

Stevenage Borough Local Plan: Publication version

Summary of consultation representations and officer response

August 2016

Contents

Introduction, context and sustainability	3
A vital town centre	19
A strong, competitive economy	40
Infrastructure and transport	54
High quality homes	77
Gypsy and traveller Provision	124
Good design	138
Healthy communities	143
Green Belt	149
Climate change, flood risk and pollution	158
Natural and historic environment	170
Monitoring and delivery	175

The following tables contain a summary of all responses to the Publication consultation on the Stevenage Borough Local Plan and an officer response to these. Where minor amendments are proposed in response to comments, cells are highlighted in yellow. Where the Council does not believe that the issues raised go to tests of fundamental soundness, but that, if the Inspector was minded to disagree, we feel that an alternative form of words could be agreed, the cells are highlighted in red.

Introduction, context and sustainability

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
115	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	About this consultation	The 'Have Your Say' button on the website does not work/is oversubscribed. It is not accessible.	We have met, and exceeded, the statutory requirements for consultation on the Local Plan. No change.
301	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	About this consultation	Concern locally that information in the leaflet is inaccurate and misleading. It suggests the plan is a fait accompli. It also states 'existing open spaces will be protected', which is not true (see objection to HO1/13 and HO14). It makes no mention of the new Travellers Site.	The leaflet was intended to provide a summary of proposals only. The Local Plan is the document being consulted upon. See also response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
320	970676	Mr Alan McDonald	About this consultation	The leaflet is of no use, it is sketchy and provides no details to judge the huge impact of these changes. Terms used are not explained - i.e. green 'links' and 'corridors'. Hope there is a more detailed plan to comment on before SBC plans go ahead.	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
354	973835	Mrs Cheryl Peers	About this consultation	Remove all plans to build on Green Belt and/or alter/amend/review the boundaries of the current Green Belt. NPPF 'very special circumstances' to build on the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. Increasing population is not a very special circumstance. Remove all plans to build on/amend/alter Green Belt boundaries.	Our Green Belt Technical Paper sets out the Exceptional Circumstances to justify Green Belt release. No change.
357	962420	Angela Turner	About this consultation	Residents are being misled by the leaflet. The north Stevenage development boundary does not show NHDC plans for additional housing.	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). Our Plan cannot designate or show proposals for sites outside the Borough Boundary. No change.
369	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	About this consultation	The representation form does not appear to be designed to allow a member of the public to use. The sections are confined to 'procedural and legal requirements' or 'duty to cooperate' and options presented do not allow comments. Time constraints do not allow research on whether SBC has followed all legal guidance and precedent. The leaflet failed to mention the gypsy and traveller site - what else do SBC wish to gloss over?	The representation form was created in accordance with best practice Government guidance. See also response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
440	771716	Aston Village Society	About this consultation	It is unrealistic to expect members of the public to read and understand the Local Plan and its supporting documents, and relevant legislation within 6 weeks. There should have been a longer period of consultation and more help, perhaps, public events with a presentation of the plan.	The 6 week consultation period is defined by planning Regulations. See also response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
531	922051	Friends of Forster Country	About this consultation	The plan should be corrected and re-issued for consultation. Leaflet maps showing the extent of HO3 are confusing and conflicting. Residents will have been misled by this. These inconsistencies are appalling, more so if the intention was to make the plan seem less invasive. The reader gets the impression that the Green Belt Review has already happened and there is no chance for demographic input. Surely this is not right? Leaflets were not delivered to a number of streets. The consultation process has not been executed properly and has not been fully democratic.	See responses to comments 301 (leaflet) and 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
598	976265	Patricia Samuel	About this consultation	Object to the lack of time available to comment on the Local Plan.	See responses to comments 115 (statutory consultation requirements) and 440 (consultation period). No change.

853	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	About this consultation	The way in which SBC had asked for replies to this form is not user friendly. This is biased and will discourage responses. There should be a space for contact details. Many may respond without these, meaning their response will not count. To compensate for this, SBC should recognise that an email address is the modern type of address.	See response to comment 369 (response form). Email addresses are accepted as contact details. No change.
856	977185	Mrs H M Jones	About this consultation	Believe a drop in session should have been held on the 15th February due to clashes with the half term holidays.	A drop in session was held on 8th February. Staff were also available to take phone calls and meet with people on an informal basis, throughout the consultation period. No change.
987	922235	Eur Ing John C Spiers	About this consultation	The consultation has not been carried out fairly. The representation form was not advertised. There is no reference to it in the Plan. The comments of lay people may be discounted because they were unaware of the requirements for making formal submissions. Recommence the consultation making methods of commenting formally much clearer.	Concerns noted. All responses will count as formal representations and will be treated in the same way. See also response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
1067	342862	Mr Ken Wing	About this consultation	Did not receive a leaflet. Website was not taking comments.	Noted. See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements).
1114	974652	Mr Paul Schimmel	About this consultation	Question whether local residents comments will be taken into consideration as the consultation process has been designed to avoid any chance of the public registering their concerns.	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). We have exceeded statutory requirements voluntarily, to try and encourage public response. No change.
1150	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	About this consultation	Opportunities for public consultation pitiful - a few small notices offering Monday 8 February.	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
1161	342592	Mrs Marion Ohlendorf	About this consultation	The leaflet centrefold map and the smaller map show different areas for HO3. Residents who only look at the larger map are being deceived.	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
1196	922456	Mr Rick Ohlendorf	About this consultation	The leaflet centrefold map and the smaller map show different areas for HO3. Residents who only look at the larger map are being deceived.	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
1220	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	About this consultation	Far from encouraging public involvement, the language and format of the response sheets could have been designed to deter it. That is the effect they have had on many people.	See response to comment 369 (response form). No change.
1254	974444	Mrs Cathleen Edwards	About this consultation	Did not receive a copy of the leaflet. Others did not receive this either.	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
1279	974433	Mr Patrick Newman	About this consultation	Such a large change to the population requires more than a few weeks public consultation, timetable should be extended by four weeks.	See response to comment 440 (consultation period). No change.
1354	974005	Mr David Gray	About this consultation	The leaflet contained little detail and several notable omissions. Expected public meetings to be organised.	See responses to comments 301 (leaflet) and 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
1370	974244	Angela Hepworth	About this consultation	Congratulate SBC on the document distributed to residents. The leaflet is clearly presented and easy to understand.	Support welcomed.
1407	973937	Jacqueline Pond	About this consultation	Consultation portal is dreadful and designed to restrict commentary. Unreasonable and discriminatory to expect people to wade through a 200 page document.	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.

1825	909897	Mrs Sue Jones	About this consultation	Concern that the leaflet is inaccurate and misleading. It suggests the plan is a fait accompli. It states existing open spaces will be protected - not true. It makes no mention of the G&T site.	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
1835	973697	Yvonne Pendlebury	About this consultation	Did not receive a leaflet. Numbering vague areas on a map hardly constitutes a plan. Did SBC intend to make it ambiguous?	See response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
1851	974451	Mrs Kathy Richardson	About this consultation	Feel strongly Hooks Cross residents have been left out of the consultation process. Do EHDC residents not get a say?	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
1863	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	About this consultation	Although online document is easy to find and read, it is not obvious how to comment in an overall manner. This will put people off giving their input therefore the consultation itself is flawed.	See response to comment 115 (statutory consultation requirements). No change.
26	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Local Plan - Publication version	Congratulations on the ambitious Local Plan. Broadly support the ideas and proposals. Would be useful to understand how credible securing government and private funding and backing is for these plans. Has the council been given encouragement that the plans are realistic?	Support welcomed. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out how the plan will be delivered. No change.
45	969605	Manju Thanky	Local Plan - Publication version	Similar fancy plans without milestones have come to nothing over the last 22 years. This Plan looks no different. Provide 3, 5 and 10 year milestones, not pie in the sky dreams.	Noted. See response to comment 26 (IDP). It is a statutory requirement for the plan to cover at least a 15 year period. No change.
48	969607	Mr Bill Pilgrim	Local Plan - Publication version	Very interesting reading the Local Plan. Watched the town grow since 1957. Council do a great job, keep up the good work.	Support welcomed.
80	965000	Mr Andrew Nelson	Local Plan - Publication version	Support the draft Local Plan 100%. Believe there is significant un-tapped potential in the town and it can be turned around. Although we are already several years behind where we should be and the plan is not ambitious enough in some areas, particularly Green Belt development. Should set a higher bar.	Support welcomed.
83	969644	Ms Joan Galeano	Local Plan - Publication version	Generally welcome your plans for the future.	Support welcomed.
125	969678	Mr Derek Harrington	Local Plan - Publication version	Support shown for the plan, which is all embracing and is utilising space within the town.	Support welcomed.
141	969698	Mr John Moorhouse	Local Plan - Publication version	Whilst new jobs and homes (including affordable homes) are both important targets for the future of the town, they simply highlight political issues which may be viewed as the correct expression of a Socialist led Council. The brochure is poorly detailed and vague and leaves unanswered questions.	Noted. See also response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
173	342647	Mr Edward Pugh	Local Plan - Publication version	General objection to the Local Plan.	Noted. No change.
196	342058	Mr Roger Burt	Local Plan - Publication version	How many Government Planning Inspector Inquiries, previously refused, does it take to stop this plan going ahead. The reasons stated then are still relevant today.	Noted. No change.
201	342026	Mr Clive Brackenbury	Local Plan - Publication version	Considering you can't please everyone, the plan for Stevenage is a pretty good job.	Support welcomed.

356	971158	Ms Janice Mellett	Local Plan - Publication version	The town needs improvement not expansion. SBC are responsible for the town's decline. The Old Town has been spoilt by high rise flats and parking controls. The town centre is worse than others. Homes are being converted to HMO's. These plans will increase congestion.	Noted. We are required to meet our objectively assessed needs for housing and employment. The plan aims to provide the infrastructure needed to support new development. Our IDP identifies the infrastructure required and how it will be delivered. No change.
370	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Local Plan - Publication version	The Plan is a waste of time as it does not address the serious issue Stevenage faces in regenerating the town centre and the wellbeing of the town as a whole. Stevenage risks becoming a dormitory town with little infrastructure to generate money.	Noted. No change.
424	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Local Plan - Publication version	No impact assessment of how proposals will affect communities immediately outside the SBC boundary and on the non-A1 road network. Disregard of the impact of development on the road network, improvements to which will be restricted/prevented by existing development and a lack of funding.	Traffic impacts will be mitigated through improvements, where possible. SBC are working with other local authorities to actively lobby Highways England to provide further A1(M) improvements. No change.
428	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Local Plan - Publication version	No impact assessment of how proposals will affect communities immediately outside the SBC boundary and on the non-A1 road network. Disregard of the impact of development on the road network, improvements to which will be restricted/prevented by existing development and a lack of funding.	See response to 424 (traffic). No change.
452	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Local Plan - Publication version	Support a range of issues and principles including, but not limited to: The identification of the key challenges; The geographic definition of the housing and economic market areas; The OAN and its accommodation within the Boundary; Affordable housing targets; Regeneration of the town centre; The strategy for the two main employment areas; new neighbourhoods to the N & W and their cross-boundary masterplanning; Safeguarded corridors to provide access to land within North Hertfordshire; The role of Lister Hospital; Principles underpinning the demonstration of exceptional circumstances; The need to ensure appropriate infrastructure; The approach to Green Infrastructure; and Providing support for relevant schemes beyond the Borough's boundary whilst recognising that other authorities will determine the most appropriate outcomes in these locations.	Support welcomed.
510	619933	Natural England	Local Plan - Publication version	Amendments suggested to the SA and HRA Screening Report and changes to policies which are unsound. Do not agree with the conclusion of the HRA Screening Report of no likely significant effects. Reasons relate to recreational disturbance issues, concerns about water quality and Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works.	Noted. Amendments have been made to the SA and HRA Screening Report in response to these comments. No change.
616	976290	Cara Ward	Local Plan - Publication version	As much green land and countryside as possible should be retained.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
625	976295	T Brignall	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to proposals for the countryside based on the loss of amenity.	The plan aims to provide a balance between providing new homes and protecting green infrastructure/the environment. No change.
634	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Local Plan - Publication version	Support the location of the West Stevenage residential and employment allocations on the Proposals Map.	Support welcomed.
668	342421	Mr & Mrs J Jones	Local Plan - Publication version	Against the proposals for the countryside contained in the SBC Local Plan.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.

674	976431	S Meredith	Local Plan - Publication version	General objection. No reasons provided.	Noted. No change.
689	976484	S H Kestin	Local Plan - Publication version	Against the proposals for the countryside contained in the Local Plan.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
693	342067	Ms Christine Callingham	Local Plan - Publication version	Urban sprawl to the south of the centre of Stevenage is cramped, soulless and unsustainable. Why not develop Hitchin? It is always Stevenage.	We cannot plan for land outside the Borough boundary. No change.
698	976506	Mr and Mrs Rex	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to the overall growth plan of Stevenage and detrimental impact it will have on surrounding areas.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
712	976532	S.F & A.J. Fish	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to proposals for the countryside, as this would spoil an area of natural beauty.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
716	976543	Mr and Mrs Adams	Local Plan - Publication version	General objection. Object to destruction of the countryside, destruction of animal/bird/ plant habitats, traffic issues and noise and light pollution.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
728	342304	Mr Gordon Hadden	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to proposals to build on the countryside.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
859	977188	Mrs A Palmer	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to building on any Greenfield sites due to the loss of agricultural land.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
865	342707	Mrs Kath Shorten	Local Plan - Publication version	Parts of the plan are well researched. However, lack of information on credibility and consultation. Reports should have authors names and authors should be available for public discussion and comment.	Staff were, and are, available for meetings and over the phone to discuss the Local Plan. No change.
870	342707	Mrs Kath Shorten	Local Plan - Publication version	The Plan is missing a section containing demographic information i.e. who will live and work in the town by 2030 and how should the housing stock/ parking be modified.	The Plan is supported by a wide range of evidence studies that consider this information. We do not wish to unnecessarily lengthen the plan. No change.
876	973603	Lisa Walker	Local Plan - Publication version	Object to changes to surrounding area of Little Wymondley and Graveley. It will change the area that I chose to live in, create more traffic and flood risk, and will take away the village feel.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
878	973610	Ben Walker	Local Plan - Publication version	Concerns around proposed development near Little Wymondley. Impact on traffic routes people use for work, increase flood risk and impact, most of all, on the overall look of the surrounding area with more houses, more people, more cars and more noise.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
881	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Local Plan - Publication version	The plan is unlikely to be deliverable within the 20-year period. Long passages of duplicated evidence do little to add clarity. Full proposals map lacking despite references being made to it, with no link found in the document, only available on the website.	Noted. See response to comment 26 (IDP). The full Policies Map was made available in line with the statutory regulations. No change.
889	973781	Mr Loyd Davies	Local Plan - Publication version	The Comet stated SBC has spent £1.82M on the development of this Local Plan. Given the limitations and omissions, struggle to see how this has been spent; this is a poor investment of public funds.	Producing a Local Plan is a statutory document. Concerns around costs need to be taken-up with council auditors. No change.
906	973669	Ann Scott	Local Plan - Publication version	Plans are still not clear and will they happen? Heard many times that the town will be regenerated but nothing happens.	Noted. See response to comment 26 (IDP). No change.

953	977311	Russell Sparrow	Local Plan - Publication version	Support additional housing as this is a real pressure due to the lack of homes. Consideration has been given to providing something for everyone.	Support welcomed.
997	922235	Eur Ing John C Spiers	Local Plan - Publication version	The Plan makes qualitative statements and gives no quantitative indication of what it actually means. E.g., under IT4 it references a study that is difficult to access. The Plan should state the conclusions of studies. This all in the face of a likely population increase of 15% or more if the Plan goes ahead. It is unreasonable and undemocratic to consult people on a document lacking in real facts. Revise the Plan to include more quantified outcomes affecting Stevenage residents.	We do not wish to unnecessarily lengthen the Plan by repeating the results of supporting evidence. Copies of evidence studies are provided on our website and will be made available in the Examination library. No change.
1066	771969	Mr Geoffrey Laughlin	Local Plan - Publication version	Broadly agree with most of Plan. Stevenage is in dire need of something. Town Centre is abysmal, the whole fabric is tatty. Was once a fine town, now sad. Impossible to park for trains - need MSCP. Great plan, but will be a long delivery process.	Support welcomed.
1130	972739	Mr Aidan Heritage	Local Plan - Publication version	Aware of the delicate balancing act required by the plan. We must attempt to assess current and future needs. Hope the town is regenerated sympathetically to the ideals of our founders, whilst causing our descendants to look back and feel proud.	Noted. No change.
1151	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	Local Plan - Publication version	No named authors, let alone recognised architects or civic planners. Lacks deeper thought and broad vision. The plan is needlessly grandiose, when all know there is no money available.	See also responses to comments 865 (Plan authors) and 26 (IDP). No change.
1182	975380	Mr Gary Daines	Local Plan - Publication version	Development will ruin Stevenage forever causing congestion, more crime, more traffic and more concrete.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses) and 356 (infrastructure). No change.
1187	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Local Plan - Publication version	Plan appears to be overly-ambitious, no indications of cost, how it is funded or how investment will be obtained. Stevenage should not increase in size without necessary improvements to infrastructure and amenity.	See response to comment 356 (infrastructure). No change.
1239	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Local Plan - Publication version	No impact assessment of how proposals will affect communities immediately outside the SBC boundary and on the non-A1 road network. Disregard of the impact of development on the road network, improvements to which will be restricted/prevented by existing development and a lack of funding.	Traffic impacts will be mitigated through improvements, where possible. SBC are working with other local authorities to actively lobby Highways England to provide further A1(M) improvements. No change.
1284	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Local Plan - Publication version	The plan does not acknowledge Stevenage has probably reached the limit of its potential, as there are references to expansion beyond the boundary. Neighbouring authorities have not agreed. The plan is not likely to be fully implemented, due to agreements and finance not being in place. Without this, the plan is a wish list. There are too many loose ends and SBC has overstepped its area of responsibility.	The Plan does not seek to allocate any land outside of the Borough Boundary. It acknowledges potential cross-boundary schemes might come forward, but does not rely on them. See also response to comment 26 (IDP). No change.
1310	975858	Mr Chris Marley	Local Plan - Publication version	Maps are confusing and unreadable. Can't see exact location of proposed housing. Different plans have contradictory information.	Noted. See also response to comment 301 (leaflet). No change.
1319	978900	O Campbell	Local Plan - Publication version	Do not take away the countryside.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.

1320	983470	Charli Campbell	Local Plan - Publication version	Stevenage needs this beautiful countryside for recreation and nature.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). No change.
1795	976199	Suren Nair	Local Plan - Publication version	No mention of Lister Hospital expansion, already struggling to cope with existing demand. Question whether roads be widened for additional traffic, additional railway parking and trains will be provided as well as other infrastructure. Widening A1 is not enough to address issue of traffic management.	See response to comment 356 (infrastructure). No change.
1801	977370	Mrs Margaret Ward	Local Plan - Publication version	Comments on Archer Road Neighbourhood Centre improvements.	This is not a Local Plan issue. No change.
1817	922429	Diana Hayward	Local Plan - Publication version	Plan is too woolly. No details of how congestion and parking will be addressed. Noise and emissions will increase. There is nothing about sustainability, solar panels etc. Where is the mention of cycle tracks? Nothing seems to have been positively prepared. Officers should come and experience the problems first hand.	See response to comment 356 (infrastructure). The overarching aim of the plan is for it to be sustainable. Policy FP1 seeks to address climate change. No change.
1849	974410	Margaret Hawkins	Local Plan - Publication version	Commend SBC for its hard work to maintain quality of life residents enjoy here. Stevenage is well suited to respond to the needs of population expansion, rather than becoming a dormitory town for London.	Support welcomed.
1865	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Local Plan - Publication version	Overall, the report is a huge disappointment and a missed opportunity. The redevelopment of the town centre would be a big improvement, but in practical terms, improving the transport infrastructure would make a bigger difference. Where people work has barely been addressed.	Noted. See response to comment 424 (traffic). No change.
9	342737	Mr David Stone	What is the National Planning Policy Framework and why is it important?	Plan conflicts with the NPPF. This requires Green Belt protection. SBC plans will create urban sprawl. This is unsustainable. Forster Country, previously protected by SBC, is a heritage asset and is integral to the spatial relationship and rural character of the place.	The NPPF allows Green Belt release in Exceptional Circumstances. See also response to comment 354 (exceptional circumstances). The remainder of Forster Country will be protected via proposals for a Country Park on this site. No change.
503	922051	Friends of Forster Country	What is the National Planning Policy Framework and why is it important?	Plan conflicts with the NPPF. It does not accord with advice on some of those matters listed in para 1.9. Car journeys will be increased - especially to/from HO3. HO3 is further from the town than areas west of Stevenage not considered. NPPF says housing needs are not 'exceptional circumstances'. The historic environment is not protected - HO3 includes most of Forster Country.	Our policies seek to promote passenger transport at new developments, to reduce car journeys. Land to the west of Stevenage is allocated for housing. See also response to comment 354 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1059	922235	Eur Ing John C Spiers	What is the National Planning Policy Framework and why is it important?	Object to the implication that Green Belt is being protected, when it isn't. Green Belt within SBC boundary must not be removed.	Noted. See responses to comments 9 (Green Belt release) and 354 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
483	619933	Natural England	What is environmental assessment?	A number of technical objections raised. Subsequent discussions and amendments mean these have now been resolved.	Noted. Amendments have been made to the SA and HRA Screening Report in response to these comments. No change.
506	922051	Friends of Forster Country	A picture of Stevenage	Revised wording suggested relating to the development of Stevenage as a settlement.	Noted. We consider the wording to adequately reflect the history of the town. No change.

507	922051	Friends of Forster Country	A picture of Stevenage	Revised wording suggested for para 2.3. Para 2.5 - Focussing residential use to the north has already had detrimental effects on the Old Town roads and footpaths. Adding more homes will increase the imbalance and create even more demand for open space. Para 2.12 - not fair to describe Stevenage as having access to open countryside when the intention is to build on it.	Noted. See response to comment 506 (history of the town). Our Housing Technical Paper and the SLAA: Housing show that we have explored all options in terms of housing sites and that the allocated sites are required to meet our needs. Access to countryside will remain. See also response to comment 9 (Forster Country). No change.
508	922051	Friends of Forster Country	A picture of Stevenage	The area around the Lister is already heavily congested. Population growth will mean more patients, exacerbating this issue.	See response to comment 424 (traffic). No change.
726	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	A picture of Stevenage	The plan should make use of available data on health and wellbeing from the JSNA and Public Health England to inform and support policies.	See response to comment 870 (evidence base). No change.
1205	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	A picture of Stevenage	Revised wording suggested relating to the development of Stevenage as a settlement.	See response to comment 506 (history of the town). No change.
216	342737	Mr David Stone	History	The New Town and existing housing stock should be re-used more effectively to provide housing fit for 21st Century living. Shopping is moving towards the internet. There are shopping centres spread all around Stevenage. Mixed uses should be provided and the rationalisation of shopping outlets. Surely more higher rise housing might be possible?	Plans for the town centre aim to provide high rise housing and a mix of uses. Strategies to reprovide ageing housing stock are being considered as part of the council house building programme, by our Housing Team. No change.
217	342737	Mr David Stone	Main challenges	Disagree that housing is unaffordable. Many properties are ex-council and cheaper than other areas of Herts. Housing to the north will increase commuting. Cycle paths are infrequently used. Concerns around congestion. The utilisation of space in the New Town should be better addressed before any peripheral expansion is considered. There is still unused space within Gunnels Wood that could be used for housing.	Noted. Our monitoring data shows that housing is not very affordable when considered against average salaries. The Plan uses a Brownfield first approach, as demonstrated in the Housing Technical Paper. All suitable, available and achievable sites are being used, where possible. See also responses to comments 424 (traffic) and 507 (housing options). No change.
218	342737	Mr David Stone	Drivers of change	Disagree that housing is unaffordable. Many properties are ex-council and cheaper than other areas of Herts. Housing to the north will increase commuting. Cycle paths are infrequently used. Concerns around congestion. The utilisation of space in the New Town should be better addressed before any peripheral expansion is considered. There is still unused space within Gunnels Wood that could be used for housing.	See response to comment 217. No change.
329	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Drivers of change	In order to make the local plan more effective, provisions for reviewing, changing and ending the plan should be included, should change proceed in a way not anticipated by the plan. The plan has been developed on the assumption of continued growth but this is not a given at all.	National Regulations and Guidance set out the process for reviewing and updating Local Plans. No change.
332	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Strategic context	Include information showing salaries in Stevenage and how they relate to 80% of market price. If there is a gap, show how you plan to close it. The definition of Affordable being 80% of market price does not mean the cost is within reach of Stevenage residents.	See responses to comments 217 (monitoring data) 870 (evidence base). No change.

509	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Strategic context	<p>Para 3.34 - The plan does not say how additional capacity on the A1(M) and other transport improvements will be delivered. HO3 will aggravate problems. Extra capacity is required before HO3 is developed.</p> <p>Para 3.39 - Can find no plans for improvements to the railway line. Building a new platform will not help. Do not see how SBC can influence Network Rail. Can find no plans for improvements to the A1(M).</p>	Work to improve the A1(M) is due to begin in the near future. See also response to comment 424 (traffic). The Council is actively working with Network Rail to deliver improvements. No change.
1258	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Strategic context	<p>Para 3.1 - Should state the neighbouring Councils' views. Not effective. Para 3.10 - Mentions seeking to maintain the green belt, but elsewhere there are plans to change it. There is no agreement in place. Not effective.</p> <p>Para 3.37 - You say you intend to have discussions with EHDC and NHDC. EHDC last said they had no intention of discussing boundaries. Your mention of the Green Belt boundary accurately defines that boundary on the EH side. Without agreement this is not effective.</p>	<p>A Statement of Compliance with the Duty to Co-operate has been prepared to detail how our Plan has been prepared in accordance with this duty.</p> <p>See responses to comments 9 (Green Belt release) and 354 (exceptional circumstances).</p> <p>We are working closely with EHDC and NHDC to ensure a coherent Green Belt boundary around the town. Our plans do not, and cannot, designate land outside of the Borough. No change.</p>
90	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Strategic planning	Support para 3.9. Close working relationships with the other Herts local authorities is key to SBC meeting the Duty to Co-operate. Further, due to boundaries being drawn tightly around the urban area, cross-boundary co-operation with both NHDC and EHDC is essential to Stevenage being able to produce a credible and sound Local Plan.	Support welcomed.
412	341653	Home Builders Federation	Strategic planning	Support collaboration with neighbouring authorities on the SHMA and Green Belt Review. This signals the effectiveness of the duty to cooperate.	Support welcomed.
533	632508	Luton Borough Council	Strategic planning	Support the approach taken, as part of the Duty to Co-operate, to shared evidence bases e.g. joint SHMA and HMA studies. Support the progression of the local plan recognising the similar position each authority will be in with regard to cross boundary relationships to NHDC and the potential outputs from the joint Growth Options Study, in autumn 2016.	Support welcomed.
737	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Strategic planning	Further work / discussion requested around employment provision. Subsequent discussions and commitment provided by Central Beds to support SBC in seeking to meet full employment needs.	Support welcomed.
879	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Strategic planning	The plan does not demonstrate effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. E.g., the NHDC Draft Plan will not be published until November 2016, whereas the Stevenage Plan will be submitted for review at much the same time: joint working is clearly lacking.	We do not feel it is necessary, or practical, to align our plan-making timetable with NHDC. See also response to comment 1258 (Duty to Co-operate). No change.
1300	977162	S T Smyth	Strategic planning	Question what, if any, co-operation there is between NHDC and SBC and HCC, given differing political backgrounds.	See response to comment 1258 (Duty to Co-operate). No change.
91	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	What does this mean for Stevenage?	Support para 3.10. Co-operation with neighbours essential. Stevenage must be aware of role to play in assisting NHDC in meeting OAN of housing market area. Support Para 3.11.	Support welcomed.

326	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Other relevant plans and programmes	Wymondly is compiling its own neighbourhood plan with a 92% survey response demanding surrounding Green Belt is untouched. The Plan will be ready to submit to NHDC in a couple of months. This must be taken seriously by SBC, as it takes priority over SBC and NHDC draft Local Plans.	Wymondly lies outside the SBC boundary, so its Neighbourhood Plan cannot take precedence over the Stevenage Borough Local Plan. No change.
448	974795	Active4Less	Other relevant plans and programmes	Para 3.29 - The plan must be inclusive and involve those already working towards the Plan's strategic goals. Active4Less contributes to these aspirations. Keen to preserve and develop the health and activity benefits offered.	Noted. No change.
774	636011	Environment Agency	Other relevant plans and programmes	Water Framework Directive must be reflected in the Plan. The WFD is implemented regionally by way of River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs). Stevenage is covered by the Thames RBMP. The EA would strongly support a requirement for developers to carry out WFD actions on sites adjacent to relevant stretches of river. Would also support a commitment from SBC to carry out such actions on council owned land. Perhaps WFD actions could be included in the IDP and/or CIL list.	Noted. Stevenage can make limited contribution to the objectives of the WFD given the low number of watercourses in the Borough (Aston End Brook, Stevenage Brook and Ash Brook). However, policy FP3 identifies opportunities for developers to improve the watercourses in the Borough. In addition, Policy FP5 contributes to groundwater quality objectives through the remediation of contaminated land in the Borough. Whilst the Council does not believe that the EA's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
884	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Other relevant plans and programmes	No mention of how the Sustainable Community Strategy has been fulfilled. No outcomes of Duty to Co-operate discussions provided.	Para's 3.26 and 3.40 demonstrate how the Community Strategy has been considered extensively. See also response to comment 1258 (Duty to Co-operate). No change.
25	969598	Ms Amanda Wright	Vision and objectives	Excited about the proposals to raise the standards of the town and give it the right image. Improvements are much needed. It will allow for better housing, leisure and employment facilities and the community being proud of the town. We need a good balance of new builds and protecting the nature and park areas.	Support welcomed.
40	969602	Ms Yvonne Shaw Basciu	Vision and objectives	The Plan is trying to attract commuters, judging by the extra station platform and building new homes. Look forward to what the future holds but hope the regeneration is done sympathetically and with continued input from the community.	Noted. No change.
164	969921	Mr Peter Fuller	Vision and objectives	Applaud proposals to regenerate the town, which is long overdue. If these do not go ahead the town will continue to die.	Support welcomed.
439	341719	GlaxoSmithKline	Vision and objectives	Helpful to see in the 'vision' that the Plan supports GSK (para 4.19).	Support welcomed.
488	619933	Natural England	Vision and objectives	Welcome objective 4.26. Objective 4.28 should be strengthened to commit to protecting and enhancing the natural environment and landscape. This should be a strategic priority, in line with the NPPF.	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
511	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	The plan says SBC will take advantage of its position between, and good links to, London and Cambridge. These links (except possibly Cambridge) are already under stress with no prospect of improvement. This statement is misleading and should be withdrawn.	The excellent strategic location of the town must be acknowledged. The Borough Council is working with Network Rail to improve the station and increase capacity. No change.

512	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	There should be a full Green Belt Review, in conjunction with all neighbouring authorities and an opportunity for democratic input. The town and infrastructure was planned for a certain population and is struggling. The phrase 'rolling back the inner Green Belt boundary' implies there is scope for new Green Belt near that which is lost. There is not. NHDC will also 'roll back' Green Belt until it is under 400m from Graveley. The proposed small patch west of the A1(M) is no recompense.	Neighbouring authorities were invited to produce a joint Green Belt Study, but declined. Our Green Belt Review identifies the sites to be released will not have a significant impact on overall Green Belt purposes, which includes the restriction of urban sprawl. Further sites to be added into the Green Belt are identified in NHDC. We will continue to work with NHDC to implement these recommendations and ensure a coherent boundary is maintained.
513	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	Discussions with neighbouring authorities should be held regarding all implications of Green Belt destruction and creation and the Plan re-issued with the outcomes of these discussions published. Para 4.12 implies co-operation with NHDC and EHDC which FoFC do not believe has taken place. If these discussions have not happened, Green Belt to the north will just disappear without a trace.	See response to comment 512 (Green Belt). See also response to comment 9 (Forster Country). No change.
514	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	Further consideration must be given to Lister Hospital expansion. The plan makes no mention of congestion and insufficient parking near the hospital. This will be exacerbated. Para 4.23 - not much land allocated for hospital growth. The site beyond the car park includes 3 buildings already. The plans for other sites between North Road and Hitchin Road are sensible in themselves but not for the hospital.	The Plan allocates a sufficient site for hospital expansion. No change.
515	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	Para 4.25. The statement about retaining access to open space is flatly contradicted by rolling back the Green Belt. This plan will make green space substantially further away.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses). Our policies aim to ensure access to open spaces will be retained. Para 4.25 does not state all green spaces will be retained. No change.
516	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	Building on Green Belt (Forster Country) will push open countryside further away and out of reach of many. Replacing Green Belt with Green Links and increasing Principal Open Spaces in other parts of the town cannot compensate for building on Forster Country. New development would disrupt country walks. If the Green Belt proposals were to go ahead, existing Rights of Way should become Green Links.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses) and 9 (Forster Country). No change.
517	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	Amended wording suggested relating to the history of the town. Delete proposals to build on any part of the Green Belt in north Stevenage, thus justifying the claim that the Plan will 'maintain the historic setting of Rooks Nest and the landscapes which inspired his novels.' The tiny amount of remaining Green Belt can hardly be described as 'landscapes'. Neither can the constricted Conservation Area 'maintain the historic setting of Rooks Nest.' We already have a continuous Green Link from the Old Town to the open Green Belt countryside, signposted Forster Country Walk from the bottom of the Avenue.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses) and 9 (Forster Country). No change.
518	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Vision and objectives	SBC should liaise with NHDC, EHDC, WHBC and other local authorities to set up a joint working party with the objective of improving road infrastructure. The plan accepts there are already capacity issues on the A1(M). Cannot find reference to the SMART scheme online/publicly. A start date of early 2020's will not be in time for these plans. Has land been set aside for proper widening to three lanes?	Noted. See response to comment 424 (traffic).

545	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Vision and objectives	Para 4.14 - Inconsistency between this and policy target of 25-30%. Para 4.31 - Not all routes through Gunnels Wood will require upgrading. Should be amended to avoid ransoms being created.	Minor changes to the wording of para's 4.14 and 4.31 to provide clarification.
547	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Vision and objectives	Para 4.20 - Welcome the constructive working with NHDC in particular.	Support welcomed.
570	767712	Knebworth Estates	Vision and objectives	Object to the inclusion of Norton Green within the Green Belt boundary. This is already a developed settlement. It will leave the village-like character exposed to the A1(M). The way to protect this community is with sensitive development that shields it from the A1(M). This is a misguided and regressive addition to the Plan's Green Belt policy.	Including Norton Green within the Green Belt will enable further control on development and mitigate against loss of Green Belt elsewhere. It will not preclude development altogether. No change.
578	922156	Pigeon Land Ltd	Vision and objectives	Support the vision and, in particular, the aspiration to deliver transformational physical, social and economic regeneration' of the town, and the decision to review the inner Green Belt boundary to deliver growth (para 4.4). Support intention to meet full OAN (para 4.6) and the decision to make provision for new neighbourhoods on the edge of the existing urban area. Support the target to increase the skill base of the workforce (para 4.21). Support the requirement for aspirational homes (para 4.14). This demonstrates the Plan has been positively prepared, and that this part of the Plan is justified.	Support welcomed.
743	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Vision and objectives	Support the vision and objectives. It is a positive statement of intent reflecting the challenges and opportunities for the Borough in the coming years.	Support welcomed.
858	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Vision and objectives	The Plan has some misfortunate and misleading phraseology. The first sentence in para 4.6 - Does this mean the aim is that a total will have been built - if the plan is followed? It is not clear. Para 4.12 and 4.13 - The Green Belt has not been rolled-back yet so this should read 'intend to roll-back'. This phrase makes it sound like a carpet.	The phrase 'rolling back the Green Belt' is widely used. Minor amendment proposed to the first sentence of para 4.6 to provide clarity.
875	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	Vision and objectives	Under Health, Education and Skills, correct wording of final sentence to 'school curricula'.	Minor amendment proposed to amend typographical error (p9).
1050	973919	Mr David Inward	Vision and objectives	Plan supports policies aimed at increasing jobs and housing but also complains about the constrained nature of the Borough due to Green Belt. Plan should seek better balance between jobs and people rather than increasing both.	See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses).
1216	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	Vision and objectives	Building on Green Belt (Forster Country) will push open countryside further away and out of reach of many. Replacing Green Belt with Green Links and increasing Principal Open Spaces in other parts of the town cannot compensate for building on Forster Country. New development would disrupt country walks. If the Green Belt proposals were to go ahead, existing Rights of Way should become Green Links.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses) and 9 (Forster Country). No change.

1262	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Vision and objectives	<p>Para 4.6 - If you can build your required homes within the boundary, why discuss it with others?</p> <p>Para 4.8 - Concerns around parking and jobs provision.</p> <p>Para 4.12 - If you can build what is required within the existing boundary, why is the Green Belt being rolled back? Reviewing the Green Belt is not justified.</p> <p>Para 4.14 - Support affordable housing target. Office conversions are far from affordable.</p> <p>Para 4.30 - Concerns around capacity on the A1 and A602. SMART scheme is probably only a stop gap solution.</p> <p>Para 4.35 - Concerns infrastructure won't be built. Details around financial provision are lacking.</p> <p>Para 4.36 - This acknowledges that all the proposals may not be implemented. Not positively prepared.</p> <p>Key Diagram - Area c is remote from facilities and lacks passenger transport. No mention of extension to the cycle network or the option of a new railway station at Bragbury End.</p>	<p>The Duty to Co-operate requires us to work closely with neighbouring Local Authorities. This will hopefully ensure plans fit provide the most effective strategic outcome.</p> <p>Multi-storey car parks will be provided in the town centre to increase provision.</p> <p>Our Economic policies aim to provide sufficient jobs for the increased population.</p> <p>Green Belt is being rolled back within the boundary. Our Housing Paper demonstrates that Green Belt release is required to meet our needs.</p> <p>See responses to comments 424 (traffic) and 356 (infrastructure).</p> <p>The Plan uses a robust evidence base to ensure as much certainty as possible and allows for contingencies, where required. Some estimations are required when planning for such a timeframe.</p> <p>Policy HO4 requires infrastructure to be provided to ensure development to the south east is sustainable.</p>
92	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	A vision for the future	<p>Support Para 4.4. It is essential that the plan includes a creative and innovative "vision" for the long term future of the Borough. Previous and recent work on the new Plan, in particular the SHLAA and SHMA, have made it clear that for the Borough to meet its OAN it will be necessary to roll-back the Green Belt. Achieving a robust and deliverable Plan for Stevenage will be dependent on the twin approaches of coupling urban regeneration with new greenfield developments.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
93	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	A vision for the future	<p>Support Para 4.8. The regeneration and expansion of the town centre (railway station and bus interchange) will be a key part of ensuring Stevenage develops as a desirable retail/work/leisure destination and attracts investment. 3,000 new homes is very ambitious and progress should be kept under continuous review. Should it prove to be difficult, consideration should be given to whether additional peripheral greenfield sites should be allocated.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst reliance on the 3,000 town centre homes does form a part of the plan, we are confident this will be delivered within the plan period. Just under 1,000 are either already underway or have permission, and this is the key priority for the Council.</p>
94	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	A vision for the future	<p>Support Para 4.11 (specifically HO3). Combined with NHDC plans, these sites can deliver a sustainable urban extension, contributing to the OAN of both areas, and is a good example of effective cross-boundary working within the HMA. Development would also be close to Lister Hospital, a large employer.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
95	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	A vision for the future	<p>Support Para 4.12. Green Belt review is methodical, thorough and robust. Support HO3 - removing this land from the Green Belt will not result in any material harm to the objectives of the Green Belt in this location.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p>
132	969683	Ms Maggie Williams	A vision for the future	<p>The future vision for the town looks very 21st century and would attract more visitors to the town. Agree that we need more affordable homes and businesses. Obviously land needs to be built on but hopefully not by compromising the beautiful open green spaces.</p>	<p>Support welcomed. See response to comment 625 (balance of land uses).</p>

188	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	A vision for the future	Add a requirement to build on Brownfield first. More honesty and justification required for building over the only thing close to a heritage site that Stevenage has. Distance to reach countryside will increase. HO3 impacts on Forster Country. No evidence of exceptional circumstances.	See responses to comments 217 (Brownfield first), 9 (Forster Country) and 354 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
330	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	A vision for the future	Reads as a marketing document rather than a considered plan. No mention of impact on water supply.	Noted. The vision and objectives section cannot cover all issues. Water supply is dealt with in other sections of the Plan. No change.
776	636011	Environment Agency	A vision for the future	Para 4.26 should also give consideration of river corridors and their importance for biodiversity.	Noted. The vision and objectives section cannot cover all issues. River corridors and their importance for biodiversity are considered in other sections of the Plan. No change.
731	341526	East Hertfordshire District Council	Strategic Policies	Support positive and pro-active approach to development and regeneration. Support commitment to protect and enhance employment areas, retail and community facilities, and improvements to public transport and road networks. Support plans to ensure Lister Hospital can expand. The Plan is supported by a wide range of technical evidence that has been prepared using accepted methodologies. All alternatives have been explored and decisions are based on proportionate evidence and are justified. The council's own house building programme and regeneration strategy for the town centre shows a pro-active approach to development. Detailed policies provide clear guidance as to how the Council will approach development proposals and sets outs specific projects for improvements to various types of infrastructure, forming a useful basis upon which to base CIL or Section 106 contributions to mitigate development impacts. Policies are consistent with national policy.	Support welcomed.
519	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Strategic Policies	A target far below 7,600 new homes is more likely. No logical reason for population to increase by 18,000. Jobs are not available and Stevenage has the lowest growth rate of any Hertfordshire town. New residents will have to commute, meaning Green Belt is used for commuters and putting more strain on the congested roads. SBC has not openly declared it intends to build on the Conservation Area that includes Forster Country. The Plan points to a growing elderly population, which needs less housing (not more) in the form of sheltered accommodation, one and two bedroom flats and town centre accommodation.	The process of reaching Stevenage's housing target and evidence that informs this is set out in the local plan at para's 5.65 to 5.67. Further detail is provided in the Housing Technical Paper. SBC cannot control who buys new homes. The Plan is clear that HO3 is a conservation area. The Plan makes provision for the elderly population. No change.
520	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Sustainable Development	A full section on sustainability should be produced quantifying requirements at high level for use at the detailed stage. If not, contractors will seek the cheapest options. No firm plan to address many aspects of sustainability i.e. insulation, cycle ways, energy efficiency.	Sustainability is at the heart of the Plan. Policy FP1 sets out specific energy efficiency requirements. However, energy efficiency is mainly governed by Building Regulations. No change.
1049	973919	Mr David Inward	Sustainable Development	Plan should aim to make Stevenage more resilient and reduce ecological footprint. The SA had minimal impact on the plan. It was produced by the same team, therefore not objective. Major restraint of growth is water supply and over abstraction impact on ecology. There should be greater integration between Stevenage and surrounding agricultural land. Farmers markets, local-based food shops and allotments should be encouraged.	The SA has been prepared in accordance with the Regulations and has assessed the impacts of options at all stages of plan-making. Policy FP1 aims to reduce water consumption. No change.

210	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy SP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	The plan fails to fulfil its legal environmental duties by building on Forster Country. Question the deliverability of extra jobs. Most new residents will have to commute, thus increasing transport pressures and pollution. Sustainable travel will not be improved. Alternative inner area sites should be used first. Development of Forster Country will destroy historic assets and an area of open space, wildlife and habitats.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses), 424 (traffic), 217 (Brownfield first) and 9 (Forster Country). No change.
331	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development	Support SP1. Pleased to see the increased emphasis on travel by bus and hope that cuts to funding for bus travel won't make this vision unachievable.	Support welcomed.
189	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	Commuters will move to Stevenage. The plan is unlikely to address the needs of local housing as a result of the influx from elsewhere. Reduce scope of developments and ring fence for local people. Improve partnership with surrounding councils, North Herts seem unwilling to engage with Stevenage West.	See responses to comments 519 (who buys new homes) and 1258 (Duty to Co-operate). No change.
211	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	The plan fails to fulfil its legal environmental duties by building on Forster Country. Question the deliverability of extra jobs. Most new residents will have to commute, thus increasing transport pressures (roads and trains) and pollution. Sustainable travel will not be improved by adding more housing. Alternative inner area sites (e.g. town centre, housing estates and industrial areas) should be used before considering the northern boundary. Development of Forster Country will destroy historic assets and an area of open space, wildlife and habitats. Development of Green belt is not permitted under NPPF. The plan over exaggerates the 'benefits' of development.	See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses), 424 (traffic), 217 (Brownfield first), 9 (Forster Country) and 354 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
489	619933	Natural England	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	Criteria 'n' should include landscape .	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
534	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	North Stevenage (HO3) does not comply with criteria 'g'. It is remote. The Plan will not 'preserve/enhance' Forster Country as in criteria 'o'.	Development at HO3 will be required to connect to sustainable transport networks. See responses to comments 625 (balance of land uses) and 9 (Forster Country). No change.
585	922156	Pigeon Land Ltd	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	Support Policy SP2 and in particular, the aspirations to support a balanced community and delivering homes and jobs to make a positive contribution towards the targets. Support objectives for development to raise the aspirations, earnings, education level or life expectancy of residents; and provide for a mix of homes and jobs for all sectors of the community.	Support welcomed.
745	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	Support Policy SP2. Recommend that new neighbourhoods are obliged to adopt best practice sustainable site planning/urban design principles.	Support welcomed.
777	636011	Environment Agency	Policy SP2: Sustainable Development in Stevenage	SUDS, including green / brown roofs, should be added to this list. Should require open space assets to be linked by creating strategic habitat corridors.	More detailed criteria for development is set out in the detailed policies section of the plan.

