements for applications can be obtained via the Council's website at: https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-building/make-planning-application.</u></p>
131-Tarmac	7.3 Submission requirements		The proposed requirement in section 7.3 for all new major developments to submit a Biodiversity Impact Assessment, which demonstrates a minimum 10% net gain is supported by Tarmac. This will help to promote the retention of existing habitats and	Support noted and welcomed	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			the creation of new habitats, to enhance biodiversity as part of sustainable new communities. This approach is consistent with the requirements outlined in the Governments Environment Bill, which will take effect once passed by Parliament.		
38-Swords	7.4 Checklist	Object	This proposed Biodiversity checklist duplicates the existing biodiversity checklist and any necessary Ecological Survey report. This is considered to be unnecessary repetition.	The checklist aims to provide an overarching framework for transparently assessing the sustainable design and construction of a proposed development, as a whole. It does not need to replicate other evidence, so where relevant should signpost the biodiversity checklist (which relates specifically to the presence of protected species and habitats) and ecological surveys to demonstrate how the checklist criteria are being met.	No amendment in response to this issue
156-Pigeon	Section 7.4, Checklist		States that the requirements of the biodiversity checklist (criteria bio 1-5 & 7) are covered by a Preliminary Ecological Assessment or protected species surveys, which are a local validation requirement. Query whether it is necessary to require the checklist to be provided for all applications of 1+ dwelling (in particular, major schemes).	The checklist aims to provide an overarching framework for transparently assessing the sustainable design and construction of a proposed development, as a whole. It does not need to replicate other evidence, so where relevant should signpost the biodiversity checklist (which relates specifically to the presence of protected species and habitats) and ecological surveys	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section./ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
7			Biodiversity		
			<p>In addition, what constitutes sufficient information be will determined on a case-by-case basis (dependent on a site's location and condition), therefore it is questionable what the value of including this requirement is.</p> <p>Bio.6- Whilst this criterion is as per the District Plan, the forthcoming Environment Bill will introduce a mandatory condition for 10% net gain. It is therefore questionable whether Bio.6 is necessary.</p>	<p>to demonstrate how the checklist criteria are being met.</p> <p>The Council will consider the implication of the Environment Bill once it the final state of the bill is known.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
20- C. Rowe	General comment	Support	Support this section but considers stronger wording is necessary to ensure, particularly for large developments, that the sorts of infrastructure provision and community facilities that form part of the overall plan MUST be delivered before (or, less satisfactorily, in parallel) with residential areas coming into occupation. Typically, these things	Primary Policy TRA1 Sustainable Transport in the District Plan makes provision at (e) that development proposals should "In the construction of major schemes, allow for the early implementation of sustainable travel infrastructure or initiatives that influence behaviour to enable green travel patterns to become established from the outset of occupation".	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>happen the other way around, even when the original proposals suggested they would be provided in parallel.</p> <p>For instance, the Gilston mega-development has 7 "villages" that should be developed in sequence from 1 to 7, in order to minimise road transport increases, yet recent changes now suggest that "village" 7 will be developed first, before community provision is available - AND before the new roads through the rest of the Gilston site are ready.</p> <p>This is completely unacceptable and results from a lack of enforceable conditions on the developers to ensure that the correct sequence is maintained. This will cause enormous volumes of extra traffic to on the A414, with all the consequent accident risk and pollution that should have been avoided.</p> <p>Please ensure that these concerns are reflected in much stronger wording to prevent this in the future.</p>	<p>The SPD text supports the need for early implementation at paragraph 8.20, which clearly makes reference to sustainable measures needing to be in place at the outset of development to engender behavioural change.</p> <p>Likewise, paragraph in the 'Pedestrian and cycle route provision- making journeys healthier and sustainable' section makes a similar point.</p> <p>Both points are further strengthened at checklist</p> <p>Checklist T4: Have you included measures (traditional and/or innovative) to encourage uptake of more sustainable modes of transport and engender modal shift from the outset of development?</p> <p>As the SPD is intended to serve all types of development, not just strategic allocated sites, it is not considered that amendment to existing wording is required.</p>	
104- C	Section 8.1	Support	Strongly support the reference to	Acknowledge support for para. 102	No amendment in response

