

## ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER 'Q': MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Q44 - Summary Comment	Q44 - Detailed Comment
<b>Object to housing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for so many houses. Question basis on which housing requirement figures have been calculated/housing capacity. Building more houses will not increase affordability.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inappropriate to suggest a reduction in the planned number of new houses until new evidence is produced.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more development/develop elsewhere. Do not allow Hertfordshire to go the way of Middlesex.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expect strong opposition from East Herts Council to any proposal of green belt movement from Stevenage.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many large executive dwellings in the villages. More 2-3 bed semis.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to prevent an influx of applications between adoption of Core Strategy in 2013 and Zero-carbon 2016.</li> </ul>
<b>Role of the Core Strategy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy must reflect local wishes</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Strategy should drive development control. Too many planning applications are considered in isolation, rather than as part of a strategy. After all this consultation, will it be possible to refuse an application because it does not fit in with the Core Strategy that results?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will the consultation feedback influence the final strategy?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support sequential approach to brownfield-greenfield development</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need an empty homes strategy</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To be a strategy, must be measurable and attainable, otherwise it is not a strategy but a set of aspirations. Parish plans are informative background, but not evidence.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is wrong that Rural Area policies are virtually indistinguishable from Green Belt policies and the Council should consider how such policies can be re-written to reflect a difference in emphasis and application.</li> </ul>
<b>East of England Plan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RSS situation remains fluid – even greater need for sound evidence base. Need to reflect changes to RSS as Core Strategy develops</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not legitimate to consult at this stage when the RSS is to be rescinded. There will be a need to re-consult on Issues and Options.</li> </ul>
<b>Question the consultation process</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaflets not delivered</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaflets do not include details of distribution</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responding online is not easy and might have deterred people as a result.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question presentation, content and methodology of the consultation</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No-one will vote for the town in which they live to accommodate growth</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why no stakeholder events involving the development industry?</li> </ul>
<b>Buntingford</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorrect to say that there are frequent bus services in Buntingford. This is currently exaggerated in Ch 3.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dispute assertion that Buntingford is below standard provision of parks, gardens and open spaces</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife sites in Downhall Ley and Porters close are both completely built up and residential</li> </ul>
<b>Advice &amp; guidance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the potential benefits of waterways.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Mail has a number of sites in East Herts</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways Agency is happy to offer assistance in respect of assessing the potential impacts of planned development growth on the strategic road network.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to reflect the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority's 'Vision Aims and Principles' document (July 2010).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be a telecoms policy within the LDF Development Management Policies DPD. See PPG8 for guidance. [Suggested policy wording provided].</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommend that the Council consults with aerodrome operators directly. Consider</li> </ul>

Q44 - Summary Comment	Q44 - Detailed Comment
	<p>a 'non-official' safeguarding map. Notify local aerodrome operators or any plans for telecom installations, wind turbines, high structures, or minerals venting/flaring nearby</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for collaborative working with neighbouring Local Planning Authorities.</li> </ul>