A vital town centre

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
1153	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	A Vital Town Centre	The plan ignores trends in the retail sector - move to online shopping, preference for out-of-town retail.	The plan's proposals make an allowance for on-line retailing. No change.
383	452235	Homes And Communities Agency	A Vital Town Centre	HCA asset: Town centre assets. TC1 to TC13 town centre policies. HCA retains a number of assets within the town centre and remains supportive of the vision and framework for the future of Stevenage Central and will continue to liaise with SBC and Stevenage First to facilitate delivery. It is noted that 30% affordable housing provision is required as a minimum but would suggest this could be exceeded with the introduction of Starter Homes as an affordable housing product.	Support welcomed. Comments about Starter Homes noted.
1824	769262	Mr Clive Bell	A Vital Town Centre	The plan does not effectively cover long term viability. The town's rich heritage should be developed, not destroyed. More high rise buildings in the town centre will obliterate the original design, removing historical value. Historic assets will attract long term investment.	The plan's proposals strike the balance between protecting the best of the past whilst building the best of today. No change.
965	909897	Mrs Sue Jones	A Vital Town Centre	Concern regarding the lack of deliverability of regeneration plans. Town Centre Framework is not a regeneration plan, not an investment vehicle, not costed and has no access to funding. It is not supported. It is a barrier to any future regeneration of the town centre.	The comments are noted but unfounded. No change.
35	969599	Ms Susan Tew	A Vital Town Centre	Improvements should be made to the covered walkways - copy those starting at Topshop and replace those on opposite side and elsewhere.	This is too detailed a matter for the local plan. No change proposed
1828	970932	Mr Mike Phillips	A Vital Town Centre	The town centre is a disgrace and needs to be redeveloped.	Noted. No change proposed
1118	972739	Mr Aidan Heritage	A Vital Town Centre	Need to ensure that the town centre is attractive for shops which cannot work online. Shops which add value (artisan bakers, craft shop, shops with a 'personal touch') should be the ones the plan tries to attract. The town centre must be fit for the mid to late 21st century rather than the early 20th.	This lies outside planning control. No change.
1834	973688	Caroline Partridge	A Vital Town Centre	Facilities in the new town need to be vastly improved before housebuilding can be considered. The town centre is appalling and an embarrassment.	The plan's proposals address these concerns. No change.
961	973860	Mr Chris Burton	A Vital Town Centre	Regeneration of town centre is long overdue. It is run down and an unwelcome place to shop.	Noted. No change
1051	973919	Mr David Inward	A Vital Town Centre	Plan recognises parking is inefficient use of land and unattractive, and retail warehouses weaken the town centre. Demolition of Gordon Craig is not an efficient use of building materials. Assumes large amount of capital is available. Buildings should be designed for a long life and flexible to allow for changes in use.	Noted. No change
1852	974452	Mr Andrew Harvey	A Vital Town Centre	Applaud the desire to improve the town centre and its connectivity to the station and Leisure Park. Congratulate SBC on thinking forward. Concerns around intention to close Lytton Way. Together with the increase in traffic due to housing growth, this will be disastrous. Estimates of traffic are never high enough.	Welcome support. The highways proposals associated with the town centre have been tested. No change

1188	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	A Vital Town Centre	Intention to turn Stevenage into dormitory commuter town. High density town centre with little or no parking. This housing is unsuitable for couples or families. London commuters do not help the local economy. Town centre is in need of regeneration but leisure park and Gordon Craig are assets and don't need redevelopment. Both are well-used. and provide good facilities.	It is not the intention to turn Stevenage into a dormitory town. A wide range of housing is being provided to meet the diverse needs of the people of Stevenage. No change proposed.
1200	975422	Ms Liz Brown	A Vital Town Centre	Concerns r.e. plans to demolish swimming pool and Arts and Leisure Centre. How will this be paid for? New homes in the town centre cannot possibly meet demand for parking. Out of town developments e.g. Debenhams and a new supermarket, will not help the town centre.	All of the proposals have been costed. The intention is that the proposals for the town centre should enhance its attractiveness. No change.
1809	975432	Mr Roger Dunz	A Vital Town Centre	Support town centre redevelopment plans. It is an eyesore. Shop frontage should be reduced. Units should be used to provide affordable 1 or 2 bed starter homes for young people.	Welcome support. No change
1210	975642	Paul Rice	A Vital Town Centre	Why move Gordon Craig and the bus station, they are accessible. Spend money on upgrading town centre, attracting better shops and reducing parking fees	The town centre proposals are a balanced package designed to make the town centre fit for purpose. No change
567	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	A Vital Town Centre	Fire and Rescue provision St. Georges Way and Hitchin Road is likely to be required for the foreseeable future. The locations adequately meet service needs. There are no plans to alter provision. However, there may be benefits, to a range of stakeholders, in considering the relocation of the St. George's Way station closer to the A1(M) (J7). This would provide access to faster roads and free up land.	Noted. HCC have made no proposal to move the fire station. No change proposed
1094	464410	Mrs Verity Yates-Mercer	A Vital Town Centre	Town centre plan is too ambitious, un-funded, unrealistic and undeliverable. Requires major investors which have failed to be secured.	Disagree: the Stevenage Central Framework has been costed and the Stevenage First partnership have embarked upon implementation. No change proposed
1198	975412	Mr Mel Wood	A Vital Town Centre	Town centre has become a place to avoid. Understand pressure to build houses but thousands more flats in town centre will add to social problems. Concerned the move of the Gordon Craig and Library will take many years to be rebuilt. Infrastructure to support homes may take many years.	See response 1834. No change
1204	975626	Mr Daniel Wood	A Vital Town Centre	Support principle of redeveloping the town centre. Do not support loss of commercial uses to homes. Build homes for families with own front door and own garden, not tower blocks. Flats should be maximum four stories. Provide parkland in the centre, to free up Town Centre Gardens for new homes.	Noted. Higher densities and a mix of uses are amongst the necessary proposals for the centre. It is not proposed to use Town Centre Gardens for housing. No change
1234	975655	Jean Hayden	A Vital Town Centre	Spending a great deal of money on a design that does not fulfil needs. Fragmenting the town and creating a road system that will cause congestion. Town Centre is a mess but we allow businesses to set up at Roaring Meg.	See response 1834. No change
1415	976157	Kathie Martins	A Vital Town Centre	Provide sufficient toilets in the town centre. Provide a central public space for voluntary organisations to publicise causes.	Noted. These are detailed design matters unsuited to the local plan. No change.
1105	978246	Mr Donald Manning	A Vital Town Centre	Large outlets moving to the smaller web-driven local store model. Large shops are dying, more web-driven.	Noted. No change

744	341398	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Sainsbury's strongly oppose plans for a large new store at Graveley Road. This is not the most appropriate strategy and not in accordance with the NPPF. The location is inappropriate. The floorspace would be more sustainably distributed to existing centres within the retail hierarchy, where public transport provision is focused, as well as existing stores. This would accord with the sequential test and support the vitality and viability of existing centres and stores. It also accords with the NPPF town centre first approach. Convenience retail needs for this area are already being met by the Coreys Mill superstore.	The plan already proposes this strategy. Even so, it leaves a large residual amount of floorspace for which provision needs to be made. There are no alternative sites available within the Borough to enable a large store to be provided elsewhere. No change
754	341398	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Sainsbury's supports Policy SP4 to provide up to 7,600sqm net of additional convenience floorspace by 2031. Support the provision of this floorspace through extensions to existing centres in the retail hierarchy, then other stores in accordance with the sequential test.	The plan already proposes this strategy. No change
438	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The proposed development is inappropriate use of Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough, if lost. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion at the North Road/Graveley Road junction and the risk of accidents. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill.	Our Green Belt technical paper identifies the exceptional circumstances that exist to justify rolling back the Green Belt. Competition is not a valid planning matter. Garden centres are not protected in national or local planning policy: the owners and operators support the redevelopment. Traffic matters have been assessed and mitigation will be proposed in any planning application. See response 822. No change
1377	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support SP4. The town centre plan is long overdue and will result in a much better image of Stevenage. If left, it will continue to deteriorate with little chance of attracting large stores due to the out of town shopping centres.	Support welcomed.
156	341843	Stevenage Society For Local History	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The museum barely gets a mention. It is in desperate need of a new home. The Plan should commit the council to investing in this facility and finding it a new home.	The Borough Council maintains a watching brief on opportunities to relocate the museum into better premises. No change.
1249	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The proposed development is inappropriate use of Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough, if lost. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion at the North Road/Graveley Road junction and the risk of accidents. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill.	See response to 438.
842	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Stevenage struggles to compete with other towns. Parking is an inefficient use of land. More affordable housing, in medium rise flats is needed, especially for the increasingly ageing population. It is disappointing that the Plan does not provide greater detail on the regeneration, which is being discussed with a developer (BDS). SBC have ignored the heritage angle.	The plan recognises that surface parking is an inefficient use of scarce town centre land and proposes to redevelop these car parks. The level of detail given is appropriate to the local plan. Town centre heritage is recognised and protected. No change
1040	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The New Town shopping area is unattractive. Please leave the railway station except for another platform. Do not move the Gordon Craig Theatre or Swimming Pool but perhaps relocate the Bus Station to the Leisure Park car park, to link up with the Railway Station. There should be a mix of small shops and major stores. Parking should be plentiful and reasonably priced. Rents should be affordable and attractive to traders.	The proposals for the town centre represent a balanced package of measures. No change

423	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The proposed development is inappropriate use of the Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough, if lost. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill	See response to 438.
467	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The impacts of the proposed new convenience retail store have not been considered in either the joint traffic modelling or in the flood assessment work that underpins the plan. No specific mitigation measures are identified. If the objections can be overcome, NHDC would be interested in exploring any extent to which this site might help address convenience retail needs arising from within the NHDC area.	Both flood assessment and traffic modelling have been updated. It should be noted that the site is a brownfield site already in Class A1 shop use. We would expect NHDC, if they proceed with development proposals to the north of Stevenage, to meet the needs generated by their development within their own administrative area. Given the respective sizes of the two LPAs administrative areas, it is more likely that NHDC will be able to assist Stevenage to meet development needs. No change.
400	406724	Highways England	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support for strategic residential and employment locations in or close to the town centre, as these could encourage sustainable travel and reduce pressure on the road network.	Noted. No change
269	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Objection due to lack of deliverability on plans to regenerate the town centre, which the plan treats as a core element for both housing numbers and economic regeneration. The Town Centre Framework does not have 'the buy-in' of local people or stakeholders contrary to the assertions made in para 7.9 of the Plan.	See response to 965. No change.
446	759461	Aberdeen Asset Management	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	To impose a moratorium on out-of-centre comparison proposals is in conflict with NPPF and NPPG. Acknowledge the town centre is not fit for purpose (para 5.31). Support regeneration plans. But studies show visitors to Roaring Meg also visit the town centre. The two destinations can co-exist. Important to recognise that Roaring Meg is a key retail destination. The town centre should not be promoted in a way that precludes other opportunities (that comply with NPPF). SBC should not seek to restrict or prevent higher-end development where impact and sequential tests are met.	The moratorium on out-of-centre comparison retailing is motivated by the need to support, protect and regenerate the fragile town centre. Even a small additional impact on the town centre would be significant and adverse. The situation is likely to be worse today than at the time of the Retail Study because of the closure of the large Marks and Spencer unit and the imminent closure of the large BhS unit. Against this background, it is reasonable to introduce policies to control or prevent additional development which would exacerbate the situation. No change.
733	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support town centre regeneration to provide over 3,000 homes. Encouraged by proactive measures to boost the supply of housing and recognise that this has implications for meeting employment needs.	Welcome support
736	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	NPPF seeks 'town centre' first approach to retail. Welcome the regeneration of the town centre, and support provision of up to 7,600m2 net additional convenience floorspace to meet needs and attract customers.	Welcome support
555	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The inclusion of retail provision for the new neighbourhood at West Stevenage is supported.	Welcome support
495	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Policy SP4, part (d) - Bellway/Miller are concerned this proposal could have implications on the need for a new local centre on the north Stevenage site. The provision of a local centre must be based on identified need.	The retail evidence base suggests that there is sufficient demand to justify both proposals as set out in the plan. No change.

360	962420	Angela Turner	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Agree the train station needs updating, but provisions for parking is inadequate, particularly as Leisure Park is to accommodate 1,500 new homes. Town centre infrastructure cannot cope with this number of homes.	Noted. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change
27	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Old Town has been shamefully treated. Welcome plan to safeguard its integrity. Recent housing to the south has created a walled effect. More housing and loss of the Deco cinema building on Letchmore Road will see the Old Town swallowed up further. Old Town is a desirable area, but more housing, people and traffic will erode this.	Support is noted. Character of the High Street can be protected whilst necessary growth and regeneration are implemented elsewhere across the town. No change
87	965121	Dr Enric Vilar	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Town centre regeneration is urgently needed. However, too much emphasis is given to new homes and not to sustaining a high quality environment. Growth will exacerbate traffic congestion. Details around the Leisure Park development are absent from the plan. Leisure facilities are essential to the town.	Support is noted. Quality is identified as a recurring requirement in the town centre policies. Policy TC3 makes clear what is to happen to the leisure facilities on the Leisure Park - proposals fully supported by the landowners. No change
145	965967	Mr Chris Phillips	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Principles of cohesive, distinctive design have been lost. Support the town centre evolving to fulfil changing needs, but new development should be sympathetic to existing. Should embark on programme of sustained improvement to existing centre. This will cost less and be delivered more quickly.	The Town Square Conservation Area is largely untouched by the proposals for the regeneration of the centre. Small-scale improvements will not bring about the necessary nature and scale of change to drive the town centre forward. No change
10	969594	Ms Lynne Jackson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Knock it all down. No feeling or character and a poor choice of shops. Other centres have free parking. Too many cheap shops and cafes. Start again.	A clearance of the entire area within the ring road would be an inappropriate response, not least because of the existence of the Town Square Conservation Area. No change.
41	969602	Ms Yvonne Shaw Basciu	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Town centre is an embarrassment. Pedestrianisation is good but lacks character and decent shops. If you are to appeal to commuters, think about what will entice them - mid range shops, department stores, food stores, delis, wholefood stores. Regeneration must be top priority, before building more homes.	Regenerating the town centre is the Council's No1 corporate priority. No change
46	969606	Ms Katie Ingham	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Welcome plans to regenerate town centre. No reason why the town shouldn't be attracting big brands to suit the more affluent demographic. Too many bargain basement and betting shops. Would like to see commitment to bring back a vibrant market, or the existing market accounted for in the plans. Something aspirational and community led.	Support welcomed. Management of the indoor market is not a matter for the local plan: a new outdoor market is currently being trialled. No change.
49	969608	Ms Michelle Kennedy	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Plans look great. The town centre definitely needs a revamp.	Support welcomed
51	969612	Mr Colin Rawlings	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Shops are not good enough to get people to come to Stevenage. Building at Roaring Meg will take more trade away. Regeneration plans look good but concerns over whether it will happen. Parking is too expensive.	See response 1094. Parking charges are not a local plan matter. No change
54	969615	Mr Barry Johnson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Doubts over the delivery of town centre plans; nothing has been delivered in the past. No dates included. It should be developed before 2031. Most of the town centre around Queensway should be pulled down. Concern over car parking charges.	See responses 10, 41, 1094 and 51. No change
117	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	There is still a need for town centre shops. Your plan seems to take this into account. Support the overall view of the plan and the need for additional leisure facilities.	Support welcomed.

123	969677	Ms Wendy Moody	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Encouraged by proposals to develop the town centre, the family welcome its regeneration.	Support welcomed.
129	969682	Mr Trevor Allin	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Recognise the town centre needs radical improvement to make it more welcoming in all weathers and to provide free parking. The current link between the station and the town centre is poor due to the need to use steps or a long ramp and because it is open to the elements.	One of the aims of the proposals is to remove the current high-level walkway from the train station to the Town Square. No change
142	969698	Mr John Moorhouse	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The brochure raises unanswered questions. Support an enlarged Westgate Centre. The council need to acknowledge the growth in car ownership. Should consider demolishing parts of the town centre to form bigger car parks.	The brochure is not the local plan, which should be used as the reference point. The aim is to have fewer, larger car parks to service the needs of the expanded and regenerated town centre. No change
146	969704	Ms Debbie Dunn	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Best things about Stevenage are the Gordon Craig and Leisure Park - both are being redeveloped. Hope the Leisure Park facilities remain and the new theatre is as good as the existing one. Support the green area in the centre, but the planned buildings are ugly. Brick should be used.	Noted. No change
150	969710	Ms Rita Boyce	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	How will you encourage new shops when you cannot keep the original ones. Only shops left are bargain shops. Debenhams is opening in the retail park but this is not easily accessible for those who don't drive.	Retailing is a vibrant sector that responds to changes in market conditions. The regeneration of the town centre and the growth of the town as a whole are, in part, designed to create the circumstances under which the retail offer can be broadened, enhanced and upgraded. No change
157	969919	Ms Doreen Weston	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Town centre regeneration looks good and sounds good, but most towns are now being developed as under-cover shopping malls, which hasn't been considered.	The plan allows for an extension to the Westgate Centre. The plans are sufficiently flexible to allow for other forms of development to happen. No change
160	969923	Ms Alison Blanshard	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Welcome many of the proposals to regenerate and build within the central area of Stevenage.	Support welcomed.
274	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support Policy SP4 Support Policy TC13 in order to support the town centre and network of smaller centres around the borough.	Support welcomed.
280	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support Policies SP4 and TC4.	Support welcomed.
891	973781	Mr Loyd Davies	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The Town Square and the Old Town are two main landmarks but are largely ignored in the Plan. Conservation Area status controls development, but does not prevent maintenance and improvement.	The local plan cannot control maintenance. The High Street and the Town Square Conservation Area both feature in the plan. No change.
373	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Regeneration is dependent on others, so the proposals are wishful thinking and a blinkered vision. It is clear there is no funding for much of what is proposed. Concerns that key facilities: theatre, swimming pool and museum, will close and not be replaced.	The Borough Council has established the public-private Stevenage First delivery partnership to take forward the regeneration of the town centre. Investors are showing interest in the proposals. It is the Council's intention to replace any of its own closed facilities. No change
404	974043	Mr James Salmon	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	SBC plan to gut the surroundings of the town but have left the most important part, the shops, with no future. Minor improvements is not enough when you have allowed retail units outside of the centre. The centre does not need all the new homes planned.	There are policies in place for the shopping streets. Given the current state of retailing in the UK these are relatively 'light touch' policies that leave the market free to drive change within a framework set by the council. The town centre is making a significant contribution to meeting the housing needs of the entire Borough. No changes proposed.

814	975231	Catherine Wallwork	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Supports redevelopment of the town centre and the railway station.	Support welcomed.
747	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Support Policy SP4 as an active member of the Stevenage First group. The LEP supports the pro-active management of this innovative development planning exercise.	The support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership is welcomed.
1215	976308	Elizabeth Robinson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	Big stores are needed, as the town centre is like a ghost town i.e. Market Place etc... Sort the town centre by demolition, then bring in new companies. We must try to attract big employers to the town which will bring more money and work to the town. So sites for this to happen need to be available.	See responses 10 and 41. The regeneration strategy for the town centre has a number of aims. Amongst them are providing new business and retailing opportunities. It does not have enough land to meet all of its predicted employment needs - see the Employment chapter. No change.
1222	976308	Elizabeth Robinson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	More thought is required. Support the comments made by Mr Bob Carter in the Comet. Existing landowners should be made to keep buildings in good order via their contracts, as the town looks in a terrible state. There has been a lack of money and planning in the town for some years.	The local plan cannot control maintenance. The other points are noted. No change.
1213	976315	Mr R A Robinson	Policy SP4: A Vital Town Centre	The train station requires a large multi-storey car park with reasonable charges. Do not agree with building homes at Roaring Meg, suggest shops instead. The town centre needs rebuilding to attract larger and better companies. People shop outside the town centre which is a loss of income. Rebuilding the theatre seems a waste of money and finding a new site close to all amenities would be difficult.	Proposals for the town centre include a number of multi-storey car parks, new premises for new companies and the potential to attract new retailers. A replacement theatre will be designed to reduce/remove the call on public subsidy. There are no proposals to build homes on Roaring Meg. No changes.
1221	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	Stevenage town centre	It will be many years before town centre work is complete. Immediate action is required to improve the appearance of the backs of buildings and dirty and unpleasant entrances from car-parks. SBC should persuade building owners to work with them to clean, clear rubbish and renovate exteriors of premises.	The Borough Council is engaged in a programme of environmental improvements across the town centre. Maintenance is outside the remit of the local plan. No change.
288	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Stevenage town centre	Support regeneration of Stevenage town centre. Paragraph 7.10 - concern at how your ambitions for Stevenage to become dominant might impact on the viability and vitality of Welwyn Garden City town centre. Specific ambitions for Stevenage to attain a more dominant role within the retail hierarchy should be deleted from the supporting text, as this does is not supported by the evidence. The impacts that such dominance could have on other centres which have overlapping catchments with Stevenage (specifically Welwyn Garden City) have not been taken into account. Your evidence base does not provide any support for Stevenage becoming a larger and more dominant centre.	Part of the ambition for the regeneration of the town centre is to arrest decline and attract back some of the Stevenage customers that have been lost to other centres, which has led to less sustainable shopping patterns. The NPPF would support the plan's desire to claw back trade lost to other centres, including Welwyn. Retail hierarchies are dynamic, reflecting changes in retail patterns determined, largely, by market forces and rarely in equilibrium. These concerns are alarmist and ill-founded. No change.
1348	974049	Mr Pete Le Porte	Stevenage town centre	Concerns around lack of deliverability on plans to regenerate the town centre. The town centre has deteriorated. It has too many gambling shops and charity shops and the demeanour is seedy and unwelcoming.	See responses 41 and 373. No change
1326	974059	Miss Nathalie Watts	Stevenage town centre	Great idea to redevelop and modernise the train station. However, this would increase traffic in the Leisure Park. Plans for the 'central core' are welcomed. Object to plans to redevelop the Leisure Park to add housing. Facilities should be improved, not houses added. This will be overdevelopment.	Welcome support. Plans for the redevelopment of the Leisure Park into Centre West MOA are deliberately designed to raise densities to reflect its highly central location. Replacement leisure facilities will be reprovided on the park. No changes

1149	975218	Mr Raymond Dawson	Stevenage town centre	Object to plans. Removing existing buildings is a waste of resources. The plan has no backers. See responses 41 and 373. No change	
761	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Stevenage town centre	Support Policies TC1 to TC7. As a member of Stevenage First, the LEP supports the development framework and the MOAs. The LEP will seek an increase in residential numbers where appropriate and supported by market demand.	The support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership is welcomed
1077	342862	Mr Ken Wing	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Need to encourage better shops because at the moment one has to go further afield to places like Milton Keynes for good quality shops.	The planning system cannot control the perceived quality of retailing. However, one of the aims of the town centre regeneration is to create the circumstances which will lead to a broader spectrum of retailers wishing to be represented in the town centre. No change.
896	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Object to the closure of Lytton Way. The original road layout of Stevenage was very well conceived. Much of the traffic during peak times is in a north-south direction. Traffic is busy, but flows well. The grid system works well to integrate the N-S traffic with E-W traffic. Closing Lytton Way will take away one of the busiest roads in this system, causing congestion on various roads and junctions. A ground level crossing on St George's Way will further exacerbate this.	A new traffic assessment identifies that the town centre section of Lytton Way can be removed and the impacts of that can be mitigated. HCC as the highway authority support this proposal and the two councils are working closely together to develop a package of multi-modal mitigation measures. No change
697	612038	Miss Pauline Maryan	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Question where funding for town centre regeneration is coming from and where the museum will be relocated to if regeneration does happen.	See response 373. No change
449	759461	Aberdeen Asset Management	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Seek amendment of Policy TC1 to extend the Town Centre boundary outwards. There are a number of developments beyond the boundary that are town centre uses, including educational uses south of Six Ways Hill, Asda, and hotel and leisure facilities on the eastern side of St. Georges Way.	A relatively tight boundary is considered appropriate in order to focus regeneration activity. Extending the boundary to include retailing uses that are clearly beyond the town centre would lead only to fragmentation and a movement away from the core retail area, contrary to the intentions of the NPPF. No change
193	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Infrastructure needs should be carried out or committed to as soon as possible.	Noted. In the current financial climate, infrastructure schemes are only begun as and when necessary. No change
230	973034	Hart	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Town centre plans developed without consideration of cost and disruption to residents. The plan to remove a major road from the town and no mention of replacement is concerning.	Major changes such as those proposed will inevitably have some disruption associated with them. See responses 373 and 896. No change
295	973409	Mr Mark Smith	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Previous plans have failed. Nothing here gives any direction on what you will actually do. It's full of non-descript planning rubbish, just words - no actual plans - and based on the need for private investment. The plan should be more descriptive stating how, when and what will be done.	See responses 41 and 373. The level of detail is appropriate to a local plan. No changes
914	973682	Mrs Patricia Procktor	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Cannot comment on pretty artist drawings that have no substance in reality and no funding. Document lacks clarity, honesty and truthfulness and is completely flawed.	Objector appears to be commenting on local plan leaflet, rather than local plan itself. No change

1399	973929	Mr Kevin Smith	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Does not make sense to demolish and rebuild the Theatre & Leisure Centre. Waste of money. The theatre is the one thing Stevenage has that is better than anywhere else in the area. This iconic building should be the hub of the new plan with a new town created around it. Concerned that the existing 1960's shopping centre eyesore will be left untouched. Complete rebuilding of this area should be at the heart of the plan and the creation of a shopping centre that draws in people and businesses.	The Arts and Leisure Centre is moving towards the end of its useful life. The theatre is the wrong size to be either a host to major touring productions or to be a local community theatre. The indoor sports facilities should be co-located with the swimming pool to obtain economies of scale. The future of the shopping streets is dealt with in a series of policies that provide a suitable market-responsive framework. No change.
1391	974207	Mr Roger Acraman	Policy TC1: Town Centre	The Theatre and Arts & Leisure Centre is a perfectly fine building, in an ideal location, that forms the nucleus of the town centre. To replace them elsewhere would be a waste of money and less accessible. Object to the closure of Lytton Way. This is the main arterial route through Stevenage. Redirecting traffic through Gunnels Wood Road will create increase traffic problems.	See responses to 896 and 1399. No changes
1371	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy TC1: Town Centre	The town centre is in need of regeneration. The designs look attractive. Development of housing here and in other neighbourhood shopping areas is a good idea for many reasons.	Welcome support
1368	974257	Mr Martin Price	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Plans for the town centre are excellent and much needed. Hope this will be the highest priority of the plan and first to be delivered. Concerns due to lack of information on funding and locations e.g. theatre and railway improvements and the new sports facility.	Welcome support. See response to 295. No changes.
1359	974277	Norma Elliot	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Demolishing the Arts and Leisure Centre and swimming pool is completely unnecessary and a waste of money. These are in a good location and the theatre is the best around. The town centre needs regeneration.	Welcome support. See response to 1399. No changes.
1355	974281	Mrs N J Griffiths	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Redevelopment is long overdue, but unclear where the funding will come from. Shopping should be totally undercover.	Welcome support. See response to 295. No changes.
1346	974282	Mrs Julie Paterson	Policy TC1: Town Centre	The town centre is in need of improvement, but why knock down the theatre and swimming pool. This is a town icon.	Welcome support. See response to 1399. No changes.
1344	974286	Mr Phil Reah	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Agree with proposals to regenerate the Town Centre.	Welcome support.
1315	974383	Mr Alan Ford	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Town centre forms part of Britain's architectural heritage. Support that buildings either side of the Town Square and Queensway are to remain and trust that the mural side of Primark will be conserved.	Welcome support.
1307	974414	Jo Pullan	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Object to the town centre regeneration. Doing up the Gordon Craig Theatre and the town centre is a complete waste of money.	The town centre is in urgent need of regeneration. No changes

1248	974444	Mrs Cathleen Edwards	Policy TC1: Town Centre	In favour of town centre regeneration proposals, and plans to provide more homes. Have two comments on the proposals: 1. Not clear from the leaflet where the bus station will be located. Previous plans for it to go on Lytton Way, opposite the railway station. This is quite a distance from the shops. Leave it where it is and expand it. 2. Toilets in Westgate should be moved from the first to the ground floor during its extension.	Welcome support. The objector is relying upon the local plan leaflet, rather than the local plan itself, as the reference point. Exact location for bus station yet to be determined. Location of toilets is too detailed a matter for the local plan. No changes
1145	974448	J.A England	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Acknowledge regeneration of the town centre is urgently needed, but believe too much emphasis on building new homes and not enough to creating a town centre people want. Replacing Leisure Park with houses will create traffic issues. Leisure facilities should be maintained.	Welcome support. Leisure facilities will be replaced on current site in a more urban format. Homes form an important and necessary part of the town centre regeneration proposals. No changes
1143	974449	Mrs Agnieszka De Silva	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Hoped that Stevenage would introduce larger department stores, nice coffee shops, restaurants and good quality schooling. Instead seeing more bargain shops, lack of quality school places, shortage of 'top-end' homes and less and less open space.	Comments noted. No changes proposed
1058	974699	Margaret Daly	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Plans to regenerate the town centre are fabulous.	Welcome support.
1028	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Pleased to see that the town centre is to be regenerated. Should be done before housing is built on Greenfield sites.	Welcome support. The Council will generally follow the principal of brown before green but both are needed to meet the Council's housing target. The provision of necessary infrastructure may, on occasion, necessitate greenfield sites being developed alongside brownfield sites. No change
1022	977259	Mr and Mrs Meldrum	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Concerns that there are no plans to have the new library incorporated within the museum as existing library leaves a lot to be desired. Museum is in a poor location at present and should be located in the centre of the town. Already have 3 hotels and another planned for the retail park, space should instead be saved for a museum and library.	There are proposals to include a replacement library in the public sector hub. Negotiations are ongoing to find a long-term solution to the museum's challenging conditions. Demand for hotels continues. No changes.
1026	977260	Mrs M Selvage	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Question whether the public conveniences will remain in their present location next to the clock tower.	New public conveniences are likely to be provided in the public sector hub but this is too detailed an issue for the local plan. No change
1027	977264	Ann Cooper	Policy TC1: Town Centre	Generally pleased about regeneration of the town centre which should be the number one priority.	Welcome support.
1019	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy TC1: Town Centre	The extent of the town centre referred to in the plan should include the full width of St. George's Way, the Town Centre Gardens, St. Andrew and St. George's Church and Museum, the Fire and Ambulance Station and the Holiday Inn Hotel. Proposals set out for the town centre, as currently defined, will have critical affects for this area. The proposals for infrastructure and transport will have a significant impact on St Georges Way.	See response to 449. No change

297	973409	Mr Mark Smith	Policy TC2: Southgate Park Major Opportunity Area	Plans for Lytton Way are unclear. Concerns about traffic implications and how people will access the Railway Station / Car Parks / Police Station.	See response 896. No change
544	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy TC2: Southgate Park Major Opportunity Area	Policy TC2 seeks the creation of a new public sector hub at the Plaza, to release the current buildings for high density residential development. HCC is supportive of this, subject to the reprovision of the library and public health clinic. HCC also supports the regeneration of its Southgate Offices (currently vacant). HCC welcomes the inclusion of a primary school within the town centre. This school will need to be 2FE in size. HCC Property would welcome further discussion on design details.	Welcome support. SBC have been in discussions with the landowners to help identify new premises, such as space in the new public sector hub, however, it is the responsibility of the landowner to ensure that suitable premises are identified to release the land for development at Southgate MOU.
1048	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy TC2: Southgate Park Major Opportunity Area	Proposal for a public sector hub is welcomed, but the Museum should be included. The Crypt could then be of greater use to the church or be used as a community facility within an extended Southgate Park development. No thought appears to have been given to the Fire and Ambulance Station site. With improved pedestrian access across St Georges Way, this is a valuable site for development.	See response to 1022. The Fire and Ambulance Station has recently been the subject of substantial investment: the site-owner is not looking to move. No change.
296	973409	Mr Mark Smith	Policy TC3: Centre West Major Opportunity Area	The Leisure Park is currently effective and draws people from surrounding areas. Concerned the loss of parking will make it difficult or impossible to park here. Development here is unnecessary. Work on the rest of the town centre is required to a much greater degree. The plan does not state how parking facilities will be replaced and if the levels will be the same.	The plan proposes redeveloping the Leisure Park at higher density: parking will be provided at an appropriate scale to meet the needs generated by the development. No change
282	973636	Legal and General	Policy TC3: Centre West Major Opportunity Area	As landowner, L&G recognises the significant development potential offered by the Leisure Park. Support Policy TC3, but seek some amendments to the policy wording and supporting text. L&G intends to work with SBC, to progress this scheme. L&G would like to remain involved and fully understand the activities of SBC and the LEP in bringing forward the regeneration of Stevenage Central, both as a key stakeholder, landowner and investor, who is committed to long term investment in the social infrastructure and regeneration of Stevenage. L&G has the financial capabilities to deliver a redevelopment scheme. Amendments to wording suggested.	Comments noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that L&G's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
1306	975836	Susan Bucktrout	Policy TC3: Centre West Major Opportunity Area	Businesses in the Leisure Park are undergoing considerable redevelopment. It is a shame to replace these refurbished buildings with houses. This is a popular area in a convenient location.	See response to 296. No changes
1197	976313	R Turner	Policy TC3: Centre West Major Opportunity Area	No mention of where leisure facilities will be relocated when the leisure park is redeveloped.	The proposals are to retain the facilities on the site in a more urban form. No changes
1152	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Wasteful plan for Stevenage station - suburban station not a nodal interchange. Leisure centre is well placed and fit for purpose - demolition is madness	Network Rail's analysis of passenger growth, coupled with current operational difficulties, suggest that a new station will be needed within a decade. See also response to 1399. No change

868	342707	Mrs Kath Shorten	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Stevenage station only requires a slightly longer concourse and a better approach, not a full re-build.	See response to 1152. No change
912	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Object to the relocation of The Arts and Leisure Centre. This facility is more modern that much of the town centre and the facilities it offers are valued and remain closely in line with requirements.	See response to 1399. No change
28	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Welcome attempts to make the town centre and train station more accessible through loss of Lytton Way and Gordon Craig. Concerned that the loss of the only arts centre is counter-productive. Plans must include a standalone arts/theatre space.	See response to 1399. No change
281	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Support Policies SP4 and TC4	Welcome support
289	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Target amount of floorspace for town centre in Policy SP4 is relatively appropriate - concerned that other policies do not support this strategy. Policies TC4, TC6 and TC7 could make provision for additional retail floorspace over and above that in TC5. Wording of TC4, 6 and 7 is excessively flexible, not justified and is therefore unsound.	See response 288. The evidence base suggests that the town centre requires to improve the quality of floorspace rather than the quantity: the local plan follows this recommendation. Any additional floorspace is consistent with improving the town centre but not to the extent that major shifts in retail draw would have any significant effect on Welwyn. No change.
975	973869	Mr Ralph Black	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Parking at station is already at capacity, even cycle racks are full.	See response to 296. No change
1062	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Support proposals for a fifth platform. Improving the appearance of the station should be a lesser priority than improving the services.	See response to 1152. The nature of train services is not a matter for the Borough Council or the local plan. No change
957	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	No account has been taken of the fact that vehicular access to the station to drop off/ pick up passengers is important and the station has insufficient parking or disabled spaces and a lack of lay-by's to drop off passengers.	It is planned that vehicular access to the train station should not be impaired by the plan's proposals. No change
1868	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	The plan proposes to remove several car parks and replace them with one multi-storey car park on what is currently the Leisure Park. There is no mention of how many spaces this will contain, or if they will be sufficient for local workers.	The overall parking strategy for the town centre is to remove many surface car parks and replace them with fewer, larger multi-storey car parks that meet the needs generated by development. No change
1021	977259	Mr and Mrs Meldrum	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Should be a Shop Mobility shop within the bus terminus so that disabled/ elderly can get off the bus and obtain a mobility scooter/ wheelchair with ease.	This is an operational matter too detailed for the local plan. No change
1025	977260	Mrs M Selvage	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	Concerns over the location of the new bus station. Plans are not specific enough as to where the new bus station will be located, do not want to walk too far and the bus station is convenient in its present location.	The current bus station is too small to suit current needs. A new location for the bus station has yet to be determined - this is a detailed matter for master-planning work. No change
1053	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	The redevelopment of the station can allow improved access to the town centre and the creation of a transport hub without the need to demolish the Arts and Leisure Centre. Includes detailed proposals.	See response to 1399. No change

1869	977308	Patricia Acres	Policy TC4: Station Gateway Major Opportunity Area	One of the best things about the town is the theatre - why move it. Too many plans drawn up and not implemented.	See response to 1399. No change
346	974000	Historic England	Policy TC5: Central Core Major Opportunity Area	Recommend additional text to policies TC2, TC5 and TC7.	Comments noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that Historic England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
546	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy TC5: Central Core Major Opportunity Area	HCC own the Stevenage Register Office on Danesgate. The plan suggests no changes are being proposed to this building. If, however, redevelopment is being considered, HCC Property would have no objection subject to the service being re-provided.	Comments noted. No change
1055	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy TC5: Central Core Major Opportunity Area	The redevelopment of the station can allow improved access to the town centre and the creation of a transport hub without the need to demolish the Arts and Leisure Centre. Includes detailed proposals.	See response to 1399. No change
290	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC6: Northgate Major Opportunity Area	Policy TC6 could make provision for additional retail floorspace over and above that in TC5. Wording is excessively flexible, not justified and is therefore unsound. The wording would permit unlimited A1 retail development & should be amended to ensure that a substantive increase in comparison floorspace over and above 4,600m ² for the entire town centre would not be acceptable. This would allow us to conclude that these policies are justified and effective.	See responses 288 and 289. No change
292	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC7: Marshgate Major Opportunity Area	Policy TC7 could make provision for additional retail floorspace over and above that in TC5. Wording is excessively flexible, not justified and is therefore unsound. The wording would permit unlimited A1 retail development & should be amended to ensure that a substantive increase in comparison floorspace over and above 4,600m ² for the entire town centre would not be acceptable. This would allow us to conclude that these policies are justified and effective.	See responses 288 and 289. No change
549	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy TC7: Marshgate Major Opportunity Area	HCC own Bowes-Lyon House youth centre within this policy area. Para 7.56 makes reference to enhanced youth facilities. HCC Property will continue to participate in discussions regarding this building and would seek to retain youth facilities in the town centre area. HCC Property would welcome the opportunity to review future information regarding the regeneration of the town centre.	Comments noted. No change
450	759461	Aberdeen Asset Management	Policy TC8: Town Centre Shopping Area	Seek amendment of Policy TC8 and the proposals map to extend the Town Centre boundary outwards, to encompass those other town centre uses located beyond, and to extend primary and secondary frontages. Acknowledge competition from Roaring Meg but also acknowledge the linked trips and the fact that Roaring Meg stops more leakage to competing areas. Not seeking a retail allocation for Roaring Meg, but are concerned about the negative approach.	See response 449. No change

34	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy TC9: High Street Shopping Area	Old Town has too many food outlets and losing its mixed use. Realises empty units are undesirable but there must be a way of encouraging other businesses into the premises.	The nature of retailing and retailing provision is continually changing in response to market trends. Flexible policies are designed to ensure that there are as few empty units as possible. No changes
351	974000	Historic England	Policy TC9: High Street Shopping Area	Support policy TC9 (b) and would recommend the addition of "Would not cause harm to the significance of any designated heritage assets <u>including their setting</u> ". Supporting text (para 7.65), the final line requires amendment to reflect s.72 of the 1990 Act: ~Consequently, development will be expected to protect, <u>preserve</u> and enhance these heritage assets".	Comments noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that Historic England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
1309	974410	Margaret Hawkins	Policy TC9: High Street Shopping Area	Generally supportive of commitment to protect the old town. Some new businesses have less attractive frontages. Current windows and shop fronts should be protected, even with a change of use.	Welcome support. Conservation Area policies will continue to be applied to changes of use. No changes.
893	973781	Mr Loyd Davies	Policy TC10: High Street Primary and Secondary Frontages	Welcome no more A5 food retailers in the Old Town. However, nothing in the plan to use and develop the character of the Old Town to attract specialist retailers as has been achieved in Hitchin and Hertford.	Welcome support. The planning system is unable to address issues of perceived quality of retailers. No change
355	974046	Kentucky Fried Chicken (Great Britain) Limited	Policy TC10: High Street Primary and Secondary Frontages	Policy is not justified. A ban on A5 Use Classes is unfair and ineffective. It will penalise businesses within this use regardless of efforts they might make to offer healthy choices. Policy based on the suggested incidence of obesity or overweight arising from the proximity of food outlets to schools is flawed as evidence shows no correlation .	There is a large body of evidence on the role that fast food outlets play in obesity levels. There are also a considerable number of food outlets available in the High Street: the ban applies to any additional A5 uses, not existing uses. No change
710	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Policy TC10: High Street Primary and Secondary Frontages	The negative impact on health of living near takeaways is supported by research. Limiting A5 uses could be more widely adopted - particularly with respect to neighbourhood centres.	Welcome support. The Borough Council is the freehold owner of the overwhelming majority of neighbourhood centres [and similar] in the town. It can, therefore, exercise, a policy of restraint on A5 uses through its land-ownership. No change
367	769036	Wyvale Garden Centres Ltd	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Wyvale Garden Centres Ltd. are the leaseholders of this site. Support the allocation for a food store. The allocation will meet the retail need identified in SBC's retail study, in a sustainable manner; via the reuse of a brownfield site and in an accessible location. The allocation of this site has taken into account the proposed location of future housing and appropriateness of other sites. The site is well situated to serve existing and future residents. It is the most appropriate strategy for provided the required provision. The Plan is effective as the site is deliverable within the plan period. It is consistent with national policy, which encourages the reuse of previously developed land.	Welcome support. No change proposed

749	341398	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Sainsbury's strongly oppose proposals to allocate a large new store at Graveley Road. Convenience retail needs for the Graveley Road area are already being met by the objector's Coreys Mill Superstore. This is not the most appropriate strategy and not in accordance with the NPPF. The identified increase in floorspace would be more sustainably distributed to existing centres within the retail hierarchy, as well as existing stores. This would accord with the sequential test and support the vitality and viability of the existing centres and stores. It also accords with the NPPF town centre first approach.	In arriving at the decision to allocate this site, the council has already followed the sequential test and the town's established retail hierarchy, as set out in TC11. After following this approach, a large residual amount of floorspace remains/is needed and the NPPF requires that where a need is identified the local plan must make provision. No other site is available to accommodate these needs: the Wyevale Garden Centre site is already in Class A1 use and is, therefore, a brownfield site. The policy requires that a retail impact assessment should be completed at the time of any planning application, allowing an assessment of the impact on local/neighbourhood centres and other stores. No change
822	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to TC11 due to close proximity of Sainsbury's store, loss of garden centre and loss of overflow parking from Lister Hospital which the garden centre provides.	In arriving at the decision to allocate this site, the council has already followed the sequential test and the town's established retail hierarchy, as set out in TC11. After following this approach, a large residual amount of floorspace remains/is needed and the NPPF requires that where a need is identified the local plan must make provision. No other site is available to accommodate these needs: the Wyevale Garden Centre site is already in Class A1 use and is, therefore, a brownfield site. The policy requires that a retail impact assessment should be completed at the time of any planning application, allowing an assessment of the impact on local/neighbourhood centres and other stores. No change
833	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to TC11 due to close proximity of existing Sainsbury's store, loss of only Garden Centre in Stevenage and also loss of overspill parking from Lister Hospital.	See response to 822. No change
982	342828	Mrs Jennifer Watson-Usher	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to TC11. This is the last remaining garden centre. Sainsbury's had recent application for expansion refused, yet allowing another supermarket a few hundred yards away.	See response to 822. No change
437	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The proposed development is inappropriate use of the Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. Policy TC11 is not effective. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough to visit one if lost. It also fulfils an important social/leisure role. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion at the North Road/Graveley Road junction and the risk of accidents. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill due to easier road access, thereby further increasing traffic. Improvements to this junction are restricted by physical constraints.	See response to 822. Stevenage is a small, heavily urban Borough with limited options in finding appropriate sites to meet its development needs. The redevelopment of the site is supported by the site owners and the garden centre operators. Whilst the site is within the Green Belt, it is a brownfield site on the edge of the urban area and already in a Class A1 shop use. Highways impacts can be mitigated. No change
847	342182	Miss Margaret Donovan	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new convenience retail store at Graveley Road. Not in accordance with Duty to Co-operate - the garden centre were unaware of the allocation. Not met procedural requirements and not justified - information was omitted from the leaflet sent to residents. Not sound and not justified - The importance of the garden centre has been ignored. This is the only remaining centre in Stevenage. It will cause a loss of recreational facility for recovering hospital patients (health implications) and loss of parking for the hospital.	See response to 437. The Council has been talking to the garden centre operators for over a year about this allocation. The leaflet distributed to all addresses in the Borough is not the local plan and no-one should place reliance solely on the leaflet to inform them about the contents of the plan. No change

946	341677	Mrs Fiona Hutton	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to TC11. Proposal is puzzling given the trends in supermarket shopping and proximity to Sainsbury's. Development would create more traffic and congestion on B197, Junction 8 and all adjacent roads.	See response to 437. No change
1154	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Plan is appalling. One widely appreciated garden centre that is left in Stevenage replaced with supermarket. Sainsbury's is within walking distance	See response to 822. No change
1230	773173	M Wright	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to primary access route on North Road for HO3, TC10 (actually means TC11 due to error on Proposals Map) and EC1/4. The traffic volumes will paralyse Lister Hospital and the ambulance service, especially during peak times.	The traffic issues can be mitigated. Herts CC as highway authority have raised no objections to the scale of development proposed. No change
219	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to Policy TC11. This will have a detrimental impact on traffic congestion and increase pollution, and will represent additional urban sprawl.	See response to 437. No change
208	969971	Ms Karen Bridden	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	This proposal will result in a further increase in traffic on the B197 through Graveley increasing pollution and accidents. The local area is well served by supermarkets already, another is not needed.	See response to 437. The traffic issues can be mitigated. Herts CC as highway authority have raised no objections to the scale of development proposed. No change
241	973034	Hart	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to TC11. There is a large supermarket just minutes walk away. What is the justification for having a large new store? Part of the site is currently used for staff parking at Lister Hospital. No mention of where this parking will be moved to. This will increase congestion on Graveley Road and the Graveley Road/North Road junction. No proposals to improve the junction.	See responses to 208 and 437. No change
266	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Only one garden centre in Stevenage. Why do we need another supermarket?	See response to 437. No change
312	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	New supermarket on garden centre site will result in further traffic increase on B197 through Graveley. There is a large supermarket around the corner from this site. Why do we need another?	See responses to 208 and 437. No change
396	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Concerns relating to the flood plain impact. The site would be unsustainable without significant housing development (objections to which have been raised). Without this it would seem an unnecessary out of town retailer, when the town centre needs the investment.	A Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. Comparison and convenience needs are rather different in their locational requirements. The sequential test and the retail hierarchy have been followed before this allocation has been arrived at. No change
365	342698	Mrs Gillian Shenoy	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to proposal for new supermarket on garden centre site. This will increase traffic, congestion and accidents, which are already an issue. Plans to create a park and ride facility nearby would also exacerbate issues. The Garden Centre serves the whole of Graveley and Stevenage, providing an important social meeting place. If it were forced out, residents will have to travel further afield, increasing travel and pollution.	See response to 437. There are no plans for a park and ride site anywhere in Stevenage. No change

422	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The proposed development is inappropriate use of the Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough to visit one if lost. It also fulfils an important social/leisure role. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion at the North Road/Graveley Road junction and the risk of accidents. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill .	See response to 437. No change
461	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Traffic modelling and flood assessment work do not consider impacts of new convenience retail store - no mitigation measures identified. NHDC interested in site helping address convenience retail needs in their authority area. The Proposals Map should be amended to show the correct policy notation. In the event that these objections cannot be overcome, the proposed retail allocation should be removed from the plan.	The proposals map incorrectly identifies the allocation site as Policy TC10 - a Minor Modification is proposed to correct this to Policy TC11. See also response to 467. No change
577	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The policy wording should make it explicitly clear, in line with the NPPF, that there should be no requirement for the provision at West of Stevenage to be subject to sequential / retail impact assessment. A neighbourhood centre may require A2 - A5 use classes as well in order to ensure a long-term sustainable centre.	The objector's comments are consistent with the correct interpretation of the local plan: it is not necessary to make that point any clearer. The proposed neighbourhood retail facilities will provide an adequate level of service for the West of Stevenage development [1,300 homes] but if NHDC propose more homes further west it will be necessary for them to make additional convenience retail provision. Potentially, this could be of sufficient scale that it could subsume and/or supersede all, or a part of, the need for the TC11 allocation at Graveley Road. No change.
805	977009	Mrs Hilary C Thompson	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new supermarket along B197 due to the close proximity of other supermarkets, lack of need as existing shops are not over-trading due to changes in online shopping habits and that the garden centre should remain as provides a service not fulfilled by other outlets nearby.	See response to 437. No change
923	973688	Caroline Partridge	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Disappointed that the garden centre is being threatened. Garden Centre is a popular and well used facility - why take it away from the Old Town?	See response to 437. No change
944	974779	Mr James Blanksby	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new supermarket provision. Why is there a need for this, when there is a huge supermarket less than 3 minutes drive away (a 10 minute walk)? This site is in the flood plain, therefore it would appear you have not carried out your duty of care in constructing the plan. The plan needs to be fully discussed with local residents. Green Belt land should be protected, flood plain should not be built on, villages should not be destroyed. Such a severe impact on this area is not just.	See responses to 396 and 437. The plan does not propose village destruction - Graveley lies in North Hertfordshire District. No change
1011	977238	Professor Emeritus David Noakes	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new retailing being provided on the existing garden centre site due to close proximity of Sainsbury's Corey Mill store and High Street and use the Garden Centre site for housing and the Rugby Club Ground for car parking.	See response to 437. No change
1041	973704	Mrs Ann Sharman	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	SBC plan to compulsory purchase the last garden centre in Stevenage. Another supermarket is not required.	See response to 437. There is a willing land-owner, hence Compulsory Purchase is not envisaged. No change
1046	973849	Mr Chris Nathan	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	New supermarket will exacerbate the chaos at North Road and Graveley Road junction and ruin the landscape of the area.	See responses to 208 and 437. No change