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
Arnott	Policy Context, para. 8.4		para 102 of the NPPF on the assessment of impacts of development – in particular that transport should be considered early in development proposals (where appropriate at masterplanning stage and not left to the assessment of the planning application TA) and environmental impacts should be identified, assessed and taken into account including mitigating any adverse effects. This should be reflected in section 8.3 on Submission Requirements and 8.4 on the Sustainability Checklist to developers.	of the NPPF. The purpose of this SPD is to ensure that the principles of sustainable transport are transparent and considered up front. Section 2 of the SPD emphasises the need to consider sustainable design and construction early in the design process. Paragraph 8.62 sets out that the checklist should be submitted as part of the application process, but also that it should be used early to inform pre-application discussions.	to this issue
125- C Arnott	Section 8.1 Policy Context, Policy box	Object	The policy box should reference the Transport Policies in the relevant Neighbourhood Plans (NPs). Along with the District Plan, NPs form part of the Development Plan and have more significant statutory status than, for example, the Local Transport Plan which is listed in full. Bishops Stortford Neighbourhood Plan is currently under review by the Town Council and includes 12 Transport Policies and other climate	The Council acknowledge the importance of neighbourhood planning in the decision-making process. Paragraph 1.16 of the SPD emphasises that development must comply with relevant neighbourhood plan policies. However, given the number of neighbourhood plans covering the district it would be disproportionate to list every relevant neighbourhood plan policy in each section.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			change and sustainability policies which should be referenced		
189- Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group	Section 8.1 policy Context, para 8.2	Object	The importance placed on providing for sustainable transport is fundamental, although the language of the key introductory paragraph 8.2 is unacceptably wishy washy.	Agreed that wording of paragraph should be strengthened.	Amend paragraph 8.2 to read: In considering new development and ensuring that the transport impacts are less damaging and more sympathetic to the environment, <u>it is important that greater priority needs to be given now to reducing the overall need to travel.</u> and, w Where journeys are necessary, <u>it is vital to make sure</u> make certain that suitable hard and soft infrastructure and measures are provided to <u>both mitigate their impact and ensure</u> that they can be undertaken in a more sustainable manner going forward. This section of the SPD discusses various specific mechanisms to that <u>can be employed to assist</u> in achieving these aims.
51- East Herts Rural	Section 8.2 Topic Guidance,		Reducing the need to travel is acknowledged as a vital aspect of achieving garden city principles, for	Support for the principles in this section are noted and welcomed. The Council acknowledges the local	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
Labour Party	para 8.12		<p>example at HGGT.</p> <p>However on a smaller scale it should be about building sustainable communities, which minimise the need to travel for services, facilities and employment.</p> <p>There is potential for innovation and the changes to working conditions due to Covid-19 are likely to extend into the future and make the proposals even more pressing and relevant to the sustainability of housing and also to the movement of people. Particularly in the case of commuting to London from East Herts the location of housing in relation to railway stations could become less important and the access to local facilities more important.</p> <p>The Sustainability proposals will require firm action from EHDC to ensure compliance by developers! In Buntingford, in recent years, promises from developers have not been delivered.</p>	and infrastructure provision are fundamental to delivering sustainable development.	
95- Herts County	Section 8.1, Policy		Paragraph 8.4- Herts Count Council endorses National Planning Policy	This context setting section provides an outline of national and local	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
Council	Context, Paras 8.4-8.7		<p>Framework (NPPF) position in terms of sustainable transport and would ask that all developments consider the requirements as set out in (paragraph 102 of the document).</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 - National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) expands on the objectives included in the NPPF and provides specific guidance around the need for, and use of, transport evidence bases, travel plans, transport assessments and statements to support sustainable transport provision. HCC also ask that these objectives are considered.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.7 - The policies within East Herts District Plan policies TRA1, TRA2, TRA3, DES4, CFLR9 and DEL2, promote the delivery of sustainable transport and HCC would further promote the need to achieve sustainable transport through its own planning and transport policies</p>	<p>policy as a reference rather than providing specific guidance at this point.</p> <p>HCC LTP4 and East Herts District Plan policies are likewise listed in a context setting role.</p> <p>In combination, all these strands are taken into account in the decision making process as standard, with the SPD intended to add further detail and supplement these policies.</p>	
170- S. Landon	Section 8.2 Topic Guidance		Car dependence can only be addressed when people have a reliable, regular, dependable and fully integrated public transport system. We need a transport	The Council acknowledges the role of the public transport network to reduce dependence on cars, alongside the other measures in this topic guidance: reducing the need to	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			network that links all villages to the major towns around together with health centres, schools, and leisure facilities.	travel and enhanced walking and pedestrian provision, Developer contributions are important for subsidising new or enhanced passenger transport services. Section 8.2.6 explains this process and outlines the role of community transport initiatives in delivering passenger transport services to local communities.	
188-Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group	Section 8.3 Topic Guidance Para 8.13, 8.15, 8.27, 8.4, 8.35,		8.13- In relation to reducing the need to travel there is no discussion of rejecting developments whose need is not demonstrated or which are poorly located. In particular, for new community infrastructure there should be evidence of full consideration of options for more intensive use of existing infrastructure to reduce the need for new development.	As the SPD cannot go beyond the positively worded policies in the District Plan, it is not considered appropriate to include wording which directly speaks of rejecting developments, especially as each application has to be considered on its own merits in the context of the Plan as a whole and where other factors, such as social infrastructure, may need to be balanced and taken into account in the decision making process. However, it is agreed that greater emphasis could be made of other locational policies in the Plan, which seek to prioritise the location of development in sustainable locations and additional wording in the	Amend 8.13 as follows: Location is a key determinant in this respect and the District Plan's guiding principles (paragraph 3.3.2) and its Development Strategy hierarchy (outlined in Policy DPS2) therefore seek to direct development to areas that minimise the need to travel, by means such as utilising and supporting existing local facilities and networks that lie in close proximity. <u>To avoid harmful development, policies GBR1 and GBR2 set the context of constraints in Green Belt and other rural locations, while policy TRA1 further states that</u>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>8.15 & 8.27 Agree with the draft SPD that the desired modal shift requires developments to address both sustainable transport within the development and beyond the development's boundaries (eg through providing connectivity and through routes)</p> <p>8.24 & 8.35 Welcome the focus on</p>	<p>paragraph is therefore proposed. The need for additional community infrastructure is considered in line with the Policy CFLR 7, where (II) allows for the enhancement of existing facilities, where appropriate.</p> <p>Support noted and welcomed</p> <p>Support noted and welcomed</p>	<p><u>development proposals should "primarily be located in places which enable sustainable journeys to be made to key services and facilities to help aid carbon emission reduction"</u>. Where larger scale allocations and developments are proposed which may be more distanced from existing facilities, measures can be introduced that aim to largely self-contain movement within a site, and these can be supplemented by sustainable travel measures where journeys beyond are required.</p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>reducing the need to travel and then prioritising sustainable transport over private motorised vehicles and doing this through the scheme layout and other facilities (8.24) and enabling potentially vulnerable users to feel safer (8.35). We note that the density of the proposed</p> <p>Welcome the requirement that the design of a development will need to provide for electric car charging as a norm (8.49), but consider this should not be undermined by the statements that this may not be feasible in the short-term</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed. Further consideration of this issue will be addressed by the emerging Vehicle Parking SPD.</p>	
145- Andrew Martin Planning on behalf of Countryside	Section 8.2 Section 8.2.3 Pedestrian and cycle route provision-making journeys healthier and sustainable, para 8.32	Object	<p>In respect of making journeys healthier and more sustainable, paragraph 8.32 of the Draft SPD states that where rail stations are available, a maximum walking distance of 800 metres is sought.</p> <p>This guidance is unrealistic and could be misinterpreted by members of public. There is also nothing in national policy or guidance or the District Plan to support this position.</p> <p>Firstly, even in the District's towns</p>	<p>Agreed that the draft wording may be misinterpreted and that the text should be clarified.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 8.32 to read:</p> <p>In respect of recommended distances to bus stop locations, HCC seeks for these to be a maximum of 400m away from any property, which should be measured as the actual walking distance, and not through use of radius circles or 'as the crow flies' distances. Where rail stations are available, a maximum</p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>and villages, very few development sites will fall within an 800-metre walk of a railway station and therefore is it unhelpful to set out such a low figure in the SPD. The majority of site allocations in the District Plan are situated more than 800 metres from a railway station and yet they were considered 'sustainable' by EHDC and found to be acceptable by the Inspector who examined the District Plan.</p> <p>Secondly, using a 'maximum' walking distance of 800 metres and setting out that 'this is sought' could lead members of the public to believe that this is a mandatory standard, with development sites beyond 800 metres deemed unacceptable. This is clearly not the case, as proximity to a railway station is just one of a long list of transport and planning considerations.</p> <p>With this in mind, the final sentence in paragraph 8.32 should be either deleted or at the very least amended to reflect that this is a recommended (not maximum) distance.</p>		<p>walking distance of 800m is sought.</p> <p><u>The layout of new development should ensure that streets and paths facilitate direct and efficient bus operation and as many homes and workplaces as possible should lie within 400m access of bus services. Where rail stations are available, the design of development should seek to provide a maximum walking distance of 800m, where achievable. Distances should be measured as the actual walking distance, and not through use of radius circles or 'as the crow flies'. While the Council will seek to maximise this approach, in cases where HCC agrees that such distances cannot be achieved, new development proposals should demonstrate alternative measures to maximise sustainable journey opportunities to occupiers of the development.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>Countryside submits that to be realistic and an accurate reflection of development management practice, the final sentence in paragraph 8.32 should be either deleted or at the very least amended to read:</p> <p><i>"Where rail stations are available, a recommended walking distance of 800 metres is preferred."</i></p>		
80 – Hunsden, Eastwick and Gilston NP Group	Section 8.2, Section 8.2.3 Pedestrian and cycle route provision-making journeys healthier and sustainable, para 8.32		<p>Support the general approach on transport. However, the focus appears only on new provision, the need for connectivity with existing local communities and the lack of existing infrastructure needs addressing as does the need to maintain what little there is; surely EHC have a policy position to achieve better provision, if so why not state it?</p> <p>On new provision developers should make commuted sums available or endowments to provide for the long term maintenance needs. There needs to be a rethinking of the design of cycle routes to make them attractive to users; at Gilston EHC appears to be encouraging a cycle</p>	<p>Paragraph 8.27 states that "Intrinsic to the heart of design, routes for pedestrians and cyclists should be well thought out, making sure that linkages and permeation between existing and new developments can be successfully achieved so that maximum opportunities present themselves to engender green travel behaviours through active travel". This text, in combination with District Plan Policy TRA1 (c) and other national and local policies, ensures that the need to both integrate with, and improve, existing cycle and walking provision is taken into account.</p> <p>Funding for schemes, for both initial provision and their maintenance, is</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>and walking bridge of over 300m length to simply cross a classification road at Eastwick roundabout when a signalled crossing with priority for pedestrians and cyclists would be more user friendly and better value? EHC seems to have made no option analysis other than side with vehicle users at odds with your suggested strategy to give priority to walking and cycling; why?</p> <p>While the focus on cycling and walking is commendable, we would draw attention to:</p> <p>“ Garden Villages and Garden Towns: Visions and Reality. (Text copyright © 2020 Transport for New Homes and the conclusion, in section 4, that; -</p> <p>“Public transport is very popular but unfunded. Nearly every garden town wanted excellent public transport. Equally the vast majority of garden villages put sustainable transport at the heart of their vision. Funding was however, very uncertain and pushed a long way into the future - there was little definite. Could find no garden community where the sustainable transport elements were costed and funded with delivery dates.”</p>	<p>largely achieved through specific mechanisms, such as Section 106 legal agreements attached to planning permissions, and it is clearly important that these achieve all that they are intended to. Policies DEL1 and DEL2 seek to ensure such arrangements are achieved and avoid the issues described in the representation.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			Without a clear policy for funding public transport, the conclusion is that the car will dominate these new communities as it does the old ones.		
132- David Lock Associates on behalf of Tarmac	Section 8.2, Section 8.2.3 Pedestrian and cycle route provision-making journeys healthier and sustainable, paras 8.9, 8.32 Section 8.2.5 Electric vehicle charging Section 8.2.6 Contributions towards passenger and community transport		Tarmac support the approach adopted in paragraph 8.9 of the SPD, which states that major development proposals should be developed as walkable neighbourhoods, which prioritise non-car borne movement. BGS has been developed as a walkable neighbourhood, to help promote active travel and is therefore consistent with the draft SPD. Tarmac support the promotion of bus accessibility within new communities, to encourage active travel. However, Tarmac consider that the maximum distance between dwellings and bus stops should be amended to reflect national guidance. The stated maximum actual walking distance of 400m at paragraph 8.32 is considered unreasonable and is not justified. This unduly onerous criteria could restrict the ability of a viable bus service from operating within a new development to the detriment of bus	While use of the 800m measurement is not considered appropriate in light of both local guidance and to support the approach of CIHT's Buses in Urban Development, 2018, rewording of the paragraph is suggested to allow for flexibility where potential situations where 400m access to bus services may not be achievable.	Amend paragraph 8.32 to read: In respect of recommended distances to bus stop locations, HCC seeks for these to be a maximum of 400m away from any property, which should be measured as the actual walking distance, and not through use of radius circles or 'as the crow flies' distances. Where rail stations are available, a maximum walking distance of 800m is sought. <u>The layout of new development should ensure that streets and paths facilitate direct and efficient bus operation and as many homes and workplaces as possible should lie within 400m access of bus services. Where rail stations are available, the design of development should seek to</u>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
	initiatives (para 8.53)		<p>journey times. This could disincentivise residents from using public transport which would be counter-productive to the Council's sustainable transport ambitions.</p> <p>Best practice design guidance suggests that "the siting of bus stops should be based on trying to ensure they can be easily accessed on foot" (DfT (2007) Manual for Streets). Walkable neighbourhoods are characterised by having "a range of facilities within 10 minutes' (up to about 800 m) walking distance of residential areas"(Ibid) , which can reasonably be assumed to also include bus stop provision. Similarly, CABI guidance identifies 800 m as being the threshold distance for access to facilities on foot and "...opportunities to reach more distant facilities by public transport" (CABI (2001), Better Places to Live By Design: a companion guide to planning policy guidance 3. London: Thomas Telford).</p> <p>Tarmac suggest that the SPD is amended to reflect best practice design guidance as follows (para 8.32):</p>		<p><u>provide a maximum walking distance of 800m, where achievable. Distances should be measured as the actual walking distance, and not through use of radius circles or 'as the crow flies'. While the Council will seek to maximise this approach, in cases where HCC agrees that such distances cannot be achieved, new development proposals should demonstrate alternative measures to maximise sustainable journey opportunities to occupiers of the development.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>In respect of recommended distances to bus stop locations, Bus stops should be located to ensure as may homes and workplaces as possible lie within a 400m walking distance of a bus stop, and at most an 800m walking distance of a bus stop. This HCC seeks for these to be a maximum of 400m away from any property, which should be measured as the actual walking distance, and not through use of radius circles or 'as the crow flies' distances. Where rail stations are available, a maximum walking distance of 800m is sought.</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging provision In principle, Tarmac support electric vehicle charging provision within new developments. However cannot comment on appropriateness as yet. Tarmac therefore reserve comment until such a time that EHDC's proposed standards for EVC provision are available, as anticipated in early 2021.</p> <p>Contributions towards passenger</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Being non-prescriptive, the current</p>	