1057	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Lack of medium sized food store in core of town centre, this encourages travel by car rather than buses. It is a mistake to allow another new supermarket on the edge of town, especially close to Sainsbury's. Land should be safeguarded for health related uses.	There is both a Tesco and an Iceland in the town centre plus an Asda and Aldi on the edge of the centre. See response to 437. Land is already safeguarded for hospital expansion: the East and North Herts NHS [Hospital] Trust have shown no interest in this site. No change.
1072	974740	Felix Power	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Garden Centre is the only one in Stevenage. Why do we need another supermarket on a congested road. Online shopping and some improvement in high street shopping there is a move away from large supermarkets. Won't need another during the Plan term.	See response to 437. No change
1112	974652	Mr Paul Schimmel	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	What gives SBC the right to decide to close the garden centre and require a 'convenience store'?	See response to 437. No change
1129	977378	King George Surgery Patient Liaison Group	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The loss of the last remaining garden centre is not justified. There are already other supermarkets. If a new one is required it should be provided within the new housing development. This could be detrimental to health, as the centre provides relaxation and a social environment. It could lead to residents paving gardens, leading to less exercise and water absorption. The council did not co-operate with the garden centre, as they were not aware of this proposal.	See response to 437. The Council has been talking to the garden centre operators for over a year about this allocation. No change
1172	341965	Mrs Hazel Barnham	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The garden centre is the only one in Stevenage and an important feature of the community.	See response to 437. No change
1174	342277	Mrs Sandie Greed	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Lister Hospital was chosen as the main hospital due to its proximity to A1 and available land for expansion. Road infrastructure cannot support development of houses, supermarket and industrial area. Another supermarket is not required but the garden centre is. Last garden centre in Stevenage and provides social benefits. Hosts parking for hospital employees.	See response to 437. No change
1192	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The town needs a garden centre, no mention of relocation. Why do we need another supermarket so close to Coreys Mill?	See response to 437. No change
1247	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	The proposed development is inappropriate use of the Green Belt and inconsistent with national policy. This is the only garden centre left. Residents will be required to travel outside of the Borough to visit one if lost. A new supermarket will significantly increase congestion at the North Road/Graveley Road junction and the risk of accidents. The new store is likely to take business from Sainsbury's at Coreys Mill.	See response to 437. No change
1261	974442	Jill Gray	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Question why a supermarket is needed so close to Sainsbury's. This will remove the only remaining Garden Centre.	See response to 437. No change
1273	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Opposed to the closure of the garden centre on the approach to Graveley to be replaced by yet another food store.	See response to 437. No change

1283	342024	Mr Henry Bracey	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Question whether there is need for another supermarket. This will increase traffic volumes at North Road/Graveley junction and through Graveley. Stevenage will lose its only Garden Centre forcing residents to travel out of the area, thus increasing traffic and pollution, and a loss of a social/leisure facility.	See response to 437. No change
1294	342154	Mrs Madelaine Crouch	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new convenience retail store at Graveley Road. The increase in traffic will have a big impact on Graveley and the surrounding roads. Only Garden centre in Stevenage and provides a valuable service for locals in Stevenage.	See response to 437. No change
1323	974362	Patricia Milliner	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Addition of a new supermarket will cause further traffic problems.	See responses to 208 and 437. No change
1327	342032	Mr Paul Bridden	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new convenience retail store at Graveley Road. This is not required and will cause traffic congestion, potentially impacting emergency services.	See response to 437. No change
1333	342133	Ms Helen Lumley	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to new convenience retail store at Graveley Road. Already have too many supermarkets in the area. Proposal would lead to a significant increase in traffic. Garden centre is also an important local amenity.	See response to 437. No change
1352	974282	Mrs Julie Paterson	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Question why we are getting rid of our one and only Garden Centre, as Stevenage is obviously not going to become a Garden City if these plans go ahead.	See response to 437. Do not see correlation between Garden City and garden centre - the Council has no plans to see Stevenage become a Garden City. No change
1358	974277	Norma Elliot	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Garden centre is the only one left in Stevenage. A town of this size should have a garden centre. Another supermarket is not necessary. Edge of town provision is no use to those old and without cars. Need supermarkets within the town centre.	See response to 437. No change
1392	974207	Mr Roger Acraman	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to proposals for convenience store on Graveley Road. This is last remaining garden centre. Stevenage has enough supermarkets. Will not create extra revenue; same money will be spent but across more supermarket sites.	See response to 437. No change
1797	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	This is the only garden centre in Stevenage and the proposals to replace it with a supermarket is questionable. If the garden centre is seen as surplus to requirements, would the building of homes not be a better option.	See response to 437. No change
1813	975687	Mrs Margaret Presland	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Object to convenience retail store on Graveley Road . This would encroach on and overwhelm Graveley. Green Belt should protect the rural and historic village of Graveley. Concerns around extra traffic causing congestion and accidents and passing through Graveley. Sainsbury's is nearby and the garden centre is well-used.	See responses to 437 and 461. No change
1846	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Concerns around development north of Stevenage. This is the most densely populated area of Stevenage and is already feeling the impact of the large Great Ashby development. North Road would effectively be industrialised with the employment areas, travellers site and superstore.	See response to 437. No change

1871	976206	Mr Norman Gray	Policy TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision	Difficult to see why another supermarket is needed when Sainsbury's is nearby.	See response to 437. No change
29	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy TC12: New Comparison Retail Provision	Agree with plan to stop business locating in retail parks to the detriment of the town centre. SBC should have the confidence to tell businesses to look elsewhere if they won't consider town centre.	Welcome support. No change
293	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC12: New Comparison Retail Provision	Target amount of floorspace for town centre in Policy SP4 is relatively appropriate - concerned that other policies do not support this strategy. Policy TC12 should be amended to require any schemes which create an excessive amount of floorspace above that which would meet the needs of Stevenage to be refused.	See response 288. No change
750	341398	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Policy TC13: Retail impact assessments	The Local Plan in not Justified, it is not the most appropriate strategy. It is not consistent with the NPPF. The suggested thresholds for Retail Impact Assessments are unnecessarily low and should be increased, in line with the threshold at para 26 of NPPF. The following changes are proposed: Town Centre: 2,500sq.m; High Street Shopping Area: 1,000sq.m to 1,500sq.m; District Centre and Local Centres: 750sq.m to 1,000sq.m; Neighbourhood Centres: 500sq.m to 750sq.m; Elsewhere: 300sq.m to 500sq.m	The NPPF allows LPAs to set local thresholds where they are justified by circumstances. Our evidence suggests that local thresholds are needed to avoid potential harm to our centres. Given the peculiar challenges facing Stevenage we believe that the published thresholds are necessary to allow the Council to properly control the quantity and location of new retail development. No change.
451	759461	Aberdeen Asset Management	Policy TC13: Retail impact assessments	Object to the 300sq.m threshold for non-central retail proposals. This is in conflict with NPPF. Threshold should be increased from 300sq.m to 1500sq.m. This would be more akin to minimum floorspace sizes proposed in large format retail stores. Acknowledge future investment in town centre retail is important and consider that it will not be delayed as a result of very small changes to non-central floorspace.	The NPPF allows LPAs to set local thresholds where they are justified by circumstances. Our evidence suggests that local thresholds are needed to avoid potential harm to our centres. A low threshold is necessary to encompass a wide range of potential developments which could have a direct or collective adverse impact upon the town centre. The suggested threshold of 1,500 sq. m would not afford an adequate level of scrutiny and protection of the town centre. No change
579	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy TC13: Retail impact assessments	Should explicitly state that there is no requirement for a sequential or retail impact assessment for any of the retail provision at West of Stevenage that accords with Policy TC11/TC13.	See response 577. No change
279	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy TC13: Retail impact assessments	Note your proposed range of thresholds for Retail Impact Assessments in Policy TC13 in order to support the town centre and network of smaller centres around the borough. We are considering similar approaches in order to support our designated centres, and therefore support your approach in this regard.	Welcome support. No change

A strong, competitive economy

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
551	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	A Strong, Competitive Economy	Para 5.16 The quantum of floorspace for West Stevenage should be clarified and cross referenced to Policy EC1. Clarification should be provided to ensure the Plan is clear and sound.	Stevenage West is referenced in Policy HO2 which allocates land for approximately 1,350 dwellings. Para 9.13 discusses options for mixed use of the land incorporating around 10,000m2 for employment. No change.
735	452235	Central Bedfordshire UA	A Strong, Competitive Economy	Whilst we are happy to contribute to providing unmet employment need within the FEMA (at Stratton Farm Business Park, Biggleswade), clarification of the context and justification is required.	This issue is being addressed in joint Duty to Co-operate work with CBC and other authorities. CBC are being informed of the latest information and are continuing to be co-operative in providing land at Biggleswade [also in the A1 corridor] to help meet a part of Stevenage's employment needs. No change.
1111	978246	Mr Donald Manning	A Strong, Competitive Economy	More employees are working from home reducing costs for both. Or adoption of Regus rent as and when office space is needed. There is an excess of office space in Stevenage, some being converted to residential.	Noted. No change.
1267	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	A Strong, Competitive Economy	Para 5.23 - Providing employment elsewhere is not sustainable and car use is required to get to Central Beds. This is not positively prepared. Para 5.26 - Outlining employment opportunities outside Stevenage suggests that Stevenage becomes a dormitory town for nearby employment. Para 5.27 - This is encouraging commuting, which will increase congestion on the A1(M), and there are no plans to increase capacity.	This issue is being addressed in joint Duty to Co-operate work with CBC and other authorities in the A1 corridor. Stevenage is a small net attractor of labour: there are no plans to convert it into a dormitory town. Biggleswade is accessible directly by train, as well as road, from Stevenage. HE have plans to improve capacity on the A1(M) J.6 - J.9 and are investigating improvements further northwards. No change.
1848	974286	Mr Phil Reah	A Strong, Competitive Economy	Businesses should be encouraged to expand or relocate to the town centre rather than being a town to house commuters working in London.	Welcome support for the plan's objectives for the town centre. There are no plans to convert Stevenage into a dormitory town.
44	969602	Ms Yvonne Shaw Basciu	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Stevenage had a technological niche, but is developing into a commuter town. Employment will increase investment in the town.	Stevenage is proud of its broad economic base, with particular specialisms in advanced manufacturing, aerospace, R&D and pharmaceuticals. There are no plans to convert Stevenage into a dormitory town. No change.
287	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Welcome proposals to maximise the amount of employment land and floorspace. An Article 4 designation would help maintain control over employment designated areas.	Support and helpful advice welcomed. No change.
294	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Strong relationship with WelHat - recognised in Policy SP3. SP3 target of providing 140,000m2 of new employment floorspace within Stevenage Para 5.23 notes not being able to meet need but is silent on the scale of the shortfall. Little clarity as to whether sites in Central Beds and NHDC are likely to appear in respective plans. Policy SP3 suggests that WelHat should assist in meeting your shortfall. Latest evidence shows that WelHat may not have a surplus of employment floorspace by the end of our plan period. Request amended wording to SP3 and supporting text.	Para 5.15 notes the uncertainty surrounding economic projections. Agreement has been reached with CBC and NHDC to provide part of Stevenage's employment needs in their local plans - we are awaiting the publication of their Reg. 19 plans. The information regarding the non-availability of land in Welwyn Hatfield was not made available by WHBC under the Duty to Co-operate until after the start of the SBLP consultation period. However, the plan is not reliant on the release/use of any employment land in WHBC and modifications to 5.25/5.26 can convey the factual change in circumstances. The change to Policy SP3 has been treated as a Major Modification [as it is a change to policy] but, it does not go to any issues of soundness and is merely reflective of changed circumstances.

333	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Prioritise use of brownfield sites for housing. Development of offices should be cautious and follow demand. 5.29 Long-term impacts are described as due to Green Belt development.	Identification of brownfield sites was prioritised before greenfield and Green Belt sites were identified for housing. The development of offices for residential use is through the 'prior approval' scheme introduced by the government. We are only able to refuse permission on 3 grounds: contamination, highways and flooding; not because there is a lack of demand. The SA concludes that our Local Plan is sustainable and detailed mitigation will be agreed when a detailed planning application is submitted. No change.
374	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Pin Green is allocated as an employment area in the plan, yet DuPont was recently allowed to convert to housing, rather than encouraging new employment. Gunnels Wood has many vacant sites.	The Du Pont site was lost to housing due to the Government's office to residential Permitted Development Rights regime. Gunnels Wood is currently protected from the impacts of this regime by a Government-granted exemption dated August 2013. The town continues to need employment land. No change.
399	406724	Highways England	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	The HCA's Employment Densities Guide indicates that the 140,000m2 new employment floorspace proposed over the plan period will create 4,000 jobs. This is less than the 7,600 new homes proposed over the plan period and could result in residents needing to travel outside the Borough for work, leading to detrimental impacts on the strategic road network.	The FEMA report sets out the relationship between new homes and new jobs. It is not the intention to turn Stevenage into a dormitory town but the town's proximity to London and the ease of commuting there for work cannot be ignored. No change.
444	341719	GlaxoSmithKline	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Response relating to Policy SP3 part c and para 5.21. Welcome SP3 part c. Request text is reworded to make reference to 'Stevenage GSK and Bioscience Catalyst Campus' rather than 'Bioscience Catalyst'.	Welcome support. A Minor Modification will be made to amend the title to 'Stevenage GSK and Bioscience Catalyst Campus' as requested.
455	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Objects to the allocation of site EC1/7. North Hertfordshire District Council does not consider this to be an appropriate employment location. It is physically separated from both the existing and proposed urban area of Stevenage by Junction 8 of the A1(M) and is poorly related to the existing town. The impacts of the proposed allocation have not been considered in either the traffic modelling or in the flood risk assessment. Could exacerbate flood risk within North Hertfordshire's administrative area, particularly at Little Wymondley. Exceptional circumstances justifying the Green Belt release have not been adequately demonstrated. It is questionable whether this site is deliverable.	This site has previously been promoted by NHDC as a suitable location for a large waste disposal facility and a depot for NHDC waste collection vehicles. The highways and flooding issues were resolved to their satisfaction at this point and this work has been updated: a Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. The landowner is willing to release the site for development. The Green Belt Review and the Green Belt Technical Paper set out the reasons for the release of this site from the Green Belt. No change.
532	632508	Luton Borough Council	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	LBC support the approach to the economy (Policy SP3). Note that Stevenage has a shortfall in employment land based on the Central Bedfordshire, North Herts and Stevenage FEMA. LBC welcomes the strategy for meeting this shortfall.	Welcome support
550	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Policy SP3 “employment provision is supported where there is market demand.”	Welcome support
719	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Support aspirations of Stevenage to meet its economic needs, in particular to make better use of existing land to improve the image of the town centre and lack of suitable premises by providing replacement, new town-centre office space. Notes that whilst a significant amount of new employment can be accommodated within Stevenage, there remains an element of unmet need which will have to be met within the wider FEMA. Welcome further text setting out the level of shortfall in terms of floor space and jobs, and the anticipated contribution that CBC will make.	Welcome support. See response to 735. No change.
746	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Support Policy SP3. The LEP supports the strategy for the creation of the Science and Engineering Campus or Edge of Centre Zone [para 5.20] in Gunnels Wood and the production of a development framework/site briefs in collaboration with site/building owners.	Welcome the support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership.

845	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	Policy SP3 and the text in Chapter 5 should be amended to delete all references to specific sites and areas of land beyond the Borough boundary as potential development sites. Object to references to potential proposals outside the Plan area. Reliance on such development, in advance of any approved plan policy, is unjustified, contrary to national policy, and likely to be ineffective.	See response to 735. It is inevitable that not all LPAs will publish their local plans to the same milestones. No change.
928	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4 and EC1/7 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley.	A Level 2 Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. These sites can be developed in a way that will not increase the flood risk downstream in Little Wymondley. No change.
1203	978537	RPS Planning and Development Ltd	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	The definition for employment land should be expanded to acknowledge that non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses are also acceptable on employment land.	The reference in 5.15 to the NPPF provides appropriate context for flexibility around innovative employment and business activities. No change.
1839	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy SP3: A strong, competitive economy	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4 and EC1/7 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. The increased level of traffic has not been considered.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
458	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	New employment land	Objects to the allocation of site EC1/7. North Hertfordshire District Council does not consider this site to be an appropriate location for employment development. It is physically separated from both the existing and proposed urban area of Stevenage by Junction 8 of the A1(M) and poorly related to the existing town. The impacts of the proposed allocation have not been considered in either the traffic modelling or in the flood risk assessment. Could exacerbate flood risk within North Hertfordshire's administrative area, particularly at Little Wymondley. Exceptional circumstances justifying the Green Belt release have not been adequately demonstrated. It is questionable whether this site is deliverable.	See response to 455. No change.
1157	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	New employment land	No long-term strategic thinking regarding demography or employment trends. Mindless 'build it and they will come' plan for industrial areas.	The Borough Council is statutorily required to produce a local plan and to meet development needs to 2031. Guidance in the NPPF and NPPG, as laid down by Government, has been followed. The NLP study provides the basis for the employment work. No change
130	969682	Mr Trevor Allin	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Allocation of Halfpenny Field and Land at North Road cause concerns. Traffic on A602, A1(M) southbound and North Road is already heavily congested at peak times. Access to Halfpenny Fields from A602 (near Sainsbury's) will be unworkable with increased traffic. Traffic flow is made worse by illegal parking around Thomas Alleyne. Widening North Road is not an option.	Traffic implications of the allocation have been assessed. No change.
236	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Objection to EC1/4. The proposed industrial development is on a single field to the north of the rugby club. Why are we designating this small area of Green Belt for industry when it is far too small to be anything other than an area of small warehouse units, and we are now building houses on previously designated industrial land in the Pin Green industrial area, and converting office space into flats elsewhere in the town?	The land use allocations proposed in the plan are considered appropriate having regard to evidence of economic change locally. No change.

270	970834	Mr Alan Gates (landowner)	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Local Plan is sound and the Duty to Co-operate has met all legal requirements, including policy EC1. Policy clearly sets out where employment development will take place. Scope to improve traffic flows and ease congestion at J8. Halfpenny Field is in the most appropriate location, off J8 of the A1, avoiding the need for vehicles to go through the centre of Stevenage. A Flood Risk Assessment confirms that development can take place. Loss of Green Belt will not create any particular issues given its position.	Welcome support
313	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The new employment sites EC1/7 and EC1/4 have not considered the regular flooding in Little Wymondly. SBC have not carried out a flood risk survey for Little Wymondly. Chantry Lane provides the main access point to EC1/7. This is a small, rural lane, not a major road, and will be expected to carry large volumes of HGVs on a daily basis.	A Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out. Further Flood Risk Assessments will be required when applications are submitted for development on these sites. Traffic impacts are also understood and can be managed. No change.
345	974000	Historic England	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The allocation EC1/1 - GSK/Bioscience catalyst sits to the north-east of the Knebworth Grade II* historic park and garden (registered parkland) within North Hertfordshire District. Its redevelopment presents an opportunity to improve views out from the registered parkland. In any supporting text we would recommend reference to the opportunities presented to improve matters of design and layout when redevelopment comes forward.	Welcome support. These matters can be addressed at application stage. No change.
381	341656	Homes And Communities Agency	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Land at North Road is a HCA asset. Original objection to employment allocation [housing preferred] has now been withdrawn.	Welcome withdrawal of objection. No change.
395	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Site is on or close to a flood plain. This will have a prejudicial effect on surrounding land and potentially impact existing developments from surface water run off.	See response to 928. No change.
445	341719	GlaxoSmithKline	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Response relating to Policy EC1/1. Text to make reference to 'Stevenage GSK and Bioscience Catalyst Campus' rather than 'Bioscience Catalyst' to reflect that there are a number of occupiers of the site. Para 6.8 should explicitly recognise that the Stevenage GSK and Bioscience Catalyst Campus has potential to accommodate a greater level of floorspace than identified in policy EC1/1.	A Minor Modification is proposed to amend the title to 'Stevenage GSK and Bioscience Catalyst Campus' as requested. The amendment to para 6.8 would be inappropriate as there has been no demonstration that that the statement is true: no change.
454	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Objects to the allocation of site EC1/7. North Hertfordshire District Council does not consider this site to be an appropriate location for employment development. It is physically separated from both the existing and proposed urban area of Stevenage by Junction 8 of the A1(M) and poorly related to the existing town. The impacts of the proposed allocation have not been considered in either the traffic modelling or in the flood risk assessment. Could exacerbate flood risk within North Hertfordshire's administrative area, particularly at Little Wymondley. Exceptional circumstances justifying the Green Belt release have not been adequately demonstrated. It is questionable whether this site is deliverable.	See response to 455. No change.
575	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Support Policy EC1/6 and para 6.6. Text could provide greater clarity - specifically reference the employment site being on the former Norton Green landfill site.	Welcome support. Not clear what advantage accrues by identifying that the employment site is on a former landfill site. No change.
650	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Policy EC1/4 will limit the expansion of Lister Hospital. This is a serious flaw. Lister will need expansion space to maintain its role. The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	The Borough Council supports the growth of the Lister Hospital. The designation of the Health Campus is designed to afford the hospital a number of growth options. No change.
655	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Policy EC1/4 will limit the expansion of Lister Hospital. This is a serious flaw. Lister will need expansion space to maintain its role. The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	See response to 650. No change

758	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Support Policy EC1, sites 1 to 7.	Welcome the support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership.
802	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7 allocation and removal from the Green Belt. No demonstration of exceptional circumstances. This would set a precedent leading to the spread of development westwards and threaten coalescence with Little Wymondley. The visual gap between Stevenage and Wymondly would be halved, and the purposes of the Green Belt unacceptably undermined, contrary to NPPF.	The Green Belt Review and the Green Belt Technical Paper set out the reasons for the release of this site from the Green Belt. No change.
821	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/4 on traffic impacts, to reserve for recreational facilities being relocated as a result of HO1/11 and land is saved for expansion of Lister Hospital.	See responses to 130 and 650. No change.
832	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to Policy EC1/4 due to access and traffic concerns, site should be reserved for expansion of Lister Hospital and associated car parking.	See responses to 130 and 650. No change.
885	342259	Mr Stewart Gillies	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	This is an expansionist policy, inappropriate for a town which has already exceeded its design size, pushing hard against its boundaries and running above capacity in many areas. Providing more jobs will result in further pressure to carry out more development in the future.	See response to 1157. No change.
895	341949	Mrs Lesley Bacon	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7 & EC1/4 as sites are flood plans. Development would lead to increased run-off.	See response to 313. No change
901	973662	Mr Wayne Tamcken	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7 and EC1/4. These are on the floodplain. Extra traffic will be too much for already congested roads, particularly EC1/7 as this is a country lane. Against any further infilling and building on Green Belt land which will join Stevenage up with the villages.	See responses to 130, 313 and 802. No change
910	974268	Mr Brian Pells	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The increase in congestion in Chantry Lane, Stevenage Road and, in particular the A1(M) junction 8 due to Heavy Goods Vehicles from EC1/7 has not been considered, or allowed for.	See response to 130. No change
911	973679	Mrs Jackie Hayes	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7 being built on floodplain. Stevenage Road regularly floods. Traffic on Chantry Lane will be made worse.	See responses to 130 and 313. No change
915	973684	Mr Gordon Macdonald	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to industrial development between Stevenage and Graveley. Planned developments, most on floodplains, will lead to a far greater flood risk in Wymondly (which already floods), putting lives and homes in danger. Concerns about increased traffic through Wymondly due to rat runs. This would adversely affect the character of the village. A shame to lose this beautiful area of countryside. Planning authorities should protect Green Belt at all costs.	See responses to 130, 313 and 802. No change
925	973694	Mrs Dylis Macdonald	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Would result in the destruction of Green Belt. Local towns are merging into one another. There will be no countryside left. This is a flood plain and would increase flood risk for Little Wymondly. It is not suitable for development. Concerns over traffic increase. Don't need more noise and pollution from Stevenage Road.	See responses to 130, 313 and 802. No change
930	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4 and EC1/7 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. The increased level of traffic has not been considered.	See responses to 130 and 313. No change

934	973701	Deb Cottrell	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Oppose EC1/7 and EC1/4 due to potential flood risk to Little Wymondley and heavy increased traffic. See responses to 130 and 313. No change	
973	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7. This is Green Belt and adjacent to a wildlife site that would inevitably deteriorate.	See response to 802. Impact on the wildlife site will be assessed at application stage. No change.
981	770454	Ms R Stevenson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to EC1/7 due to loss of Green Belt land. Adjacent wildlife site would inevitably be ruined.	See responses to 802 and 973.
1096	342182	Miss Margaret Donovan	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	EC1/4 should be designated for healthcare. Power lines within the site make large areas unsuitable for buildings (hospital or industrial). Ground level parking should be allowed here. Health buildings need to be on one site for efficiency and effectiveness. No provision is made for Lister's current and future needs. The population is to increase in all Lister catchment areas. Stevenage should be aiming to be a centre for health in this part of eastern England.	See response to 650. There is also a need to provide new employment and to meet the needs of new local residents. No change
1119	974224	Mr Adrian Hawkins	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. The impact on the Ash Brook has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/7 and EC1/4 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on the flood plain. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. Increased traffic levels, particularly HGV from EC1/7, have not been considered.	See response to representations 130 and 928. No change
1125	973077	Mr Chris Turvey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1128	977378	King George Surgery Patient Liaison Group	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The plan in relation to Lister Hospital is not sound. It does not meet healthcare requirements for Stevenage and the surrounding areas covered by East and North Herts NHS Trust. The non-existence of proposals will make adequate future healthcare undeliverable. No co-operation has been shown for Lister's requirements. If this results in healthcare being centralised elsewhere, this would be disastrous.	See response to 650. No change.
1137	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Additional information to Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224. Water run-off from these sites will run down Stevenage Road and into Little Wymondley, increasing flood risk to houses on it's route.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1164	975310	Mr David Owen	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Flood plains have been ignored. Surface water runoff from EC1/4 and EC1/7 will end up in Little Wymondley where there is already a significant problem. Industry should be centralised and kept at Wedgewood Way and Gunnels Wood. Development will increase already congested traffic. There are no plans for improvements.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1173	342277	Mrs Sandie Greed	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Lister hospital was chosen as the main hospital due to its proximity to A1 and available land for expansion. Road infrastructure cannot support development of houses, supermarket and industrial area.	See responses to 130, 650 and 928. No change
1206	978537	RPS Planning and Development Ltd	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The definition of employment land should include non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses. Non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses are also acceptable on employment land.	See response to 1203. No change
1231	773173	M Wright	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to primary access route on North Road for EC1/4. The traffic volumes will paralyse Lister Hospital and the ambulance service, especially during peak times.	See responses to 130 and 650. No change.

1250	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Policy EC1/4 will limit the expansion of Lister Hospital. This is a serious flaw. Lister will need expansion space to maintain its role. The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	See response to 650. No change.
1287	974427	Mr Roger Fletcher	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	EC1/7 will increase flood risk. Wymondly already suffers from flooding due to development in Stevenage. Access would actually be via Todds Green or via Little Wymondley village as people try to avoid congestion. Have transport and the impacts on surrounding areas been given full consideration?	See response to representations 130 and 928. No change
1317	974383	Mr Alan Ford	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Employment sites to the north will result in more road journeys. Before these sites are developed, Gunnels Wood should be returned to full use for employment e.g. Kodak site has been vacant since 1980 and other vacant buildings and sites exist.	There is a need to provide new employment land to meet the needs of new businesses and residents. No change
1363	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Sites EC1/4 and EC1/7 are located on the flood plain. This raises concerns over water run-off into housing areas.	See response to 313. No change
1383	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4 and EC1/7 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. The increased level of traffic has not been considered.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change.
1387	974210	Christine Marshall	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Concerns around EC1/4 and EC1/7. There are lots of issues r.e. infrastructure. Development would increase flood risk in Little Wymondly.	See response 928. No change.
1403	973937	Jacqueline Pond	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Commercial development on a flood plain is not a good idea. Kimpton experienced the return of a flood plain water course when ground water conditions changed in 2000. Will impact businesses and homes in the area.	See response 928. No change.
1418	977318	Mr Ray Elmes	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1422	975864	Nicky Gilbert	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1426	974622	Caroline McDonnell	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1430	977211	K Davies	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1434	977221	Ms M Garrett	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1438	977228	M Scallan	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1443	977231	B M Rumney	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change

1448	977234	Mr Alan McCarley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1452	977235	Ms Annette Fisher	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1456	977294	Mrs Marjorie McCarley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1460	977296	B Shadbolt	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1465	977302	Ms Janet Fraser	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1469	977305	M K Issac	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1473	977306	H Cussens	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1477	977322	J M Roberts	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1481	977323	Mrs Vivian Snowdon	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1485	977690	Ms Tracy Wicklow	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1489	977691	Daljit Dale	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1493	975881	Mr David Jackson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1497	977618	Ms Anne-Lise Domeisen	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1501	975830	Victoria Jackson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1505	977300	Ms Una Bracey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1509	977332	Ms Tracey Owen	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1513	342785	Mrs Nina Turvey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1517	977689	Mr Julian Tribe	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change

1521	977201	Mr Stephen Westwood	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1525	976087	Mrs Josie Norledge	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1529	977203	Mr Jonathan McCarley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1533	977206	Mr Tim Dean	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1537	977207	Ms Anne Larkins	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1541	342082	Mr Carter	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1545	342081	Mrs Cherry Carter	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1549	977214	P Smith	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1553	342433	Mr & Mrs Kennedy	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1557	977219	R Frosterick	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1561	977220	C Briggs	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1566	977230	Ms Lucy Rayer	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1570	977289	Mrs Kathleen Matthew	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1574	977291	Ms Clare Hancock	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1578	977292	Mr Ivor Hancock	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1582	977324	Mrs M Bartrip	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1586	977326	Mr D E Bartrip	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1590	977329	Ms Valerie Day	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change

1594	977331	R Taylor	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1598	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1602	977333	Mr Mark Santacreu	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1606	977335	A L Brown	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1610	977337	Mr John Day	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1614	977338	Mr John Berry	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1618	977340	Mr Nigel Pointing	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1622	977343	Mr Steven Young	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1626	977344	Mr Kenny Crowe	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1630	977345	Mr Ian Hyde	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1634	977350	Mr Brad Watts	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1638	977352	Mr Wayne Shambrook	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1642	977354	Mr Spencer Ryan	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1646	977355	Mr R Fautley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1650	977356	J Fautley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1654	977359	Ms Yvonne Millard	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1658	977360	S Fairey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1662	977361	Mr M Anstiss	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change

1666	977362	Mr Stephen Osburn	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1670	977364	Ms Jane Osburn	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1674	977365	Mr Steven Emson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1678	977366	Ms May Emson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1682	977371	Mr David Wiggins	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1686	977612	Ms Nancy Bidmead	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1690	977613	Mr Robin Baker	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1694	977614	Mrs Caroline Kumar	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1698	977616	Mr Navin Kumar	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1702	979347	Mr K Crowe	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1706	977620	Ms C Kerry	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1710	977621	E Farey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1714	977622	N Farey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1718	977624	Mrs S Tribe	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1722	977626	Mr R Tribe	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1726	977692	Zena Connell	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1730	975681	Mr Colin Rafferty	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1734	974290	Jennie Hawkins	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change

1738	974350	Mr Adam Connell	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1742	342532	Mr Tom McCall	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1746	974373	Ms Kimberley Richardson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1750	974438	Mr Martin Charles	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1754	974521	Mr Barry Bunningham	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1758	974600	Jessica Simpson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1762	974657	Sheila Marvell	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1766	975352	Mr Trevor Beard	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1770	975702	Hannah Kimberley	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1774	975778	Elspeth Jackson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1778	975819	Ms Patricia Rumpus	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1782	975870	Mr Ross Jackson	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1786	973079	Mr Paul Watts	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1790	976079	Mr Robin Norledge	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Representation to EC1/7 and EC1/4. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See responses to 130 and 928. No change
1800	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	The area below EC1/4 is an area that after heavy rain acts as a flood plain. Further building within the area will only exacerbate the problem. If no action is taken, or indeed the flood plain is reduced, the knock on effect to areas of Wymondley and Graveley will without doubt increase the frequency of properties flooding.	See response to 928. No change
1833	973648	Sheena Kitchener	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Object to SBC plans for industrial uses between St Nicholas Church and Graveley. Plans will destroy precious Green Belt in an area of natural beauty and literary significance and add to existing congestion and pollution. These areas are on the flood plain. This will increase flood risk for existing homes.	See responses to 130, 802 and 928. No change
1836	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Plan proposes new supermarket, housing and industry north of Lister Hospital. Land should be safeguarded for health related uses.	See response to 650. No change.

1844	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy EC1: Allocated Sites for Employment Development	Concerns around development north of Stevenage. This is the most densely populated area of Stevenage and is already feeling the impact of the large Great Ashby development. North Road would effectively be industrialised with the employment areas, travellers site and superstore.	See responses to 130 and 802. No change
459	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Gunnels Wood	Delete paragraph 6.14: encourages non-employment uses in the most accessible part of Stevenage's main employment area. Given the constrained nature of employment land within Stevenage, the wilful release of existing employment land by the Borough Council does not represent a positive strategy to meet future employment needs. It may, additionally, prejudice NHDC's ability to demonstrate the exceptional circumstances in order to release land from the Green Belt to address any future shortfall arising from within the Borough.	The proposals for the Edge-of-Centre Zone have come from the Hertfordshire LEP [see 746] and major local employers, such as Airbus. They are, in part, a recognition of what has already happened, with North Hertfordshire College [NHC] having a significant presence within this zone. Most recently, the Borough Council has granted permission to a LEP-sponsored joint Airbus/NHC STEM Centre to engage with, and encourage, students to enter the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics. 6.12 states " <i>This area contains a number of low density or under-utilised sites. It has significant potential to deliver additional employment and jobs</i> ". The Borough Council remains committed to this as primarily an employment area, albeit one at a high density, rather than with the current low density uses. In no way should this be seen as prejudicing NHDC's ability to release land at Baldock to assist Stevenage in meeting its future employment needs. Against this background, NHDC's objection is baseless. No change.
759	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Gunnels Wood	The LEP generally supports Policies EC2 to EC5.	Welcome the support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership.
1207	978537	RPS Planning and Development Ltd	Policy EC2: Gunnels Wood Employment Area and Edge-of-Centre Zone	Policy EC2. The definition for employment land should be expanded to acknowledge that non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses are also acceptable on employment land.	See response to 1203. No change
1208	978537	RPS Planning and Development Ltd	Policy EC3: Gunnels Wood Industrial Zones	Policy EC3. The definition for employment land should be expanded to acknowledge that non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses are also acceptable on employment land.	See response to 1203. No change
673	341408	Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd	Policy EC4: Remainder of Gunnels Wood	Recognise that SBC do not want new office blocks to be introduced in Gunnels Wood Employment Area, but concerned that the second part of EC4 could prejudice existing properties. Comark House is located to the south of USS's estate. It was granted permission in 1989 to operate under B1 use class. In 2013 permission was granted for the whole park for open B1, B2 and B8 uses. USS are looking for a new occupier and want to ensure this policy does not prevent Comark House returning to a B1(a) use in the future if it was used for other Class B uses in the intervening time. Request the policy is amended to exempt properties that have previously operated under B1(a) use class.	Offices are no longer considered an appropriate use in this location. To make the alteration suggested would undermine the policy's intention. Nonetheless, where existing permissions are extant, the new policy designation will not come into play unless/until a new permission is required. Each case will be judged on its merits - including its history - against the policy basis in place at the time of determination. No change.
1209	978537	RPS Planning and Development Ltd	Policy EC4: Remainder of Gunnels Wood	Policy EC4. The definition for employment land should be expanded to acknowledge that non traditional B class specialist businesses and sui generis employment generating uses are also acceptable on employment land.	See response to 1203. No change
760	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Pin Green	Support the maintenance of an appropriate range of premises across the employment area not exceeding 3,000m2.	Welcome the support of Hertfordshire's Local Enterprise Partnership.

Infrastructure and transport

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
42	969602	Ms Yvonne Shaw Basciu	Infrastructure and transport	Roads are terribly congested. Providing extra buses alone will not solve the problem. The roads need improvement or alternative forms of public transport considered. Cycle tracks are little used, think about some form of transit such as a tram - it would pay for itself in terms of environmental impact and efficiency.	The plan's proposals aim to increase walking and cycling transport modes. The innovative proposals in the representations are noted. No change.
86	452235	Dr Helen Birkett	Infrastructure and transport	Concerns around capacity of the A602. Further expansion will exacerbate this. A602 requires increase in capacity.	Noted. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change
401	406724	Highways England	Infrastructure and transport	HE would like to agree with SBC a way forward that assesses the impacts of new development on key junctions and determine what infrastructure is required. Lack of funding for essential schemes creates a risk that the plan, or that the operation of the road network could suffer if mitigation schemes are not delivered.	Welcome HE approach and continued joint work with HE and HCC to assess impacts and determine infrastructure required. SBC have worked with HE and HCC throughout the plan's development. Traffic modelling has informed the plan and mitigation proposals are included within the plan's proposals. The latest transport modelling work will be available.
521	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Infrastructure and transport	The plan promises further road schemes to mitigate impacts of the plan. There is nothing in the plan about coping with extra traffic.	See response to comment 401.
523	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Infrastructure and transport	Section 8 makes no quantifiable prediction of the number of additional vehicles the road network will need to cope with. Accidents between J7 & 8 of the A1(M) are a regular occurrence and can have a significant adverse impact on Stevenage roads, leading to severe congestion. This will be exacerbated by the proposal to make Lytton Way a pedestrian area. Para 8.32 does not make sense. There is no mention of any new track being laid to enable trains to reach the station (from Hertford loop) without crossing the East Coast Mainline. An additional platform will not allow trains to approach/depart in any different direction.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). Paragraph 8.32 is clear. There will be new track from Langley Junction to the new fifth platform. No change.
539	342647	Mr Edward Pugh	Infrastructure and transport	The plan does not address the transportation infrastructure of large scale development, on what is currently Green Belt land, in any meaningful manner. Only limited statements are made on road schemes that will be implemented. Traffic levels are too high already, particularly along North Road which experiences severe congestion at peak times. Building more homes would make levels of traffic unacceptable. Experience tells us infrastructure is unlikely to be developed in a timely manner (if ever) to cater for increased traffic. This is an amazing oversight and makes the plan unsound.	See response to comment 401.
559	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Infrastructure and transport	Para 5.41 Object. "It should be made clear that S106 contributions or provisions should not be duplicated by CIL payments. Para 5.43 The wording should include "where viability permits". Para 5.48 Object. It is not appropriate for a development to have to make provision for adjacent land. It is inappropriate for development at West Stevenage (on land within SBC) to provide for a much larger development in NHDC, on land outside the developers control, for unknown proposals.	Para 5.41 It is not the purpose of the local plan to repeat national policy. No change proposed. Para 5.43 The NPPF addresses issues of viability and reasonable contribution referred to. No change proposed. Para 5.48 Text refers to "appropriate facilities". No change proposed.
563	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Infrastructure and transport	Para 5.62 Support "It is supported that levels of car parking should reflect the levels of car parking from new development, particularly in relation to aspirational housing requirements.	Welcome support.

569	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Infrastructure and transport	<p>The Waste Disposal Authority (WDA) has concerns about the ability of the existing Stevenage Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to accommodate the additional 7,600 dwellings. There are existing capacity issues at the site as its limited size means it is unable to accommodate a large number of vehicles. An increase in population will exacerbate this. Expansion of the site or the provision of a larger alternative site is necessary. The plot size for a new HWRC is approximately 1ha and the centre would need to be close to residential properties. Contributions would be sought from developers.</p>	<p>Noted. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change.</p>
672	976430	Mr David Hoxby	Infrastructure and transport	<p>Object to the Local Plan due to lack of infrastructure, poor access into Stevenage, flood risk, hospital parking, lack of off road parking at the hospital.</p>	<p>See response to comment 569 (infrastructure). No change.</p>
778	636011	Environment Agency	Infrastructure and transport	<p>Infrastructure and transport Paragraph 5.54 should state that loss of environmental biodiversity will be mitigated wherever feasibly possible.</p>	<p>The Local Plan follows the avoid, mitigate and compensate hierarchy. No change.</p>
1016	964447	Mr Louis Burton	Infrastructure and transport	<p>The Local Plan is unsound. It has not been positively prepared to meet infrastructure requirements as there are no specific commitments from neighbouring authorities in south east Stevenage to achieve sustainable development. The need for road infrastructure is acknowledged in North Stevenage, but there is no equivalent commitment for South East Stevenage. This is apparently because the infrastructure lies in other authorities. Due to its distance from the station, the development will result in increased traffic. Roads are already congested. Unsound to build south east Stevenage, with no commitment to road improvements.</p>	<p>See response to comment 401 (traffic).</p>
1073	342862	Mr Ken Wing	Infrastructure and transport	<p>The infrastructure cannot take more growth. There is insufficient education and healthcare provision. Traffic problems will be increased, as well as crime and litter, as most people will be commuters. Much of the land to the north gets heavily flooded in winter.</p>	<p>Infrastructure needs arising from the local plan have been fully assessed in conjunction with infrastructure providers. Policy SP5 requires Infrastructure and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out detailed projects. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change.</p> <p>The plan allows for new schools, local facilities to serve the community including GP surgeries, where required. The plan allocates a site for future hospital expansion. No change.</p> <p>See response to comment 401 (traffic).</p> <p>The police have been consulted and have not raised concerns about increased crime.</p> <p>See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).</p>
1074	974740	Felix Power	Infrastructure and transport	<p>Traffic congestion in the north is already a big issue. Nothing sensible can be done to alleviate traffic problems that would come with additional housing.</p>	<p>See response to comment 401.</p>
1166	975310	Mr David Owen	Infrastructure and transport	<p>Worsening traffic has not been considered, no plans to make any improvements. No planned improvements to cater for increased waste & foul water. Ryemeads and Letchworth are already overstretched. Clean water and gas are in short supply, development will make this worse. Can emergency services cope with development? Will schools increase to accommodate children?</p>	<p>See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure).</p> <p>We are satisfied that water and waste water needs can be provided and are actively working with Anglian and Thames Water.</p> <p>Utility providers, including gas, have been consulted and have not raised any concerns.</p> <p>The emergency services have not raised concerns about the proposals. No change.</p>

1193	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Infrastructure and transport	Infrastructure needs to be sufficient to support an increase in population, yet it is barely adequate for the current size of the town. Capacity problems with both road and rail. A1(M) is a bottleneck between jnc 6 and 8, widening needs to occur before expansion of the town. Use of hard shoulder is not sufficient. Fifth platform will increase capacity at station, but not the frequency of trains. The train companies should increase carriage sizes.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). See response to comment 77 (fifth platform).
1277	974433	Mr Patrick Newman	Infrastructure and transport	The plan does not satisfactorily deal with infrastructure and public services. The station upgrade is speculative. Parking demands will escalate. Existing roads cannot cope with population growth. Development in NHDC add to this. The plan should make provision for a North and South park and ride facility. Additional capacity at NHS and GP surgeries needs to be secured, as well as expansion in both primary and secondary schools. It is not clear how this can be planned for.	See response to comments 1073 infrastructure and 401 (traffic).
1281	342024	Mr Henry Bracey	Infrastructure and transport	Concerns around traffic congestion. Graveley and Stevenage already suffer from congestion. Development proposals will increase problems. The junction of North Road/Graveley Road is subject to regular accidents. EC1/4 will also increase congestion.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1313	975858	Mr Chris Marley	Infrastructure and transport	Lister A&E experiencing heavy workload, GP surgeries already have long waiting lists, where are school for all the extra children. Roads already gridlocked, will not cope with extra vehicles. Larger traffic jams will be the norm. Where will rail parking be?	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure). There are proposals to increase parking at the station, as set out in the infrastructure delivery plan.
1314	974383	Mr Alan Ford	Infrastructure and transport	Concerns around traffic and parking. Agree with the need for more homes for Stevenage people. But without employment increase, Stevenage will expand as a commuter town, which will increase these problems. Offices being converted to residential will be used by people outside of Stevenage.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). The plan allocates new employment land, see policy EC1 and chapter 6. The planning authority cannot control who purchases private property.
1336	974321	Julie Peddington	Infrastructure and transport	Reservations about the plan. The town suffers from heavy congestion, particularly on main routes to the A1(M) and A602. The A1(M) needs widening. Many roads are in very poor condition. Lister Hospital parking is a nightmare. Road infrastructure needs to be addressed in advance of plans for town centre.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1345	974282	Mrs Julie Paterson	Infrastructure and transport	Lister Hospital is already over-subscribed. Concerns around whether developers will really provide schools, doctors and shops. Existing population should be looked after first. Has the impact of additional traffic on the A602 and the closure of Lytton Way been fully considered?	See response to comments 1073 and 1166 (infrastructure) and 401 (traffic).
1811	975432	Mr Roger Dunz	Infrastructure and transport	Infrastructure must be improved before housing expansion occurs. Currently, the roads are congested, and the hospital, schools and doctors surgeries are overrun.	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure) and 401 (traffic).
1827	970676	Mr Alan McDonald	Infrastructure and transport	Town centre homes will create huge demand for already over-loaded resources i.e. parking, doctors, schools and dentists. The roads are congested. There is a limit to how many people the town should support. Where will the bus station be located?	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure), 377 (car parking), 401 (traffic) and 390 (bus station).
1857	976265	Patricia Samuel	Infrastructure and transport	The plan does not satisfactorily deal with infrastructure and public services. The station upgrade is speculative. Parking demands will escalate. Existing roads cannot cope with population growth. Development in NHDC add to this. The plan should make provision for a North and South park and ride facility. Additional capacity at NHS and GP surgeries needs to be secured, as well as expansion in both primary and secondary schools. It is not clear how this can be planned for.	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure) and 401 (traffic). There are currently no proposals for a park and ride facility. No change.

1874	976290	Cara Ward	Infrastructure and transport	Infrastructure needs improvement i.e. A1(M) and schools.	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure).
17	969594	Ms Lynne Jackson	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns regarding infrastructure provision i.e. schools, doctors, open spaces. If the population increases more provision will be required. The A1(M) requires improvement and more parking is needed for the railway station.	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure) and 1313 (station car parking).
24	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns regarding road traffic congestion at peak times. Hope measures to alleviate congestion are built into the plan.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
50	969608	Ms Michelle Kennedy	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns relating to congestion on local roads out towards the A1(M). Hope this is taken into account when planning for expansion.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
56	969620	Mr Michael Bean	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Plan does little to address congestion around the railway station. An increased population will exacerbate this. An additional station, with parking, taxi and passenger transport facilities, is required near J8 of A1(M). Aware that this might be outside of the Borough boundary, but it would impact the plans for Stevenage. Aware that it would cause objections from certain stakeholders.	The plan includes proposals for improving the capacity of Stevenage station and improving integration with the bus network. An additional station would require the support of Network Rail and train operators given the impact on existing railway capacity. No change.
57	768523	Sport England	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	SP5 is supported - it makes provision for new development to provide sports facilities to meet the additional demand. A positive and appropriate response to the Council's evidence base on sport that accords with NPPF.	Welcome support.
71	969642	Ms Mariad Cross	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Support proposals to help traffic on A602. Pleased roundabout at Bragbury End is being removed and replaced. Concerns relating to roundabout at Watton at Stone and Heath Mount School.	Welcome support.
78	969652	Mr Danny Tsang	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Would love to see new lanes on A1(M) from J6. Question how much thought has gone into road infrastructure. Six Hills Way, Fairlands Way (towards Tesco and Asda) already experience heavy congestion. Increased development will exacerbate this. If car parks are to be redeveloped, where will people park?	See response to comment 401 (traffic). Proposals for the town centre include a number of multi-storey car parks, new premises for new companies and potential to attract new retailers. No change.
81	965000	Mr Andrew Nelson	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The Plan misses out on the impact of key infrastructure projects, particularly Thameslink. This will transform Stevenage and we should exploit it as much as possible and put in place the homes, retail and office capacity to capitalise on this now.	Comments are noted, the plan includes proposals to improve the capacity and connectivity of Stevenage railway station and bus interchange. No change.
84	969653	Mr David Norcott	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Before development begins, the road system needs an overhaul, congestion is a big problem.	See response to comment 401.
131	969682	Mr Trevor Allin	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns around poor traffic flow through the one-way system to the north of the High Street at peak times.	Noted. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change.
133	969683	Ms Maggie Williams	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Stevenage can become gridlocked at various times. Increased population will worsen these problems. What provision are the council looking to, to reduce heavy traffic? Will there be a park and ride scheme? Will there be dedicated parking for those visiting the football ground? One additional lane on the motorway will not be sufficient. How many are intended to be built?	See response to comment 401 (traffic). See response to comment 1857 (park and ride).
143	969698	Mr John Moorhouse	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The various shopping centres in the town should be linked; from the northern end of the High Street to Tesco at Roebuck. A two way narrow gauge tramway or system of driverless electric passenger vehicles could provide a continuous passenger service linking the whole area. Many structures (bridges and underpasses) already exist for such a system.	Noted. An interesting and innovative proposal. Government are working on driverless transport initiatives, however delivery is not in the remit of the local plan. No change.

165	969921	Mr Peter Fuller	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The local road network (including A1(M)) is already badly congested, particularly during rush hour. More houses will add to this nightmare.	See response to comment 401.
205	969971	Ms Karen Bridden	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Increases in congestion and pollution on B197 and in the village caused by traffic from new developments will be disastrous for the local environment. Graveley is already congested at peak times. Accidents often occur at the T junction near the garden centre - increasing traffic will increase accidents. The fields in this area provide recreation areas for walkers and horse riders, removing this will require those people to drive to other places or use the roads, and increase congestion and accidents further.	See response to comment 401.
242	969987	Mr Anthony Welsh	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns around transport implications of the plan. Congestion throughout the town is very bad at peak times. There are problems at the two A1(M) junctions and the A602. Employment Areas need good road links to attract investment. Where are the plans for road improvements? Request for s106 contributions to be used to improve road infrastructure rather than funding public transport. The east west corridors through Stevenage are essential for the County and it's ability to attract investment.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). Road improvement plans are set out in the local plan and infrastructure delivery plan. The plan promotes sustainable transport in accordance with national policy, this includes walking, cycling, bus, rail and road. No change.
306	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns around the increase of congestion on the B197 and through Graveley village. The area around J8 and the A1 are always gridlocked at peak times. These proposals will worsen this situation. A new park and ride facility (p181 of the plan) will increase traffic volumes through Graveley. There is no provision for increasing utilities to service the planned areas. National Grid have confirmed Graveley is barely operating at the safe level. An increased demand will be placed on emergency services, which could cost lives.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). There are currently no proposals for a park and ride facility. The infrastructure delivery plan has been amended to this effect. See responses to 1073 and 1166 (infrastructure). No change.
324	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	With over 8,000 new homes in Stevenage, there are no plans for increasing utility services or for an additional water treatment plant - how will services cope? There is also a shortage of gas in the area. Is there enough to service the plan?	See response to comment 1166 (infrastructure).
334	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The assumption of unrestrained economic growth is in itself not sustainable. Plan should be based on maintaining a steady-state, sustainable economy which ensures the fair use of resources for a shared community. Include provisions for Stevenage's economy remaining steady.	Noted. No change.
352	970932	Mr Mike Phillips	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Infrastructure should be upgraded before building new homes. The bus station needs to be rebuilt. More parking for residents is required. Sort existing problems out first before expanding.	See response to comment 1073 (infrastructure). Policies TC4 and TC5 of the plan include proposals to provide a replacement bus station. See response to comment 377 (car parking). No change.
377	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Parking is an issue town-wide. Assumptions in the plan do not reflect modern life. Households have more cars than indicated. SBC is assuming others will provide sports facilities. Providers do not have money to do this, School provision is not suitable for adult use.	The local plan takes a comprehensive approach to car parking in Stevenage. See policy SP6: sustainable transport, policy IT5: parking and access, para's 8.25 to 8.30 and Appendix B: residential car parking standards and policy IT8: public parking provision. No change. Local Plan Policy SP5 requires provision for sports and Policy SP9: healthy communities sets out specific requirements for sport. This is expanded on at para 5.115. No change.

415	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Policy SP5 is not effective. SMART road improvements may reduce current peak A1(M) congestion and pressure on B197. Doubt, with these improvements, the A1(M) will cope with increased traffic volumes associated with development in Stevenage and NHDC (22,000 homes). Using the hard shoulder creates safety issues. Proposals for Stevenage and NHDC will create increased traffic, air and noise pollution. Development to the north conflicts with Policy IT4, para 8.21.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
430	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Policy SP5 is not effective. SMART road improvements may reduce current peak A1(M) congestion and pressure on B197. Doubt, with these improvements, the A1(M) will cope with increased traffic volumes associated with development in Stevenage and NHDC (22,000 homes). Using the hard shoulder creates safety issues. Proposals for Stevenage and NHDC will create increased traffic, air and noise pollution. Development to the north conflicts with Policy IT4, para 8.21.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
442	771716	Aston Village Society	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerned there does not appear to be sufficiently clear plans to deliver the necessary supporting infrastructure for road and rail transport in a timely way. It is not clear how effective road and rail improvements will be. The A602 scheme will not add capacity and its load will be increased by the 550 new homes.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
490	619933	Natural England	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Mitigation required to address impacts on the Lee Valley Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site will need to be a priority for infrastructure provision. Policy to be amended to give certainty development will not be permitted when it has the potential to impact on the SPA and to ensure compliance with Habitats Regulations.	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
535	975798	NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Healthcare will require s106 developer contributions to enable the current and future population to receive adequate healthcare. This growth will impact on all facets of the health system including service for: Primary Care (GP), Community, Mental health and Acute hospital. For out of hospital services, very likely that new premises in addition to the new central hub will be required. Requested flexibility to enable a contribution to be used off-site (still for the new patients a particular development will generate) as well as on-site, should that prove more clinically effective.	The local plan and infrastructure delivery plan make provision for health contributions, see policies SP5: Infrastructure, SP9: Healthy communities, HC1: District, local and neighbourhood facilities, HC3: The Health Campus, HC4: Existing health, social and community facilities and HC5: New health, social and community facilities. No change.
556	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Policy SP5 Object. Whilst it is acknowledged that developments should deliver appropriate infrastructure, the policy should also recognise that such infrastructure can only be provided where viability permits and that it may be necessary for the Council to determine what its priorities are. It should be made clear that S106 contributions or provisions (including land provision) should not be duplicated by CIL payments. The wording should include "where viability permits" in order to ensure that the Plan is deliverable and sound.	Policy SP5: Infrastructure, refers to 'reasonable contributions where relevant' and accords with national policy. Para 5.42 explains that a whole plan viability study including CIL has carried out as part of preparing the plan. It is not the purpose of a local plan to repeat national planning policy and legislation on the use of s106 contributions once CIL is introduced. No changes.
557	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Support - We support the Council's position in seeking to work with other providers in the delivery of infrastructure.	Support welcomed.

732	341526	East Hertfordshire District Council	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The housing site to the south-east straddles the A602, an important artery linking the A10 and the A1(M). A new roundabout will need to be compatible with the County Council's improvement plans. It is concerning that a large number of projects in the IDP identified as being critical or essential do not have costs, timings or sources of funding identified. EHDC recommends that as much as possible is done to complete this information prior to the Examination in order for the plan to be considered effective.	Noted. No change.
740	341431	Aston Parish Council	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concern about infrastructure including roads (especially the A1(M) and A602), water, sewage and schools. Worried about proposal to build some 300 homes on both sides of the A602, adding 600 vehicles to a road already at capacity. Oppose development unless Stevenage Borough Council produces, in conjunction with HCC, proposals to accommodate this substantial increase in local traffic, without increasing the current large tailbacks on the A602 in rush hours. Proposals also needed to make Hooks Cross safer with a bypass or improvements to the A602.	See response to comments 1073 and 1166 (infrastructure) and 401 (traffic). Hooks Cross by-pass outside the borough is a Hertfordshire County Council responsibility. No change.
748	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Support Policy SP5, but consider the adherence to proposed levels of affordable housing >30-40%, may limit the scope for developer contributions to fund necessary infrastructure. The LEP will support a flexible negotiating position.	Support welcome. The whole plan has been viability tested, including affordable housing policies. No change.
863	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Paragraphs 5.49 to 5.51 - This implies pumping water back up to Stevenage some 16 miles. This is expensive to do. Surely it is more environmentally friendly to collect water locally, purify and store it locally and then use it locally. A new local reservoir for storage of excess water should have been included in the plan.	We have actively consulted and engaged with water and waste water infrastructure providers throughout the plan preparation. This has not been raised by the relevant infrastructure providers. No change.
866	763098	Epping Forest District Council	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Response from Epping Forest District Council related to duty to co-operate. The main issue of common interest to both Councils is the current and future capacity of Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works. The references in the consultation document to co-operation between authorities and utilities providers regarding Rye Meads STW are entirely satisfactory from this Council's point of view. We have no further comments on the Plan.	Noted with thanks.
880	975231	Catherine Wallwork	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Support widening of A1(M). The local roads to the south east are not suitable for heavy traffic and are already busy. Traffic is both excessive and too fast. Traffic calming/speed reduction measures need to be put in place before further development could be supported in this area.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
931	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. The increased level of traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, particularly HGV, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey to justify the imposition of HGV traffic accessing site EC1/7 using minor roads and impacting on J8.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
976	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Concerns relating to the scale of development west of Stevenage and its consequences of the A1(M). The A1(M) is regularly congested. The SMART scheme will help to relieve pressure, however, it is not programmed until 2020 at the earliest and even with this the road will not be able to cope with the additional traffic arising from development West of Stevenage.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).

1004	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Hospitals, Drs and dentists have long waiting lists. Leisure facilities and retail parks are heaving at weekends with not enough parking. Additional growth will make them overcrowded. North Road and Graveley Road is an inadequate accident blackspot. As is the North Road access to the hospital, where it is unlit at night. Flood water cascades across this junction from the fields during heavy rain. Another major junction onto North Road would be madness. The junction from Chancellors Road and Granby Road is difficult to negotiate and exit safely at rush hour. These roads are already at maximum capacity during busy periods. These roads are the overflow for a congested A1(M). Construction vehicles will need to use North Road, possibly blocking this main route, which is used by ambulances. Trains are already seriously overcrowded to London, more houses will add more commuters. Whilst there are plans for a 5th platform, there is no further parking considered to accommodate the commuters who will be outside of walking distance.	See responses to 1073 and 1166 (infrastructure) and 401 (traffic). See response to 1313 (station parking).
1171	769045	Mr Richard Blake	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Water and sewage are not dealt with adequately. What additional water resources are there to cope with new housing here and elsewhere in the region? The East of England Plan said no additional water sources were available, has anything changed since then?	See response to 1166 (infrastructure).
1242	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Policy SP5 is not effective. SMART road improvements may reduce current peak A1(M) congestion and pressure on B197. Doubt, with these improvements, the A1(M) will cope with increased traffic volumes associated with development in Stevenage and NHDC (22,000 homes). Using the hard shoulder creates safety issues. Proposals for Stevenage and NHDC will create increased traffic, air and noise pollution. Development to the north conflicts with Policy IT4, para 8.21.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1298	975836	Susan Bucktrout	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	No proposals are made to improve roads and address traffic congestion. Roads cannot cope with existing housing growth and congestion causes disruption. Houses are built without infrastructure being delivered at the same time, or at all.	See response to comments 401 (traffic) and 1073 (infrastructure).
1361	969152	Mr Tim Franklin	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	SBC cannot build houses without major development of the road network. Roads are gridlocked at peak times already. Planning policies to restrict the use of cars have largely failed.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1840	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. The increased level of traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, particularly HGV, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey to justify the imposition of HGV traffic accessing site EC1/7 using minor roads and impacting on J8.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1873	976491	K F O'Sullivan	Policy SP5: Infrastructure	Huge effect of traffic flow in and out of Stevenage during peak hour travel.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
187	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	No evidence of baseline transport assessment. ONS indicate increase in passenger journeys through Stevenage station since Great Ashby. Infrastructure upgrades need to take place in advance of any development.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).

387	763085	Transport for London	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Although not directly adjoining London, good rail links mean there will inevitably be a degree of interaction. This is acknowledged. A challenge identified in the plan is capacity on trains. Stevenage will benefit from Thameslink by 2018, an interchange with Crossrail at Farringdon and higher capacity trains on the East Coast Mainline. This will provide additional capacity and radically improve onward connectivity. The plan should seek to maximise the benefits of these projects, i.e. encouraging higher densities around the station and on transport corridors to the station, and enhancing onward connectivity from the station so benefits can be spread through the Borough. Policy SP6 is supported in its bid to improve bus-train transfer and improved pedestrian and cycle links to the station.	Noted. Support welcomed.
390	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Support Policy SP6. However, buses need to run when needed. Few buses serve the Lister after 6pm. Bus services are not integrated with each other, let alone the railway. Tickets are not cross-company. An integrated service is required.	Support welcomed. The local plan makes provision for relocation of the bus station to a site closer to the train station (see para 5.57, Policy IT6, para's 8.31 to 8.35 and Policy TC4). The timetabling of buses/trains is beyond the Council's power. No change.
402	406724	Highways England	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Highways England welcome policies to implement and promote sustainable travel, particularly the provision of a new rail station and bus hub.	Support welcomed.
543	975653	Bus Users Group Stevenage	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	The Bus Users Group, Stevenage (BUGS) welcomes the commitment to sustainable transport in SP6. The new bus station should directly serve the railway. Urge that public transport users, including groups like BUGS, are involved in deciding the location and design of the new bus station.	Noted.
751	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Support Policy SP6. Recommend an emphasis on 'smart' and light practical solutions over higher cost and lengthy engineering solutions, where opportunities are presented.	Support welcomed. Feedback noted.
809	977009	Mrs Hilary C Thompson	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Object to new Gypsy and Traveller site due to the opening of the Gypsy and Traveller site creating an additional access onto the B197 which will result in more cars using an unofficial route and more traffic in Graveley.	Objection noted. See response to comment 264 (site access).
817	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Object to Local Plan and housing growth on the grounds that development of North Of Stevenage and other nearby sites would lead to an increase in traffic on North Road, B197 and A1(M) cannot cope with the increase in traffic.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
828	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Concerned that development proposals will lead to an increase in traffic and the B197 and A1(M) will be unable to cope.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
844	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	There is no provision across the whole of the town for re-charging electric vehicles. This eliminates emissions, is much quieter, and more environmentally friendly and sustainable. How can SBC be serious about encouraging people to use cleaner and greener modes of transport without such provision? This is unsound.	Electric re-charging vehicle points is not a local plan matter. No change.
959	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	There are poor links between the north and south cycle networks, only meet west of the industrial area beside the railway line and along St George's way, results in complaints from pedestrians against cyclists using pavements. Proposal to remove Lytton Way and pedestrianise area between the centre and Railway/ Bus station is to make problems linking northern and southern cycle routes much worse.	Policies SP5: Infrastructure, SP6: Sustainable transport and IT5: Parking and access, require on-site provision, off-site provision or contributions towards cycling, cycleways and secure bicycle parking. Policy IT8: Public parking provision protects existing public cycle parking. The infrastructure delivery plan sets out a number of schemes to improve cycling in Stevenage, including a review of the existing cycle-way network. No change.

996	964447	Mr Louis Burton	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	The Local Plan is unsound. It has not been positively prepared to meet infrastructure requirements as there are no specific commitments from neighbouring authorities in south east Stevenage to achieve sustainable development. The need for road infrastructure is acknowledged in North Stevenage, but there is no equivalent commitment for South East Stevenage. Due to its distance from the station, development will result in increased traffic. Roads are already congested.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1122	972739	Mr Aidan Heritage	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Improving the cycle/footpath network should be a key feature of the plan. It does cover this, but it dwells on the negative (lack of maintenance). The plan focuses heavily on the needs of motorists.	See response to comment 959 (cycling).
1311	974410	Margaret Hawkins	Policy SP6: Sustainable transport	Children should be able to cycle around the town, especially to school and leisure facilities. Supportive that the Plan includes provision for cycle paths and underpasses. In newer areas there is inadequate provision with just lines painted on main roads. Traffic-free routes should be provided for children to access new schools.	Policy SP6 f. requires arrangements for provision of cycling facilities. No change.
499	619933	Natural England	Infrastructure and developer requirements	Using Grampian Conditions to secure mitigation identified in a Habitats Regulations Assessment can be problematical. Advise more straightforward approach through policy wording to ensure the SPA is protected. State that development will not be allowed to proceed if there isn't sufficient capacity at the Rye Meads STW. This should either be reflected in Policy IT3, or Policy ST5. As a number of adjacent LPA's will also be relying on this SWT it is important that a strategic approach is taken. Grampian Conditions should only be used as long as it can be shown that there are some prospects of the action in question being performed within the time-limit imposed by the permission, and there are no adverse planning implications caused by such a condition.	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
583	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Infrastructure and developer requirements	Para 8.15 Object - It is noted that the land around Todds Green could be used to reprovide facilities lost at Meadway, however the Council's evidence base document Sporting Facility Assessment and Strategy document indicates that there is no requirement due to existing provision to re-provide the existing Meadway pitches. Delete the last sentence in order to the plan to be in accordance with the Evidence base and therefore sound.	Agree that the land could be used to provide sports pitches. It could also be used to reprovide open space as required by the open space study and local plan, e.g. para 14.7. The Sports Facility Assessment concludes at para 22.100 there is a need to "Mitigate for the loss of the Meadway site at a value equivalent to the provision of the same number and size of pitches lost plus the cost of replacement ancillary facilities." This text refers to the potential of this land to offset the loss of facilities (related to both sports pitches and open space) at Meadway. No change.
762	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Infrastructure and developer requirements	The LEP generally supports Policies IT1 to IT4 and IT6 to IT7. Significant development proposals should demonstrate how infrastructure needs will be met. Plans to improve the bus and train stations will act as a catalyst helping to mobilise necessary investment support for regeneration. The removal of Lytton Way will improve walking and cycling in the town centre. Investigations into the impact of its removal need to be completed.	Support welcomed.
790	636011	Environment Agency	Infrastructure and developer requirements	Infrastructure and developer requirements Paragraph 8.19: add "to mitigate and offset any impact on the SPA".	The Local Plan follows the avoid, mitigate and compensate hierarchy. No change.

1270	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Infrastructure and developer requirements	The A602 already gets gridlocked at peak times. A roundabout on the A602 will be the only way to get out of the development. Residents will almost certainly be using cars, and there will be more cars than dwellings. This will increase congestion and rat running, probably along Aston Lane and through Aston. A bypass for Hooks Cross was first proposed just before WW2.	See response to comment 401 (traffic). See response to comment 740 (Hooks Cross).
98	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Support Policy IT1. Primary access to HO3 will need to be taken from North Road. Secondary access points may be taken from the existing estate roads to the south of the site. HO3 and NHDC proposal would comprise a comprehensive and sustainable urban extension contributing to meeting the needs of both authorities. An integrated Master Plan for the whole development will be essential to ensure that a high quality of design and layout is achieved.	Support welcomed.
99	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Support para's 8.3 to 8.7. HO3 and NHDC proposal would provide a comprehensively planned sustainable urban extension which will contribute towards meeting the housing needs of both areas.	Support welcomed.
261	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Nothing to alleviate congestion on B197 to A1(M). Preferably no new houses north of Stevenage. Otherwise a bigger roundabout at J8 with traffic light controlled access from B197 and probably also from Little Wymondley.	See response to 401 (traffic).
338	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	There is no mention of how the waste from infrastructure building will be dealt with. Add a clause requiring contractors to re-use and recycle as much of the materials as is possible.	The Waste Site Allocations and Development Management Policies DPD forms part of the statutory development plan for Stevenage. Policy 12: Sustainable Design, Construction and Demolition adequately covers this. In addition, Stevenage Local Plan, Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution, refers to ensuring new development minimises and mitigates its impact on the environment related to waste. No change.
496	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Support the proposal within Policy IT1 for a preferred vehicle access point to north Stevenage from B197. Formally request that other works proposed to A1(M) do not impact on the North Stevenage scheme. In accordance with part (b) of this policy, the north Stevenage development will integrate with further phases of development beyond the Borough boundary.	Support for preferred access point welcomed. See response to 401 (traffic).
580	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Policy IT1. Reference to the "preferred" vehicle access points for West Stevenage being Bessemer Drive and Meadway is supported. Whilst it is envisaged that such routes should be delivered, the wording allows for alternative provision.	Support welcomed.
581	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Policy IT1 b Object. Policy sets a requirement to demonstrate how development to the West of Stevenage would integrate with any phase beyond the Borough boundary. Whilst masterplanning for West of Stevenage within SBC can take into account future connectivity and boundary treatment with NHDC, it is beyond the developers in Stevenage to anticipate what will come forward in NHDC. Delete requirement to demonstrate integration. Replace with requirement to ensure future development can connect and to provide appropriate boundary treatments.	NHDC have not objected to these proposals. The plan seeks an integrated approach to the development. This is in accordance with the requirements of NPPF para's 178 to 181, which place a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priority of housing delivery for both SBC and NHDC. No change.

806	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Object to references in IT1 to potential proposals outside the Borough boundary. These are currently speculative. Reliance on such development, in advance of approved development plan policy, is unjustified, contrary to national policy, and likely to be ineffective. Promoting a preferred road alignment outside the Plan area (para 8.4) is a matter that should be resolved through the NHDC Plan, not by Stevenage.	Change to policies IT1 & IT2 is not appropriate. It is considered legitimate for the Authority to indicate preference for strategic highway improvements to serve proposed development in the Borough. NHDC have not objected to these proposals.
900	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Object to the closure of Lytton Way. The original road layout of Stevenage was very well conceived. The grid system works well to integrate N-S traffic with E-W traffic. Closing Lytton Way will take away one of the busiest roads in this system, causing congestion on various roads and junctions. A ground level crossing on St George's Way will further exacerbate this.	Objection noted. See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1056	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Proposal for closing Lytton Way is welcomed, it is a barrier to town centre development. However, it does not appear there is sufficient provision to deal with increased traffic on alternative routes. St George's Way will be the most likely alternative, and the proposal for pedestrian crossings at ground level will create congestion and danger for pedestrians.	Support noted. Transport modelling has been carried out.
1117	974224	Mr Adrian Hawkins	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. Increased traffic levels, particularly HGV from EC1/7, have not been considered. Chantry Lane, Stevenage Road and the A1(M) junction 8 are already congested and grid locked at peak times. SBC should have carried out a Traffic Survey to justify the imposition of HGV traffic accessing site EC1/7.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). The latest transport modelling work will be made available. Hertfordshire County Council have raised no objection.
1124	973077	Mr Chris Turvey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1136	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1229	773173	M Wright	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Object to primary access route on North Road for HO3, TC10 (actually means TC11 due to error on Proposals Map) and EC1/4. The traffic volumes will paralyse Lister Hospital and the ambulance service, especially during peak times. Remove policy HO3, TC10/ TC11 and EC1/4. Correct proposals map.	Minor change, reference to TC11: New Convenience Retail Provision will be corrected on the policies map. See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1266	974437	Mr Alan Davis	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Concerns regarding proposal to enhance Meadway to allow one way traffic to new homes at HO2. Combined with Costco, this is totally unrealistic, bearing in mind the volume of traffic currently using Gunnels Wood Road. Can't have two access points for these developments at the same point.	See response to 401 (traffic).
1417	977318	Mr Ray Elmes	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1421	975864	Nicky Gilbert	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1425	974622	Caroline McDonnell	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1429	977211	K Davies	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1433	977221	Ms M Garrett	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1437	977228	M Scallan	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1442	977231	B M Rumney	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1446	977234	Mr Alan McCarley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1451	977235	Ms Annette Fisher	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1455	977294	Mrs Marjorie McCarley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1459	977296	B Shadbolt	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1464	977302	Ms Janet Fraser	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1468	977305	M K Issac	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1472	977306	H Cussens	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1476	977322	J M Roberts	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1480	977323	Mrs Vivian Snowdon	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1484	977690	Ms Tracy Wicklow	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1488	977691	Daljit Dale	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1492	975881	Mr David Jackson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1496	977618	Ms Anne-Lise Domeisen	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1500	975830	Victoria Jackson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1504	977300	Ms Una Bracey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1508	977332	Ms Tracey Owen	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1512	342785	Mrs Nina Turvey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1516	977689	Mr Julian Tribe	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1520	977201	Mr Stephen Westwood	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1524	976087	Mrs Josie Norledge	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1528	977203	Mr Jonathan McCarley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1532	977206	Mr Tim Dean	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1536	977207	Ms Anne Larkins	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1540	342082	Mr Carter	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1544	342081	Mrs Cherry Carter	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1548	977214	P Smith	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1552	342433	Mr & Mrs Kennedy	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1556	977219	R Frosterick	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1560	977220	C Briggs	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1565	977230	Ms Lucy Rayer	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1569	977289	Mrs Kathleen Matthew	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1573	977291	Ms Clare Hancock	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1577	977292	Mr Ivor Hancock	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1581	977324	Mrs M Bartrip	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1585	977326	Mr D E Bartrip	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1589	977329	Ms Valerie Day	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1593	977331	R Taylor	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1597	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1601	977333	Mr Mark Santacreu	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1605	977335	A L Brown	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1609	977337	Mr John Day	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1613	977338	Mr John Berry	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1617	977340	Mr Nigel Pointing	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1621	977343	Mr Steven Young	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1625	977344	Mr Kenny Crowe	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1629	977345	Mr Ian Hyde	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1633	977350	Mr Brad Watts	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1637	977352	Mr Wayne Shambrook	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1641	977354	Mr Spencer Ryan	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1645	977355	Mr R Fautley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1649	977356	J Fautley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1653	977359	Ms Yvonne Millard	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1657	977360	S Fairey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1661	977361	Mr M Anstiss	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1665	977362	Mr Stephen Osburn	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1669	977364	Ms Jane Osburn	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1673	977365	Mr Steven Emson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1677	977366	Ms May Emson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1681	977371	Mr David Wiggins	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1685	977612	Ms Nancy Bidmead	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1689	977613	Mr Robin Baker	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1693	977614	Mrs Caroline Kumar	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1697	977616	Mr Navin Kumar	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1701	979347	Mr K Crowe	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1705	977620	Ms C Kerry	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1709	977621	E Farey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1713	977622	N Farey	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1717	977624	Mrs S Tribe	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1721	977626	Mr R Tribe	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1725	977692	Zena Connell	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1729	975681	Mr Colin Rafferty	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

1733	974290	Jennie Hawkins	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1737	974350	Mr Adam Connell	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1741	342532	Mr Tom McCall	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1745	974373	Ms Kimberley Richardson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1749	974438	Mr Martin Charles	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1753	974521	Mr Barry Bunningham	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1757	974600	Jessica Simpson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1761	974657	Sheila Marvell	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1765	975352	Mr Trevor Beard	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1769	975702	Hannah Kimberley	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1773	975778	Elspeth Jackson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1777	975819	Ms Patricia Rumpus	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1781	975870	Mr Ross Jackson	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1785	973079	Mr Paul Watts	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1789	976079	Mr Robin Norledge	Policy IT1: Strategic development access points	Representation to IT1. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).

220	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Proposed traffic scheme destroys Green Belt land, creates urban sprawl.	Safeguarded corridors west of Stevenage are not within the Green Belt. No change.
327	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	The Wymondly NP has kept the so called safeguarded area (NHDC) in its area map and it cannot be developed without the prior permission of the Wymondly NP.	As the consultee may be aware, any Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan must be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the local plan (NPPF para 184). Wymondly Neighbourhood Plan sits outside of Stevenage Borough. No change.
358	774015	Mr and Mrs Allard (landowner)	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Objection to policy IT2. In not allocating the non-Green Belt site in Todds Green for housing, the council has failed to optimise available housing sites and identify the most appropriate strategy. It identifies Green Belt release in preference to using available non-Green Belt land. Green Belt should only be released in exceptional circumstances. This site should be identified as a housing allocation, with a site specific consideration to include an access suitable as a transport corridor in relation to the wider scheme.	Safeguarding the site is in accordance with the requirements of NPPF para's 178 to 181, which place a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, particularly those which relate to the strategic priority of housing delivery. It also relates to the requirement to take account of longer term requirements (NPPF para 157). See also response to comment 368. No change.
582	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Policy IT2. Support: The highway access strategy for serving West of Stevenage is supported.	Support welcomed.
807	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Object to references in IT2 to potential proposals outside the boundary. Prevention of development that would otherwise be acceptable, when there is no approved Policy for the development, is neither justified nor effective. Procedurally, if proposals were included by NHDC, the two Councils could prepare a joint Action Area Plan.	See response to comment 358.
1296	977162	S T Smyth	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Within the timescale of the Local Plan, 10 to 15 years, provision is made for a new landscaped Parkway road leading from the Wymondley By Pass A602 into the centre of Stevenage to be constructed, under the A1(M) possibly via Redcar Drive.	The proposal has not been raised as a strategic priority in duty to co-operate discussions with North Hertfordshire (where the locations are situated). No change.
1804	977246	The Greens & Great Wymondley Residents Association	Policy IT2: West of Stevenage safeguarded corridors	Response seeks implementation of a recommendation of the Chesterton Report to expand small settlements at the northern end of the West Stevenage site, including the settlement of Todds Green, Almshoe, Redcoats Green, Lower Titmore Green etc. To use public services and facilities at Fishers Green and Symonds Green across the bridge over the A1M at Todds Green. The settlement is close to junction 8 of the A1M and Stevenage railway station.	The proposal has not been raised as a strategic priority in duty to co-operate discussions with North Hertfordshire (where the locations are situated). The Chesterton Report has now been superseded by other work. No change.
227	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Inadequate infrastructure. Transport: A1(M) is heavily congested and capacity needs to be upgraded to at the least a three lane motorway between junction 8 and junction 6. Trains from Stevenage to London are standing room only. Sewerage: the document itself casts doubt on the ability of the treatment works at Rye Meads to cope with all the proposed developments.	See response to comments 401 (traffic) and 1166 (infrastructure).
359	962420	Angela Turner	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Infrastructure of the town centre and the road network will not support further expansion. North Road, between J7 and J8 of A1(M), A602, and Hitchin Road are always congested at peak times, and this has become worse since expansion of Lister. Would be a serious mistake to put more dwellings so close to the hospital, roads will not cope. North Stevenage housing area (HO3) and NHDC homes would require access to North Road.	See response to comments 401 (traffic) and 1073 (infrastructure).

584	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Greater clarity is required as to what infrastructure provision is likely to be sought from West of Stevenage, if any, over and above those items specifically identified in the Plan given the requirement to prepare an Infrastructure Assessment as part of any planning application. Without such clarity the basis for the plan policy is unsound.	The whole plan has been viability tested in accordance with the NPPF. The work included detailed modelling of sites within the current plan. The council will continue to work with developers to produce a statement of common ground setting out the strategy for delivery of the site, as para 9.11 of the viability report. The Council will continue to work with the developers as the site reaches application stage. The policy seeks to provide certainty to the developers without being overly prescriptive and allowing sufficient flexibility. No change to the policy. The IDP sets out details of infrastructure requirements.
593	922156	Pigeon Land Ltd	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	To ensure the Plan satisfies the "Effective test" and is deliverable with effective cross-boundary strategic priorities. Policy IT3 should be amended to acknowledge planned development to the north of Stevenage. If further land on the eastern edge of Stevenage is identified in the emerging East Hertfordshire Local Plan, the Policy may also need to be amended to refer to this site.	This is a generic policy applying to sites throughout the borough and further detail on thresholds is provided in the supporting text. No change.
768	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Support policy aim. Concern about what constitutes significant development. Policy to apply to all major development as a minimum. For wastewater infrastructure, policy to require developers to demonstrate developments will not result in adverse impacts on or off site on the sewerage network. The policy wording could allow for the Council to require developers to demonstrate that there is sufficient wastewater infrastructure capacity. To ensure the policy is clear and effective, the following supporting text should be added requiring an impact assessment where necessary.	Welcome support. Whilst the Council does not believe that Thames Water's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
1003	975922	Mr Clive Donaghue	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	The Stevenage Borough Infrastructure Funding Strategy document published in September 2015 indicates that there will be an infrastructure funding deficit of between £2.7M and £22.2M, with a £8.3M deficit if the recommended affordable housing rate scenario is adopted. The high level modelling approach undertaken in The Whole Plan Viability Study published in September 2015 identifies that CIL funding is required, but only goes as far as saying that "CIL could make a useful contribution", without providing any certainty as to the ability of CIL to meet the entire shortfall. The plan should be reworked to present options which are achievable within the budgetary constraints.	See response to comment 584.
1170	341965	Mrs Hazel Barnham	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Graveley is subject to heavy traffic congestion, this would be increased. Junction is accident blackspot, not likely to improve with additional traffic. There has been no Impact Assessment of development on surrounding communities or the local road network.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1186	975393	Mr James Todd	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Increased traffic at peak times can be high and further decrease quality of life.	See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1867	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy IT3: Infrastructure	Emergency services, ambulances etc. cannot cope with demand. How will they cope with an increase? Especially with an ageing population. There is nothing in the plan to address this issue. Utilities, no plans for increasing utility services or for adding an additional water treatment plant. How will the services cope?	See response to comments 1073 and 1166 (infrastructure).

589	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Sustainable Travel	Para 8.44 Support/Further clarity. Recognition that pedestrian / cycle routes may be provided at Six Hills rather than via Bessemer Drive in recognition of third party landownership in connecting to West Stevenage is welcomed.	It is considered that paragraph 8.44 is sufficiently clear. No change. More detailed transport infrastructure requirements will be agreed with the Highways Agency at the time of application.
1060	973919	Mr David Inward	Sustainable Travel	More sustainable Stevenage would mean a reduction in car use. Path and cycleways are poorly maintained and require improvement. Bus service should be increased. Moving bus station away from shops would be a mistake. Improve bus service to Gunnels Wood. Proposals for new links in path and cycle network are welcomed. Safe and secure cycle parking is needed, particularly around town centre. There should be no widening of the A1(M). Congestion is a constraint on growth. Traffic lights at Lytton Way/Six Hills junction should help. Luton airport should be closed and used for housing.	Maintenance of path and cycleways is not a local plan matter. Policy SP2: Sustainable development in Stevenage, promotes journeys by bus, train, bicycle and foot. Policy IT6: Sustainable transport identifies improvements to bus services including direct services to employment sites. See response to comment 959 (cycle parking). See response to comment 401 (traffic). The Stevenage Local Plan does not cover Luton or London Luton Airport, a nationally important facility. No change.
1271	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Sustainable Travel	Guidelines on appropriate levels of car parking are generally considered to be inadequate. Provision in new developments has not been sufficient. The aspiration to encourage people to have fewer cars isn't working. This is not effective planning although it might pass the agreed standards test.	See response to comment 377 (car parking).
134	969683	Ms Maggie Williams	Policy IT5: Parking and access	Will new homes be provided with at least one parking space to reduce parking on the roads? There are problems with insufficient parking at GP surgeries. Will new surgeries have adequate parking?	See response to comment 377 (car parking).
1009	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Residential car parking standards	Can you provide a development of enough houses for the quota that is in keeping with the type of housing and gardens currently bordering Stevenage with front gardens and driveways, with wide enough roads for emergency vehicles and without having a detrimental impact upon other local residents? 'NHDC' build of Great Ashby is far from adequate. There will be the increase in parking that will be needed around the town to support the extra vehicles.	Policies SP8: Good design and GD1: High quality design cover design along with the Stevenage Design Guide SPD. See response to comment 377 (car parking).
246	973479	Mrs Scott	Table C1 Residential car parking standards	Object to residential car parking standards.	See response to comment 377 (car parking).
243	973433	Mr Neil Dunbar	Table C2 Accessibility zone discounts	Table C2 and the associated map showing zones, should be considered together. Planning requirements should insist that the necessary parking places are provided - this could easily be done in most cases if underground parking was provided. Rather than accepting proposals in which parking is only going to become even more of an issue, planning requirements should insist that the necessary parking places are provided - this could readily be done in most cases of new developments if underground parking is provided.	Table C2 and the associated maps are all part of Appendix B and are presented together, to be considered together. No change.
73	964791	Mr Peter Bentley	Policy IT6: Sustainable transport	Welcome the redevelopment of the railway station and plans to move the bus station closer to the station.	Support welcomed.
77	969652	Mr Danny Tsang	Policy IT6: Sustainable transport	Question the benefit of a 5th platform. Lines narrow to 2 after Knebworth and trains are not held up.	This is not a local plan matter, it is a strategic decision of Network Rail. No change.
82	969644	Ms Joan Galeano	Policy IT6: Sustainable transport	Few buses mean it is almost impossible to travel in the evenings. Bus provision needs to be considered if there are to be more homes.	Policies SP2: Sustainable development in Stevenage and IT6: Sustainable transport require bus provision.
194	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy IT6: Sustainable transport	Bigger station does not equate to more line capacity. Consult as to how capacity can be improved, particularly given that every area that the line serves is having more houses built.	See response to comment 77. No change.

586	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT6: Sustainable transport	Policy IT6 Object point 6 should be clarified as it is not clear as to what is required.	Whilst the Council does not believe that Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
31	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy IT7: New and improved links for pedestrians and cyclists	Town is unpleasant experience for pedestrian. Subterranean footpath system is out-dated, feels unsafe and not fit for purpose. New developments should have traditional footpaths at the side of the road.	Comments noted. No change.
89	969662	Mr Ken Cooke	Policy IT7: New and improved links for pedestrians and cyclists	New developments should include provision for cyclists.	See response to comment 959 (cycling).
587	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy IT7: New and improved links for pedestrians and cyclists	Object. It is accepted that the pedestrian and cycle routes between Gunnels Wood Road and Bessemer and the new development should be improved, however this can only be achieved where the land required is in the control of the Council, Highway Authority or applicant. It would be unreasonable for the applicant to obtain third party land as has been accepted by an Inspector previously. Policy IT7 5 insert "where possible and appropriate within land in the control of the Council, Highway Authority or applicant."	Policy IT7 is reasonable, it states "... where proposals maintain, enhance, reasonably provide or reasonably contribute towards these routes." The proposed additional wording would not improve the policy. More detailed transport infrastructure requirements will be agreed with the Highways Agency at the time of application. No change.
705	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Policy IT7: New and improved links for pedestrians and cyclists	Fully support the aspiration towards improving walking and cycling across the town. Happy to engage in discussions around 'what works' and the health benefits of various interventions.	Support welcomed.
1061	977293	Mr Bruce Clavey	Policy IT7: New and improved links for pedestrians and cyclists	Proposal for closing Lytton Way is welcomed, it is a barrier to town centre development. However, it does not appear there is sufficient provision to deal with increased traffic on alternative routes. St George's Way will be the most likely alternative, and the proposal for pedestrian crossings at ground level will create congestion and danger for pedestrians.	See response to comment 1056.

High quality homes

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
6	965048	Mrs Laura Russell-young	High Quality Homes	Object to building on Bragbury End Sports Ground car park. This is a floodplain. No trees can be removed. The new homes will impact light, security and current living conditions.	Areas within the flood plain will not be built on. More detailed impacts will be dealt with at the application stage. No change.
1017	452235	Julia Brettell	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - group response with additional attachment: NPPF requires local authorities to bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings and, where appropriate, acquire properties under CPO powers. No evidence this has been taken into account to attempt to reduce the number of new homes required.	Bringing empty homes back into use would not reduce housing numbers required, as this would not create a net gain. No change.
1084	974579	Mr John Sim	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response. NPPF requires local authorities to bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings and, where appropriate, acquire properties under CPO powers. No evidence this has been taken into account to reduce the number of new homes required.	See response to comment 1017.
1089	975303	Andrea Skidmore	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1091	975308	Debra Matherson	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1093	975325	Mr Colin Wright	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1097	975425	Mr Robert Wright	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1099	975434	Mr Trevor Palmer	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1102	975668	Elizabeth Crowley	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1104	975676	Mr Neil Pedder	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1107	975685	Mrs Samantha Marshall	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1109	975245	Julia Mathers	High Quality Homes	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell 974712 and John Sim 974579.	See response to comment 1017.
1160	342592	Mrs Marion Ohlendorf	High Quality Homes	Unsound in respect of projected population numbers. Not clear how the figure has been reached. Population of Stevenage has grown very slowly over past few decades. CPRE submission (2014) pointed out 'more people will leave Stevenage than move in'. Who are the houses are for? Assume for commuters. Should consolidate and improve existing.	The process of reaching Stevenage's housing target and evidence that informs this is set out in the local plan at para's 5.65 to 5.67. Further detail is provided in section 2 of the Housing Technical Paper. SBC cannot control who buys new homes. No change.
1195	922456	Mr Rick Ohlendorf	High Quality Homes	Unsound in respect of projected population numbers. Not clear how the figure has been reached. Population of Stevenage has grown very slowly over past few decades. CPRE submission (2014) pointed out 'more people will leave Stevenage than move in'. Who are the houses are for? Assume for commuters. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated. Should consolidate and improve existing.	See response to comment 1160.

16	969594	Ms Lynne Jackson	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Too many HMO's; these create issues for neighbours. Build affordable homes for younger working generation, don't give them to people on benefits and single parents.	The planning authority cannot control who affordable homes are given to. Policy HO6 aims to ensure conversions do not adversely affect surrounding properties. No change.
30	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Agree with the need for more affordable homes in the town. But 3% aspirational seems at odds with Stevenage becoming a more desirable place to live. Percentage needs to be substantially increased.	Our evidence suggests that our targets to achieve a mix of house types and sizes are appropriate. No change.
96	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support Policy SP7, in particular Item iii. OAN cannot be met through regeneration and brownfield sites alone. The three 'new settlements' identified in Policy SP7 ii and iii are the most appropriate locations for major new housing, in tandem with the regeneration of Stevenage Central, plus other, smaller sites within the urban area.	Support welcomed.
121	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	We do need new houses, just not at the density proposed here. Another new town is called for.	A completely new town would not enable us to meet our housing target within the plan period. Para's 2.49 - 2.52 of the Green Belt Technical Paper provides further details. No change.
151	969710	Ms Rita Boyce	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Looks like Stevenage will become an extra large housing estate. Affordable homes should be affordable for young people from Stevenage not for commuters.	See response to Comment 16. No change.
190	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to building on Green Belt. Lack of cooperation seems to come from surrounding LA's rather than Stevenage. Plan should explicitly require building on brownfield site first only using Green Belt once there is no other option. Failure to do this means that the Exceptional Circumstances test cannot be passed.	Noted. The Plan uses a Brownfield first approach, as demonstrated in the Housing Technical Paper. All suitable, available and achievable sites are being used. Our Green Belt Technical Paper sets out the Exceptional Circumstances to justify Green Belt release. No change.
272	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Welcome proposed housing target of 7,600, 11 - 16 pitches for G&T provision Welcome support for East and North Herts allocating housing sites immediately adjacent to boundary and safeguarding of land. Unclear if able to maintain a steady supply of housing land over the plan period.	Support welcomed. The Housing Technical Paper includes the housing trajectory, which demonstrates a supply of land over the plan period.
299	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to the housing target. SBC have ignored responses to the Housing Targets Consultation. SBC have not considered working with NHDC to deliver a new Garden City. No evidence provided for the discrepancy between option A and B for the number of homes that can be built in the existing urban area. Option B includes 900 additional homes.	Responses to previous consultations have been considered, alongside other evidence, in producing this plan. An explanation of the difference between Options A&B is included in the 2015 consultation document. See also response to comment 121. No change.
305	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The target of 7,600 is excessive and does not include provision by recent developments built and planned to be built. A new New Town, with proper effective infrastructure, should be built as a long term solution to most, if not all, Local Plans in Hertfordshire.	See response to comment 121. No change.
322	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The housing waiting list for the whole of North Herts is only 3,400. How can Stevenage justify 8,155 new homes. NHDC is proposing c.16,000. Why?	See response to comment 1160. No change.
335	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support the use of brownfield sites and SBC's efforts to redevelop sites around the town. As the plan is based on estimates of growth, it is important to reserve Green Belt sites until all others have been developed. This seems to be the intention, but the way the list under criteria b. is ordered implies otherwise.	Support welcomed. See also response to comment 190. No change.
343	970888	Mr Anthony Glanfield	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Objection to building significant numbers of new homes. Too many new homes have been built already, most snatched up by non-Stevenage residents. Building is encouraged to increase council tax revenue, which is often wasted on outrageous schemes. Open spaces should be retained. They have not in the past.	See response to comment 1160. The plan protects open spaces across the town. No change.