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>and community transport initiatives</p> <p>With regards to draft paragraph 8.53, in relation to site-specific financial contributions towards passenger and community transport initiatives, it will be necessary for the final version of the SPD to be consistent with national policy. This is particularly necessary in the light of the Government's White Paper proposals published in August 2020, which propose a consolidated Infrastructure Levy which would replace CIL and any financial obligations associated with Section 106 Agreements.</p> <p>Emissions from transport</p> <p>Tarmac support the approach taken in the draft SPD with regards to promoting sustainable travel modes within new developments to support improved air quality,</p>	<p>wording is considered to offer sufficient flexibility to accord with any potential changes in Government approach across the lifetime of the document.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p>	
146-Andrew Martin Planning on behalf	Section 8.2, Section 8.2.5 Electric vehicle charging	Support	Paragraph 8.49 of the Draft SPD acknowledges that "... While it is recognised that supplying active electric [car] charging points to every residential or commercial property	Support noted and welcomed. Suggested amendment to wording to add reference to the OLEV grant.	Amend end of paragraph 8.49 by adding additional text to read: Another benefit of accommodating the

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
of Countryside	provision, para 8.49		<p>may not be feasible in the short-term due to current energy network supply availability, the infrastructure to enable future connection should be provided from the outset of the development...</p> <p>Countryside welcomes this flexible approach and in particular its use on development sites that may have been brought forward via planning applications prior to the formal adoption of the District Plan.</p> <p>Another benefit of accommodating the infrastructure to enable future connection is that occupiers should be able to apply for the Government's OLEV Grant (currently £500), which could provide them with an affordable and relatively simple route to acquiring a domestic electric vehicle charging point.</p> <p>Countryside's current preferred approach to electric vehicle charging on development sites in East Herts is to ensure that all garages and some houses with on-plot parking have a 7kW 32Amp (single phase) smart</p>		infrastructure at the outset of development to enable future connection would be to offer occupiers the opportunity to apply for the Government's