371	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Should address the issue of housing via an integrated, 'costed', cross-boundary plan that assesses housing requirement but also the environment, the well-being of residents and overall viability. SBC seems to want to build on any green space within Stevenage. SBC should listen to residents.	SBC is working with neighbouring authorities via the Duty to Cooperate. A joint plan is not considered to be necessary. See also response to comment 343. No change.
380	341656	Homes And Communities Agency	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Maintain support for the principles outlined and the intention of this plan to meet demands for sustainable growth, within the constrained boundaries of Stevenage, but also across wider administrative boundaries and the A1(M) corridor. Note SBC has maintained the housing target figure for provision of 7,200 homes. Maintain support for this level of housing delivery.	Support welcomed.
394	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	<p>The Council's OAN is unsound. The DCLG 2012 household projections provide the starting point for the assessment of need. Using a 10 year migration trend lowers the demographic starting point to 325hpa compared to the DCLG 2012 Household Projection of 380hpa. Question whether the council is justified in using a 10 year trend. Question the approach taken to second and vacant homes - it is unclear from the SHMA what percentage has been applied for Stevenage and North Herts. Consider 380dpa for Stevenage does not provide any flexibility in the plan if the council is wrong in its predictions about migration.</p> <p>Unclear what the reason is for the difference between the 7,300 OAN and the 7,600 plan target. Furthermore, para 4.6 refers to 8,155 homes - not entirely clear what the origin of this figure is. Para 5.68 states Stevenage is able to accommodate its OAN within the boundary. It is unclear, however, whether this refers to the 8,155 or 7,600 figure.</p>	<p>The OAN is sound. The SHMA at paragraphs 2.10 to 2.35 demonstrates why ORS chose to use the ten year migration trend. This is consistent with best practice, including the second edition of the PAS ONS technical advice note (July 2015), published research and Inspectors local plan findings. The migration assumptions used by ORS were agreed as appropriate by the GLA in January 2015. The vacant and second home rate is set out in the SHMA at para 2.74. For clarity, a rate of 1.9% was used for Stevenage.</p> <p>The Housing Technical Paper para's 2.1 to 2.5 sets out the OAN of 7,300 and how the local plan target of 7,600 has been reached.</p> <p>The local plan figure is 7,600, see response to comment 398. No change.</p>
398	406724	Highways England	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	There is a discrepancy regarding the overall housing target. In one section it says 8,155 dwellings, while later it is outlined as 7,600. This should be clarified.	Noted. The housing target is 7,600 homes. Minor modification made to amend the phrasing of Para 4.6 for clarification.
408	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	<p>ONS projections can be dramatically affected by very small changes in underlying assumptions. They should be used with caution. It is not appropriate to meet Stevenage's needs using Green Belt land. A 5,300 target is more appropriate. 7,600 will require use of Green Belt land and impact on nearby villages to the north.</p> <p>Development will create coalescence. Proposals to develop 3,000 homes in the town centre are welcomed. However, concerned this has put more pressure to build more on Green Belt to help finance the costs involved.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Support for town centre development welcomed.</p> <p>SBC do not own the majority of Green Belt land allocated, so will not gain any profit from its development. See also responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (housing target), 190 (Green Belt) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt). No change.</p>
420	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to new travellers site in close proximity to Graveley. Site not deliverable. Believe landowner opposed to the use. Policy HO12 inconsistent with national policy. NPPF states unmet need (including for travellers sites) unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. If required, put new provision at Dyes Lane. Policy HO13 requires an appropriate buffer between travellers sites and adjacent uses. Impact on Graveley School.	The site is deliverable. The landowner has not objected to the proposed use. The very special circumstances test relates to planning applications in the Green Belt. See response to comment 190 (exceptional circumstances). Policy HO12 takes a precautionary approach in requiring updated evidence. The existing site at Dyes Lane has already been extended. It is not suitable for the entire need arising in the plan period as this would concentrate all provision (and associated demand for services) onto a small area of the Borough. The site has an appropriate buffer. The site is proposed for allocation, policy HO13 applies to unallocated sites. Objection noted.
425	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	<p>ONS projections can be dramatically affected by very small changes in underlying assumptions. They should be used with caution. It is not appropriate to meet Stevenage's needs using Green Belt land. A 5,300 target is more appropriate. 7,600 will require use of Green Belt land and impact on nearby villages to the north.</p> <p>Development will create coalescence. Proposals to develop 3,000 homes in the town centre are welcomed. However, concerned this has put more pressure to build more on Green Belt to help finance the costs involved.</p>	See responses to comments 408, 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (housing target), 190 (Green Belt) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt). No change.

435	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to a new travellers site near Graveley Village.	See response to comment 420.
447	974647	Jorn Peters	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The Mayor of London supports the positive approach to housing growth and meeting housing need, specifically the use of a 10yr migration trend in the SHMA. The Borough will benefit from improvements to rail connectivity, as detailed in the TfL response. The Plan should seek to maximise the benefits of strategic transport projects.	Support welcomed.
471	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to G&T - lack of transport modelling. Need dialogue between SBC, NHDC, Graveley PC and other interested parties. NHDC interested in potential for site to address G&T provision in their administrative boundary.	See response to comment 470.
485	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support housing target and Green Belt release. This approach is essential to meet housing needs. Land at North Stevenage plays an important role in this.	Support welcomed.
524	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Projected number of dwellings is unsound. Plan uses the SHMA, which bases projections on an extrapolation of ONS past population growth figures. This is incomplete and incorrect. Projections should lead to a lower number. Use of past figures is not a correct basis for future growth. The required number of dwellings is well below 7,600.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target) and 190 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
530	632508	Luton Borough Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support the proposed strategy within the Plan, including the approach to housing. Understand there is no impact (in terms of any unmet housing need) on the wider Stevenage/North Hertfordshire HMA or therefore, potentially upon the wider Luton HMA.	Support welcomed.
564	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support part b. (iii) the delivery of a new neighbourhood at West Stevenage.	Support welcomed.
565	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	30% affordable housing is unrealistic. No evidence of need for self build. Should refer to approximately 1,350, not 'at least 1,350'	Our evidence suggests these targets are appropriate. No change.
588	922156	Pigeon Land Ltd	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support the housing target, new neighbourhoods, and the objective to build a range of house types and sizes, in particular Aspirational Homes. If land to the east of Stevenage is identified in the EHDC Plan, Policy SP7 will need to be amended to reflect this inclusion.	Support welcomed. We believe the proposals will improve quality of life for residents. There are no definite proposals for land east of Gresley Way. No change.
594	773057	RPF Developments	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Broadly supportive of the housing target that exceeds OAN. Support aspiration to encourage development early in plan period. Note there may be factors likely to delay other key schemes i.e. North and West. RPF's land is available now and can be delivered in the next 5 years. SBC is encouraged to consider the early delivery of new homes on land north of the A602.	Support welcomed.
642	976805	Bragbury End Sports LLP	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support the overall housing strategy set out within Policy SP7.	Support welcomed.
686	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support 7,600 target in SP7. Agree with extent of the identified HMA, methodology and conclusions of the SHMA. Note that this exceeds OAN identified in the SHMA. Acknowledge and welcome para 5.68 that the Plan will meet all Stevenage needs within the Borough and does not rely on neighbouring authorities. Housing Technical Paper: Suggest Stevenage adopt the Sedgefield approach. NPPG suggests this should be used 'where possible'. This will not affect overall OAN or housing target. 5yr requirement could well be higher.	Support welcomed. The NPPG does not preclude the use of the Liverpool approach. This is consistent with national policy. No change.

742	977192	National Custom and Self Build Association	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Policy SP7 requires that 1% new homes in the urban extensions are self-build. This equates to 27 self-build opportunities. No evidence that this small figure will be sufficient to meet future need. The council must broaden opportunities by increasing the requirement to 5%.	The Self Build Portal does not identify a need for self-build plots Stevenage. No evidence provided to justify increasing requirement.
752	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support Policy SP7 and the plan to exceed the OAN. The LEP's SEP seeks an increase of dwelling provision where appropriate and feasible. Recommend a review of development sites to determine whether there are opportunities to increase densities.	Support welcomed. Dwelling provision on specific sites has been estimated according to up-to-date information/SLAA submissions. No change.
824	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to housing growth location due to supporting the building of a New Town.	Noted. See response to comment 121 (new New Town). No change.
835	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to Policy SP7 due to alternative proposal for New Housing to be allocated in a new town.	Noted. See response to comment 121 (new New Town). No change.
838	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	In 2013, SBC announced it needed 5,600 new homes. Now an increase to 7,600. The methodology to arrive at this higher figure is based on misleading statistics. In 2011 migration figures significantly increased. It was later found that this was largely due to students being listed as migrants, which has since been changed. This extraordinary high level was included in SBC's calculation. More sites becoming available, especially in Green belt, does not give SBC the right to increase targets.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target).
851	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to housing target. This would require removal of large Green Belt areas, which is unjustified and contrary to national policy. Para 5.66 fails to note the NPPF requirement to meet housing need 'unless other policies indicate development should be restricted'. No explanation of how SBC has balanced housing need with constraints. SP7 and the related text, particularly paragraphs 5.66 and 5.67 should include a more accurate summary of NPPF context.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target). The NPPF has been considered in full when identifying the housing target for Stevenage, including the sentence referenced. See comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). It is not the purpose of a local plan to repeat sections of national policy. See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses).
902	341949	Mrs Lesley Bacon	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Concerns on the level of housing growth and the impacts this will have on local roads, emergency services and utilities.	We are actively working with all infrastructure providers including the highway authority, emergency services, education and utility providers. Our IDP identifies the infrastructure required to support the Plan's proposals and how it will be delivered. In addition, larger sites in the plan have specific infrastructure requirements identified to be provided.
919	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to Green Belt release. The plan does not comply with the NPPF. Not proven that 'very special circumstances' exist. If HO3 and the additional 1,000 homes in NHDC go ahead, Graveley will be swallowed up by urban sprawl. The housing target is the upper bound of the projections. The process used to calculate this makes no allowance for Green Belt constraints. Constraints should be reflected by modifying the response to market signals in the OAN calculation.	See response to comment 190 (exceptional circumstances). SBC have no control over land or development in NHDC. Our Green Belt Review identifies the sites to be released will not have a significant impact on overall Green Belt purposes, which includes the restriction of urban sprawl. See also response to comment 851. See response to comment 1160 (housing target). No change.
929	973697	Yvonne Pendlebury	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Are the allotments in Eliot Road to be part of the development? Appreciate the need for new homes, but SBC has not considered impacts on residents. Drains and sewers are unable to cope already. Building more homes will increase flooding.	The Proposals Map illustrates the allocated site boundaries. See response to comment 902 (infrastructure). See response to comment 810.
932	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Site HO12 is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley.	A Level 2 SFRA has been completed for this area. This details areas where development would be unacceptable, or where mitigation might be required. This does not preclude development of any of our allocated sites. See also response to comment 937 (Ashbrook). No change.

949	974779	Mr James Blanksby	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to the building of 8,155 new homes. These will be unsightly. Will increase noise pollution and disruption during the building process, which will take a number of years . Traffic problems and flood risk will be increased. The rural setting of Graveley should not be destroyed.	Traffic impacts will be mitigated through improvements. Flood zones associated with Ash Brook will not be built on. See also response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
956	769624	Marie Courtman	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Relying on the Calverton Judgement to justify 'exceptional circumstances' is not acceptable - judgements are site specific. Concentrating development West of Stevenage would be more sustainable. Not clear that the evidence for the 7,300 target is an accurate assessment of the town's OAN. Concerned this, with the Gypsy site and new supermarket proposed (HO12 and TC11) will lead to increased traffic and affect access to the Lister.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1160 (housing target) and 949 (traffic). No change.
967	342146	Donald Courtman	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Relying on the Calverton Judgement to justify 'exceptional circumstances' is not acceptable - judgements are site specific. Concentrating development West of Stevenage would be more sustainable. Not clear that the evidence for the 7,300 target is an accurate assessment of the town's OAN. Concerned this, with the Gypsy site and new supermarket proposed (HO12 and TC11) will lead to increased traffic and affect access to the Lister.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1160 (housing target) and 949 (traffic). No change.
974	973869	Mr Ralph Black	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Villages like Graveley should not be swallowed up by Stevenage sprawl. Where are jobs coming from for people to pay for new homes. North Road cannot cope with hundreds more cars.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). Our Plan allocates a number of new employment sites to provide new jobs. No change.
983	922235	Eur Ing John C Spiers	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The target of 7600 homes is not sound. No link between the SHMA and the Housing Technical Paper and the target. The plan makes no reference to Stevenage residents needing housing. The plan should be revised to give it clear derivation of the number of proposed dwellings.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target).
984	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Supported target that fully meets OAN. Support section c. to ensure at least 60% of new homes are on PDL. Acknowledge review of Green Belt boundaries is necessary for SBC and NHDC to meet their OAN and supported new allocations at West and North Stevenage. The plan has taken a pragmatic approach to the fact that North Herts is significantly behind Stevenage in its timetable, and still allows for development of cross-border urban extensions. South East Stevenage extension is remote from town centre, employment and leisure facilities. Recommend omitting from the plan and an early review of Brownfield capacity and the longer term possibility of increasing the capacity North and/or West Stevenage in association with NHDC, to accommodate the 550 dwellings.	Support welcomed. Improved pedestrian, cycleways and passenger transport links will be required as part of any scheme, to improve sustainability of South East Stevenage. See responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first) and 887 (meeting OAN using Duty to co-operate). No change.
1006	975922	Mr Clive Donaghue	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Figures from the SLAA indicate all but 80 of the entire housing target could be met without development in Green Belt. Therefore, very unlikely that 'exceptional circumstances' can be demonstrated. Green Belt sites should be withdrawn. Alternatively, only the smaller Green Belt sites (such as Bragbury End Sports Ground and the Todd's Green sites), should be considered.	The SLAA is just one piece of evidence that must be considered. The Housing Technical Paper ties all evidence together and explains how we have got from this to the Local Plan allocations. See also responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1054	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Support recent office to residential and 'retirement housing' around town centre. Enables the elderly to downsize and young people to move into suitable premises. This process should be encouraged - represent good use of resources and more intensive land use.	Support welcomed. See response to comment 190 (Brownfield first). Some of the town's neighbourhood centres are allocated for mixed-used redevelopment. This will be encouraged at the earliest opportunity.
1116	974650	Benedict Harrison	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	In agreement with Stephen Mcpartland's objections. Concerns around loss of easily accessible green space on the edge of Stevenage, which will reduce quality of life . Infrastructure is not keeping pace with population growth. Believe a new Garden City in partnership with NHDC is a better option.	Noted. See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 121 (new New Town). See response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.

1142	974449	Mrs Agnieszka De Silva	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Against development of the countryside. Already have a lack of green space compared to neighbouring towns. Plans to build on more of the lovely fields and open spaces will add to concrete jungle feel.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 902 (infrastructure) and 133 (country park). No change.
1167	769045	Mr Richard Blake	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The target of 7,600 dwellings is not sustainable, having regard to the already high population, the proximity of outer urban areas and the lack of appropriate infrastructure, namely egress on to the A1(M), B197 and A602. The three new settlements are not sustainable due to traffic implications.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target). See also response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1235	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	ONS projections can be dramatically affected by very small changes in underlying assumptions. They should be used with caution. It is not appropriate to meet Stevenage's needs using Green Belt land. A 5,300 target is more appropriate. 7,600 will require use of Green Belt land and impact on nearby villages to the north. Development will create coalescence. Proposals to develop 3,000 homes in the town centre are welcomed. However, concerned this has put more pressure to build more on Green Belt to help finance the costs involved.	See responses to comments 408, 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (housing target), 190 (Green Belt) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt). No change.
1244	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to new travellers site in close proximity to Graveley. Site not deliverable. Believe landowner opposed to the use. Policy H012 inconsistent with national policy. NPPF states unmet need (including for travellers sites) unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Policy H012 not justified. Plan states there is uncertainty around the level of future requirements. If required, put new provision at Dyes Lane. Land is available and this would address police concerns regarding tensions on the existing site. This would restrict management and policing to one local authority rather than spreading it over two. Policy H013 requires an appropriate buffer between travellers sites and adjacent uses. Graveley is a walk away, site conflicts with policy. Impact on Graveley School.	See response to comment 420.
1263	758229	Ms Karen Robinson	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Increase in housing target is not appropriate or justified. Many office to residential permissions have been granted since last assessment March 2013/14. SBC should consider long term growth of the town. Building on open spaces is inappropriate and reduces quality of life. Make the best use of brownfield and empty buildings.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target). The Housing Technical Paper takes into account new housing data to 30 September 2015. See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 343 (open spaces) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1272	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	There may be a shortage of 'affordable' homes, but the expansion of Stevenage has reached its maximum within the current boundaries. Further growth should use land in the borough without destroying existing houses. SBC should not be providing housing for London commuters, unless they can be accommodated within the current boundaries.	Noted. See responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
1292	977162	S T Smyth	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Findings of Chesterton Report should be followed. Todd's Green and Lower Titmore Green should be taken out of the Green Belt and allowed to expand. If Todd's Green is not taken out of the Green Belt, it should become an 'excluded' village. A 'Suggested Village Envelope' boundary is recommended.	The Chesterton Report has been superseded by other more up-to-date evidence studies. Our Green Belt Review recommends Todd's Green remains in the Green Belt. Policy GB2 allows for small-scale development within this village. Lower Titmore Green is not within SBC. See response to comment 1278 (land outside the boundary). No change.
1324	342032	Mr Paul Bridden	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to housing target due to consumption of green belt and impact on local services. The A1(M) must be converted to 3 lanes if plans go ahead. Development between Stevenage and Graveley will change the nature of the village. Brownfield options should be looked at more closely, the housing target reduced, and infrastructure improved.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target). The A1(M) will become a SMART motorway using the hard-shoulder, see para's 4.30 and 5.47 and the infrastructure delivery plan. See response to comment 190 (brownfield and green belt). See response to comment 902 (infrastructure).

1330	974059	Miss Nathalie Watts	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Concerns around the amount of housing planned and the locations. This will have major impacts on traffic, parking, public services and crime. Widening the A1(M) to use hard shoulder is not good enough. It is disgusting some of the sites are open spaces. It would be more sensible to build a new garden city elsewhere.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target), 902 (infrastructure) and 121 (new settlement). No change.
1335	974055	Clare Matthews	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Object to the scale, number and location of houses proposed. The local infrastructure cannot cope - trains, Lister Hospital, roads and schools.	See response to comment 902 (infrastructure).
1343	974049	Mr Pete Le Porte	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The plan makes reference to a hypothetical target for increased housing that, according to SBC, now cannot be built due to cuts in government subsidies. The plan is politically motivated to discredit the democratically elected Government. A new garden city should have been considered with NHDC.	Council house building programme is not a local plan issue. The plan complies with national planning policy and is sound. See response to comment 121 (new settlement).
1356	969152	Mr Tim Franklin	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The housing target is too high. Puts too much pressure on the Green Belt land and will encroach too close to Graveley. It is unsustainable, as the infrastructure is inadequate.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1357	974005	Mr David Gray	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The plan has omitted to provide for homes for the elderly retired, who want their own homes.	Policy H10 provides new homes for the ageing population. No change.
1373	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Stevenage is already larger than what was originally envisaged. Already suffer from traffic and parking problems. Brownfield sites have obviously been well researched and incorporated into the plan.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1796	973959	Leo Carpenter	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Do not need more people and houses in Stevenage and Hertfordshire, instead need to keep our valuable farmland and a limited population.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1820	342487	Mr Alan Lines	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	The 7,600 target is excessive. The quantity of aspirational housing seems too modest in view of the heavy imbalance of existing stock.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target) and 30 (housing mix). No change.
1832	972739	Mr Aidan Heritage	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Whilst there is clearly a need for new homes, this should not be at the expense of green values.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1841	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Impact on the Ash Brook, flood zone 3, not adequately assessed. Site HO12 is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream.	See response to comment 937 (Ashbrook). See response to comment 86 (traffic site EC1/7). No change.
1850	974433	Mr Patrick Newman	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Too much countryside is being sacrificed. SBC should downsize their plan to approx. half the no of dwellings.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target). The plan aims to provide a balance between providing new homes and protecting green infrastructure/the environment. No change.
1864	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	Understand the Council has been set certain targets to be met, but targets should be challenged. With limited undeveloped areas, the targets are probably far too ambitious for the limited physical capacity of the borough.	See response to comment 1160 (housing target).
1872	341526	East Hertfordshire District Council	Policy SP7: High Quality Homes	EHDC support the principle of meeting and exceeding OAN within the borough boundary.	Support welcomed.
734	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	High Quality Homes	Support para's 5.68 and 5.69. Welcome the recognition that the Plan will meet all the housing needs of Stevenage within the Borough boundary and that SBC are not seeking assistance from neighbouring authorities. Also pleased to see reference to ongoing commitment to engage with neighbouring local authorities in identifying where Luton's unmet housing needs will be accommodated.	Support welcomed.

963	909897	Mrs Sue Jones	High Quality Homes	Disappointed with the plan. New Garden City is a great idea. No account has been taken for the need for highways, social and affordable housing, education, health and potential social and leisure infrastructure that will be required for the amount of housing in each community. A new Garden City could resolve these issues. Withdraw Plan and identify 5 year land supply.	See response to comment 121 (new settlement). Policy SP5 requires new development to contribute fairly towards the demands it creates, this specifically includes affordable housing, community facilities, education, health care facilities, leisure facilities. Policy SP7 sets targets for affordable housing. See also response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1007	975922	Mr Clive Donaghue	High Quality Homes	Figures from the SLAA indicate all but 80 of the entire housing target could be met without development in Green Belt. Therefore, very unlikely that 'exceptional circumstances' can be demonstrated. Green Belt sites should be withdrawn. Alternatively, only the smaller Green Belt sites (such as Bragbury End Sports Ground and the Todd's Green sites), should be considered.	See responses to comments 1006 (SLAA), 190 (Brownfield first and exceptional circumstances).
1113	978246	Mr Donald Manning	High Quality Homes	Housing numbers are confusing. 2,000 affordable homes, but North Stevenage has 800 unaffordable homes, East - 550 and West - 1350.	This comment is not clear. The housing target and how we propose to reach this is set out in the Housing Technical Paper. No change.
1	966961	Mr Timothy Mefo	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/13 (Scout Hut). Stevenage lacks scout hut facilities, will result in downward spiral. Consider alternative housing site. Revise site specific consideration to protect the Scout hut and land adjacent from demolition and remain in use for the local community.	Noted. Existing facilities will need to be relocated, or their loss satisfactorily justified if the development is to go ahead. No change.
5	965048	Mrs Laura Russell-young	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1. No reasons provided.	No change.
53	432515	Mr Glen Kitchener	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Access to HO1/11 (Rugby Club) will be onto North Road, which is already congested.	No change.
55	969618	Ms Angela Carpenter	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/5 (Ex-play Centre). Children require a play centre.	See response to comment 1 (existing facilities). No change.
72	964791	Mr Peter Bentley	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Welcome the development of new homes in existing urban areas, such as the town centre and neighbourhood centres.	Support welcomed.
85	621166	Mr Bryan Clare	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/14 (Shephall Centre). Previous public consultation demonstrated objections to site from local community. The centre is well used. It should not be lost or relocated elsewhere. Question whether 34 homes is overdevelopment. Sufficient parking should be provided.	See response to comment 1 (existing facilities). It is considered 34 homes would create a satisfactory scheme. Parking will be required in accordance with the Parking Standards.
100	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support Policy HO1, particularly the 'Urban Extensions'. The plan explains it is not possible to meet housing needs through regeneration and brownfield sites and that new peripheral greenfield land must be released for development, including Green Belt sites. The land identified in Policies HO2 to HO4 is supported as the most appropriate locations for new homes for new greenfield development.	Support welcomed.
114	969665	Ms Diane Grinham	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Brownfield sites are being used as a last option - they should be priority. Many buildings have been empty for years. HO1/7 (Fry Road nursery) - concerns over access and parking. Green spaces should not be used for housing.	See response to comment 190 (Brownfield first). See response to comment 85 (parking standards). The Plan aims to create a balance between development and protecting green infrastructure and other assets. No change.
118	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Is the proposal to mainly replace community halls within these allocated areas, whilst retaining/upgrading the shops, to allow new accommodation to be built? Many residents who use the halls are anxious their facilities will be lost.	See response to comment 1 (the loss of existing facilities).

126	969678	Mr Derek Harrington	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The plan should consider the underused garages being replaced with housing, particularly in Chells.	Most garage redevelopments would not yield over 5 units, which is the minimum to be included in the Plan. These could still come forward as proposals on sites not allocated in the plan (known as windfall schemes). No change.
139	969696	Ms Rebecca Davis	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/5 (Ex-play centre). Many children use this play area, especially in the holidays. Bored children = increased trouble. We have already lost many park areas in Symonds Green. It is disgusting to take away this extremely well used play area. It will have a detrimental impact on Symonds Green.	See response to comment 1 (the loss of existing facilities).
153	969915	Mr Chris Tillbrook	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1/11 (Rugby Club). There is a desperate need for new and expanded facilities. Support the Club's relocation.	Support welcomed.
154	969917	Mr Lee Whitcelo	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1/11 (Rugby Club). Existing facilities are overused and not fit for purpose. The club desperately needs to expand. Support the relocation of the Rugby Club.	Support welcomed.
163	969923	Ms Alison Blanshard	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The area surrounding the hospital should be reserved for hospital and healthcare expansion.	Policy HC3 allocates sufficient land to meet future healthcare/hospital needs. No change.
169	969924	Ms Sue Casey	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Has the council considered offering additional land to the Lister Hospital for parking? Staff parking is a problem.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
171	969931	Mr Daniel Gwilliams	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support Policy HO1, specifically HO1/11 (Rugby Club). The Club desperately needs room to expand and sustain its current activities for the future. The facilities are oversubscribed and not fit for purpose. The Club's relocation will allow it to meet it's needs.	Support welcomed.
183	969942	Mr Will Sheppard	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1/11 (Rugby Club). The relocation of the Rugby Club is required to provide newer, bigger premises.	Support welcomed.
200	972851	Mr Michael Coy	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Query which areas in Marymead are being developed. Concerned development will encroach on Shephalbury Park.	The Proposals Map identifies the allocated sites. There are no plans to develop Shephalbury Park.
207	969971	Ms Karen Bridden	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Proposals involve building right up to the hospital boundary. The relocation of the tennis club would adversely affect quality of life in terms of access to such opportunities.	Sport England have agreed to the relocation of sports facilities from this site, subject to an appropriate site being found. No change.
231	973034	Hart	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). This would severely curtail further expansion of the hospital.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
245	969989	Mr Tom McGrath	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support Policy HO1, specifically allocation HO1/11 (Rugby Club), which enables the relocation of the Rugby Club. The club has needed to relocate for a long time to allow it to expand and reach its true potential.	Support welcomed.
255	342487	Mr Alan Lines	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Land adjacent to Lister Hospital should not be used for anything other than hospital use. The increase in homes and the growing local population are bound to increase demand at the Lister.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
300	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1. SBC have not brought forward all available land before considering Green Belt sites. All parks and recreation grounds in Stevenage should be allocated for housing. SBC have not justified the evidence base for why Shephall Recreation Ground/Green (HO1/14) and the Scout Hut (HO1/13) can be made available for housing, but other areas cannot. Sites are in the Green Belt and there has been no effort to co-operate or consult with the affected London Authorities.	See responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first approach) and 1850 (balance of land uses). The Council does not need the permission of London Councils to alter Green Belt. SBC has determined not to use any new public open space for housing development. The land in HO1/14 is part of the community centre facility, and not public open space. The open space to the rear is being retained. The land within HO1/13 is not accessible to the public. No change.

303	970580	Ms Penny Lines	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). Lister Hospital require this land for expansion (that is one of the reasons it was designated for new development over QE2). Population growth, particularly the elderly, will increase demand.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
353	406958	Stevenage Sports Ltd. (landowner)	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support policy HO1 and allocation HO1/11 (Rugby Club). No objection to the site specific considerations. The site boundary on the Proposals Map is incorrect. The area allocated should follow the red line on the plan submitted as part of the SLAA reps.	Support welcomed. Whilst the Council does not believe that Stevenage Sport Ltd.'s representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative site boundary could be agreed.
364	342698	Mrs Gillian Shenoy	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to development up to boundary of Lister Hospital. The hospital is rapidly expanding and faces huge parking problems. Building up to the boundary will limit parking and reduce further planned expansion. How will the hospital cope with extra demand from new homes with no land for expansion.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
368	774015	Mr and Mrs Allard (landowner)	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Landowners of Land South of Todd's Green object to HO1. Not allocating this non-Green Belt site means SBC has failed to optimise available sites. This site should be allocated for housing, but with an access suitable as a transport corridor in relation to the wider West of Stevenage scheme.	Due to its separation from existing facilities, residential use on this site would need to form part of a wider scheme, to create a new community. No change.
386	341380	East And North Herts NHS Trust	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). 2 to 3 acres of this site is needed for future Lister Hospital expansion. The land allocated for healthcare use is remote from the main hospital site, and connected only via a very narrow pinch point. There are major topographical issues with this land, it is substantially lower than the adjacent hospital site.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). The land allocated under HC3 is suitable and available for healthcare use. Site specific constraints can be mitigated. No change.
392	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). Sites west of North Road are all close to the flood plain. Housing should be avoided in flood plains. Policy SP9 is quiet on the loss of the Rugby Club. A relocation site across the boundary is unlikely to fulfil the needs of residents unless they drive as there is limited public transport. The site should be reserved for hospital expansion.	Our evidence shows the majority of site HO1/11 is not within the flood plain. Any necessary infrastructure will be required as part of any new development. See also responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 207 (relocation of sports facilities). No change.
417	341844	Stevenage Sports Club Limited	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Landowner support for HO1/11 (Rugby Club). The Rugby Club is well established and respected, with strong links to local schools. It needs space to expand and thrive. Relocation will enable essential needs to be met. NHS proposal is prejudicial and uninvited. Stevenage Sports Club Ltd. are entirely committed to residential development. Any proposal by the NHS Trust involving this site will not be deliverable.	Support welcomed.
418	341724	National Grid	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/11 (Rugby Club) is crossed by, or close to, IP/HP apparatus. National Grid policy is to retain existing overhead lines in-situ. Prefer buildings not to be built directly beneath lines. Statutory safety clearances must not be infringed. Land beneath and adjacent to the line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the site. National Grid design guidelines should be used.	Noted. This will be dealt with in more detail at the application stage, but is already reflected in the estimation of dwelling numbers. No change.
419	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/11 (Rugby Club) will limit expansion of the hospital. Lister will need to expand. The hospital already experiences severe capacity issues. The plan proposes building right up to the boundary and in the adjacent field (EC1/4). The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 386 (HC3 site). No change.
432	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/11 (Rugby Club) will limit expansion of the hospital. Lister will need to expand. The hospital already experiences severe capacity issues. The plan proposes building right up to the boundary and in the adjacent field (EC1/4). The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 386 (HC3 site). No change.

453	974795	Active4Less	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Active4Less is not included in the HO1/11 (Rugby Club) allocation. Would be more logical to designate the whole area and relocate the club.	Noted. The landowner has not expressed any interest in including this facility within the HO1/11 area. See also response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
476	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support the allocation of land North of Stevenage in HO1. Bellway and Miller are in a position to bring forward this land for residential use. The allocation reflects the extensive assessment of the scheme's deliverability. A draft Masterplan enables development to be delivered on SBC land alone or as a wider cross-boundary scheme.	Support welcomed.
538	975798	NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). Support response made by the NHS Trust. Concerns about the close proximity of development to the Mental Health in-patient units, and the detrimental effect it will have on the service to vulnerable elderly patients. A key element in promoting mental health well-being is to enable a healing environment with light, open space and calm. This would be severely inhibited by the proposed development. Lister Hospital will become land locked and consequently services may end up being delivered in less accessible locations.	Concern noted. It is not considered residential use on HO1/11 will have a negative impact on services provided by the mental health unit or elderly patients. This is not public open space currently. See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
552	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Landowner support for HO1/6 (Former Pin Green Playing Field). HCC will work to bring it forward for development expediently.	Support welcomed.
623	773057	RPF Developments	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support the broad approach to housing allocations and the overall housing requirement set out in HO1. RPF welcomes the release of land north of the A602 from the Green Belt and its inclusion as a strategic residential allocation.	Support welcomed.
639	976805	Bragbury End Sports LLP	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Landowner support for HO1/2 (Bragbury End car park). HO1 should allow for an uplift in capacity, as referred to in Para. 9.5. Object to the text stating the loss of sports facilities should be mitigated. The site is a car park, ancillary to the sports facility. No sports facilities exist.	Support welcomed.
770	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Sites have been assessed individually. The potential cumulative effect of development should be considered once details of phasing are available. Do not envisage concerns regarding wastewater infrastructure capability at HO1/1 , HO1/2, HO1/3, HO1/4, HO1/5, HO1/6, HO1/7, HO1/8, HO1/9, HO1/12, HO1/13, HO1/14, HO1/15, HO1/16 and HO1/17. HO1/10 - available information does not allow for a detailed assessment of impact. Significant concerns at HO1/11 (Rugby Club) and concerns at HO1/18 (The Oval). Network capacity unlikely to be able to support increased demand. Improved drainage infrastructure likely to be required. Should require developers to provide a detailed drainage strategy. A planning condition will also be required to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation. Time required to deliver infrastructure should not be underestimated.	Noted. We are satisfied that water and waste water needs can be provided and are actively working with Anglian and Thames Water. See also response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change. .

815	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1 and para 9.1. Housing target is too high. Did not undertake balancing exercise between meeting needs and constraints. No demonstration of exceptional circumstances. The Council has adopted the approach of meeting all housing need identified in the SHMA. Calverton Judge says this is impermissible. A more detailed assessment of local need is required. No explanation of how the Green Belt constraint has been considered in increasing the target from 7,300. Aspirations for regeneration do not outweigh Green Belt policy. A buffer (above 7,600) is not justified. SBC evidence shows OAN can be met without Green Belt. Evidence provided by the Council to support its proposals should be tested. SBC has underestimated windfall - this should be increased to at least 1,000 and include years up to 2021 as well.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target) and 1850 (balance of land uses). See response to comment 190 (exceptional circumstances). The SLAA and Housing Technical Paper explains how the windfall allowance has been calculated and taken into account. No change.
820	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club) on traffic impacts, loss of recreational and sports facilities and development of the site preventing expansion of Lister Hospital.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 207 (relocation of sports facilities) and 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
829	977185	Mrs H M Jones	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to overall housing growth in Stevenage on the grounds that the level of growth is too much, infrastructure will be unable to cope, loss of Green Belt land, loss of neighbourhood centres and increase in traffic. The Borough Council should also have worked with neighbouring authorities to build a new town.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target), 1850 (balance of land uses), 902 (infrastructure), 949 (traffic) and 121 (new New Town). Neighbourhood centres are protected by the Local Plan. No change.
831	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to Policy HO1/11 (Rugby Club) due to access and traffic concerns, loss of recreational facilities on site and that the site should be saved for expansion of Lister Hospital.	See also responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 207 (relocation of sports facilities). No change.
852	342182	Miss Margaret Donovan	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club) and Land adjacent to Foxholme / Great North Road behind Lister Hospital. Land should be reserved for hospital expansion. The population is to increase in all Lister catchment areas. Land should be allocated for current and future needs, as well as possible underestimates.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
877	977009	Mrs Hilary C Thompson	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). This prevents the expansion of Lister Hospital.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
933	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse, designated as flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed.	See response to comment 932 (flood risk - Ash Brook). No change.
985	342828	Mrs Jennifer Watson-Usher	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). This will prevent expansion of Lister Hospital. If John Henry Newman wish to expand, where would the Air Ambulance land? Where will the Rugby club go? Sports facilities are essential. Question where the mains water is coming from as there already is a shortage of water.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 207 (relocation of sports facilities). There is currently no requirement to reprovide air ambulance facilities. A dual application will be required to ensure sports facilities are reprovided before development is permitted. We are satisfied that mains water can be provided at all development sites. No change.
990	977200	W Abbott	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to housing growth. Concerns around parking provision, flood risk, the need for road infrastructure improvements and healthcare capacity.	See response to comment 85 (parking standards) and 902 (infrastructure).
1005	977215	Mr and Mrs Avery	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to development around Little Wymondley due to historic flooding issues, traffic issues, water shortages and poor condition of roads around the village.	See responses to comments 932 (flood risk - Ash Brook) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1012	977238	Professor Emeritus David Noakes	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	There will be a requirement for hospital expansion. Rugby Club should be used for parking/expansion rather than housing. Also concerned development will lead to more traffic using North Road and the A1(M). A third lane is needed for A1(M), not hard shoulder running.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.

1014	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Well documented that living near high voltage pylons increases health risks.	Noted. Best practice guidance on building near power lines will be followed to ensure an adequate buffer is retained. No change.
1018	974440	Mrs Ruth Baker	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Concerns around HO1/18 (The Oval). This will have a big impact on local facilities, roads, schools, healthcare etc. Drainage is already inadequate. Mildmay Road area experiences flooding. This has been raised with infrastructure providers and it is clear that Vardon Road cannot cope with excess water from heavy rainfall and major improvement to drainage is required.	See response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1024	977260	Mrs M Selvage	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Concerns over whether housing will go to local people.	See response to comment 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
1029	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Neighbourhood centre regeneration is a good idea as long as shops are retained and adequate parking is provided.	Support welcomed.
1033	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The Plan says existing green spaces will be protected, yet allocation to build 42 new homes on Pin Green School Field. Question whether housing is to be built on the site of the former Special School on Lonsdale Road which was recently demolished. 3,000 new homes will spoil some delightful countryside. Concerned on the impact this will have on Lister Hospital, school places and parking provision.	See response to comment 343 (open spaces). Pin Green school playing field is inaccessible to the public, so does not provide open space provision for the town. See also response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1037	342675	Mr Michael M. B. Ross	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Question why North or West Stevenage requires further housing development as the population and industries appear to be reducing/sluggish and area is already densely populated.	See response to comment 1160 (housing number). No change.
1043	973704	Mrs Ann Sharman	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Wish to reiterate the response of Mr McPartland (Person ID: 452235). Are all the parklands to be sold off for housing. Will houses be built with sufficient parking? Will there be space for children to play?	See responses to comments 1033 (protection of open spaces) and 85 (parking provision). Policy NH7 requires new children's play spaces to be provided on larger sites. No change.
1063	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Plan proposes new supermarket, housing and industry north of Lister Hospital. All of this land should be safeguarded for health related uses. Development may mean a redesign of the current congested traffic layout, particularly buses.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1068	974740	Felix Power	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	No room for Lister Hospital to expand if there are new houses. Lister was chosen over QE2 because it had surrounding land.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1070	974712	Julia Brettell	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Concern about loss of scout hut at Drakes Drive (HO1/13). Community facility must be reprovided.	Community facilities will only be allowed to be lost where it can be demonstrated that they are no longer required, or that they can be satisfactorily relocated elsewhere. The scout hut is clearly used frequently, therefore its loss will not be permitted. The facility is protected under this and other local plan policies. No change.
1083	975076	Linda Rose	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to loss of scout hut and land. Building is used every weekday for scouting activities and at the weekend. Fenced land is safe and used frequently.	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1085	974579	Mr John Sim	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response. Concern about loss of scout hut at Drakes Drive. Site used extensively by the local community. It is within walking distance of users, which does not impact on local parking. Proposal does not fit with other plan objectives i.e. increasing skills, supporting leisure facilities, preventing traffic problems etc.	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1090	975303	Andrea Skidmore	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1092	975308	Debra Matherson	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1095	975325	Mr Colin Wright	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.

1098	975425	Mr Robert Wright	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1101	975434	Mr Trevor Palmer	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1103	975668	Elizabeth Crowley	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1106	975676	Mr Neil Pedder	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1108	975685	Mrs Samantha Marshall	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1110	975245	Julia Mathers	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/13 - Scout Hut, Drakes Drive - Group Response As Julia Brettell (comment 1070) and John Sim (comment 1085).	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1127	977378	King George Surgery Patient Liaison Group	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Plan does not meet healthcare requirements for Stevenage and the surrounding areas. Additional hospital capacity is required currently, and for increased population and new treatments. No co-operation shown for Lister's requirements. If space were available, the CCG could be consulted to see if they were willing to co-locate services.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 985 (air ambulance). Neither the CCG, nor the NHS Trust, have expressed an interest in co-locating. No change.
1147	974448	J.A England	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Question why a new Garden City can't be developed instead, with its own infrastructure, as suggested by Stephen McPartland. All infrastructure issues can then be planned from the start.	See response to comment 121 (new New Town). No change.
1155	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Deprives Lister Hospital opportunities for further expansion	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1180	975335	Mr Chris Ransom	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1, specifically HO1/11 (Rugby Club), which will enable the relocation of the Rugby Club. Club needs room to expand, relocation will help achieve its aspirations and meet essential needs.	Support welcomed.
1181	975375	Mr Richard Constantine	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1, specifically HO1/11 (Rugby Club). This will enable the relocation of the Rugby Club. The club needs room to expand and the relocation will help achieve its aspirations and meet essential needs.	Support welcomed.
1183	975383	Mr Gareth Wall	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Supports HO1, and specifically HO1/11 (Rugby Club). It will enable the relocation of the rugby club. Club needs to expand to combat existing issues.	Support welcomed.
1189	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Shephall Centre is a well-used facility. Site should be redeveloped as a new community centre, not housing. Concerned about the Elliot Road site. Should not include the allotments that are well-used. Instead of shoe-horning in more homes, work with NHDC to create a New Town.	See response to comment 1 (existing facilities). Allowing housing on part of this site provides the money required to redevelop the community facility. The Proposals Map shows the exact locations of the allocated housing sites. See response to comment 121 (new New Town).
1227	773173	M Wright	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). Rugby club must be allocated for future use by Lister Hospital. The need to provide healthcare for the increased population in the wider area, far outweighs a minor housing site. Hospital management have already expressed an interest in this site.	See response to comment 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1236	975659	Mr Doug Scholes	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support Policy HO1/11 (Rugby Club) which will enable the relocation of the rugby club. Club needs room to expand, the relocation proposal will help the club achieve its aspirations.	Support welcomed.
1243	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/11 (Rugby Club) will limit expansion of the hospital. Lister will need to expand to maintain its role. The plan proposes building right up to the boundary and in the adjacent field (EC1/4). The plan allocates the land next to Cygnet Hospital for healthcare use, but there are issues due to pylons and land levels.	See responses to comments 163 (hospital expansion) and 386 (HC3 site). No change.
1260	975807	Annette Bowdery	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to more houses on previously designated Green Belt. Local roads near J8 are already frequently gridlocked and no proposal to improve capacity for additional vehicles from developments	See response to comment 974 (traffic impacts). No change.

1269	974435	Mr Paul Bentley	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1/11 (Rugby Club), which will enable the club's relocation. Provides an opportunity for housing with good local facilities and road links.	Support welcomed.
1288	978762	Chells Scout Group	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Petition of 258 signatures. Object to HO1/13 (Scout Hut) without acceptable reprovision. The current site is easily accessible for pedestrians and by bus, and has parking. It is a safe environment. Both the building and outdoor space are used nearly every day. There is adequate storage. The hall is large enough and has kitchen facilities.	See response to comment 1070 (Scout Hut). No change.
1291	342154	Mrs Madelaine Crouch	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Understand the need for new homes, but need to consider the huge impact an increase in traffic will have on Graveley and the surrounding areas. Expansion will exacerbate existing problems. Graveley is being crushed between the proposals of both NHDC and SBC. Concerns that Lister Hospital will be unable to cope with growth and the lack of land available should the hospital need to expand.	See responses to comments 974 (traffic impacts) and 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1297	974420	Mrs Caroline Gray	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/11 (Rugby Club). The nearest Primary School is oversubscribed. J8 and local roads are already congested, with regular accidents. Increased housing will exacerbate problems. Homes should be in keeping with the large family homes in the area. If not, may struggle to attract high earners.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). Aspirational homes are encouraged by the Plan in appropriate locations. Detailed proposals for the site will be dealt with at the application stage. No change.
1328	342133	Ms Helen Lumley	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Housing target is too high. A lower option is more appropriate. Much of the housing goes to commuters. Must leave land available for expansion of Lister Hospital and not build up to its boundary.	See responses to comments 1160 (housing target and who buys new homes) and 163 (hospital expansion). No change.
1334	974339	Mr Graham Lemon	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support HO1/11 (Rugby Club) and Stevenage Town RFC's relocation proposals to provide much needed rugby and sports facilities for the club and local schools.	Support welcomed.
1339	974286	Mr Phil Reah	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support regeneration of neighbourhood centres. Object to proposals to build houses on green spaces or land accommodating community facilities. Agree with new developments on the outskirts of town, but transport infrastructure needs upgrading first. Conversion of family homes into HMOs should be actively resisted.	Support welcomed. See also responses to comments 343 (open spaces), 1 (existing facilities) and 902 (infrastructure). Policy HO5 aims to ensure conversions do not overburden existing infrastructure. No change.
1364	974264	Janet Beacom	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to HO1/18 (The Oval). There are problems with drainage. A loss of green space will reduce absorption, exacerbating problems. More homes will put further pressure on infrastructure, especially GPs, schools and parking.	See response to comment 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1381	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The impact on the Ash Brook, designated flood zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Site HO12 (Gypsy and Traveller provision) is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream.	See response to comment 937 (Ashbrook). See response to comment 86 (traffic site EC1/7).
1393	974199	Mrs Andre Harrold	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (housing target). No change.
1401	973937	Jacqueline Pond	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	HO1/11 (Rugby Club) land-locks the hospital and prevents expansion. The loss of sports facilities will impact on children as they will be too far out of the town. This will further increase traffic. Failure to identify other sites i.e. redundant office buildings. Failure to communicate what is happening with adjacent NHDC proposals. Infrastructure is poor and insufficient.	See responses to 163 (hospital expansion), 207 (relocation of sports facilities), 902 (infrastructure) and 190 (Brownfield first). Development outside of the boundary is referenced, but further detail would be inappropriate at this stage in their plan-making. No change.

1799	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	The area below HO1/11 (Rugby Club) & EC1/4 acts as a flood plain after heavy rain, further building will exacerbate the problem.	See response to comment 932 (flood risk). No change.
1837	973929	Mr Kevin Smith	Policy HO1: Housing allocations	Support the regeneration of neighbourhood centres and the creation of more housing.	Support welcomed.
4	965048	Mrs Laura Russell-young	Site specific considerations for housing allocations identified in Policy HO1	Object to HO1/2. This is a floodplain. The trees along the Brook and the banks will not be allowed to be removed for construction.	See response to comment 6. No change.
60	768523	Sport England	Site specific considerations for housing allocations identified in Policy HO1	HO1/2 - No Objection. Loss of sports facilities will be mitigated. Priorities are to improve the quality of existing, not provide new/reinstate uses. Sport England to be engaged in discussions over mitigation. HO1/6 - No objection. Direct replacement not sought. Table should specify redevelopment will need to provide mitigation via developer contributions to enhance existing playing fields. HO1/11 - The site specific considerations should be more explicit and worded to accord with NPPF. Essential that replacement facilities are at least equivalent in quantity and quality and in a suitable location, prior to development. Amended wording suggested. Proposals Map for allocation is queried. Appears to exclude the area covered by the clubhouse, tennis club and car parking area.	Noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that Sport England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative site boundary and revised wording could be agreed.
21	969597	Ms Kathie French	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to West of Stevenage. Concerns relating to loss of Green Belt and countryside assets. Concerns regarding access via Meadway and Bessemer Drive and congestion generated.	HO2 is not currently within the Green Belt, so no loss will occur. See also responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). Access arrangements for Stevenage West have been assessed and agreed by the Highways Authority. No change.
61	768523	Sport England	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Support HO2 - evidence identifies need for cricket provision. Amend para. 9.18 to refer to monitoring/reviewing sports facility needs to ensure provision is responsive to needs at the time of application.	Support welcomed. Whilst the Council does not believe that Sport England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, a form of revised wording could be agreed.
75	964791	Mr Peter Bentley	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Building west of A1(M) would take away countryside and risks being first step to urbanisation west of Stevenage.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
116	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Clovely Road and Gunnels Wood Road are already congested. Stevenage West, particularly access via Meadway, will exacerbate problems. Public transport provision is required.	See response to comment 949 (traffic) and 21 (HO2 access). No change.
127	969678	Mr Derek Harrington	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to building west of A1(M). This is Green Belt and will lead to further erosion of this area, giving a green light to future expansion. The A1(M) is a boundary to development and should be maintained as such.	See response to comment 21 (HO2 access). No change.
166	969921	Mr Peter Fuller	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Building houses to the West is great, but this is under the flight path and will have noise implications.	HO2 requires noise impacts from the airport to be mitigated. No objection received from London Luton Airport Operations Ltd. No change.
225	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to HO2. Poor option due to difficult access. Will result in more traffic in an already congested area. Motorway is a natural boundary to expansion to the West. Nothing has changed since the previous consultations.	See response to comment 949 (traffic) and 21 (HO2 access). No change.
275	341391	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Support criterion q). Such mitigation is vital to enable the development to come forward without hindering the growth of the Airport.	Support welcomed.