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			charger fitted and the remaining dwellings are served by sufficient infrastructure to enable future connection, including via the Government's OLEV Grant.		
ID 116- East Herts Green Party	Section 8.2 Section 8.2.2 Reducing the overall need to travel (paras 8.15 and 8.19) Section 8.2.5 Electric Vehicle Parking (paras 8.50 and 8.53)		Para 8.15: Can the use of Active Travel Zone assessments be recommended to applicants? 8.19: Add references to car sharing/club such as co-wheels.org.uk - social enterprise offering different car sharing modes Section 8.2.5 Para 8.50: Add reference to Chargemystreet.co.uk, a community benefit society which installs and operates community vehicle charge points, raising money through community shares. As well as supplying electric charge points at each house, a developer can work with Chargemystreet to set up community-owned electric charge points on streets near developments to encourage existing residents without driveways to switch to EVs. 8.53 – see Chargemystreet.co.uk and co-wheels.org.uk	Reference to Active Travel Zones is already made and it would be for HCC to consider the assessments as part of the consideration of wider travel planning through planning applications. Unless and until such an approach is adopted by HCC, while the document makes reference to the consideration of ATZs, to actively seek such assessments through this SPD would be premature. As there are multitudinous companies and organisations offering car sharing services and on-street EV charging schemes, with many changing operations/names over time, it is not considered appropriate to highlight any particular enterprise.	No amendment in response to this issue
ID 31- A.	Section 8.3		All applications for developments	In order to meet the district's	No amendment in response

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
Rowe	Submission Requirements, para 8.59		that will generate significant amounts of transport movement should surely be refused. What is the point of generating meaningless and unenforceable plans?	Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing via the delivery of the District Plan's strategic sites, it is inevitable that, while seeking to contain movement so that journeys are significantly reduced, these developments will generate trips as part of everyday life. The key factor is to ensure that, where trips are made, they are facilitated by the most sustainable mechanisms possible to mitigate their impact.	to this issue
ID 96-Herts County Council	Section 8.3 Submission Requirements, para 8.56		Asking developers for all new residential and non-residential development to submit a completed Sustainability Checklist to demonstrate their support of sustainable transport, could be an effective tool in promoting the adoption of policies which prioritise walking and cycling over simple car use, is something HCC is happy to endorse.	Noted and welcomed.	.
ID 39-Sworders	Criterion T6	Object	T6 of the Checklist suggests that the provision of EV charging is a mandatory requirement; however it is considered unreasonable for this to be a blanket requirement given that paragraph 8.50 of the SPD, and Policy TRA3, make provision for a site	The Council's Vehicle Parking at New Developments SPD is currently subject to review and consultation on the document, which will contain standards pertaining to EV charging, will be undertaken in due course.	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			specific assessment 'where possible'. Further, the adopted Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development SPD (2008) makes no reference to electric vehicles or charging provision.		
157-Pigeon	Criteria T1-T6		<p>T1- Pigeon support the use of a variety of measures as identified in the draft SPD (such as Active Travel Zones, Walkable Neighbourhoods, Measures to promote working at home and 'local office hubs', Car sharing and Electric assisted bike schemes) to promote sustainable transport choices, whilst recognising the difficulties in achieving these in a predominately rural District.</p> <p>The SPD provides useful guidance/information on the above measures, but does not explicitly state how these are to be assessed. The SPD should provide clarity on this, and amended to make clear that the assessment of a schemes compliance with sustainable transport objectives should be assessed through reviewing the TA/TS. Including all these measures in a single document makes it clear for all parties what is being provided to promote sustainable transport. The SPD should also set out clear</p>	<p>In order to ensure that the SPD contains relevant advice throughout its lifetime in respect of requirements and thresholds necessary for submission of a planning application, a link is provided to the Council's main website where any updates will be easily and accurately accessed. However, it is acknowledged that thresholds were not detailed in the draft document and additional text is therefore proposed to cover this aspect.</p> <p>The Council's Vehicle Parking at New Developments SPD is currently subject to review and consultation on the document, which will contain standards pertaining to EV charging, will be undertaken in due course.</p>	<p>To clarify that thresholds may apply in respect of submission requirements, amend text of paragraph 8.60 to read: Further details of submission requirements for applications (<u>alongside relevant thresholds, where appropriate</u>) can be obtained via the Council's website at: https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-building/make-planning-application</p> <p>To reflect scalability of approach, amend paragraph 8.62 as follows: The checklist needs to be submitted with applications for all new development. The level of detail submitted needs to be proportionate to the scale of application. <u>This statement is explained in</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			<p>thresholds for when a TS/TA is required to accompany an application.</p> <p>T2- As above, the SPD should set out what will need to be included/ provided to satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>T3- As above, the SPD should set out what will need to be included/ provided to satisfy this requirement.</p> <p>T4- As above, the SPD should set out what will need to be included/ provided to satisfy this requirement. Examples of best practice schemes or case studies would be beneficial in this regard.</p> <p>T5- The SPD should include criteria for when a TA/TS and TP will be required and what should be included in these documents.</p> <p>T6- Parking Standards are set out within the Vehicle Parking Provision at New Developments SPD. If the Council is seeking different parking standards to those set out within the Parking Standards SPD then this</p>		<p><u>Appendix A: the combined checklist</u>. The checklist can also be used as part of the pre-application process.</p> <p>Additional text added to the combined checklist in Appendix- see proposed response to rep 118 above</p>