284	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Doubts over deliverability. Demonstrated by a previous inability to resolve access issues across A1(M) and railway line, and High Court Judgements over the last 25 years.	See response to comment 21 (HO2 access). Our evidence demonstrates the site is suitable, available and achievable within the plan period. No change.
382	341656	Homes And Communities Agency	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Support mixed use development at West Stevenage. Agree 1,350 homes can be delivered. Suggest the 30% affordable housing target could be exceeded with the introduction of Starter Homes as an affordable housing product.	Support welcomed. See response to comment 565 (affordable housing target). However, SBC would welcome any increase in affordable housing provision. No change.
403	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	No objection to self build requirements in principle and support the initiative. Recommend wording is amended to allow self build plots to revert to conventional build plots if they are not taken up by the public after two years.	Support welcomed. Whilst the Council does not believe that the HBF's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, revised wording could be agreed.
434	341724	National Grid	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	HO2 is crossed by, or within close proximity to, IP/HP apparatus. Detailed guidance on how to deal with gas pipelines provided.	Noted. This will be dealt with in more detail at the application and masterplanning stage. No change.
501	619933	Natural England	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Concerns around impacts on environmental assets. Potential to impact on Knebworth Woods SSSI and Wildlife Sites. No mitigation for potential recreational disturbance, particularly on the SSSI and Wildlife Sites. Concerned impacts have not been properly considered in the SA.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Subsequent amendments have been made to the SA. No change.
553	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Welcome inclusion of a site for a primary school. Support the requirement for masterplanning, and that the proposal must be capable of being fully integrated with a wider cross-boundary scheme in the future, particularly having regard to the need for new schools.	Support welcomed.
590	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Support approx. 1,350 dwellings at West of Stevenage.	Support welcomed.
591	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Inappropriate to masterplan beyond the land controlled by developers. Provision of 5% aspirational homes should be subject to viability testing and offset against other plan policies. No evidence for self build. 30% affordable homes is unrealistic. Supported/sheltered housing provision is subject to viability test. Cricket pitch is not justified. Boundary should not be compromised with greenfield buffers in light of NHDC potential to develop further.	The Policy requires demonstration that development could be expanded beyond the boundary. It does not require a full masterplan for land outside of the Borough. See response to comment 30 (housing mix). Our evidence identifies this is the most suitable site for new cricket facilities. No change.
638	976306	P Servante	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to the loss of countryside West of Stevenage.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
763	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Support HO2. Stress the need for cross-boundary working to deliver holistic, sustainable, long term solutions. Seek an increase in residential numbers, where appropriate.	See responses to comments 371 (cross-boundary working) and 752 (dwelling estimates). No change.
771	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Concerns regarding wastewater services. The wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support demand from HO2. Upgrades to existing drainage are likely to be required ahead of development. The developer should be required to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. A planning condition is likely to be required to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation. Important not to under estimate the time required to deliver infrastructure.	Noted. See responses to comments 770 (wastewater) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
862	977188	Mrs A Palmer	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	HO2 will have a negative impact on the Knebworth Woods SSSI and issues with sewage and sewerage.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses), 501 (Natural England) and 771 (Waste water). No change.
962	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to HO2 (and safeguarded land in NHDC) due to destruction of the Green Belt, which fulfils all five NPPF purposes.	See response to comment 21 (no Green Belt loss). No change.
977	770454	Ms R Stevenson	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to HO2 due to loss land valuable for farming, wildlife and the environment, and roads unable to cope with increase in traffic.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.

992	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Consistently supported a housing target that fully meets OAN. Previously acknowledged that a review of Green Belt boundaries is necessary for SBC and NHDC to meet OAN and supported new allocations at West and North Stevenage, but as urban satellites rather than urban extensions. The plan has taken a pragmatic approach to North Herts being significantly behind Stevenage in its timetable, and still allows for longer term development of cross-border urban extensions.	Support welcomed.
1030	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Object to development west of A1(M) due to increased traffic on the A1(M) and local roads. Widening between J6-8 will only help in the short term.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). No change.
1039	342675	Mr Michael M. B. Ross	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	West of A1(M) is the best place for development. Planned A1(M) widening provides opportunity for improving access under or over bridges, and the inevitable completion of duelling on the A602 from Corey's Mill to the A505 will provide robust infrastructure. The area is sparsely populated. Development should be sought here rather than the north.	Support welcomed. Development in other areas, as well as the west, is required to meet our housing target. No change.
1080	974740	Felix Power	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Countryside around west Stevenage is beautiful, widely used and full of wildlife.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1278	758229	Ms Karen Robinson	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Need to demonstrate the impact on the road network is acceptable. Access should be via Bessemer Drive and Meadway only. Boundary of Chadwell Road (Bridle way 98) has a historic hedge - this should be covered by NH3. Provision for recreation is insufficient. Needs appropriate buffering of the area and Green Belt should be extended at least 200m around Norton Green. Proper consideration has not been given to the impact on Knebworth SSSI, Norton Green Common and wildlife. Positive creation, protection and enhancement of biodiversity is needed. Use the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 21 (HO2 access). Chadwell Road is not designated as an ancient lane. Our evidence identifies open space provision required. The area surrounding Norton Green is within NHDC. Our plan cannot designate land outside of the boundary. See also response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). It is considered that the policy wording read together with the NPPF para 116 covers the suggestion regarding impact assessment. No change.
1286	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	The A1(M) forms a barrier to expansion westwards. This should be kept as agricultural land. Nearby hamlets and villages should retain their identifies and not be incorporated in an extended Stevenage.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). The three urban extensions are required in order to meet our OAN. No change.
1318	974383	Mr Alan Ford	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Any development beyond the A1(M) would be isolated and unconnected. Could result in further loss of the Green Belt beyond. Countryside between Stevenage and Luton is the finest in the County and should be preserved. Unsure how access via Meadway can be improved without further degradation of Meadway itself.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 1278 (land outside the boundary) and 21 (HO2 access). Policies require new settlements to provide community facilities and services to avoid issues of isolation. No change.
1342	974299	Mr David Morgan	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Infrastructure concerns. Bessemer Drive and Meadway are small, single lane roads. Congestion onto surrounding roads will increase. Extra traffic, mixed with cycleways, pedestrians, horses and children is a hazard. Development will require extensive infrastructure. Loss of one of last rural areas for outdoor pursuits.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 21 (HO2 access), 902 (infrastructure) and 343 (open spaces). No change.
1367	981988	Herts Against the Badger Cull	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	There is a small badger sett on the northern boundary. The location of the sett must be taken into account. However, the sett is on the boundary of SUDs and green space on the plans; there is also further green space to the north. Development will not pose a problem unless housing is put in this part of the site. HO2 would have the least devastating effect on wildlife, woodlands and green corridors.	Noted. No change.
1379	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Missing an opportunity at Stevenage West. A larger scheme would allow for more local services. NHDC have a duty to cooperate.	See response to comment 1278 (land outside the boundary). Our plan safeguards land to enable a wider scheme if NHDC choose to progress this. No change.
1794	778064	Saving North Herts Green Belt	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Do not object to HO2, as long as plans remain. This area is barren agricultural land with minimal hedgerows and ancient woodland. The woodland and public footpath would be protected as allotments (which is positive), along with open space.	Support welcomed.

1829	971985	Mr Robin Dickens	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Should use existing brownfield sites for housing. Stevenage is now largely a dormitory town for London and it is already much larger than originally planned.	See responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
1855	774013	Mr Neave (landowner)	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Landowner objection to HO2. The combination of planning obligations, abnormal infrastructure costs and ransom payment sought by SBC means a competitive return is not produced.	Noted. Negotiations being undertaken by SBC as landowner have no relationship with the Local Plan. See response to comment 30 (housing mix). No change.
1859	774017	The Titmuss Family (landowner)	Policy HO2: Stevenage West	Landowner objection to HO2. The combination of planning obligations, abnormal infrastructure costs and ransom payment sought by SBC means a competitive return is not produced.	See response to comment 1855 (landowner objection). No change.
22	970259	Picture SRL	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plan fails to address secondary education needs. No account of HCC aspirations for a secondary school in North Stevenage. HO3 should add secondary education as a requirement and provide school playing fields and open space in Green Belt. HO3 precludes bus only link to the new school from the east.	The Local Education Authority have confirmed they are satisfied that the Plan provides sufficient secondary school capacity. No change.
52	432515	Mr Glen Kitchener	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Road infrastructure will not support more traffic. Land is part of NHDC, not SBC. Green Belt removal will impact property values. Adding affordable homes to this premier housing area would be disastrous.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 30 (housing mix). HO3 is entirely within the Borough boundary. Loss of property values cannot be taken into account in plan-making or decision taking. No change.
70	342442	Mr Denis Kingslake	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Building on this Green Belt would be a serious loss to residents. The small part that would remain has no footpaths. Housing should not be built too close to power lines for health reasons. Research should be carried out to determine the effect in Great Ashby.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses). HO3 requires buffers to be provided around pylons in accordance with statutory guidelines. No change.
88	965121	Dr Enric Vilar	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Green Belt provides separation between Stevenage and Graveley and prevents urban sprawl. Plans to build 800 homes are disproportionate and out of keeping with local low-density housing, it would alter the character of the area and diminish the quality of the remaining open space. The west of HO3 is a flood risk area. The gradient of land means flooding for existing homes will be exacerbated. No evidence this will be mitigated. Congestion on North Road will be made worse. Policy does not guarantee community facilities will be provided. No provision for secondary school provision within this area.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 932 (flood risk), 949 (traffic), 1318 (community facilities) and 22 (secondary school provision). The location of the secondary access point will be determined at the masterplanning stage, in accordance with the Highways Authority. No change.
101	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 and NHDC proposal will deliver a sustainable urban extension, contributing to the OAN of both areas, and is a good example of effective cross-boundary working with the HMA. Development would be close to Lister Hospital, one of the town's largest employers.	Support welcomed.
102	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support HO3. Co-ordinated joint Master Planning will ensure comprehensive provision of amenities on site and across administrative boundaries	Support welcomed.
103	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.22. HO3 and NHDC proposal will deliver a sustainable urban extension, contributing to the OAN of both areas, and is a good example of effective cross-boundary working with the HMA. Development would be close to Lister Hospital, one of the town's largest employers.	Support welcomed.
104	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.23. HO3 and NHDC proposal will deliver a sustainable urban extension, contributing to the OAN of both areas, and is a good example of effective cross-boundary working with the HMA. Development would be close to Lister Hospital, one of the town's largest employers. Joint Master Planning will ensure a comprehensive, high quality and fully integrated scheme.	Support welcomed.
105	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.24. Development could provide a fully integrated access and transportation strategy (including necessary improvements to the local road network), designed and delivered jointly by the landowners and developers in both SBC and NHDC.	Support welcomed.

106	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.25. The cross-boundary urban extension should provide the infrastructure and local services/facilities required to meet the needs generated by the development. Joint Master Planning can ensure infrastructure and facilities/services are located to efficiently serve the whole development	Support welcomed.
107	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.25. The cross-boundary urban extension should provide the infrastructure and local services/facilities required to meet the needs generated by the development. Joint Master Planning can ensure infrastructure and facilities/services are located to efficiently serve the whole development	Support welcomed.
108	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support para 9.28. HO3, and adjacent development in NHDC could contribute to meeting the need for aspirational homes, as part of an integrated high quality urban extension	Support welcomed.
113	342198	Mr Steve Durrant	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	H03 is Green Belt for a purpose. It should not be changed or destroyed. Forster Country is regularly used by many and has historical value. Concerns over transport effects on North Road. The attempt to compromise and preserve the small country park is not enough.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). An area of Forster Country has been retained to ensure historic assets, countryside and opportunities for recreation are protected. No change.
138	969685	Mr Gary Huskinson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to new homes North of Stevenage. North Road cannot take anymore traffic at peak times. We need to preserve some of the best walking and countryside wildlife spots in the town that many people use daily. This proposal should be scrapped, there are lots more areas double the size west of Stevenage.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). Land west of Stevenage, within the borough, is already allocated for housing. Our Plan cannot allocate land outside of the Borough. No change.
144	969701	Beej Patel	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Disgusted at plans to build a large new community that incorporates social housing in the most affluent part of Stevenage. Object to this development particularly as access will be from North Road.	Some level of affordable housing is required within all new developments. We have a demand for this across the Borough. See also comment 949 (traffic). No change.
170	969925	Ms Maria Camilleri	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country should be kept intact, it is the one thing residents are truly proud of. Beautiful countryside all over Britain should be saved.	See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
172	770043	Mr David Sully	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt should only be developed in Exceptional Circumstances. HO3 is an area of natural beauty and historic links to E.M Forster. It has health benefits. Already lost a lot of open space. Don't we need farmland? Infrastructure concerns.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
175	910641	Mr & Mrs Bernard Drummond	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on the natural countryside of Foster Country.	See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
176	770689	Dr Robin Bailey	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country forms an essential part of Stevenage's history. Green Belt should be left until all suitable brownfield sites have been redeveloped. Will put extra load on the existing road network. Stevenage has had more than its share of building over the years.	See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first) and 949 (traffic). No change.
177	341923	Dr John S Alabaster	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	<p>SBC has failed to preserve Forster Country. Proposals do not fulfil the stated objectives of maintaining and enhancing the environment and protecting the openness of Forster Country. They enclose a small portion of Green Belt. As well as its historical interest, the Green Belt has health benefits, geological interest and prevents urban coalescence.</p> <p>The leaflet map is misleading - an extra parcel of land is also being included. This shuts off all views from the footpath. Housing targets must be questioned - the imposition of government targets has interfered with SBC's previously balanced local view to protect Forster Country. More development should be supported in the north of the country or through one or more new towns. Providing more homes will attract commuters, not just local people. It will increase congestion, pollution and over-pumping of the aquifer.</p>	<p>See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park).</p> <p>The leaflet map broadly identifies the key proposals, it does not provide detailed site boundaries. Our evidence suggests that our housing target is appropriate. See also responses to comments 1160 (housing target and who gets new homes), 121 (new New Town), 949 (traffic) and 902 (infrastructure). Development is required locally to meet local needs. No change.</p>

180	969936	Inna John	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Appreciate the need for new homes, but not on Green Belt. This will cause loss of ecology, including bird species. There is no major road access this side of town and congestion on North Road. Could increase flood risk to existing houses. Loss of recreation and agricultural land. E. M. Forster was inspired by the land.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 949 (traffic) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
181	969939	Mr Don Cooper	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	Noted. No change.
182	342869	Mrs Laura Woodward	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to building on Forster Country and the loss of a beautiful landscape of historic interest.	See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
184	969944	Ms Jayne Cowell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on conservation area and Forster Country, due to: Loss of green space, wildlife, access to recreation in the countryside. Impact on infrastructure, e.g. North Road/Graveley Road congestion, Doctor and hospital waiting times, School capacity, Social services/local authority - struggling to cope with existing families and their associated issues, Police cuts to service.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure). No change.
185	342824	David & Deirdre Ward	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around increased traffic congestion and accidents, particularly at North Road/Graveley Road junction. This is the only major accessible Green Belt/countryside in the area, preserve to maintain quality of life. Size of development (noting NHDC proposals) will destroy the rural character. Alternative sites are available in brownfield/redevelopment areas/adding to existing developments or at West of Stevenage.	See response to comments 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first) and 138 (Stevenage West). No change.
186	969947	Ms Rachel TeWinkel	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Forster Country is an important part of British literary heritage and must be left alone.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
195	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	No evidence of exceptional circumstances to build HO3. Surrounding roads are already at capacity in rush hour. The housing density proposed is too high. Retain Green Belt to protect area of national literary interest and maintain ease of access to open countryside.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 752 (dwelling estimates). The actual number of homes to be provided will be subject to detailed masterplanning. No change.
198	969959	Ms Beryl Alabaster	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to loss of Green Belt and Forster Country, with its historic links. Loss of panoramic views of the Chilterns mentioned by Forster. Loss of a health and recreational amenity. The population is aging so the need for close access to countryside will increase.	See response to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
199	969965	Amendeep Kaur	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to houses being built between old Stevenage and Graveley.	Noted. No change.
203	342026	Mr Clive Brackenbury	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country is important. SBC have made a good compromise, but question why NHDC want to put a large development on Forster Country when land is available to the north west of Hitchin.	Support welcomed. See response to comment 919 (land within NHDC). No change.
209	969972	Pavenn Kaur	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building houses north of St. Nicholas church.	Noted. No change.
221	969974	Mr Ian Lines	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This is Green Belt. Need a clear land belt between Stevenage and Gravely. Object to loss of green lung.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
222	969978	Ms Annette Lines	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. A green lung should be maintained.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
223	969980	Mr Scott King	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to housing north of St Nicholas Church up to the Stevenage boundary.	Noted. No change.

224	921478	Selby	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to: Encroachment on land known as Forster country, a valuable landscape asset and conservation area. Encroachment on Green Belt which maintains separation between Stevenage and Graveley. This will exacerbate existing traffic congestion. NHDC are proposing larger development adjacent to HO3 - greater than described in the Stevenage plan. Makes no sense to consider the two halves separately. Their area is isolated from Stevenage. Facilities and infrastructure need to be agreed with NHDC. A large convenience store is proposed. Will there be a neighbourhood centre for the new development?	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 949 (traffic). HO3 will not be considered completely separately from land within NHDC. See also responses to comment 591 (delivery of a wider scheme) and 1318 (community facilities). No change.
226	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of agricultural land and Forster country, with only a small part left as Country Park. Not clear how the new park will be accessed. Urban sprawl and loss of identity for villages of Graveley and possibly Weston. Proposed access via North Road would add to congestion.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
233	973034	Hart	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Can't build under power lines, so more Green Belt is being removed than would otherwise be necessary for 800 dwellings. Disagree with conclusions of Heritage Impact Assessment. Impact will be significant. Existing congestion on the B197 will be exacerbated by new access points.	Noted. Our evidence acknowledges there will be some impact on the historic assets. See also responses to comments 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
237	969983	Mr Steve Thomas	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. This is Green Belt. Loss of valuable agricultural land, valuable area for recreation and wildlife habitats. Increased traffic congestion and pressure on local infrastructure.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 949 (traffic) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
238	341934	Mr John D Amess	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 would involve destruction of a major part of the essential 'green area/green lung' north of Stevenage New Town.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
239	969984	Mr Richard Everett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. The expansion will greatly affect the local countryside.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
244	969988	Manel Tenuwara	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country.	Noted. See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
247	969990	Mr Paul Griffin	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Great North road and Corey's Mill Lane are already congested. There are insufficient primary school places already. The hospital and GP's are at capacity. Green Belt has recreational use and is Forster country.	See response to 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
248	969998	Mr James Simpson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to loss of countryside on the doorstep and building on Forster Country.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
249	973479	Mrs Scott	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will exacerbate existing congestion at J8 and rat-running through villages. Green Belt should protect sprawl into Weston, Gravely and Chesfield. School provision is not adequately addressed. SBC and NHDC should develop west of Stevenage and/or a new garden city instead, which could have its own infrastructure, jobs, arable land, with no village and ancient woodlands.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 902 (infrastructure), 121 (new New Town) and 138 (Stevenage West). No change.
252	970003	Mr Graham Morris	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country. It is the only countryside readily accessible to local residents. Combined with NHDC plans - most of this countryside will vanish.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
253	342487	Mr Alan Lines	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to loss of Green Belt and the traffic effects on Graveley.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). No change.
256	973406	Mrs Susan Attwood	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country size is reduced. Power lines pose health risk to residents. Increases congestion on North Road. Reduce the area of housing to leave more green space. Set a threshold for amount of population increase before there must also be a widening of North Road.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 70 (pylon buffer) and 949 (traffic). No change.
257	922323	Mr John Morgan	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This is Green Belt and Forster Country. It will adversely impact existing residents, particularly due to increased traffic.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
262	970576	Ms Jacqueline Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country fields/views should be preserved and built around.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
265	970577	Mr Geoff Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster country fields should be preserved, built around.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.

268	970578	Senake Wickremasinghe	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 would change the nature of the area. Impact from the increased traffic onto North Road. Dangerous for vehicles entering North Road from existing housing estates. Loss of lovely unspoilt area immortalised by E H Forster. Housing is required but not at the expense of green space.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
285	970580	Ms Penny Lines	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt should be retained. Additional traffic will cause problems. Concern this will join up Stevenage and Graveley and Graveley will loose its village identity.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). No change.
286	452235	Mr Stephen McPartland MP	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This is Forster Country and has historical significance. There is disagreement on the geographic extent of this area. SBC definition is arbitrary and not justified with evidence. It appears to be solely for the purpose of enabling NHDC to build homes in their area of Forster Country. The site cannot be viably developed and SBC has confirmed it has not been market tested for housing and is more suitable for employment. No exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 284 (achievability of site). Developers have options on the land and a draft masterplan has been developed. No change.
291	970579	Ms Christine Worsdell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This is Green Belt. The infrastructure cannot cope with demand for traffic, sewerage, land drainage and the hospital. Congestion and parking are already problematic. Building more homes, creating more local traffic will be a disaster.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). No change.
308	970585	Ms Victoria King	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country and the loss of countryside in such a crowded town. Increased housing and population will overstretch the hospital and other services.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
309	342843	Mr Brian White	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
311	922327	Marlene Raftery	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on the Green Belt and Forster country, joining Graveley and Stevenage, loss of wildlife habitat, loss of recreational walking routes and increased traffic on North Road. There are other areas where housing could be built in and around Stevenage.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 949 (traffic) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
314	970671	Mr Tony Nye	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country. This is beautiful countryside, widely used by walkers and horse riders.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
319	970673	Ms Becs Hobbs	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
323	970682	Ms Adele Jackson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Appreciate the need for new homes but HO3 will increase traffic congestion; North Road, Hitchin Road and A1(M) particularly. There is no way of widening North Road. If growth is required, access off the A1(M) is necessary. Development to the west has available land, and with new infrastructure of housing and shops would be of benefit to nearby residents.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 138 (Stevenage West). No change.
328	970930	Mr G Ridgley	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster country. This would lose an area of natural beauty and ruin the existing residential area. Green Belt is used for recreation. More and more is being lost. This must stop. Wildlife would be lost. Empty buildings should be used for housing.	See responses to 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
341	342071	Mrs Carolyn Campbell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This proposal will devastate local residents, spoil a part of Forster Country Green Belt, ruin the opportunity for exercise, destroy Graveley, have a significant impact on local wildlife and cause major traffic congestion.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses, 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
342	970931	Mr Terence Rampling	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of Green Belt and open space for recreation. People have come from around the world to experience Forster Country. The proposal would cut Forster Country in half. Existing infrastructure is inadequate.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
347	974000	Historic England	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to part of allocation within the conservation area. This would result in considerable harm to the significance of the conservation area. Disagree with the HIA assessment conclusions for this area. The links with EM Forster are a key part of the listing description for Rook's Nest House. This important element of literary landscape fits with the setting of that property. Wording amendments suggested for criterion m.	Noted. Our evidence acknowledges there will be some impact on the historic assets, but that the need for housing outweighs the harm. No change.

361	962420	Angela Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Green Belt and Forster Country. The area is regularly flooded, this will increase the problem. There is a huge variety of plants and wildlife, and public footpaths, and the area is well used by many. Loss of Green Belt does not meet government guidelines. This area provides separation between Stevenage and Graveley and prevents urban sprawl. It would destroy the character of Stevenage 'Old Town' and the hamlet of Chesfield. This is not a special case and should not be permitted.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
384	342129	Mrs Anne Conchie	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Why are RoW in HO3 not given Green Lane status (as in Policy NH3). It is not enough to keep it as an alleyway between houses or a pavement. The A1(M) and railway present obstacles to walkers trying to travel east-west north of Stevenage. This housing covers the paths needed leaving about 400m of field with no RoW between it and Graveley. The government is encouraging walking for health - this will make it harder. HO3 should be removed.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). HO3 requires RoW to be retained or relocated within the development site. No change.
391	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Power lines limit developable land and are harmful. Bus services are inadequate. This will lead to increased traffic congestion. The site has no infrastructure - schools, shops, GP surgeries etc. Development will cut off a green corridor running through Whitney Wood. HO3 is Grade 3 agricultural, which is in short supply. Green Belt land is used by many walkers and horse riders. Exceptional circumstances would mean we are not reaching our housing targets? The focus should be on replacing existing old stock. Replacement at a higher density would mean more units, without loss of Green Belt. The scale of development, including NHDC proposals, make it unsustainable. No presentation of a holistic approach. What happened to 10,000 homes to the west of A1(M).	Land beneath the pylons will provide open space/landscaping provision, so will not be wasted. See also response to comment 70 (pylon buffer). See responses to 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 1850 (balance of land uses), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 190 (Brownfield first), 591 (delivery of a wider scheme) and 138 (Stevenage West). No change.
405	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	No objection to the self build requirement in principle and support the initiative. Recommend policy wording is amended to allow self build plots to revert to being conventional build plots by the developer, if not taken up after two years of promotion.	Support welcomed. See response to comment 403.
409	974043	Mr James Salmon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Planning of housing to the north has not been linked up with other councils. Doctors surgeries are planned for, but these have not been delivered in previous experience.	See responses to comments 591 (delivery of a wider scheme) and 1404 (land within NHDC). The provision of healthcare facilities will be subject to requirements at the time. No change.
413	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Proposals for SBC and NHDC, will come within 400 metres of Graveley, effectively creating coalescence.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
427	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Proposals for SBC and NHDC, will come within 400 metres of Graveley, effectively creating coalescence.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
431	341724	National Grid	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is crossed by, or close to, IP/HP apparatus. National Grid policy is to retain existing overhead lines in-situ. Prefer buildings not to be built directly beneath lines. Statutory safety clearances must not be infringed. Land beneath and adjacent to the line route should be used to make a positive contribution to the site. National Grid design guidelines should be used.	See response to comment 418 (power lines). No change.
443	432516	Mr Mark Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country Green Belt. This will have a significant negative effect on the environment and quality of life. Green Belt laws ensure we maintain a balance of development and health and well-being. The plan over-steps this position. It will destroy the town's limited history. Do not have sufficient infrastructure.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.

460	974795	Active4Less	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Keen to preserve and develop the fitness club. Happy to consider relocation to a suitable location if it allows optimal implementation of the plan and continued business in this area. In relation to para. 9.27, the club wish to participate in any future developments for sports and healthy lifestyle provision to support Policy HC8.	Noted. It will be for the developers to deliver the infrastructure required, not the Borough Council. No change.
478	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support HO3. The allocation reflects extensive assessment of the scheme's deliverability. It will make a significant contribution to OAN. Expected delivery is 150dpa. A draft Masterplan has been prepared, which enables development in SBC alone or as a cross-boundary scheme. Seek to bring forward a planning application at the earliest opportunity. Support evidence based approach and appropriate mitigation to minimise negative impact on conservation area. Wording should say 'up to 800 units'. Clarification on self-build requested. Concerned no evidence to support this and the site is not suitable. Affordable housing should be subject to viability. Evidence does not demonstrate more than 30% can be achieved. Requirements for supported and sheltered housing should be based on evidence of demand. Request confirmation that some affordable housing can be offset within this tenure. Requirements for community facilities should be subject to demand. Seek clarification on school provision - just land or built out? Parts (k) and (l) are standard requirements and not required in HO3. RoW criteria should allow for diversion, where necessary. Amendment suggested for vi. and Para 9.24.	Support welcomed. Approximately 800 dwellings allows flexibility and reflects the most up-to-date masterplan for this site. No change. See response to comment 30 (housing mix). No change. Our IDP has been updated to reflect the most up-to-date information from infrastructure providers. This should provide further clarification in relation to schools provision. Detailed design elements, i.e. RoW's, will be dealt with at the masterplanning / application stage. Do not consider amendment to criteria vi. is necessary. Further detail on access is provided under IT1 . No change.
504	619933	Natural England	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Grade 3 agricultural land. When considering land use change, the permanency of the impact on soils is an important consideration. Policies must take account of the impact on land and soil resources and the wide range of vital functions (ecosystem services) they provide in line NPPF. We would also have expected the Sustainability Appraisal to consider this.	The SA has been updated to consider this issue. No change to the plan required.
525	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Para 9.22 is untrue - states land 'HAS' been removed from the Green Belt. It has not. Should say 'will have to be removed'. Accordingly, many people may believe removal of this land is a 'fait accompli' and have given up on defending this land. Consultation should be re-done. Object to HO3 Green Belt release.	This version of the Plan is the final version to be examined by the Planning Inspector. The wording reflects Plan policies. The statutory consultation requirements have been met. See also response to comment 190 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
541	342647	Mr Edward Pugh	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 Green Belt release. Previous objections ignored. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. Loss of Green Belt would undermine the NPPF purposes. Wildlife and cultural heritage will be lost forever. Green Belt has successfully encouraged brownfield development. HO3 would degrade quality of life for residents. Recent developments at the Lister have increased traffic and parking problems. New building would add to this. It is unfair for Stevenage to continue to expand.	See response to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
554	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Welcome inclusion of a site for a primary school. Support the requirement for the development to be capable of being fully integrated with a wider cross-boundary scheme, and the masterplanning of the area as a whole, particularly having regard to new schools.	Support welcomed.
595	342257	Mrs Margaret Gibson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to removal of Green Belt and building on Forster Country.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). No change.
602	976265	Patricia Samuel	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Objects to over-development of North of Stevenage and traffic impacts.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
604	342319	Mrs Vivienne Hamilton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development of HO3 will break the promise made to residents to preserve this area. It will subsume Graveley into Stevenage and increase traffic problems on North Road. Homes should be on brownfield land.	See responses to comments (impacts of Green Belt release) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
608	342770	Mr Martin Tilley	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development of HO3 would make Stevenage an even less desirable place to live and be contrary to regeneration objectives. Forster Country should be preserved.	Noted. See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.

610	342305	Mr & Mrs Haesler	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to North of Stevenage due to loss of Green Belt.	See response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
611	976565	Mrs S Wolton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to North of Stevenage due to loss of open space and traffic concerns.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
612	976274	Mr A Whitaker	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Green Belt. The density will have a great impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Traffic problems will increase.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
613	976278	V L Humphries	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around loss of greenbelt and increased traffic congestion.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). No change.
614	976284	Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to North of Stevenage due to loss of beautiful, green area.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
617	976292	A Webb	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
620	976293	Lisa Salt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of Forster Country and Graveley becoming part of Stevenage. Traffic congestion would be exacerbated. Not enough parking will be provided. North Stevenage needs a park/green space.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 949 (traffic), 85 (parking standards) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
624	976294	P Salt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object due to concerns around traffic and Graveley becoming part of Stevenage.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
630	976297	M Bains	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around traffic.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). No change.
633	976298	Jean Archer	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the loss of an important heritage and environmental site.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
635	976300	Kim Pollok	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around the lack of capacity at Lister Hospital and traffic generation.	See responses to 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). No change.
637	976305	Mr David Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around lack of infrastructure, transport and loss of countryside. Brownfield sites, factory areas and the town centre should be used for housing.	See responses to 902 (infrastructure), 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
640	976308	Elizabeth Robinson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around impacts on healthcare, schools and transport infrastructure and loss of 'Forster Country'.	See responses to 902 (infrastructure) and 113 (country park). No change.
644	976309	Courtney Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is a flood plain. Concerns around traffic issues.	See responses to comments 932 (flood risk) and 949 (traffic). No change.
646	976311	H Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country, flooding, traffic, wildlife and Green Belt.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
647	976312	Mr C Zanfardino	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Concerns around traffic concerns and overall expansion of Stevenage.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 949 (traffic) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
649	976313	R Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Plan ignores NHDC proposals for additional homes and traffic/parking impacts. Flooding has not been considered. There are plenty of Brownfield sites that could be used instead. So much of the plan is not explained, it is difficult for people to understand the impacts and make informed decisions.	Noted. See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1404 (land within NHDC), 949 (traffic), 932 (flood risk) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
651	976315	Mr R A Robinson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around impacts on schools, health and transport infrastructure, and loss of Foster Country Green Belt land.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure), 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
653	976316	Mr and Mrs C Fielder	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Area should be retained as a 'Green Lung' for the town.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
654	342718	S M Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
658	976320	Mr and Mrs Pitcher	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.

659	976321	Mr Andrew Pickard	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
660	976322	Mrs C Pickard	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of countryside.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
664	342727	Mr A Sperber	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
666	976327	Mr and Mrs T and P Morgan	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
669	342494	J.A. Longfellow	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to development of Forster Country Green Belt.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt release). No change.
670	909233	Mrs Madeline Lovelock	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country and loss of Green Belt.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt release). No change.
671	976430	Mr David Hoxby	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
675	342558	Mr John Moir	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of countryside and adverse impact on traffic and local facilities.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic) and 113 (country park). No change.
676	341833	Stevenage League Of Hospital Friends	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
677	976444	Mr R G Wallace	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the loss of cultural heritage and amenity.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
678	976447	Jean Farrier	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
679	976456	Mr Darren Wright	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
680	976461	Erika Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
681	976465	Inga Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
682	976467	Jessica Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
683	976472	Mr Jason Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
684	976475	Susan Farrier	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
685	342253	Mr & Mrs George	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. This is the only open space in the north. It will exacerbate traffic problems.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
687	976478	P Lewin	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development will destroy beautiful land.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
688	976482	Mr B Jeffery	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country and increasing traffic near Lister Hospital.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
690	976487	Elaine Gwyther	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
692	342067	Ms Christine Callingham	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will exacerbate traffic problems and destroy Forster Country heritage. Why are there no plans to build west of the A1(M)? This is the most obvious place to develop, especially with A1(M) widening.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 138 (Stevenage West). No change.
694	982374	I A Friston	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to loss of amenity space.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
695	976497	Anil Chohan	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.

700	976507	Murrell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
701	342655	Mr Philip Reeves	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Insufficient thought given to already strained road infrastructure. Flooding around Matthews Close will be made worse. Insufficient school places available.	See responses to 949 (traffic), 932 (flood risk) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
702	976509	Dr and Mrs Bachelor	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Stevenage is already overcrowded and an area used for walking will be lost.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
703	976518	The Draper Family	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of amenity, traffic issues and loss of green areas.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
704	976520	Mr and Mrs Chahal	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
706	910638	Virginia and Rodney Cole	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. It is used for amenity purposes.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
707	342641	Mr Ronald Pratt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of Green Belt and open space.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
709	976527	Rob and Sally Gill	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. This is a green lung for the town and well used by many.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
714	976537	Mr P Edwards	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country and Green Belt. This area is unique and must be protected. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. Plan wording is false suggested site has already been released.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 525 (wording). No change.
715	922427	Edna Holt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
717	342755	Mr Mervyn Tervett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country and traffic issues.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
721	976549	Mr and Mrs Cosham	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
722	922429	Diana Hayward	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development will exacerbate flooding and traffic congestion. Local roads will become rat runs. Question how the Hospital will cope. No houses should be built anywhere near Pylons, regardless of a buffer. Parking is already an issue. Loss of open space/Forster Country/Green Belt/historic assets. NPPF says housing needs are not 'exceptional circumstances'. Been told contractors have been appointed, so is it a fait accompli?	See responses to 949 (traffic), 932 (flood risk), 902 (infrastructure), 70 (pylon buffer), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 190 (exceptional circumstances). Developers have options on the site, but the plan will still be subject to independent examination. No change.
723	978639	Mr E. W. Hayward	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Proposals include loss of nearly all of Forster Country. Historic assets are being destroyed. Infrastructure cannot cope. Concerns around flooding, loss of green belt and pylons. NPPF says housing needs are not 'exceptional circumstances'.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 902 (infrastructure), 932 (flood risk), 70 (pylon buffers), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 190 (exceptional circumstances)
724	342732	Steele	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
725	976557	J Mills	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
727	342738	Mr Peter Stones	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 (and further NHDC proposals). This is far too much on Green Belt.	See response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
729	976561	Mrs A B Munroe	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
764	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Support HO3. The LEP stresses the need for cross-boundary working to deliver holistic, sustainable, long term solutions. The LEP will seek an increase in residential numbers, where appropriate.	Support welcomed. See responses to comments 752 (dwelling estimates).

772	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Significant concerns regarding wastewater in relation to this site. Significant drainage infrastructure is likely to be required to ensure capacity is brought forward ahead of development. SBC should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy. A planning condition is also likely to be required to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation.	Noted. See responses to comments 770 (wastewater) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
818	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the removal of Green Belt, lack of access, increase in traffic and health impacts of close proximity to pylons.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 949 (traffic) and 70 (pylon buffer). No change.
830	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 on the grounds of loss of Green Belt, access issues, increase in traffic and health impacts associated with building near electricity pylons.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 949 (traffic) and 70 (pylon buffer). No change.
837	974517	Mr Pritesh Vadolia	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to removal of HO3 from the Green Belt. Transport links and subsequent traffic impacts are not addressed. Delays could impact emergency services and pollution would be increased. Loss of Green Belt will impact wildlife habitats, including protected species and badgers, and will lower quality of life. New homes will put pressure on employment opportunities. Construction of houses limited by electricity pylons.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 70 (pylon buffer). Additional employment opportunities are being provided by the Plan, to ensure a balanced approach. No change.
840	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Removal of HO3 from Green Belt is unnecessary. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. This would set a precedent leading to development north into Graveley. The current boundary is defensible and permanent. No alternative defensible boundary is proposed. Threatens coalescence with Graveley. Requiring developers to facilitate development beyond the boundary, on Green Belt not proposed for release in any formal Local Plan is unjustified. Policy fails to recognise the direct impact on Forster Country. Policy plainly cannot 'preserve or enhance' the area as stated in part 'm'. The mitigation measures in themselves promote a major change to the area.	Noted. See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). Part m aims to mitigate the impact on the conservation area. See also response to comment 347 (conservation area impact). No change.
867	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Court cases have established housing need is NOT sufficient reason to build on Green Belt, especially if it prevents the merger of settlements. Forster Country prevents merger. NHDC & SBC are colluding to build on the Green Belt, with little thought about how the new community will be managed by two councils. There is no natural road barrier between them, just an imaginary line. No mention of the pylons and the wasted space they will take up and who will maintain this land.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 113 (country park). Details such as the management of open spaces will be dealt with at the application stage. It is not a Local Plan issue. No change.
871	342707	Mrs Kath Shorten	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 due to impact on Forster Country and loss of Green Belt. Where is the civic design element?	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts on Green Belt release). The policy requires a Masterplan to be produced and our design policies will ensure a high quality scheme. No change.
872	971160	Mr David Ellis	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to any building on Forster Country for current and future residents who enjoy the whole green belt amenity.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
873	971164	Mr Ian Irving	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plan spoils area of considerable rural charm, which Stevenage lacks. It will impose an unsupportable load on the local road infrastructure. Provision of new infrastructure can further damage the area. The North Road / Graveley Road junction is a recognised hazard. Plans will increase this.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
874	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt Review ignores the presence and significance of Forster Country. The plan makes no case for reviewing Green Belt boundaries. The conclusions must be reviewed in respect of the NPPF structure that Green Belt can only be altered in 'exceptional circumstances'. Access to HO3 will exacerbate traffic conditions.	Our evidence assesses sites against the five Green Belt purposes, as required. The impact on Forster Country and the historic environment is considered in the Historic Impact Assessment. See also responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 949 (traffic). No change.
882	342615	Mr William Penton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country will be destroyed. It offers a beautiful, green amenity space and nationally recognised heritage. It offers health benefits. The loss of Green Belt will be to the detriment of all. Pylons are a health risk. People will have to drive out of town to walk their dogs. This will exacerbate congestion on North Road and the accident-prone junction.	See responses to 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 70 (pylon buffer) and 949 (traffic). No change.

887	342259	Mr Stewart Gillies	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Stevenage has already exceeded its capacity. Neighbouring authorities should be the source for future housing. Providing more homes will result in further pressure for development in the future. Should focus on improving existing. Proposals by SBC, and NHDC, may result in Graveley being swallowed up. This rural area provides a pleasant contrast with the urban development of Stevenage. New homes will increase traffic problems, pollution and will not be sustainable.	Our neighbours have not committed to meeting any of our housing need under the Duty to Co-operate. See also responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
890	973627	Rafiq Kaskar	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The Old Town will lose its character. Development will result in an immense loss of recreational green space. Congestion will increase.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
894	974445	Mr Stuart Walker	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Building on Green Belt is against NPPF. Would destroy the character and views of the conservation area. Wildlife will be destroyed, including endangered (red list) species. This is not assessed in the SA. Local roads will be used as rat runs. Local services e.g. schools, doctors and dentists, are already oversubscribed. Concerns around flooding and increased pollution due to greater traffic. The land provides recreation benefits. Congestion will be increased, impacting emergency services. Will not provide sufficient affordable housing. Already a lack of employment opportunities for young people.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 932 (flood risk), 30 (housing mix) and 837 (employment). Increased levels of affordable homes are encouraged by the Plan. No change.
897	973648	Sheena Kitchener	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	SBC and NHDC plans will destroy Green Belt in an area of natural beauty and literary significance. It will add to existing congestion and pollution. These areas are on the flood plain. It will increase flood risk. Question health impacts of pylons. Appreciate the need for new homes, but SBC must consider the huge negative impacts on existing residents, the environment and historic/cultural assets. These issues negate any possible benefits.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 932 (flood risk) and 70 (pylon buffer). No change.
909	973675	Hannah Kitchener	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Area is completely unsuitable for SBC and NHDC proposals: floodplain, pylons, traffic congestion and pollution on North Road. SBC must consider existing residents. Beautiful countryside, important for well-being and leisure, should be protected. Forster Country has historical significance. It should be a national park. Its loss would be a tragedy for residents and the cultural heritage of the UK.	See responses to comments 932 (flood risk), 70 (pylon buffer), 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
917	973684	Mr Gordon Macdonald	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development will lead to increased flood risk in Wymondley, putting lives and homes in danger. Concerns about increased traffic through Wymondly. This would adversely affect the character of the village. A shame to lose this beautiful area of countryside. Green Belt should be protected at all costs.	See responses to comments 32 (flood risk), 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). No change.
918	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt release does not comply with NPPF purposes or the sequential approach (i.e. PDL first). 'Very special circumstances' not demonstrated. HO3 and NHDC homes will mean Graveley is swallowed up by sprawl. Stevenage would also lose its last area of farmland. The housing target is the upper bound of projections. The calculation makes no allowance for Green Belt constraints. Constraints should be reflected by modifying the response to market signals.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 1160 (housing target). No change.
921	973688	Caroline Partridge	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Disappointed to see Forster Country Green Belt being threatened. Land is used for recreation and is of historical importance. SBC seems intent on ruining heritage rather than cherishing it. Surely there is other land that can be used? A new housing estate would jeopardise the very essence of the Old Town and countryside.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (Brownfield first) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
922	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plans to revise the CA boundary and build on Forster Country will result in a permanent loss of character. Building on the western side of the valley will mean the views from Rooks Nest will be dominated by the new development. This will in no way reflect the views of E M Forster.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.

924	973694	Mrs Dylis Macdonald	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Would result in the destruction of Green Belt. Local towns are merging into one another. There will be no countryside left. This is a flood plain and would increase flood risk for Little Wymondly. It is not suitable for development. Concerns over traffic increase. Don't need more noise and pollution from Stevenage Road.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 932 (flood risk) and 949 (traffic). No change.
927	767033	Mrs June R Pitcher	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The loss of around 50ha of the 260ha of SBC Green Belt seems a disproportionate sacrifice. The requirement for new housing is not an exceptional circumstance. The countryside and footpaths have well-being benefits and are used for recreation. Skylarks (in severe decline in England) use the site. HO3 would allow coalescence of Stevenage and Graveley. The area has historical value. Stevenage is neglecting a chance to enhance its image.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 113 (country park). No change.
940	973715	Mr Phil Cooper	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The absorption of Graveley into urban sprawl will not enhance the town. Building on green spaces is an act of vandalism. Another commuter suburb, without thought to where people will work is short-sighted. Re-develop the entire town centre to provide residential accommodation along with imaginative retail to solve the housing issue.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 190 (Brownfield first) and 837 (employment). No change. Development of the town centre is already being maximised to reduce the need for Green Belt use.
941	772888	Dr Richard Parkinson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Understand the need for affordable homes, but not on Green Belt. The unique literary heritage of the area should be cherished not destroyed. It is a loss to Stevenage and the world.	See responses to comments 113 (country park). No change.
943	341677	Mrs Fiona Hutton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Stevenage is only 2 fields away from homes in Graveley. Land is Grade 3 agricultural, a haven for wildlife, a recreational resource and Green Belt (fulfilling all 5 purposes). This would risk the identity of Graveley and see it subsumed into Stevenage. No exceptional circumstances. The proposals will exacerbate pollution, road safety problems and congestion. The Graveley Village Plan gives high priority to preserving its identity as a village.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 949 (traffic). No change.
947	769262	Mr clive Bell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The plan should protect and develop its historic links not destroy them. Object to building on the Green Belt. The plan should look at long term viability and needs, to provide sustained affordable housing and enhance the character of the town, so that when the needed houses are built it remains a place people are proud to acknowledge.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
950	975182	Kevin Wharton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The Green Belt should be maintained. Housing expansion would have severe impacts on the road network, especially due to the location of the hospital.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). No change.
952	973850	Mr Graham Tooze	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Understand the need for new homes, but this area is not suitable. Roads and junctions cannot cope with more traffic. No second access detailed. No cycle routes close to the site. No secondary school. Assumption is that children will attend already full schools in the Old Town, which will increase traffic on North Road. Development in the Conservation Area should not be allowed. Even outside of the conservation area, the views will be lost. The Country Park is a substantial change to the natural environment. It is currently open fields. The essence of Forster Country will be lost. Access to the park from Weston Road is not suitable. SBC and NHDC proposals will connect Stevenage to Graveley.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). Pedestrian and cycle links will also be required. See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure), 22 (education provision), 347 (conservation area impact), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park). NH8 intends to protect the openness and accessibility of the remainder of Forster Country and not to make significant changes to its function/appearance. No change.
958	973853	Mr Rakesh Magon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
964	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3 (and further homes in NHDC). This Green Belt fulfils all 5 NPPF purposes.	See response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.