Rep No.	Section/Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			Sustainable Transport		
			should be brought via an amendment to that SPD (or be explicit within the Sustainability SPD). Again, this level of detail will not be appropriate for outline applications.		

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
88- Herts County Council	9.2 Topic Guidance, paras 9.17 and 9.32		<p>9.17 – Circular Economy is more than waste disposal, looks to rethink and redesign resource use. Important to highlight design processes.</p> <p>Updates references to the Waste Planning Local Plan- the draft Waste Local Plan has been published for consultation. The replacement policy to the current Local Plan policy is Policy 15: Sustainable Design and Resource Efficiency. This policy is similar to the adopted policy but it requires development proposals to submit Circular Economy Statements rather than SWMPs. The county council are in the process of producing a Circular Economy guidance document which offers</p>	<p>Updates to the Waste Local Plan and the role of circular economy statements noted. SPD text has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>Paragraph 9.32 recognises that guidance is indicative and may change reflecting changes to government guidance or service requirements. Applicants are advised to check the council's website. Therefore it is not necessary to amend the text.</p>	<p>Insert the following text into the policy box: <u>Waste Local Plan Review Policy 15: Sustainable Design and Resource Efficiency.</u></p> <p>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 9. 8. As follows:</p> <p><u>The County Council is currently in the process of reviewing the Waste Local Plan. Strategic Policy 15 of the draft Waste Local</u></p>

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			<p>Waste Management</p> <p>detailed guidance on the principles of a Circular Economy, Circular Economy Statements and the production of a SWMP. The Waste Planning Authority welcomes the inclusion of this section.</p> <p>With regards to paragraph 9.32: The external waste storage of flats should also provide food/green waste storage. As mentioned in 9.26, the government has an ambition to collect this type of waste weekly. Flats should not be excluded from this.</p>		<p><u>Plan (2021) requires the submission of Circular Economy Statements. Details are available on their website: www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/planning.</u></p> <p><u>Amend text in paragraph 9.20 as follows:</u></p> <p><u>Circular Economy Statements are also encouraged as good practice. As part of their current Waste Local Plan Review, the County Council are planning to require development proposals to submit circular economy statements. They are currently producing guidance to inform this process. and</u></p>