966	769624	Marie Courtman	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Should not rely on Calverton Judgement to justify 'exceptional circumstances' - judgements are site specific. The loss of open space to allow urban coalescence/sprawl is contrary to NPPF. As is the loss of sites of historic and cultural importance. No alternatives discussed. Concentrating development West of Stevenage would be more sustainable. Not clear that evidence for the 7,300 target is an accurate assessment of the town's OAN. Concerned this, with other development to the north, will lead to increased traffic and affect access to the hospital.	Our evidence is structured according to the Calverton judgement, it does not rely solely on this. See also responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first), 138 (Stevenage West), 1160 (housing target) and 949 (traffic). No change.
968	342146	Donald Courtman	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Should not rely on Calverton Judgement to justify 'exceptional circumstances' - judgements are site specific. The loss of open space to allow urban coalescence/sprawl is contrary to NPPF. As is the loss of sites of historic and cultural importance. No alternatives discussed. Concentrating development West of Stevenage would be more sustainable. Not clear that evidence for the 7,300 target is an accurate assessment of the town's OAN. Concerned this, with other development to the north, will lead to increased traffic and affect access to the hospital.	See responses to comments 966 (Calverton), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first), 138 (Stevenage West), 1160 (housing target) and 949 (traffic). No change.
970	973864	Mr Ru Litherland	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Value open, green space in and around Stevenage and the cultural connection with E.M Forster. Understand requirement for new housing but continued building violates the principles of 'healthy communities', 'sustainability' and 'Green Belt' which the Plan purports to consider. Cultural, environmental, health and recreational value of Forster Country is too great, council should consider more innovative ideas like converting empty office/retail spaces in town centre.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
972	342391	Ms Jayne Howlett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Villages such as Graveley should not be swallowed up by Stevenage sprawl. Where will the jobs come from? Roads cannot cope with more cars.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 837 (employment) and 949 (traffic). No change.
978	770454	Ms R Stevenson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt land in this area fulfils all five NPPF purposes. Assertion there are 'exceptional circumstances' is specious.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 190 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
980	973871	Mr David Riddell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is beautiful countryside, enjoyed by residents and home to wildlife. There must be more logical and suitable brownfield sites. Road infrastructure is inadequate. Where will these people work? Infrastructure including schools, sewerage and the shopping centre, is inadequate to cope with expansion.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 190 (Brownfield first), 949 (traffic), 837 (employment) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
989	342828	Mrs Jennifer Watson-Usher	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Graveley and Baldock Road do not have the capacity for additional traffic.	Noted. See response to comment 949 (traffic). No change.
993	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Consistently supported a housing target that fully meets OAN. Previously acknowledged that a review of Green Belt boundaries is necessary for SBC and NHDC to meet OAN and supported new allocations at West and North Stevenage, but as urban satellites rather than urban extensions. The plan has taken a pragmatic approach to North Herts being significantly behind Stevenage in its timetable, and still allows for longer term development of cross-border urban extensions.	Support welcomed.
1008	975922	Mr Clive Donaghue	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The Stevenage UTP anticipated that, by 2014, North Road would be over capacity at peak times (with fewer new homes). Neither the Plan, nor the IDP mentions any schemes to mitigate this. Other traffic issues are also not addressed. No consideration of the impact of development on residents whose dwellings are bordering the site to the south. Tall buildings should also be excluded adjacent to the southern site boundary. Support retention of existing rights of way. Object to para 9.22. Worded as if H03 has been removed from the Green Belt already. This is misleading and may reduce the number of objections. The wording should be will, would, should. A correctly worded document should be issued and the consultation period extended.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). Further modelling work has been undertaken since the UTP. Specific transport issues will be dealt with at the application stage. Detailed masterplanning will ensure an appropriate design is achieved that will avoid harm to existing residents. No change. Support welcomed. See response to comment 525 (wording). No change.

1015	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will harm green space and amenities. SBC and NHDC have been sneaky in their approach. If NHDC get plans passed then SBC will be allowed to build without the residents having a truly transparent opportunity to comment. Power lines are harmful to health.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 70 (pylon buffer). SBC have gone over and above the statutory requirements for Local Plan consultation. No change.
1031	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Question whether the proposed development North of Stevenage will spoil/destroy any or all of Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
1038	342675	Mr Michael M. B. Ross	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Question why NHDC and SBC want to destroy culture and history enjoyed and appreciated by residents. Authorities have a duty to protect these assets. Concerns that traffic problems will be exacerbated and wildlife destroyed. Graveley is a historic village and Forster Country is a Stevenage jewel, which is the only remaining piece of protected Green Belt in Stevenage.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 949 (traffic) and 1850 (balance of land uses). Other areas of Green Belt will remain within the Borough boundary. No change.
1044	973849	Mr Chris Nathan	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development of Green Belt should be reconsidered. Are no other options available, or a lower target? Land within the borough should be used, there is plenty of park land. Concerns around traffic congestion and accidents.	See responses to comments 919 (impact of Green Belt release), 190 (Brownfield first), 1160 (housing target) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1071	977353	Dr and Mrs D L Senanayake	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building north of Stevenage due to increased traffic causing congestion and accidents. A smaller estate to the plan of Letchworth Garden City (albeit in a small way) would create a desirable area, attract a better clientele, raise the standard of living and attract high end shops to the New Town. Forster Country should be retained as it is.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 113 (country park). No change.
1081	974740	Felix Power	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Building here, along with NHDC proposals, will have a huge impact on the character of Graveley and become an outpost of Stevenage. The fields are full of wildlife, walkers and cyclists and include Rooks Nest and Forster Country.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1087	464410	Mrs Verity Yates-Mercer	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	SBC has a duty to protect Forster Country, a world renowned heritage site. Avoid rolling back Green Belt here. Develop non-Green Belt sites within the Borough and West of Stevenage. HO3 is not market tested for housing. At least the conservation boundary is protected, although the plan alludes this space will act as a gateway to the countryside, which is not true due to NHDC proposals.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first), 138 (Stevenage West), 284 (achievability of site) and 919 (land within NHDC). No change.
1088	974652	Mr Paul Schimmel	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of countryside. Lack of job prospects for new residents. No plans for new employment, so commuter traffic will increase. Forster Country is a great local asset. 'Exceptional circumstances' are not demonstrated.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 837 (employment), 113 (country park) and 190 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1131	974607	Mr Peter Gordon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Opposed to building on Forster Country. The area cannot sustain this number of houses. Occupied by people who are not residents of Stevenage, putting more pressure on local services. This is the last piece of agricultural land in the town, so is of much value to people and wildlife.	See responses to 113 (country park), 902 (infrastructure) and 1850 (balance of land uses). Other farmland will remain within the Borough Boundary. No change.
1133	342017	Ms Lisa Bouchat	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The A1(M) cannot cope with increased population. This is Metropolitan Green Belt - no co-ordination with the London Authority. Forster Country has historic and farmland value. SBC has not bought forward all land before considering Green Belt. The plan takes no account of infrastructure requirements.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park), 190 (Brownfield first) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1138	974452	Mr Andrew Harvey	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	The north is already densely populated, further development will cause significant over-crowding. New, high density developments will lead to increased congestion and parking issues. This will reduce quality of life and place untenable demand on local amenities.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.

1146	974448	J.A England	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3, and NHDC plans, will merge Stevenage and North Herts. Green Belt should prevent sprawl. HO3 is the green lung for the north. Development will alter the character and quality of Forster Country. The remaining area will be insufficient. Development will go against attempts to attract higher earners as it will ruin the area. It will increase flood risk elsewhere. Would increase congestion. No mitigation for this in the plan. No provision for secondary school places. Local Plan states wildlife sites will be protected but wildlife on this area won't be.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 932 (flood risk), 949 (traffic) and 22 (education provision). NH2 protects Wildlife Sites identified by HMWT. HO3 is not a designated Wildlife Site. No change.
1148	974447	Sara Holmes	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	In reality 1,800 homes will be built in conjunction with NHDC. No 'exceptional circumstances'. Target is too high - SBC has overestimated population growth. Development within the conservation area would destroy its rural character. Loss of Green Belt recreational land would have health impacts. Changing the character of the area would cause psychological damage. It would also increase traffic and pollution. The 'country park' is already green space. This will increase traffic and parking issues. HO3 does not meet principles listed under 5.4. The area is a habitat for Skylarks which are protected during nesting season.	See responses to comments 1404 (land within NHDC), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1160 (housing target), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). The country park proposal is designed to formally protect the remaining green space.
1156	341552	Mr Anselm Kuhn	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster is the only 'special' feature in Stevenage. Proposals would wipe this out.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
1159	342592	Mrs Marion Ohlendorf	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plan states HO3 has been removed from Green Belt - it has not (yet). This could discourage people from responding. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. NHDC will build beyond HO3, allowing Stevenage and Graveley to merge. Access to countryside has health benefits. Development would decimate Foster Country. It is the only remaining farmland, has historical significance, affords views of the Chilterns, forms a part of wider walking routes and is a vital wildlife corridor for endangered (Red List) species. NPPF requires the natural and historic environment to be protected and congestion to be minimised. Infrastructure concerns if Stevenage and Graveley merge.	See responses to comments 525 (plan wording), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1162	975307	Melanie Daly	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country - infrastructure already gridlocked.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1175	342277	Mrs Sandie Greed	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Road infrastructure cannot support development to the north. Not necessary to build on Forster Country and Green Belt. This is used for recreation. A better location could be found.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 113 (country park), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1176	975314	Margaret Walker	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Building on Green Belt is against NPPF. Would destroy the character and views of the conservation area. Wildlife will be destroyed, including red list species. This is not assessed in the SA. Local roads will be used as rat runs. Local services e.g. schools, doctors and dentists, are already oversubscribed. Concerns around flooding and increased pollution due to greater traffic. The land provides recreation benefits. Congestion will be increased, impacting emergency services. Will not provide sufficient affordable housing. Already a lack of employment opportunities for young people.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 932 (flood risk), 30 (housing mix) and 837 (employment) and 894 (affordable increase). No change.
1179	341937	Ms Janis Archer	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. Insufficient hospital, doctors and schools capacity. Where will new schools go? Traffic congestion is already severe. More vehicles and pedestrians will increase accidents. The site is Green Belt and Forster Country. Where will wildlife, hedgerows and plants go? Children won't value countryside and farmland as it will be gone.	See responses to 902 (infrastructure), 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1190	977327	Mrs Valerie J Lack	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Green Belt and loss of recreation and open space.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.

1194	922456	Mr Rick Ohlendorf	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plan states HO3 has been removed from Green Belt - it has not (yet). This could discourage people from responding. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. NHDC will build beyond HO3, allowing Stevenage and Graveley to merge. Access to countryside has health benefits. Development would decimate Foster Country. It is the only remaining farmland, has historical significance, affords views of the Chilterns, forms a part of wider walking routes and is a vital wildlife corridor for endangered (Red List) species. NPPF requires the natural and historic environment to be protected and congestion to be minimised. Infrastructure concerns if Stevenage and Graveley merge.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 932 (flood risk), 30 (housing mix) and 837 (employment) and 894 (affordable increase). No change.
1199	977336	Mr Harry Turner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development should be precluded in areas prone to flood risk. NPPF guidelines regarding Green Belt. North Road cannot cope with more traffic, parking and housing, nor can A1(M). Hospital is at breaking point. The leaflet is misleading as it doesn't show NHDC plans to extend development.	See responses to comments 932 (flood risk), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure) and 1404 (land within NHDC). No change.
1201	977342	Mrs D Parry	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plan is contrary to NPPF in relation to the Green Belt and safeguarding heritage assets. HO3 Green Belt should not be built on. This will destroy its character forever. This area provides access to countryside for recreation. The historical connection of this site should be noted.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
1202	975461	Mr R J Senior	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Would permanently destroy a significant proportion of the Green Belt resulting in the loss of important, accessible and well used amenity space. Could not be compensated by a municipal park or other urban spaces. Would give NHDC further reason to develop adjacent to Graveley. Heritage should be preserved and celebrated.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 1404 (land within NHDC). No change.
1214	974786	Janine Salmon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development will destroy open space and swallow up Graveley. Forster Country will no longer exist in its historical sense. Lister hospital can't cope with the additional population and has no space to expand.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1223	342302	Mrs Geraldine Hackett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Roads already suffer from congestion, with ambulances struggling to get through and frequent accidents. HO3 access is not sensible - opposite the exit for the hospital's car park.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). Access arrangements will require further consultation with the Highways Authority to ensure an appropriate approach is taken. No change.
1224	773173	M Wright	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Most homes will be for commuters. Congestion through the North Road access points will impact access to the Lister. Homes will not be a neighbourhood of Stevenage, residents will not be able to afford them. No option to 'roll back' the Green Belt, as HO3 builds up to the SBC boundary and NHDC are proposing more homes beyond this. The Bath and Calverton cases cited are not applicable here.	See responses to comments 1160 (who gets new homes), 949 (traffic), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1238	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Proposals for SBC (including NHDC) will come within 400 metres of Graveley, effectively creating coalescence.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 191 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1240	973815	Dr Kevin Maitland Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development will destroy beautiful countryside and increase congestion on local roads and A1(M). This is bad for business. A1(M) improvements will not solve the issue, 4 lanes are required. There are more than sufficient brownfield sites that have not been considered.	See responses to 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1245	975672	Lorraine Jones	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Proposal would increase congestion on already busy roads. Decision maker should visit the area. So many people use Forster Country. Surely there comes a time to say 'no' to building on the edge of Stevenage.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1251	975677	Christine Dillnutt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green spaces and proximity to countryside are one of the best things about Stevenage. Stevenage will become joined up with housing in NHDC and become one big urban sprawl.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.

1252	975690	Mrs Joanna Maitland-Smith	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Will destroy beautiful countryside and footpaths and increase congestion. Traffic kills industry. Sufficient brownfield sites which have not been considered as alternatives.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1253	975727	Janet Hornby	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Objects to building on green spaces to the north and encroaching on Forster Country. Such an important recreational space must be preserved.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
1255	975775	Mrs Rosemary Last	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Only literary claim to fame which attracts scholars and tourists to the town.	See response to 113 (country park). No change.
1256	341467	Mrs Rachel Sporton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Flood risk and transport issues have not been fully considered. A proper review of flood risk is required. If more traffic is directed through Chancellors Road and Granby Road, current access arrangements will be insufficient. New housing should have access onto North Road via traffic lights. Concerns around increased traffic on North Road - improvements will be required at accident blackspots.	See responses to comments 932 (flood risk) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1257	974442	Jill Gray	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt and Forster Country should be preserved for future generations. No 'exceptional circumstances' to justify destroying countryside when housing will be for people outside the town. Graveley could lose its identity. Traffic issues will be exacerbated further.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park), 190 (exceptional circumstances), 1160 (who gets new homes), and 949 (traffic). No change.
1275	974434	Mr Peter Savage	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Forster Country and Green Belt, and is of considerable benefit to residents. Concerns regarding increased traffic congestion.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1282	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Do not encroach onto Forster Country. It provides a buffer between Stevenage and Graveley.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). No change.
1301	974414	Jo Pullan	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Forster Country and the only nice thing Stevenage has to offer. It is a beautiful part of English Countryside. The A1(M) will not cope and trains are already overcrowded. This area is home to rare newts, bats and beautiful nature.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). The objector has not supported their assertion relating to rare wildlife species. No change.
1302	976124	Glenda Clifton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Local schools and doctors are already over-subscribed. Plan to build more homes without extra infrastructure. Sufficient parking is required.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure) and 85 (parking standards). No change.
1308	976121	Charlotte Conner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns this will increase problems with traffic, parking and over subscribed doctors surgeries and schools. It will devastate the remaining Green Belt areas and reduce quality of life.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 85 (parking standards), 902 (infrastructure), 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1312	975858	Mr Chris Marley	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	SBC have been 'economic' with publicity around HO3 (and the NHDC homes). Using this as a simple way to meet government targets. Loss of Forster Country shows a lack of understanding of the damage that will be caused including endangered wildlife, woodland and hedgerow. Green infrastructure is important for urban area and ecological development. Pylons are detrimental to health. Development will increase flood risk. Housing development will result in loss of farmland.	See responses to comments 1404 (land within NHDC), 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 70 (pylon buffer). No change.
1316	974041	Mrs Jill Richmond	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 development will increase traffic issues in a highly populated area.	See response to comment 949 (traffic). No change.
1321	974366	Lisa Kasperowicz	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Stevenage needs Green Belt.	See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1322	974362	Patricia Milliner	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Green Belt. Roads cannot cope with additional traffic. Parking at the hospital is already an issue. Green space is gradually being eroded. Countryside north of St Nicholas Church is some of loveliest.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 949 (traffic), 85 (parking standards) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1329	974344	Laura Sansom	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 Green Belt should continue to be protected. It provides beautiful scenery and recreation use. Historical connection with E M Forster. It will affect the value of existing homes. Would SBC compensate for this? Traffic congestion is already a big issue. Cannot cope with additional growth.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 52 (property values) and 949 (traffic). No change.

1331	342133	Ms Helen Lumley	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Development must not envelop Graveley. A suitably wide barrier between Graveley and Stevenage housing must be maintained.	See response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1337	974055	Clare Matthews	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Green Belt and heritage assets should be protected. The character of Graveley village will be ruined if it is swallowed up by Stevenage. Question whether the need for housing represents 'Exceptional Circumstances'. Brownfield sites are likely to become available in the future and should be accounted for. The site is in a flood risk area. Concern that increased flood risk has not been considered.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (exceptional circumstances and Brownfield first) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
1338	974304	Mr & Mrs John Annison	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will do nothing to provide low cost housing to the community, while scarring the countryside.	Noted. See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). Affordable homes will be provided in line with the targets set out in the Plan. No change.
1341	974302	Mrs Gill Phoenix	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. Loss of access to recreation land and the feeling of being in open countryside. The development will hem residents in. This will exacerbate congestion on North Road.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1350	976206	Mr Norman Gray	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Green Belt and Forster Country. Land used regularly for recreation. Concern that affordable housing will not be accessible to those that really need it. Development will increase congestion on local roads. With plans approved for 5,000 new homes to the West and a further 5,000, question the need to build on Forster Country. Concerns around loss of identity of Graveley.	Noted. See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). The Plan requires a mix of affordable housing types to be provided, which should aid affordability. See response to comment 949 (traffic). The previous permission for homes west of Stevenage was withdrawn in 2013. The SLAA and Housing Technical Paper details those sites that currently have permission. No change.
1351	974021	Mr Gavin Habershon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Infrastructure cannot cope now, let alone with more development. This would ruin another tranquil area that is currently used by many for leisure activities.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1362	974272	Ann Newman	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country.	See response to 113 (country park). No change.
1365	981988	Herts Against the Badger Cull	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	There are a large number of warrens on the boundary of HO3, which will undoubtedly result in problems for deer, badgers and many species of bird. Development will disrupt the green corridor needed for wildlife and biodiversity. Development is close to a very large and active badger sett and there is evidence that the badgers use HO3 as their foraging ground.	Noted. Badger setts are offered statutory protection, but do not preclude development completely. An area of Forster Country will be protected, and will offer open space for wildlife habitats and foraging. No change.
1369	974257	Mr Martin Price	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Congestion on local roads will be increased. NHDC plans should be made clear, not be in 'small print'. Forster Country is Green Belt with historic value, recreation use and wildlife. It should be used as a selling point for the town. Should be improved, not half built on. The small remaining part will lose everything special about it. Instead create a large Country Park.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 1404 (land within NHDC), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
1372	976047	Sarah-Jane Hackett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to loss of green corridor. Concerns around badgers and other wildlife and countryside being ruined.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1376	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	North of Stevenage is already overcrowded. It does not have any large open spaces. Forster Country will be reduced in size and have the status of a town park. Views and countryside will be destroyed. North Road would effectively be industrialised with development.	See responses to 1850 (balance of land uses) and 113 (country park). No change.
1386	967674	Mr Barry Green	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the development of Forster Country. No infrastructure to support this and no certain plans for sufficient improvements. Lister Hospital cannot cope with demand and local roads are at capacity. Delay expansion until the town centre has been redeveloped.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1394	974083	Eirwen Palmer	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 is Green Belt, used by walkers, cyclists and conservationists and is one of the few natural open spaces around Stevenage. Should not be lost to urban sprawl. Proposal will not preserve and enhance the historic and natural environment asset, Forster Country.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 113 (country park). No change.

1395	972740	Graveley School	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerned around lack of clarity regarding school provision and lack of concrete planning by HCC. Graveley School is vulnerable to such large development. It is oversubscribed. Feel its ethos and quality of education will be lost. Little consideration of increased pollution and traffic. Roads are already congested and will not be able to cope.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1397	979058	Mr John Campbell	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	This proposal will devastate local residents, spoil a part of Forster Country Green Belt land, ruin opportunities for exercise, destroy Graveley, have a significant impact on local wildlife and cause major traffic congestion.	See responses to comments 1850 (balance of land uses), 113 (country park), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1398	973926	Perry Ward	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to building on Forster Country. No reassurances or plans in place to support local road and rail services already beyond capacity, schools, and Lister Hospital. Proposals will destroy large area of natural beauty and threaten to reduce identity of Graveley.	See responses to comments 113 (country park), 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1404	973937	Jacqueline Pond	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Concerns around traffic issues and whether HCC will sort out bus and transport policy. Development will contribute to the loss of Graveley's village status. Concern over lack of GP capacity and education strategy to cope with demand. No evidence of environmental considerations or that the pylons have been properly considered. A lack of integration with NHDC. Need clarity around water supply, foul and surface discharge. Flooding could occur if careful modelling by the EA is not done.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 902 (infrastructure), 1850 (balance of land uses), 70 (pylon buffer), 371 (cross-boundary working) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
1410	976160	Mr James Briscoe	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Plans to develop outside the northern boundary of the town to the east of Graveley cannot be justified without the retention of the whole of 'Forster Country'.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
1411	342367	Mr Steven Hodges	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Build on brownfield sites that are locally and regionally available. Farmland needed to feed next generation. Literary and heritage considerations. Original reason for Green Belt is undiminished	See responses to comments 190 (Brownfield first), 1850 (balance of land uses and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1412	976175	Mrs Julie Manton	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Roads cannot cope with more traffic. Concern accidents at North Road/Graveley Road junction will increase with more site entrances and traffic. Object to loss of floodplain. This will increase flooding in nearby villages. Green Belt should protect villages.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 932 (flood risk) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1414	976172	Louise Caslake	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Building more houses in this area is ridiculous. Local schools do not have capacity. Building on Green Belt will cause more flooding.	See responses to 902 (infrastructure) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
1461	976094	Rachel Dixon	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will put pressure on local infrastructure. It will reduce green space, impacting the environment. No provision for primary school places. Also concerned about increasing pressures on secondary schools. Roads are becoming increasingly congested and dangerous. Parking is limited. Concerns around pressure on local services i.e. the hospital and GP's. More housing will increase problems, with no proposed infrastructure.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure), 1850 (balance of land uses), 949 (traffic) and 22 (education provision). No change.
1563	778064	Saving North Herts Green Belt	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Petition against development currently running and will be used against proposals by SBC and NHDC. Residents do not want further housing. This has caused problems with traffic and local services. Green Belt provides health and well-being benefits. Needs to be a balance between urbanisation and nature. Already insufficient infrastructure. This would be exacerbated. Forster Country is of historical importance and would be lost forever. The character of Chesfield will be lost. Why have brownfield sites (i.e. Kodak) not been considered? Housing has been allowed in Pin Green. Proposal will have a devastating effect on wildlife and the ancient woodland. A new garden city must be considered.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses), 902 (infrastructure) and 113 (country park). See response to 190 (Brownfield first). Employment sites are required to be retained for employment use. Losses at Pin Green are mainly due to permitted development, which we cannot prevent. See also response to comment 121 (new New Town). No change.

1798	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	If site TC11 (TC10 on the Proposals Map) were allocated for housing, Forster Country could be retained. This would preserve agricultural land, the natural beauty of the area, and recreational benefits.	TC11 is required to meet our retail needs. The site is not large enough to meet our housing needs without HO3 also being developed.
1806	342069	Mr Kenneth Camp	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to HO3. North Road is already dangerously busy, with frequent accidents. This will be a big strain on infrastructure.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
1808	975432	Mr Roger Dunz	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 Green Belt should be protected. This land is used for recreation and is the only such space in the area. It contributes to health and well-being.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1812	975687	Mrs Margaret Presland	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Use of Green Belt should only be in exceptional circumstances. It is there to protect the historic and rural village of Graveley. Schools and the hospital are already strained. No space left to expand the hospital. More traffic will increase congestion and accidents. Are the police aware of the increase in traffic?	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances), 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 113 (country park), 902 (infrastructure), 949 (traffic) and 163 (hospital expansion). The police have been consulted on the development proposals as part of the IDP. No change.
1818	342032	Mr Paul Bridden	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	HO3 will have a significant detrimental effect on the A1(M) and will transform the nature of Graveley forever.	See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
1830	971985	Mr Robin Dickens	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to development north of Stevenage. This is Green Belt. Should use existing Brownfield sites for housing. Unused office/industrial space is available for this purpose. Stevenage is now largely a dormitory town for London and is already much larger than it was planned to be.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 190 (Brownfield first). No change.
1847	974282	Mrs Julie Paterson	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the loss of Forster Country.	See response to comment 113 (country park). No change.
1861	342755	Mr Mervyn Tervett	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Forster Country has stood for something for 200 years why devastate it now? New development should be located away from busy roads and junctions. The broader picture of the town should be looked at.	Noted. See responses to comments 113 (country park) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
1870	976306	P Servante	Policy HO3: North of Stevenage	Object to the loss of countryside North of Stevenage.	See response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
62	768523	Sport England	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Support HO4. Criterion g. is welcomed and essential to ensure Sport England's continued support for this policy in view of the proposed loss of the former sports ground. Para 9.37 is welcomed.	Support welcomed.
137	969684	Ms Kate Barefoot	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	The A602 is already congested, increased traffic will exacerbate this. A new roundabout will not help. The nearest Primary School is Longmeadow, which is already large. Where will the children go to school? Must be investment in play areas for existing and new houses.	See responses to 949 (traffic) and 902 (infrastructure). A new roundabout has been agreed with the Highways Authority as an appropriate access to this site. Our policies require play areas to be provided in large schemes. No change.
298	973409	Mr Mark Smith	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Development would join Stevenage to Hooks Cross, which is contrary to NPPF. Area should be reduced to leave a substantial gap. The character and status of Hooks Cross and the country pub will be destroyed. Concerns an additional roundabout will exacerbate congestion. Consider use of all or part of the golf centre for housing.	See responses to 949 (traffic), 137 (HO4 access) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). Our evidence shows that the golf centre is a well-used facility, which could not be reprovided elsewhere in the Borough. No change.
406	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	No objection to self-build requirements in principle and support the initiative. Recommend wording is amended to allow self build plots to revert to conventional build plots by the developer, if not taken up after 2 years.	Support welcomed. See response to comment 403.

505	619933	Natural England	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HO3 is Grade 3 agricultural land. When considering land use change, the permanency of the impact on soils is an important consideration. Policies must take account of the impact on land and soil resources and the wide range of vital functions (ecosystem services) they provide in line NPPF. We would also have expected the Sustainability Appraisal to consider this.	See response to comment 504. No change.
615	773057	RPF Developments	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Support HO4 to contribute to OAN and provide homes early in the plan period. Land is sustainable and suitable for Green Belt release. Broadly support single point of access. Should clarify dwelling numbers are illustrative and capacity should be determined through a masterplan. Should make clear that provision under c. to h. should be made by the site as a whole and not by each of the two development parcels separately. No evidence to support 1% self build. Para 5.88 states no need has been identified. Should state provision of affordable housing is subject to viability. Part g. (and Table 3) - wording is misleading. There are no sports facilities.	Support welcomed. Requirements under criteria c. to h. will be required on each site separately. See response to comment 30 (housing mix). Whilst the Council does not believe that RPF Development's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
739	341431	Aston Parish Council	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Object to building on green belt, unless there are exceptional circumstances which need to be clearly tested. Proposals will connect Hooks Cross to Stevenage urban area. This will lose the integrity of Hooks Cross.	See response to 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). No change.
741	975863	Datchworth Parish Council	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Site north of A602 is a flood plain and should not be developed. Inadequacies of the sewerage system need to be addressed. Increased traffic would require major improvements - no plans for this. A Hooks Cross bypass would be essential. Additional primary school places will be required. Water supply issues would need to be addressed. Land to the south could be developed but only as part of a fully integrated proposal which has not been addressed in this plan.	See response to comment 932 (flood risk). The northern development site does contain areas of flood risk, but development will not be permitted within these areas. See responses to comments 949 (traffic), 902 (infrastructure) and 1278 (land outside the boundary). No change.
765	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Support Policy HO4. The LEP will seek an increase in residential numbers, where appropriate.	Support welcomed. See response to 752 (dwelling estimates). No change.
769	636011	Environment Agency	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	H04 has Stevenage Brook running through the north and a large section of flood zone 3 and 3b (functional floodplain) associated with it. Allocations should be directed away from areas of highest flood risk. Where development is necessary, make it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Need to be satisfied these developments will not increase flood risk offsite and aim to reduce flood risk onsite.	See response to comment 932 (flood risk). No change.
773	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Concerns regarding wastewater Services. The wastewater network is unlikely to be able to support demand from HO2. Upgrades to existing drainage are likely to be required ahead of development. The developer should be required to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be delivered. A planning condition is likely to be required to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation.	Noted. See responses to comments 770 (wastewater) and 902 (infrastructure). No change.
813	975231	Catherine Wallwork	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HO4 is adjacent to an area of archaeological importance and a designated heritage environment (to the north of Bragbury Lane). There would be an irreversible risk to these assets. Roads are not suitable for increased traffic. Need to understand what measures would be taken to prevent additional flood risk following any reduction in permeable areas.	Areas of Archaeological Significance are designated under Policy HO9. This requires archaeological assessments to be undertaken and preservation, where necessary. See responses to comments 949 (traffic) and 932 (flood risk). No change.
826	342548	Mr & Mrs Melmore	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HCC have stated in a Flood Investigation Report that this site is a 'flood storage area and water meadow' and is not suitable for development.	The Flood Storage Reservoir lies outside of the site boundary. No change.

843	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Object to removal of HO4 from Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances demonstrated. Would result in a tongue of development projecting into the countryside along the Beane Valley, swallowing up Bragbury End. The current boundary is defensible and permanent. No alternative defensible boundary proposed within the plan area. Cannot rely on NHDC to create a suitable boundary, without their plan in place. The entire northern site lies within the Beane Valley Landscape Conservation Area. The detrimental landscape impact of housing would not be mitigated by the introduction of new landscaping or design features.	See responses to comments 190 (exceptional circumstances) and 919 (impacts of Green Belt release). An alternative Green Belt boundary is provided for the majority of the site, except to the south. We will continue to work with EHDC to ensure an appropriate boundary is provided. No change.
969	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Object to HO4 due to loss of Green Belt and the loss in value of adjacent woodland to wildlife and the environment.	See response to comment 919 (impacts of Green Belt release) and 1850 (balance of land uses). No change.
994	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HO4 is remote from town centre, employment and leisure facilities. Remove from the plan and instead review Brownfield capacity and the longer term possibility of increasing capacity of either North and West Stevenage in association with NHDC, to accommodate the 550 dwellings.	See responses to comments 984 (HO4 sustainability) 190 (Brownfield first) and 887 (meeting OAN using Duty to co-operate). No change.
1032	977227	Gwyneth Foster	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Question whether the proposed development has considered the conservation of Stevenage Brook.	Our policies protect Stevenage Brook by ensuring no development is built over a watercourse. Watercourses are also protected by National Policy and the Environment Agency. Any detailed requirements relating to this application will be considered at the application stage. No change.
1140	974451	Mrs Kathy Richardson	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Concern no provision for a primary school. Plans will increase traffic through Hooks Cross. A602 is already congested - affecting emergency services. Query whether existing plans for A602 will still go ahead and whether this will increase the possibility of a bypass for Watton-at-Stone. Pathways should be put in/improved. Loss of Green Belt will increase flood risk, causing more traffic problems. Question what will happen with the brook on the left of the road southbound.	See responses to comments 902 (infrastructure), 949 (traffic) and 932 (flood risk). Connections to the existing pedestrian and cycle network will be required. The Local Plan cannot require utility improvements to be extended beyond the development areas. No change.
1305	377231	Mr Leslie Smith	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Accept the need for new homes, but the high number will radically change the historic character of this area. Adjacent to Green Belt and the River Beane, Bragbury End is an attractive gateway to Stevenage. Trees along A602 are essential to this. A high level of architecture should integrate the development into the area. More aspirational homes on larger plots are needed, with adequate parking. This indicates a lower density than in the Plan. A602 traffic is heavy all day, causing pollution and congestion. Increased cars will make things worse. Retain the row of trees and the 400 year old oak and water meadow along Bragbury Lane. The site is essential as a flood storage reservoir.	Noted. See response to comment 6 (retention of trees). High quality design is required by Policy GD1. HO4 requires the scheme to preserve or enhance the setting of adjacent historic assets. See responses to comments 30 (housing mix), 949 (traffic), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 826 (Flood Storage Reservoirs). No change.
1366	981988	Herts Against the Badger Cull	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	There are no badger setts in the immediate vicinity of land north of A602. The proposal wouldn't affect badgers and other wildlife living in Astonbury Woods. The south part of the development would cause a serious threat to badgers. There are two setts on the west and south boundaries. The whole foraging ground will be removed. Badgers will be forced across the A602 or onto the railway. Development would cut off access to further foraging grounds as it will join Stevenage with Hook's Cross.	We do not believe any badger setts exist within this site. An ecological assessment will be required in advance of a planning application being considered. No change.
1374	976047	Sarah-Jane Hackett	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Object to the loss of Green Belt joining Stevenage with Hooks Cross. Major concerns about badgers and wildlife. The traffic will be horrendous.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 1850 (balance of land uses) and 949 (traffic). No change.
1380	341577	Mr Peter Bracey	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HO4 offers further potential for expansion, a larger development would have the advantage of allowing more local services, it would not lead to coalescence. Development here would give good access to the A10 (via the A602) avoiding further congestion in central Stevenage. The disadvantage of this site is that it is further away from the centre.	Noted. A larger scheme would require land outside of the Borough, which SBC cannot plan for. No change.

1792	778064	Saving North Herts Green Belt	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	HO4 would have devastating consequences. Would be removing further Green Belt and only 30% would be for affordable social housing, which is too low. There are a number of badger setts in the area. Hook's Cross would be joined with Stevenage and remove the characteristics of this small hamlet. Also need to consider the A602 which is already congested.	See responses to 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 30 (housing mix), 1366 (badger setts), and 949 (traffic). No change.
1831	971985	Mr Robin Dickens	Policy HO4: South East of Stevenage	Object to HO4. This is Green Belt. Should use Brownfield sites for housing. How much unused office/industrial space is available for this purpose. Stevenage is now largely a dormitory town for London and it is already much larger than it was ever originally planned to be.	See responses to comments 919 (impacts of Green Belt release), 190 (Brownfield first) and 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
643	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Policy HO5: Windfall Sites	HO5 is written positively to ensure that new housing development can come forward on unallocated sites. Object to criterion c. and para 9.46. This is not an effective or realistic test. The effect of the detrimental impact and its level of acceptability should be the policy test. Para 9.44 suggests SBC will only consider windfalls they are aware of them due to work on the Local Plan. Site size should not dictate appropriateness. Amendments suggested.	Support welcomed. It is considered this policy provides sufficient clarity in terms of its wording. We would not wish to see large windfall developments coming forward on Greenfield or Green Belt sites. See also response to comment 1850 (balance of land uses). Developments on PDL can be of any size. No change.
500	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Homes for all	Not appropriate for garden size and density guidelines to be included in the qualifying criteria for aspirational homes. This may prevent efficient and effective use of land. Large gardens do not determine the quality of a home.	Noted. The criteria in para 9.70 provide guidelines according to what our evidence suggests creates an aspirational home. They are not policy requirements. No change.
665	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Homes for all	Ratios in para 9.67 should not be applied rigidly across all sites, due to individual site characteristics and the need to provide smaller homes in specific locations. Clarity is required. Amendment suggested.	Criteria b. allows for flexibility. No change.
37	969601	Ms Sheila Little	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	There are plans to build on all land and green space but none benefit council tenants. Need more council homes - at least 10%. Council will make enough money from sale of land to afford some council housing. Impossible for youngsters to get social housing at present.	HO7 requires 25-30% affordable housing to be provided on all sites. SBC cannot afford to take on all of this stock as new council homes, but they are working towards a new council house-building program to increase stock across the town. No change.
109	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	HO7 is conflicting - seeking to 'maximise provision based on agreed values and viability', as well as setting specific targets. Should seek one or the other.	Noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that this representation raises issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of wording could be agreed.
110	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Para 9.53. implies that provision above the target levels in HO7 might be sought. This does not provide clarity and certainty for landowners and developers and undermines the targets. The Council cannot arbitrarily seek to rely on guidance which does not yet exist.	See response to comment 109.
111	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Para 9.54 implies that provision above the target levels in HO7 might be sought. This does not provide clarity and certainty for landowners and developers and undermines the targets. It appears it is SBC's intention to try and harness any uplift in land values that arise after the grant of planning permission but before the development is commenced or completed. This is fundamentally unacceptable and could result in schemes becoming unviable.	See response to comment 109.
480	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Request that the targets are stated to be 'subject to viability', to ensure delivery is not overly restricted.	See response to comment 378 (viability). No change.
605	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	30% affordable housing is unrealistic and should be subject to viability testing	See response to comment 378 (viability). No change.

622	773057	RPF Developments	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Requirement to provide as high a proportion of affordable housing as is viable contradicts the targets. Para 9.53 conflicts with the HO7 targets and should be in the policy itself. SBC power to set maximum profit levels places an undue burden on developers and is contrary to NPPF. Reference to maximising provision should be removed. Requirement to 'maximise provision based on agreed values and viability' is also too vague. It creates uncertainty.	See response to comment 109.
641	976805	Bragbury End Sports LLP	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	HO7 should acknowledge that minor residential sites, such as HO1/2, may be constrained by viability and should be subject to a review of site-specific constraints - as per point a. of HO7. HO7 requirement to provide as high a proportion of affordable housing as is viable contradicts the targets set out later. This places an undue burden on developers and is contrary to NPPF, giving SBC power to set maximum levels of profit. Requirement to 'maximise provision based on agreed values and viability' is also too vague. It creates uncertainty.	See response to comment 109.
645	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Object to HO7 and supporting text, which requires maximisation of affordable homes, but also sets targets. Against the NPPF. If the targets are robust, no financial appraisal would be required. Does not provide certainty for developers. Amendments suggested.	See response to comment 109.
1065	974699	Margaret Daly	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Providing more affordable housing is great. Would like to live in a bungalow not a flat and in a retirement complex. Query what provision is being made for the elderly.	Support welcomed. Policy HO10 requires sheltered/supported accommodation to be provided. No change.
1378	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Seems to be more provision for commuters, as only a small proportion of homes are to be "affordable". The more aspirational incomers able to purchase the 'unaffordable' will not be attracted by built up areas.	See responses to comments 37 (affordable targets) and 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
1853	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Policy HO7: Affordable housing targets	Definition of affordable has been debated over the years. Despite opportunities to incorporate affordable homes, very little has materialised.	See response to comment 37 (affordable target). No change.
20	969597	Ms Kathie French	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	"Affordable homes" should be council homes, so Stevenage people can afford them and not commuters.	See responses to comments 37 (affordable targets) and 1160 (who gets new homes). No change.
23	969598	Ms Amanda Wright	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	Support availability of affordable housing for Stevenage people. Make sure there are larger affordable homes for working families.	See response to comment 37 (affordable target). HO8 requires a mix of affordable house types and sizes in line with HO9. No change.
47	969606	Ms Katie Ingham	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	There should be shared ownership as part of the new builds, as this is a great way to attract young professionals.	See response to comment 23 (affordable mix). No change.
202	342026	Mr Clive Brackenbury	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	A good mix of social housing is important. SBC could have done a better job of allocating social housing in the past, which could have reduced the need for Green Belt development.	Support for HO8 welcomed.
375	341656	Homes And Communities Agency	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	HO8 states that 70% of affordable housing provision will be rented. The HCA suggest that consideration is given to the current transition of the Affordable Homes programme to affordable ownership products.	Noted. Our evidence identifies the biggest demand for rented accommodation, as it is more affordable. This Policy aims to meet our needs. No change.

407	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	HO8 does not specify the precise nature of tenure mix. Does not say if 70% rent is social rent or affordable rent. Whole Plan Viability Study suggests the Council assumes that the 70% rent element will be provided as affordable rent. The mix for the remaining 30% is also unspecified. Lack of clarity will result in uncertainty for applicants and could impede delivery.	The Policy is clear that the remaining mix of affordable homes will be determined on application, in agreement with the Council's Housing team. A level of flexibility will aid viability on specific schemes. No change.
481	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	Concerned the 70% rent requirement is not evidence based and may conflict with other plan objectives, i.e. para 9.52 justifies a greater emphasis on home ownership. HO8 will need to consider the impact of amendments to the definition of affordable housing set out in the Housing and Planning Bill 2015 and the 'Consultation on Proposed Changes to National Planning Policy' document. This can be achieved by allowing for greater flexibility of affordable housing provision in HO8 including the various types that can be provided.	Our SHMA identifies it is mostly rental accommodation that is required. SBC has a council housing waiting list. Any enactments of the Housing and Planning Act in advance of Local Plan adoption will be incorporated by the Inspector at Examination. No change.
619	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	Requires greater flexibility to reflect viability, insert 'where viability permits'.	See response to comment 378 (viability). No change.
648	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	Object. HO8 fails to acknowledge the Government's drive towards increasing ownership and the starter homes initiative.	See response to comment 372 (starter homes). No change.
995	977308	Patricia Acres	Policy HO8: Affordable housing tenure, mix and design	Need council homes, not 'affordable homes'. No mention of council homes.	See response to comment 37 (Council house building). No change.
599	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO9: House types and sizes	Provision of 'at least 5% aspirational' should be subject to viability and in recognition that such provision may have to be off-set against other policy requirements.	See response to comment 30 (housing mix). No change.
1078	977353	Dr and Mrs D L Senanayake	Policy HO9: House types and sizes	Object to plans to convert family homes to flats and shared rentals (although the latter is up to the owner). The former should not be allowed. This will ruin the nature of these areas, with a constant influx of vehicles.	See response to comment 16 (conversions). No change.
1866	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy HO9: House types and sizes	Agree the town needs additional housing, but this needs to be 'affordable' in the real sense, which means the percentage of social housing needs to be prioritised. The lack of 'aspirational' housing will not be improved with the current plans.	See responses to comments 1350 (affordable mix) and 30 (housing mix). No change.
607	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO10: Sheltered and supported housing	Should be clarified that the provision of sheltered/supported housing is subject to commercial terms (viability) and market demands.	See response to comment 30 (housing mix). Our evidence demonstrates this level of provision can be met without impacting viability. No change.
1191	975398	Mrs Sue Baker	Policy HO10: Sheltered and supported housing	Only vague mention of increasing need for sheltered/supported housing.	Plan policies clearly requires sheltered/supported housing to be provided in line with identified need.
498	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HO11: Accessible and adaptable housing	Target significantly exceeds the level prescribed by national standards and is overly prescriptive. HO11 is not evidence based. 10% provision would be sufficient and avoid adversely impacting viability.	See response to comment 30 (housing mix). No change.

621	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HO11: Accessible and adaptable housing	Target is unrealistic and unviable. Government guidance suggests a much lower level, subject to viability. Not clear that the Whole Plan Viability has considered the financial implications of this and given the recommendation to undertake further work in relation to the urban extensions is particularly relevant in this context. 30% would be more realistic, although with development costs at Stevenage West, even that level is unlikely to be supported.	See response to comment 30 (housing mix). No change.
652	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Policy HO11: Accessible and adaptable housing	Object to 50% requirement. In certain circumstances this may not be relevant or possible to achieve, e.g. Starter Homes or high rise apartments near to the town centre. Request flexibility. Amendments suggested.	See response to comment 30 (housing mix). Flexibility can be applied at the application stage, if it can be demonstrated that this provision is not required at specific schemes. No change.

Gypsy and traveller provision

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
8	969152	Mr Tim Franklin	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12, land is Green Belt. Have adverse effect with increased traffic. Graveley school is over subscribed. Police requirement for separate site is not a justifiable planning policy. Site is unsuitable, existing site should be expanded. If there has to be further provision for Gypsies, expand the existing site. This could be done in such a way as to keep the warring families (that the police are concerned about) separate.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 401 (traffic). Hertfordshire County Council as local education authority have been consulted and have not raised any concerns about the proposal. The police have been consulted and have not raised any concerns. The existing site at Dyes Lane has already been extended. It is not suitable for the entire need arising in the plan period as this would concentrate all provision (and associated demand for services) onto a small area of the Borough.
112	452235	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to Policy HO12. Object to making provision for up to 16 additional pitches when the plan acknowledges (para 9.93) there is a relatively low pitch requirement. Policies should be founded on robust up-to-date evidence of need, capable of scrutiny. The evidence for the policy should be more robust.	Stevenage has an identified need for 3-5 pitches in each five year period and a need for 11-16 additional permanent pitches over the plan period to 2031. This is set out in the local plan at para's 9.90 and 9.94 and in supporting evidence. The evidence is clear, robust and up-to-date. Policy HO12 takes a precautionary approach in requiring updated evidence.
124	969677	Ms Wendy Moody	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This proposal should have been included in the leaflet circulated to residents. The Moody Family strongly object to the proposal for a Gypsy and Traveller site in this location. The price and desirability of homes in the area will fall because of this. The appalling behaviour of many have given them a bad reputation that is impossible to ignore.	Feedback on the leaflet and objection to the proposal noted. The price of housing is not a planning matter. Concern noted.
152	966739	Mrs Carla Sears	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to G&T site in Graveley. Do not understand why it is being moved from its current site. This is Green Belt land. Boundary is being moved to suit council needs. The site is on the flood plain. Not enough consideration given, if problems arise and roads need to be closed (as it was in Dyes Lane), to traffic, residents and the school. People should've been consulted when the site was first talked about in 2013. Moving the bus stop, if a lay-by isn't provided, will be dangerous. Not using fencing to shield off this area will create visible impact. Soft landscaping will not be sufficient. The site can be seen from nearby properties. The existing site at Dyes Lane does not meet the criteria set out in your plan (proximity of services). The size of the future site is uncertain (para 5.83) so a smaller site would suffice, which should go next to Dyes Lane.	The proposal is to provide a new site in addition to the existing site, not to relocate the site. Concern noted. See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). The site is not within the fluvial flood zone of the Ash Brook. The site has surface water flooding and this will be addressed on site through the use of SuDS. The proposal was included as an option in the earlier consultation document, June 2013. Policy HO12 requires site-specific considerations are properly addressed, these include the bus stop, mitigation of any surface water flood risk, screening and boundary treatment. See response to comment 8 (existing site).
162	969923	Ms Alison Blanshard	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to gypsy and traveller proposal. This is Green Belt. Numerous other sites have been proposed and suitably classed for development.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 234 (best site).
206	969971	Ms Karen Bridden	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	It would be more appropriate to expand the existing site at Dyes Lane. Policing would be split between the sites making it more difficult to deal with issues. Although the site fulfils a number of criteria in current legislation regarding the location of Travellers sites, it is Green Belt and as such is inappropriate development. It would have a significant adverse impact on Graveley School.	See response to comment 8.

229	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The site is in the Green Belt. The current site in Dyes Lane is surrounded by undeveloped land - albeit in the Green Belt. Is one Green Belt site more desirable than the other? Most residents are wary (at the least) of having a traveller site nearby, and most travellers prefer to be close to similar minded people. If more space is needed, then an expansion of the existing site is always going to be the preferred option to both communities.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
234	973034	Hart	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Concerns around whether opposite a proposed convenience store and secure mental health unit is the best place for a traveller site.	Objection noted. Para 9.91 of the Stevenage Local Plan explains that a site search has been carried out and this is the best location to meet future Gypsy and Traveller accommodation requirements.
240	342259	Mr Stewart Gillies	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	According to the SBC Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Study (2013) 'plan-making and decision-taking should protect Green Belt from inappropriate development', and 'all potentially new forming households want to move to a local authority site... in East Herts'. Despite this, Green Belt land is Stevenage is being provided.	Our evidence identifies the need to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers. Policy HO12 takes a precautionary approach in requiring updated evidence. See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
254	342487	Mr Alan Lines	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This is Green Belt.	Objection noted. The Green Belt Technical Paper and Local Plan demonstrate exceptional circumstances for a limited alteration of the Green Belt boundary.
264	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Travellers Site is pokey, on a steep hill and could only exit onto the busy B197. The owner and Graveley don't want it. The proposed site is very close to the excellent facility of Cycle Path 12.	The site has good access arrangements.
302	970580	Ms Penny Lines	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This is Green Belt. Stevenage has already developed much of this land. Green Belt should be retained.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt).
307	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Proposal for new site is unacceptable. This site is in the Green Belt and, as such, is an inappropriate development. Stevenage police have refused expansion of Dyes Lane due to existing tensions and violence between two family groups. Surely it would be more appropriate to extend the existing site where land is also available, permitting the creation of effectively two sites. Concerns around the close proximity to Graveley and new housing developments, coupled with the significant adverse impact on admissions to an oversubscribed school. The site is also in the floodplain.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (police). See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 152 (flooding).
315	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The proposed gypsy and travellers site would contribute to the flooding problem in Little Wymondly. SBC have not carried out a flood risk survey for Little Wymondly. Roads are already at capacity. There was no consultation with Wymondly Parish Council or the Wymondly Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum before the draft Local Plan was published. No exceptional circumstances have been shown for building on the Green Belt. The existing site should be extended.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic). Wymondly Parish Council were consulted on the proposals and have been consulted at each stage of the document. Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum are linked to the Parish Council, were aware of the consultation and have responded to it. See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
316	970671	Mr Tony Nye	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The location near the hospital and care homes is not appropriate.	See response to comment 234 (best site).
363	342698	Mrs Gillian Shenoy	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to Gypsy and Travellers site. This is too close to Graveley village and is inappropriate development on Green Belt land. There are already tensions at the existing site. An extension of this site would be more sensible, where additional land would be available for expansion, if required, and policing would not need to be split between two areas.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 8 (Police).