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
					something the County Council are planning to implement via their Local Plan Review.
171- S. Landon	9.2 Topic Guidance, 9.2.3 Construction Waste		Materials for recycling should be regarded not as 'waste ' but raw materials, a valuable resource that can be sold for profit. The use of Biomass and Biofuels should end. The growing of biofuels uses precious agricultural land necessary for food production. These crops also exhaust the soil. Their burning still produces carbon dioxide.	These principles reiterate the circular economy process, which is promoted in the section 9.2.3 of the SPD: recycling and re-using materials within the built environment. Additional reference has been added to the submission requirements section for clarity, Considerations associated with biomass are referenced the energy and carbon section of the SPD (table 1).	after paragraph 9.50: <u>Relevant requirements in the Waste Local Plan, to submit a site waste management plan or circular economy statement should be taken into account.</u> Further details are available on the County Council website: www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/planning .
133- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac	Section 9.2 Topic Guidance, 9.2.4 Designing Provision for Sustainable Waste Management		The consideration of innovative waste management solutions is supported in principle, as set out at draft paragraph 9.29. However, Tarmac consider that such solutions should be considered in the context of development viability, to ensure any innovative waste solutions do not compromise the delivery of much needed new homes within the District.	Noted. Assessment will take account of site context. Each application is assessed on its own merits.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
89- Herts County Council	Section 9.3 Submission Requirements		Paragraph 9.48: SWMPs and Circular Economy Statements should be mentioned here. Although they are requirements of the Waste Local Plan, the District Council would impose a condition on a development to submit a SWMP, therefore they should be noted here.	Agreed reference to the submission requirements of the Waste Local Plan should be signposted	Add the following text after paragraph 9.50: <u>Relevant requirements in the Waste Local Plan, to submit a site waste management plan or circular economy statement should be taken into account. Further details are available on the County Council website: www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/planning.</u>
134- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac	Section 9.3 Submission requirements		Clarification should be provided in relation to draft paragraph 9.48, to require details of waste and recycling storage provision at the detailed and Reserved Matters application stage. Tarmac do not consider that it would be appropriate to require such detailed design matters to be resolved at the Outline planning application stage follows: 9.48 In addition, the following information will be required at the <u>detailed/ Reserved Matters application stage...</u>	Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD), the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal.	No amendment in response to this issue
147- Countryside	9.2, Topic Guidance		Although Countryside does not object to the waste management	Noted. The Council recognises that some provision will be covered by	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
			requirements set out in Table 13, it should be noted that the provision of a number of these items, including the full complement of waste and recycling receptacle and the home composting facilities, are the responsibility of EHDC and usually covered by a developers planning contributions.	planning contributions and applicants should explain this in their checklist.	
189- Bishop's Stortford Climate Group	9.3, Submission Requirements		The encouragement to developers to reduce construction waste should be much stronger, the relevant section has no real requirements. We support the design expectations that support domestic storage for recycling. However we are concerned that the provisions requiring sufficient controls for waste storage on commercial premises are not reinforced in the checklists.	<p>The references to construction waste have been strengthened by further emphasis on the need to comply with the requirements of the Waste Local Plan submission requirements.</p> <p>The checklist requires applicants to demonstrate how they are achieving sustainable design and construction so should help increase transparency and help officers understand the approach that has been taken forward.</p> <p>The criteria are applicable to both domestic and non-domestic development.</p>	Add the following text into the Submission Requirements section (paragraph 9.50): <u>Relevant requirements in the Waste Local Plan, to submit a site waste management plan or circular economy statement should be taken into account. Further details are available on the County Council website: www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/planning.</u>
134- David Lock on behalf of Tarmac	9.3 Submission requirements		Clarification should be provided in relation to draft paragraph 9.48, to require details of waste and recycling storage provision at the detailed and Reserved Matters application stage.	Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD), the Council thinks it is	Additional text added to the combined checklist in Appendix-see proposed response to rep 118

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
			Tarmac do not consider that it would be appropriate to require such detailed design matters to be resolved at the Outline planning application stage follows: 9.48 In addition, the following information will be required at the <u>detailed/ Reserved Matters application stage...</u>	important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal. Recognised that Appendix A could be amended to provide more clarity about completing the checklist.	above
158-Pigeon	9.4 Checklist		Emphasises that the checklist requirements relate to detailed/ reserved matters applications not outline applications. Reference to internal layouts should be removed as not a planning issue	Given the importance of incorporating sustainability measures early into the design process (as outlined in section 2 of the SPD) the Council thinks it is important that the checklist is considered at the outline stage. However, it is recognised it may not be possible to provide all the information required. In these circumstances, the applicant should demonstrate which checklist criteria are not applicable to their proposal. Recognised that Appendix A could be amended to provide more clarity about completing the checklist. It is acknowledged that internal	Additional text added to the combined checklist in Appendix A- see proposed response to rep 118 above

Rep no.	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
9.			Waste Management		
				layout extends beyond the planning remit. However, the Council considers it useful design advice, to help facilitate sustainable waste management practices. As such it is referenced in the SPD.	

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEES

The following organisations were directly notified of the draft Sustainability SPD in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). It should be noted that individuals on the planning policy consultation database were also consulted, but are not listed.

Specific Consultation Bodies and/or Duty to Cooperate Bodies

- Affinity Water
- Anglian Water
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- Communication Operators
- EDF Energy Networks
- Environment Agency
- Essex County Council
- Great Anglia
- Hertfordshire Constabulary
- Hertfordshire County Council
- Highways England
- Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Historic England
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG
- NHS West Essex
- Neighbouring Authorities: Broxbourne Borough Council, Epping Forest District Council, Harlow District Council, North Hertfordshire District Council, Stevenage Borough Council, Uttlesford District Council
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- Stansted Airport
- Thames Water
- The Coal Authority
- The Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust

- Veolia Water

East Herts Town and Parish Councils	
Bishop's Stortford Town Council	Hertford Heath Parish Council
Buntingford Town Council	Hertingfordbury Parish Council
Hertford Town Council	High Wych Parish Council
Sawbridgeworth Town Council	Hormead Parish Council
Ware Town Council	Hunsdon Parish Council
Albury Parish Council	Little Berkhamsted Parish Council
Anstey Parish Council	Little Hadham Parish Council
Ardeley Parish Council	Little Munden Parish Council
Aspenden Parish Council	Much Hadham Parish Council
Aston Parish Council	Sacombe Parish Meeting
Bayford Parish Council	Standon Parish Council
Bengeo Rural Parish Council	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council
Benington Parish Council	Stanstead St Margarets Parish Council
Bramfield Parish Council	Stapleford Parish Council
Braughing Parish Council	Stocking Pelham Parish Council
Brent Pelham and Meesden Parish Council	Tewin Parish Council
Brickendon Liberty Parish Council	Thorley Parish Council
Buckland and Chipping Parish Council	Thundridge Parish Council
Cottered Parish Council	Walkern Parish Council
Datchworth Parish Council	Wareside Parish Council
Eastwick and Gilston Parish Council	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council
Furneux Pelham Parish Council	Westmill Parish Council
Great Amwell Parish Council	Widford Parish Council
Great Munden Parish Council	Wyddial Parish Meeting
28 Other Parish Councils outside of East Herts	

General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations	
Aldwyck Housing Group Ltd	Hertfordshire Community Health Services
Bat Conservation Trust	Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Bellway homes	Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group
Beds and Herts Local Medical Committee	Hutchinson 3G UK Limited
Bishops Stortford Methodist Church	Ian Baseley Associates
Bishop's Stortford District Footpath Association	Jarvis Homes Ltd
Bishop's Stortford Chamber Of Commerce	Labour Party
Bishop's Stortford Liberal Democrats	Layston Pre-School and Nursery
Bishop's Stortford Mencap	Leach Homes
Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Management Partnership	Leaside Church

General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations	
British Horse Society	Leaside Under 5's Kindergarten
British Telecommunications plc	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
British Waterways	Linden Homes
Building Research Establishment	Linden Homes Eastern
Buntingford Chamber of Commerce	McMullen & Sons Ltd
Buntingford Civic Society	Mobile Operators Association
Buntingford Town Partnership	Molewood Residents Association
CABE	National Express East Anglia
Canal & River Trust	National Farmers Union
Carers in Hertfordshire	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
CBI East of England	Network Homes
CDA for Herts	North East Herts Labour Party
Chaldean Estate	North Hertfordshire Homes
Christ Church C of E (VA) Primary & Nursery School	Openreach Newsites
Church Commissioners	Orange Personal Communications Services
Circle Anglia	Origin Housing Association
Coke Gearing Consulting	PACE
Community Safety & Crime Reduction Department, Herts Constabulary	Paradigm Housing Group
Countryside Management Service	Paradise Wildlife Park
CPRE Hertfordshire	Parsonage Residents Association
Croudace Homes	Parsonage Surgery
Department for Transport Rail Group	Pelham Structures Ltd
Diocese of St Albans	Persimmon Homes
DPDS Consulting Group	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd
East Herts Ramblers	Plainview Planning Ltd
East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Planning Potential
East of England Development Agency	RSPB
East of England Local Government Association	Salvation Army Bishop's Stortford Corps
Essex County Cricket Board	Sanctuary Carr-Gomm
Fairview New Homes	Sanctuary Hereward
Fields In Trust	Savills
First Capital Connect	Shelter
Forebury Estates Ltd	South Anglia Housing Association
Forewind Ltd	Sport England
Framptons	St Joseph's RC Primary School
Freight Transport Association	St Michaels Church
Friends, Families and Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project	Standon and Puckeridge Surgery

General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations	
Garden History Society	STANDonA120 campaign
Gascoyne Cecil Estates	Stevenage Liberal Democrats
Gladman Developments	Stewart Ross Associates
Good Architecture/ Transition Hertford	STOP Harlow North
Grange Builders	Strategic Planning Research Unit, DLP Planning Ltd
Granta Housing Society Ltd	Strutt & Parker
Hanover Housing Association	Sustrans
Hastoe Housing Association Ltd (East)	Telefonica O2 UK Ltd
Hatfield Town Council	Tesni Properties Limited
Haymeads Residents' Association	Thakeham Homes
Hazel End Farm	The Bishop's Stortford High School
Hertford Disability Support Group	The Canal and River Trust
Hertford Heath Primary School	The Gallery at Parndon Mill
Hertfordshire Action on Disability	The Georgian Group
Hertfordshire Association of Parish and Town Councils	The Gypsy Council
Hertingfordbury Conservation Society	The Lawn Tennis Association
Herts & Middlesex Badger Group	The Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust
Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	The Theatres Trust
Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust	The Traveller Law Reform Project
Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	The Ware Society
Hertfordshire Community Health Services	The Woodland Trust
Hertfordshire Gardens Trust	Theatres Trust
Hertfordshire Police Authority	Wallace House Surgery
Herts & North Middlesex Area of the Ramblers	Ware Town Partnership
Herts Sports Partnership	Wareside C of E Primary School
Hightown Praetorian and Churches Housing Association	Watermill Estate Residents' Association
Hill Residential	Wates Developments
Hockerill Residents Association	Wattsdown Development Limited
Home Builders Federation	Welwyn Garden City Society
Home Farm Trust Herts & Essex	Wodson Park Sports Centre
Housing 21	Woodhall Estate
Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust	Hertfordshire Football Association
Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Hertfordshire Cricket
Hockey England	Rugby Football Union