379	769036	Wyvale Garden Centres Ltd	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Objection. Site makes significant contribution to Green Belt purposes in SBC's Green Belt Review. North Road provides a defensible Green Belt boundary. Development to the north would encroach into the countryside contradicting Green Belt purposes. Grade 3 agricultural land. Part at flood risk. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' given suitability of two alternative sites identified by the LPA outside the Green Belt (sites 13 and 14 of SBC's Gypsy and Traveller Site Search). Site HO12/1 is close to the local road network, raising concerns about amenity for its residents.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 152 (flooding). See response to comment 234 (best site). Environmental health have raised no objection and are likely to require a noise impact assessment/survey with a planning application. No change.
393	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Why do we need a site here when one exists at Dyes Lane? Could this be expanded? This site contains woodland which will be lost. The loss of visual amenity would be significant. A better location would be as part of EC1/7. This is accessed from the A1(M) roundabout and is invisible from the road. There are no exceptional circumstances to release this site from the Green Belt.	See response to comment 8 (existing site). The site does not include woodland, it has woodland surrounding it. See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt).
414	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to new travellers site in close proximity to Graveley. Site not deliverable. Believe landowner opposed to the use. Policy HO12 inconsistent with national policy. NPPF states unmet need (including for travellers sites) unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. If required, put new provision at Dyes Lane. Policy HO13 requires an appropriate buffer between travellers sites and adjacent uses. Impact on Graveley School.	See response to comment 420.
416	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to new travellers site in close proximity to Graveley. Site not deliverable. Believe landowner opposed to the use. Policy HO12 inconsistent with national policy. NPPF states unmet need (including for travellers sites) unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. If required, put new provision at Dyes Lane. Policy HO13 requires an appropriate buffer between travellers sites and adjacent uses. Impact on Graveley School.	See response to comment 420.
470	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to G&T - lack of transport modelling. Need dialogue between SBC, NHDC, Graveley PC and other interested parties. NHDC interested in potential for site to address G&T provision in their administrative boundary.	Objection noted. The latest transport modelling work will be available. Hertfordshire County Council have raised no objection. The proposed allocation for a Gypsy and Traveller site is being made in accordance with the duty to cooperate and has been subject to consultation. SBC will continue ongoing dialogue with interested parties, including North Hertfordshire District Council. In the interests of all parties, most notably the Gypsy and Traveller community, SBC urges North Hertfordshire develop proposals to address the need arising in their area.
661	341377	Cygnnet Healthcare Ltd	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Related legal cases stated. Serious concerns relating to Green Belt release. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated. Access to a primary school does not demonstrate exceptional circumstances. The site selection process is inconsistent with NPPF and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. The selected site is larger than required. The assessment shows the site makes a significant contribution to Green Belt. Other sites assessed would be more appropriate, based on the assessment criteria.	See response to comment 112 (need). See response to comment 234 (best site). The selected site meets the requirement for 11-16 pitches arising over the plan period. It is the best site to meet the need arising and is an ideal size. See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 152 (Policy HO12). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
708	342641	Mr Ronald Pratt	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to the location of the Gypsy and Traveller site in the middle of housing. It should be an extension to the existing site.	See response to comment 8 (existing site).

823	977158	Mr Peter Kelly	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object use of Green Belt for Travellers inappropriate under NPPF, land owner opposition, contrary to Policy HO13(c) due to minimum distance between site and Graveley, impact on Graveleys village school, unmet housing need only permitted in exceptional circumstances on Green Belt which is unlikely to be outweighed by a Gypsy and Traveller site, flooding issues.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). Our evidence sets out the site assessment criteria, see Local Plan para 9.91 and Gypsy and Traveller Site Search 2014. The site is proposed for allocation, policy HO13 applies to unallocated sites. See response to comment 152 (flooding).
834	977172	Mrs Andrea Kelly	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to Policy HO12 due to being contrary to Green Belt Policy in the NPPF and a Gypsy and Traveller site is not classed as an 'unmet housing need' under the exception test on Green Belt, land owner opposition, contrary to Policy HO13(c) and minimum distance between Stevenage and Graveley and impact on Gravely village school.	See response to comment 823.
850	342182	Miss Margaret Donovan	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12. This site should be used for overspill parking from Lister Hospital, particularly if provision at the garden centre is lost. Not in accordance with the Duty to Co-operate and has not met the procedural requirements - residents have not been involved in the change of Green Belt. The garden centre are unaware. Not in line with national guidance on Green Belt (para 9.96) - use is inappropriate. Not justified - land is available at Dyes Lane (already in this use). This should be extended or two sites provided in this location. Local facilities will be provided by the new housing development. Believe an application for Policy HO12 use has already been declined.	The proposal was also included in the June 2013 consultation document. The statement of consultation sets out the consultation carried out. See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 240.
892	973631	Kerry Duggan	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Oppose G&T site being built in Graveley. Strongly disagree with the provision being brought into a lovely quiet village.	Objection noted.
898	341949	Mrs Lesley Bacon	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to Gypsy and Traveller site as is in the flood plain and on Green Belt Land. A Gypsy and Traveller site exists near the A1(M) already so provision is not needed here.	See response to comment 152 (flooding). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). The requirement for additional pitches is set out in the Local Plan at para 9.90. See response to comment 8 (existing site).
899	973648	Sheena Kitchener	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to G&T site. These areas are on the flood plain. This will increase flood risk for existing homes. SBC must consider the huge negative impacts of these plans on existing residents, the environment and a unique area of cultural and literary significance. These issues negate any possible benefits of the plans.	See response to comment 152 (flooding). Objection to the proposal noted. The price of housing is not a planning matter. Concern noted.
905	973662	Mr Wayne Tamcken	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12. This is a floodplain. Against further infilling and building on Green Belt land, which will join up Stevenage with the villages.	See response to comment number 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt).
920	973684	Mr Gordon Macdonald	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to the G&T site. Planned developments, most on floodplains, will lead to a far greater flood risk in Wymondly (which already floods), putting lives and homes in danger. Concerns about increased traffic through Wymondly due to rat runs. This would adversely affect the character of the village. A shame to lose this beautiful area of countryside. Planning authorities should protect Green Belt at all costs.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt).
926	973694	Mrs Dylis Macdonald	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Would result in the destruction of Green Belt. Local towns are merging into one another. There will be no countryside left. This is a flood plain and would increase flood risk for Little Wymondly. It is not suitable for development. Concerns over traffic increase. Don't need more noise and pollution from Stevenage Road.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 919 (impacts on Green Belt release) See response to comment number 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic).

935	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. Site HO12 is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley.	See response to comment number 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
939	973701	Deb Cottrell	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Opposes the gypsy and traveller site. Just had planning refused for extension, but Green Belt can be moved when suited. The site is on flood plain. Emergency services and schools are not equipped to deal with additional homes and traveller sites.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 152 (flooding). See response to comment 8 (education). The emergency services have not raised any concerns about the proposed site.
942	974779	Mr James Blanksby	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to the proposed Travellers site on Green Belt land. Why build on Green Belt land? This countryside should be protected for all to enjoy not visually scarred with caravans and trailers. This site is in the flood plain. The rural setting of Graveley should not be destroyed.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
948	341677	Mrs Fiona Hutton	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Proposed traveller site is in the Green Belt and creates a precedent for development on the east of B197. Contrary to Policy HO13(c) due to minimal distance between site and Graveley Village. Consequences for Graveley school.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 823 (Policy HO13) See response to comment 8 (education).
951	975182	Kevin Wharton	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The policy is not justified as the Green Belt should be maintained. The proposed site is too close to existing housing. A rural site is more appropriate and desirable.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). Our evidence sets out the site assessment criteria, see Local Plan para 9.91 and Gypsy and Traveller Site Search 2014.
960	973860	Mr Chris Burton	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Any proposal for a travellers site needs careful consideration and public discussion.	The local plan sets out the considerations. See response to comment 850 (consultation).
971	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This is Green Belt. SBC Green Belt paper states the site is 'heavily wooded'; inevitable loss of woodland will be a loss to wildlife and the environment.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 393 (woodland).
979	770454	Ms R Stevenson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to the Gypsy and Traveller site as it will lead to the destruction of woodland and wildlife surrounding it.	See response to comment 393 (woodland).
986	342828	Mrs Jennifer Watson-Usher	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Question why another site is required. Note the police have ruled out expansion of Dyes Lane. Another site will repeat these problems. This could cause inter site problems. Question where the mains water is coming from as there already is a shortage of water around Stevenage.	See response to comment 1042 (need). See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 1166 (infrastructure).
1010	977215	Mr and Mrs Avery	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Concerns over the Gypsy and Traveller site due to removal of Green Belt designation and the site is within the flood plain.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook).
1013	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Flood risk and traffic in the area are serious problems.	See response to comment 937 (Ash Brook). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1042	973704	Mrs Ann Sharman	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The town does not need a gypsy site. Why are travellers given permanent sites.	Our evidence identifies the need to make permanent provision for Gypsies and Travellers.
1045	973849	Mr Chris Nathan	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to a site so close to the village. Current site at Dyes Lane should be extended rather than transferred. This will exacerbate existing traffic problems.	Objection noted. See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 401 (traffic).

1047	342168	Mr Charles De'Ath	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Serious reservations about the positioning of the G&T site close to the hospital. Would be better to have extra space on the existing site. Assume there will be no permanent buildings will be allowed and a time limit on how long a traveller can stay on the site.	See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 234 (best site). The proposed allocation is for a permanent site, in accordance with national policy requirements for local plans to address the likely permanent accommodation needs of travellers in their area.
1075	974740	Felix Power	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Traveller site is pokey, on a steep hill and can only exit onto B197. Not wanted by Graveley village and will likely create bad feeling. Not opposed to a site nearby, but it would be better up towards Jacks Hill or off North Road. Proposed site is near Cycle Path 12, would be a shame if people stopped using it due to this.	See response to comment 234 (best site). There is a large area of woodland between the cycle path and site boundary. It is unlikely that the proposal will have any impact on the cycle path.
1120	974224	Mr Adrian Hawkins	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. The impact on the Ash Brook has not been adequately assessed. Site HO12 is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on the flood plain. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. Increased traffic levels have not been considered. Chantry Lane, Stevenage Road and the A1(M) junction 8 are already congested and grid locked at peak times. SBC should have carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment, a Flood Risk Assessment for neighbouring areas and a Traffic Survey.	See response to comment number 937. See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1126	973077	Mr Chris Turvey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Representation to HO12. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment number 937.
1139	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Additional information to Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224. Water run-off from these sites will run down Stevenage Road and into Little Wymondley, increasing flood risk to houses on it's route.	See response to comment number 937.
1165	975310	Mr David Owen	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Proposed G&T site is a flood plain. EA should have been consulted. Heavier rainfall will exacerbate the likelihood of flooding. Development will increase already congested traffic. There are no plans for improvements.	See response to comment 152 (flooding). We working actively with the Environment Agency, who have been consulted. See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1169	341965	Mrs Hazel Barnham	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Proposed location for G&T site is inappropriate. It is Green Belt. It would have an adverse impact on Graveley primary school. Land adjacent to Dyes Lane should be used.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
1177	975319	Mr Tom Franklin	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object due to use of Green Belt. It would ruin the landscape of the area. Would feel uncomfortable walking the dog nearby as heard rumours that the community can have aggressive dogs.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). Concern noted.
1232	975651	Mr Tony Hiles	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Oppose G&T site. How are you consulting residents? Just mentioning it in the Local Plan is unacceptable. Add pitches to Dyes Lane instead.	See response to comment 850 (consultation). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
1241	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to new travellers site in close proximity to Graveley. Site not deliverable. Believe landowner opposed to the use. Policy HO12 inconsistent with national policy. NPPF states unmet need (including for travellers sites) unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. If required, put new provision at Dyes Lane. Policy HO13 requires an appropriate buffer between travellers sites and adjacent uses. Impact on Graveley School.	See response to comment 420.

1259	975807	Annette Bowdery	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Site proposed on Green Belt land. Why is supposedly valuable development land be earmarked solely for this purpose.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 1042 (need).
1274	342762	Mr G.L. Thompson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	One only has to visit the site in Dyes Lane, and its approach roads, to see why this would be an unwelcome addition between Stevenage and Graveley.	Objection noted.
1285	342024	Mr Henry Bracey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This is close to the Cygnet Hospital, Graveley, the school and footpaths. The size of the site will adversely impact the school. As the size of the future requirement is 'uncertain', a smaller site would suffice and can be accommodated adjacent to Dyes Lane. Expanding the existing site would mean police could focus on one site, rather than splitting resources.	See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 8 (need). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
1293	342154	Mrs Madelaine Crouch	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12. This will put pressure on the school. Despite police objections, Dyes Lane should be expanded, placing Gypsies and Travellers a few miles away will not prevent problems.	See response to comment 8 (education). See comment 8 (existing site).
1299	974420	Mrs Caroline Gray	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12. The nearest Primary School (Graveley) is oversubscribed, Junction 8 and North Road/Graveley Junction are already very busy and regular accidents occur. Increased housing will make these problems worse.	See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 401 (traffic).
1325	342032	Mr Paul Bridden	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12 so close to Graveley village. This is a rural area which will suffer negatively from sprawl and abandoned debris, as experienced at the current site. Concerns around disruption to school classes, as experienced elsewhere.	Objection noted. See response to comment 8 (education).
1332	342133	Ms Helen Lumley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to HO12. Use of Green Belt is inappropriate use according to NPPF. Is contrary to Policy HO13(c) due to the minimal distance between the site and Graveley school. Not deliverable as land owner is opposed to the site being used for this purpose.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 823 (Policy HO13).
1340	974055	Clare Matthews	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The needs of Travellers are not enough to change the Green Belt. Local Schools are at capacity. Concerned about potential for increase in crime and antisocial behaviour, from previous personal experience of living near Traveller communities.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 8 (police).
1347	974049	Mr Pete Le Porte	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	There has been no consultation with local residents on this. Should it be developed, charges should be levied on all 'Travellers' who make use of the site so that residents do not have to subsidise the aftermath of frequent illegal sites in Stevenage (i.e. at Six Hills House last year).	See response to comment 850 (consultation). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). Gypsy and Travellers living on public or privately owned sites pay council tax and rent.
1353	974021	Mr Gavin Habershon	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Object to G&T site. This is next to a very busy junction - another heavily used entrance would cause mayhem.	See response to comment 264 (access).
1360	969152	Mr Tim Franklin	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Objection to Policy HO12. The use of Green Belt land for a Gypsy site is deemed as inappropriate under NPPF. Why does SBC think it can over rule NPPF guidelines? The effect of an ethnic minority on the balance of ethnicity on a small village school is unacceptable. Dyes Lane should be expanded.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (education). See response to comment 8 (existing site).

1384	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The impact on the Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. Site HO12 is proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have serious consequences downstream in Little Wymondley.	See response to comment 937.
1389	974210	Christine Marshall	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Concerns around HO12. There are lots of issues r.e. infrastructure. Development would increase flood risk in Little Wymondly. Direct the council to Para 6.25 of the scoping report. Old data suggests that in 2011/12 'flooding issues were resolved before planning application was granted'.	See response to comment 937.
1402	973937	Jacqueline Pond	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Conflicts with travellers requirements- is too small for the nature of the community. The use of Green Belt is contrary to national policy to prevent urban sprawl. Extensive work will be required to establish a settled community. This community will have different educational needs.	See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (education).
1413	976175	Mrs Julie Manton	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Travellers site on Dyes Lane should be extended. How will emergency services cope with increased demand.	See response to comment 8 (existing site). See response to comment 939 (emergency services).
1805	972740	Graveley School	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This is Green Belt and is counter to the "exceptional circumstances" criterion. The site being opposite a mental health facility for medium risk inmates, who are allowed out into the community, creates a potential risk. It will impact on the school, as children from the site would attend.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 8 (education).
1810	975432	Mr Roger Dunz	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	There is no logical reason to expand the number of sites in Stevenage, especially in this area that is remote from centres of rubbish collection and policing facilities. Better to expand the current site.	See response to comment 112 (need). See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
1814	975687	Mrs Margaret Presland	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	This would encroach on and overwhelm Graveley. Green Belt should protect the rural and historic village of Graveley. Concerns around extra traffic causing congestion and accidents and passing through Graveley. The existing Dyes Lane site should be extended instead.	See response to comment 254 (Green Belt). See response to comment 401 (traffic). See response to comment 8 (existing site).
1816	342738	Mr Peter Stones	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The location of the site (adjacent to the hospital and new homes) is completely irresponsible and not necessary.	See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 112 (need).
1845	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Concerns around development north of Stevenage. This is the most densely populated area of Stevenage and is already feeling the impact of the large Great Ashby development. North Road would effectively be industrialised with the employment areas, travellers site and superstore.	See response to comment 234 (best site).
1862	342755	Mr Mervyn Tervett	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	The Deputy Leader of SBC has publicly stated that all towns need an area of aspirational housing. Clearly these are not areas where travellers should be sited.	See response to comment 234 (best site). See response to comment 264 (access).
1419	977318	Mr Ray Elmes	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1423	975864	Nicky Gilbert	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1427	974622	Caroline McDonnell	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.

1431	977211	K Davies	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1435	977221	Ms M Garrett	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1439	977228	M Scallan	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1444	977231	B M Rumney	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1449	977234	Mr Alan McCarley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1453	977235	Ms Annette Fisher	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1457	977294	Mrs Marjorie McCarley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1462	977296	B Shadbolt	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1466	977302	Ms Janet Fraser	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1470	977305	M K Issac	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1474	977306	H Cussens	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1478	977322	J M Roberts	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1482	977323	Mrs Vivian Snowdon	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1486	977690	Ms Tracy Wicklow	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1490	977691	Daljit Dale	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1494	975881	Mr David Jackson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1498	977618	Ms Anne-Lise Domeisen	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1502	975830	Victoria Jackson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1506	977300	Ms Una Bracey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1510	977332	Ms Tracey Owen	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1514	342785	Mrs Nina Turvey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1518	977689	Mr Julian Tribe	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.

1522	977201	Mr Stephen Westwood	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1526	976087	Mrs Josie Norledge	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1530	977203	Mr Jonathan McCarley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1531	977206	Mr Tim Dean	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1534	977206	Mr Tim Dean	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1538	977207	Ms Anne Larkins	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1542	342082	Mr Carter	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1546	342081	Mrs Cherry Carter	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1550	977214	P Smith	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1554	342433	Mr & Mrs Kennedy	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1558	977219	R Frosterick	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1562	977220	C Briggs	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1567	977230	Ms Lucy Rayer	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1571	977289	Mrs Kathleen Matthew	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1575	977291	Ms Clare Hancock	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1579	977292	Mr Ivor Hancock	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1583	977324	Mrs M Bartrip	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1587	977326	Mr D E Bartrip	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1591	977329	Ms Valerie Day	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1595	977331	R Taylor	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1603	977333	Mr Mark Santacreu	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1607	977335	A L Brown	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.

1611	977337	Mr John Day	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1615	977338	Mr John Berry	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1619	977340	Mr Nigel Pointing	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1623	977343	Mr Steven Young	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1627	977344	Mr Kenny Crowe	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1635	977350	Mr Brad Watts	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1639	977352	Mr Wayne Shambrook	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1643	977354	Mr Spencer Ryan	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1647	977355	Mr R Fautley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1651	977356	J Fautley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1655	977359	Ms Yvonne Millard	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1659	977360	S Fairey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1663	977361	Mr M Anstiss	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1667	977362	Mr Stephen Osburn	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1671	977364	Ms Jane Osburn	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1675	977365	Mr Steven Emson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1679	977366	Ms May Emson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1683	977371	Mr David Wiggins	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1687	977612	Ms Nancy Bidmead	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1691	977613	Mr Robin Baker	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1695	977614	Mrs Caroline Kumar	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1699	977616	Mr Navin Kumar	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.

1703	979347	Mr K Crowe	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1707	977620	Ms C Kerry	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1711	977621	E Farey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1715	977622	N Farey	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1719	977624	Mrs S Tribe	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1723	977626	Mr R Tribe	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1727	977692	Zena Connell	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1731	975681	Mr Colin Rafferty	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1735	974290	Jennie Hawkins	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1739	974350	Mr Adam Connell	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1743	342532	Mr Tom McCall	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1747	974373	Ms Kimberley Richardson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1751	974438	Mr Martin Charles	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1755	974521	Mr Barry Bunningham	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1759	974600	Jessica Simpson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1763	974657	Sheila Marvell	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1767	975352	Mr Trevor Beard	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1771	975702	Hannah Kimberley	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1775	975778	Elspeth Jackson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1779	975819	Ms Patricia Rumpus	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1783	975870	Mr Ross Jackson	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
1787	973079	Mr Paul Watts	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.

1791	976079	Mr Robin Norledge	Policy HO12: Gypsy and traveller provision	Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937.
------	--------	-------------------	--	---	--

Good design

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
568	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Good Design	The plan's proposals for development do not significantly alter fire risk profile in the area. However the provision of domestic sprinkler systems in residential properties at the build stage could improve public safety further. The Fire and Rescue service would advocate this being included.	Acknowledged. The plan makes a commitment to providing safe homes of high build quality. The proposal whilst noted, would place higher build costs upon developers whilst not delivering a substantial increase in fire safety on top of Stevenage's very respectable safety record. No Change.
1304	452235	Mr Leslie Smith	Good Design	The plan provides an opportunity to improve the town's image and attract investment. A high level of architecture and greenery in all new developments on the rural edges of the town is important, integrating them into the local area with more parking, architecturally consistent aspirational homes.	The Plan incorporates requirements for a 'high level of architecture' (para 10.1/ GD1: a) and access to green space (Policy GD 1: d). No Change.
36	969599	Ms Susan Tew	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	"Bright carnival colours" are becoming popular, Nobel School for example. This makes the appearance look cheap and tacky and is not complimentary to the surrounding green, natural areas. A better example is the renovated building opposite Pankhurst Crescent. Tasteful duck egg blue is more in keeping with British heritage and sits well with existing buildings and green space.	Policy GD1:a states that permission will be granted where a development 'respects and makes a positive contribution to its surroundings'. No Change
39	969601	Ms Sheila Little	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Design of high density flats in Old Town should not be copied elsewhere. Harrow Court and the other high-rise tower blocks are awful but better.	Noted. Our design policies aim to make new developments attractive and of a high quality.
63	768523	Sport England	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	GD1 should be amended to include additional criterion relating to designing developments to encourage healthy lifestyles through the promotion of activity. Supporting text should refer to 'Sport England's' and 'Public Health England's' joint Active Design guidance. This would accord with NPPF.	The plan does encourage a healthier lifestyle and built environment, seen in policy SP2 (k), SP6, Sp9 and throughout chapter 11. No Change.
76	969652	Mr Danny Tsang	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Support housing, as long as it's built right. Hope developments are more medium, high-end homes. Great Ashby example should not be followed; it is cramped and lacks parking.	Noted. See response to comment 39. No change.
147	969704	Ms Debbie Dunn	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	New housing is good, but why is it so unattractive? Why not use decent companies such as Bovis who know how to make a neighbourhood look desirable.	Noted. See response to comment 39. No change.
158	969920	Ms Carol Beaumont	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	In Pin Green, but assumed other areas, houses have fencing which creates 'dark, narrow pathways' that are uninviting and potentially dangerous to the user. Removal would create a more open environment and offer some potential 'escape routes' should they be necessary. Open up the alleyways and enclosed pedestrian routes in Pin Green, but also where appropriate, to create a safer and less intimidating environment.	Policy GD1: B & C collectively respond to this issue.

179	634033	Mr Stephen Prince	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	All new housing should have 'adequate and hidden storage for refuse and recycling bins' and good room size standards, rather than the small room sizes developers are currently able to provide.	Policy GD 1 criteria j, k and l address these areas. The Stevenage Design SPD includes guidance on refuse and recycling bins.
197	972363	Hertfordshire Constabulary (Crime prevention and design)	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Policy 'GD1' does not go far enough. No detail showing how 'Quality Design' will be measured or achieved. All Major Applications should consult with Hertfordshire Constabulary and incorporate all reasonable crime prevention measures recommended, the NPPG includes guidance on crime prevention. This would help council meet obligations under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.	All new planning applications must consult with Hertfordshire Constabulary on reasonable crime prevention measures where appropriate.
339	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Nature, biodiversity, wildlife habitat protection and enhancement and conservation should all form an intrinsic part of this design and they don't. Include requirements for sustainable, wildlife friendly development. Green design standards should also be incorporated (energy/water/carbon footprint in construction and on-going use) Some anti-flood mechanisms are outlined. Should also consider other water management systems to allow water to return to the aquifer/be absorbed (such as porous asphalt).	The plan recognises the importance of preserving and enhancing biodiversity in chapters 5, 13, 14 and policy SP12. Incorporating green design principles to the extent suggested would severely compromise the viability and deliverability of other elements of the plan.
410	341653	Home Builders Federation	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Object to elements of GD1. The Housing Technical Paper shows that the majority of recent schemes have met the national space standards. This would suggest it is not an issue. No assessment of the impact of the standard on viability and affordability has been carried out. Impact on starter homes has not been assessed. Requiring 50% wheelchair accessible homes is likely to have significant implications. The technical paper states the plan will set a 50% target. Cannot find a policy stipulating this. The council should clarify its intentions. This requirement is significantly above the identified need and is too onerous. The requirement will impact on viability and provision could become difficult. Addressing viability on a case-by-case basis is not an ideal way to resolve potential problems. The plan-led system should provide a high degree of certainty for the applicant. Negotiating every application would result in delay. A policy requirement for wheelchair accessible homes should only be applied to the affordable element (see NPPG).	The whole plan viability study assessed the impact of the national space standards and included sufficient allowance for wheelchair accessible homes. Stevenage Borough Council has chosen to adopt these standards as minimum in order to facilitate the building of larger homes in order to balance out Stevenage's housing mix, as evidenced by 2015's 'Stevenage Borough Council Strategic Housing Market Assessment'. Policy HO11 sets out that the 50% requirement applies to major residential schemes. No change.
497	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	No justification why national space standards should be exceeded. Overly large gardens are inefficient use of land, inappropriate to a new extension. Object to 50% of all new dwelling being category 2 (accessible and adaptable dwellings), 10% would be much more acceptable. Deletion of policy 'GD 1: j'. Reduction of 50% criteria, mentioned in the housing technical paper, to 10%.	See response to comment 410. No change.

526	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Policy GD1 criteria (d) - The Plan removes countryside, replacing it with housing. How can this be creating, enhancing or improving access to open space etc.? At best it leaves small areas within the housing on top of lost countryside. The Plan should not make promises that are so inconsistent. Remove of green belt development proposals.	The plan identifies 'exceptional reasons' why development of greenbelt land is vital towards Stevenage's 'objectively assessed housing need'. See para 5.126 - 5.134. No change.
636	390063	Hill Residential Limited	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	Object to criteria j. This stifles the ability of the developer or architect to be imaginative and innovative in the use of space. Delete this criteria, para 10.4 and the final sentence of paragraph 10.3.	Stevenage's aim is to maintain the size of residential properties. See response 410 No change.
711	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Policy GD1: High Quality Design	New formal physical activity facilities should be equally accessible. Ensure well-used outdoor play opportunities and environments which encourage child-led free play outside of formally designated areas. An aspiration to meet Lifetime Homes Standards or similar should be considered.	Health and Wellbeing play a role elsewhere in the document other than design within chapter 11. The plan specifies 50% homes suitable for mobility issues. See response 63.
336	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP8: Good design	Biodiversity is better served by including wildlife friendly design in building projects rather than offsetting biodiversity to isolated wild sites. Add a requirement that building projects are low-carbon and adhere to green guidelines in terms of energy generation and conservation, insulation, and impact on biodiversity in the area. Include 'wildlife friendly design, low carbon requirements and requirements to adhere to green guidelines' regarding biodiversity, energy generation and conservation'.	The plan recognises the importance of preserving and enhancing biodiversity in chapters 5, 13, 14 and policy SP12; it refers to efforts to reduce water consumption per person and SuD's in paragraph 13.6 and policy FP1. Policy NH3 in chapter 14 designates green corridors specifically. Incorporating green design principles to the extent suggested would severely compromise the viability and deliverability of other elements of the plan. Comments on other methods of water management are welcome.
548	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP8: Good design	Good design and master planning are supported, but the aspirations sought, particularly the Governments Optional Technical Standards, should be subject to viability on a site by site basis, particularly given the generality of the whole plan, recommend viability assessment of the urban extensions. SP8 (d) - The policy wording should include 'where viability permits' to ensure that the Plan is deliverable.	Support welcomed. Stevenage has chosen to implement the governments optional technical standards within its local plan in order to address the imbalances in the current housing stock and ensure high quality, accessible and energy efficient homes.
779	636011	Environment Agency	Policy SP8: Good design	SP8 should include a section requiring new development and regeneration to include SuDS and green spaces that are connected to create ecological corridors or available habitat for wildlife.	SuD's are mentioned in paragraph 13.6 'developments should incorporate SuD's in order to help reduce flood risk'. See response 336.

626	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Design	Para 10.4 Object - There should be some flexibility in meeting the nationally described space standards subject to design detail and viability. Amend to allow greater flexibility.	The nationally described space standards are an optional Government standard that local authorities can choose to implement. Stevenage council has chosen to adopt these standards as minimum in order to facilitate the building of larger homes in order to balance out Stevenage's housing mix, as evidenced by 2015's 'Stevenage Borough Council Strategic Housing Market Assessment'.
597	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Good design	Para 5.95 Strongly Object. It would be inappropriate and undeliverable for developers at West of Stevenage to prepare a masterplan related to land beyond their control, for which they will not be able to assess the constraints, for which they cannot control the design process and for which there is no current site allocation.	Developers will not be asked to prepare masterplans for land beyond their control.

Healthy communities

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
136	969683	Ms Maggie Williams	Healthy Communities	Play areas are being closed. They should be bought back.	The Plan allows for new play areas, where required. Existing facilities are the responsibility of the Environmental Services team. No change.
167	452235	Mr Peter Fuller	Healthy Communities	Schools and GP surgeries are badly overstretched. Do you intend building more?	The plan allows for new schools and GP surgeries, where required. The needs arising from population growth have been fully assessed in conjunction with the infrastructure providers. No change.
566	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Healthy Communities	Object to para 5.103. Requirements should be subject to viability on a site by site basis.	The viability of specific developer requirements will be fully assessed at the time of application. No change.
574	975694	Churches Together	Healthy Communities	Very little reference to faith/spiritual or sacred spaces. The Plan should consider new faith/multi-faith uses in the new build areas or town centre. Churches provide care for the needy and volunteers.	Policies HC4 & HC5 protect existing facilities and allow for new facilities to be provided. Policy HC1 also protects the neighbourhood centres, which generally provide these facilities. No change.
43	969602	Ms Yvonne Shaw Basciu	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Create organic communities. Good relationships between neighbours and the community is essential for a town to grow. Consider cafe hubs for home workers, event evenings for commuters and incentivised car share schemes to integrate communities. Provide/use existing community space for groups to network.	Detailed policies within the Plan allow for new community facilities, such as this, to be provided. No change.
58	768523	Sport England	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Support criteria f. This takes positive approach to provision, enhancement and protection of leisure/sports facilities including identified facility priorities in the Council's evidence base. This accords with the NPPF.	Support welcomed.
397	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	No consideration given to need for GP surgeries. No education strategy for the housing proposed in the north of the town. At least 1 extra nursery and a 4FE school will be required. This will bring additional transport issues as well.	See response to comment 167. Transport issues have been assessed and will be mitigated, where possible. No change.
487	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	No objection to criteria d. but clarification is sought that there is evidence of need for such services. The policy should be flexible in its application.	See response to comment 167. No change.
561	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Support criteria c., provided there is a demonstrated need. Should be made clear that the provision of health facilities has to be on commercial terms.	Support welcomed. The terms of the provision of the health facilities will be negotiated at the planning application stage. It will be subject to viability studies and the evidenced need for the facility as well as the feasibility of the health provision being accommodated within already existing health practices within the town. See also response to comment 167. No change.
562	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Object to criteria f. (iii). SBC evidence indicates there is sufficient capacity for cricket, but that the existing facility needs improvement. Opportunity to secure developer contributions to make improvements. A further site is unjustified. None of the other urban extensions have been considered as an alternative to make this provision. No justification given as to why West of Stevenage has been identified. The Plan should recognise that delivery of a cricket pitch should be subject to both masterplanning and development viability, particularly if there is an expectation that the cricket pitch should be for sole cricket use and segregated from the wider community use. This could impact on developable area and, therefore, viability and could compromise masterplanning.	Our evidence study identifies Stevenage West to be the most appropriate location for this facility. The requirement will be subject to demand at the time of application. No change.

699	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Support the inclusion of a Healthy Community policy. However, should cross reference to other policies to acknowledge the wider determinants of good health i.e. access to education and employment, sustainable and active travel etc. Reference should be made to the Health and Wellbeing Planning Guidance. Consideration should be given to the use of Health Impact Assessment for all major development, if not the plan itself.	Support welcomed. Providing healthy communities is an underlying theme of the Plan and SBC's Community Strategy. We have tried to avoid cross-referencing policies, to avoid repetition and adding unnecessary length to the plan document. We believe our policies will ensure healthy communities and there is no requirement to introduce Health Impact Assessments, placing another burden on developers. No change.
903	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	Object to the relocation of the Arts and Leisure Centre. This facility is more modern than much of the town centre and its facilities are valued and closely in line with requirements. The cost of providing alternative facilities is high. Little consideration given to alternatives that keep the existing facility. The benefits of moving the bus station a few yards towards the train station do not justify the costs.	The Arts and Leisure Centre is moving towards the end of its useful life. Maintenance costs will be higher in the long term than the costs identified to provide new facilities. The bus station creates a barrier to movement through the town centre. Relocation will enable development of an improved scheme. No change.
1303	975836	Susan Bucktrout	Policy SP9: Healthy Communities	There are not enough leisure and recreation facilities already, particularly free or low cost for older children. Health, social services and schools are severely stretched and not enough is included to improve sub standard services. Increased population will increase these problems.	Our IDP identifies any infrastructure shortages and estimates the needs likely to arise from new development. The Plan allows for these needs to be met. No change.
757	341398	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	Policy HC1: District, local and neighbourhood centres	Support the allocation of the Sainsbury's store within Poplars District Centre. Support proposal to maintain the unique retail composition in Poplars over the plan period.	Support welcomed.
540	975798	NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG	Health, social and community facilities	The Plan contains incomplete detail on existing health infrastructure and does not set out explicitly the expected impact of development on health (Health Impact Assessment). The link to public health outcomes, Health & Wellbeing Board priorities and inclusion of social care is not immediately apparent. Request that these areas are included/strengthened.	Health infrastructure requirements are taken directly from the IDP, which has been developed in conjunction with infrastructure providers. Adding additional references would add unnecessary length to the plan document. No change.
149	969706	Ms Judy Nichols	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Concerns around expansion of Lister Hospital. Since the last expansion, parking has become a big problem in surrounding areas. Parking for the hospital needs to be improved.	Our Parking Standards should ensure that sufficient parking provision is provided to meet the needs of new development. The Local Plan cannot control existing parking problems. No change.
168	969921	Mr Peter Fuller	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Having closed QEII, burden is now placed on Lister Hospital. Can it cope with a bigger influx of people?	Our IDP assesses healthcare requirements for the plan period, including the impacts of growth. Any new infrastructure requirements are reflected in the plan. No change.
259	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Additional housing will worsen traffic around the hospital. The Lister was chosen for expansion because of the surrounding land, short sighted to build non-hospital uses on it.	HC3 allocates land that can be used for hospital expansion. Transport issues have been assessed and will be mitigated, where possible. No change.
271	970834	Mr Alan Gates (landowner)	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Support HC3 allowance for further expansion of the Lister Hospital and ancillary facilities. This is the most appropriate location for such a facility, given its position adjacent to the existing facilities and the A1(M), and the current vacant use with existing access.	Support welcomed.
310	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Proposed developments will limit the future expansion of Lister Hospital. To maintain its new role and to cope with increased population, it will need to expand. There are issues with the allocated site (to the rear of Cygnet Hospital) including land levels and pylons.	See response to comment 259. Site constraints can be overcome. No change.
388	341380	East And North Herts NHS Trust	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Land allocated for hospital use is remote from the main hospital site, and connected through a narrow pinch point. There are major topographical issues with this land.	See response to comment 310. No change.

421	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	HC3 will limit the expansion of the hospital. The hospital already experiences severe capacity issues, increased and ageing population will exacerbate this. Lister will need expansion space. There are issues, due to pylons and land levels, with the allocated land next to Cygnet Hospital.	See responses to comments 259 and 310.
436	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	HC3 will limit the expansion of the hospital. The hospital already experiences severe capacity issues, increased and ageing population will exacerbate this. Lister will need expansion space. There are issues, due to pylons and land levels, with the allocated land next to Cygnet Hospital.	See responses to comments 259 and 310.
465	401221	Origin Housing Group	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Object to HC3. The existing use of land leased by Origin is C3. This cannot be changed by the Plan. An application to replace residential accommodation with new could not, in principle, be refused. Origin and the Lister have been discussing occupation of the proposed residential units by hospital related residents. The plan would prejudice this.	The Plan cannot change existing uses, but it can allocate land for alternative uses if the existing site/use were to be redeveloped. No change.
474	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Joint traffic modelling and flood assessment work doesn't consider impacts of additional floorspace. Further work required. In the event that these objections cannot be overcome, the health campus allocation should be redrawn to cover the existing facilities only.	Noted. A Level 2 SFRA has been completed for this area. The latest transport modelling work will be available. Hertfordshire County Council have raised no objection. No change.
662	341377	Cygnet Healthcare Ltd	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Support proposals for a health campus. Trust SBC will give consideration to staffing of the campus and promote easy access and good public transport. The health and safety of nurses working unsociable hours must be considered; incompatible uses should not be permitted. A medical campus should not include uses other than C2 and D1.	Support welcomed.
869	342707	Mrs Kath Shorten	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	No credible proposal for hospital expansion given. No recognition of car parking issues.	See response to comment 149 and 259. No change.
888	342259	Mr Stewart Gillies	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	Further land for hospital growth will inevitably be required. There is no provision for this in the Plan.	See response to comment 259. No change.
1100	342182	Miss Margaret Donovan	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	No provision is made for Lister's current and future needs. The Inspector should check with the NHS Trust what land they require. When the Lister was originally built, the future requirements for space were underestimated. Stevenage should be aiming to be a centre for health in this part of eastern England.	See response to comment 259. The IDP feeds directly into the plan, which fully considers infrastructure needs, taking into account population growth. No change.
1121	977378	King George Surgery Patient Liaison Group	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	The Plan does not meet healthcare requirements for Stevenage and the surrounding areas. Additional hospital capacity is required now, and for increased population and new treatments. The air ambulance landing pad might require land in the future. Parking is also a concern. If this results in healthcare being centralised elsewhere, this would be disastrous. If space were available, the CCG could be consulted to see if they were willing to co-locate services. A centre of healthcare excellence should be encouraged, not prevented.	See response to comments 259 and 1100. The Plan cannot set aside land for uses for which there is no demonstrated need. No change.
1246	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy HC3: The Health Campus	HC3 will limit the expansion of the hospital. The hospital already experiences severe capacity issues, increased and ageing population will exacerbate this. Lister will need expansion space. There are issues, due to pylons and land levels, with the allocated land next to Cygnet Hospital.	See responses to comments 259 and 310.
1349	974282	Mrs Julie Paterson	Policy HC4: Existing health, social and community facilities	A hospice is required, particularly as we have an ever growing aging population. There is little provision for respite care for those children/ young adults. Existing special needs schools have respite centre for their own pupils, but what about the other children?	The IDP feeds directly into the plan, which fully considers infrastructure needs. No change.

148	969704	Ms Debbie Dunn	Policy HC5: New health, social and community facilities	New GP surgeries are essential.	See response to comment 167. No change.
527	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Leisure and cultural facilities	Disagree with para 11.31. Residents in the north of Stevenage do not have access to 'a wide choice of activities'. Forster Country is widely used for walking, cycling and running, all of which have demonstrable health benefits, yet the plan proposes to build on this area. Para 11.32 - The facilities of Forster Country cannot be relocated or replaced in line with HC6.	Part of Forster Country will be retained as countryside to enable these recreation uses to continue. Policy HC6 relates to the loss of leisure and cultural facilities as designated under use classes D1, D2 and SG. This does not include Forster Country. No change.
913	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Leisure and cultural facilities	Object to the relocation of the Arts and Leisure Centre. This facility is more modern than much of the town centre and its facilities are valued and closely in line with requirements. The cost of providing alternative facilities is high. Little consideration given to alternatives that keep the existing facility. The benefits of moving the bus station a few yards towards the train station do not justify the costs.	See response to comment 903. No change.
3	143529	The Theatres Trust	Policy HC6: Existing leisure and cultural facilities	Support Policies HC6 & HC7. These reflect NPPF guidance.	Support welcomed.
64	768523	Sport England	Policy HC6: Existing leisure and cultural facilities	Support Policy HC6. Provides robust basis for assessing proposals that affect existing leisure and cultural facilities. Policy supported by robust evidence base - shows a range of sports facility deficiencies, which justifies the continued protection of existing. Accords with NPPF and Sport England's policies.	Support welcomed.
462	974795	Active4Less	Policy HC6: Existing leisure and cultural facilities	Believe the Active4Less facility can contribute to Plan objectives. Keen to preserve and develop the club. Would consider relocation to a suitable location if it will allow optimal implementation of the plan. Happy to work with the council in delivering leisure and cultural facilities in new developments.	Noted. No change.
32	964294	Mr Eamonn Walsh	Policy HC7: New and refurbished leisure and cultural facilities	Town Centre needs a standalone theatre/arts space. Refurbishment of the swimming pool is vital for improving health - current facilities are no longer to standard. A new walking area for leisure purposes should be included.	Noted. No change.
65	768523	Sport England	Policy HC7: New and refurbished leisure and cultural facilities	Broadly support HC7. But concern about how criterion c. will be applied to sports facilities. For the majority of sports facilities, town centre/neighbourhood centre location not suitable or desirable. Sports facilities should be specifically excluded from criterion (c).	Support welcomed. Noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that Sport England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
340	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy HC7: New and refurbished leisure and cultural facilities	The plan is not fully inclusive in this area. Evidence should be gathered about users and used to make sure that all sections of the population are catered for. Older people, for example, might enjoy walking their dog, rather than formal sports. People enjoy Nature by walking or other activities in open spaces.	Our evidence assesses the needs of all members of the community. Policy HC7 relates to formal sports provision only. The health benefits of open spaces are recognised within the Natural Environment chapter, and policies are included to protect these spaces. No change.
463	974795	Active4Less	Policy HC7: New and refurbished leisure and cultural facilities	Believe the Active4Less facility can contribute to Plan objectives. Keen to preserve and develop the club. Would consider relocation to a suitable location if it will allow optimal implementation of the plan. Happy to work with the council in delivering leisure and cultural facilities in new developments.	Noted. No change.

66	768523	Sport England	Policy HC8: Sports facilities in new developments	Welcome HC8 in principle. The approach is justified by the evidence base. Policy HC8 or the supporting text should confirm how the policy would operate within the restrictions of the CIL Regulations (pooling restrictions) and alongside a potential CIL charging levy. Recommend introduction of a Planning Obligations SPD to address this in detail.	Support noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that Sport England's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
464	974795	Active4Less	Policy HC8: Sports facilities in new developments	Believe the Active4Less facility can contribute to Plan objectives. Keen to preserve and develop the club. Would consider relocation to a suitable location if it will allow optimal implementation of the plan. Happy to work with the council in delivering leisure and cultural facilities in new developments.	Noted. No change.
494	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy HC8: Sports facilities in new developments	The provision of sports facilities could be covered through CIL payments, therefore Policy HC8 should be deleted.	Noted. We believe Policy HC8 is important in ensuring sports facilities are provided. No change.
627	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy HC8: Sports facilities in new developments	There should be recognition that the delivery of facilities is subject to both masterplanning and development viability. This may impact on developable area and, therefore, viability.	Our evidence work assesses viability and considers the plan requirements to be deliverable. No change.
67	768523	Sport England	Policy HC9: Former Barnwell East secondary school	Support HC9. Justified by the Council's evidence base that identifies a need for additional sports hall provision. Policy accords with the NPPF.	Support welcomed.
135	969683	Ms Maggie Williams	Policy HC9: Former Barnwell East secondary school	Delighted to hear more schools are being planned. However, concern over low number of secondary schools. Reopening Collenswood is not enough. Need to reduce the student:teacher ratio.	See response to comment 167. No change.
558	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Policy HC9: Former Barnwell East secondary school	Landowner welcomes the allocation of this site for education use. It is not known when the site will be bought back into use and what the guidance/standards will be for school sports provision in the future. Amend wording relating to the provision of a 4 court sports hall to something like: 'Sports hall provision on the site will be made available for community use'.	Support welcomed. Suggested wording noted. Whilst the Council does not believe that the County Council's representations go to issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree, an alternative form of words could be agreed.
68	768523	Sport England	Policy HC10: Redundant school sites	Support HC10. Recognises role/potential role school playing fields play in meeting community need, even if a school closes. This approach is justified by the evidence base.	Support welcomed.

The Green Belt

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
7	964791	Mr Peter Bentley	The Green Belt	Object to building on the Green Belt. No more countryside should be taken up by Stevenage. Object to building west of the A1(M) in particular, due to loss of countryside and risk of further urbanisation to the west.	Green Belt release is required to meet, inter alia, our objectively assessed housing needs. Land to the West of Stevenage is not within the Green Belt, so does not require release in this plan. No change.
74	452235	Mr Peter Bentley	The Green Belt	Strongly opposed to any development on the Green Belt. Stevenage has already taken up a lot of the Hertfordshire countryside, it should not take more. Preserving the countryside is more important than building new homes.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). The plan aims to provide a balance between providing new homes and protecting green infrastructure/the environment. No change.
235	973034	Hart	The Green Belt	Need to remove the Green Belt has not been demonstrated.	Our Green Belt Technical Paper identifies the Exceptional Circumstances that exist to justify rolling back the Green Belt.
1807	975422	Ms Liz Brown	The Green Belt	Object to Section 12. The recent approval for 14 homes in Norton Green is against these policies/aspirations, so leads to thinking there is no point in expressing a view.	The plan cannot impact on applications that have already been permitted. The plan proposes to put Norton Green back into the Green Belt, in order to protect its rural character.
258	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Green Belt	Greenbelt should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. Build a new town outside the greenbelt area.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). NHDC and EHDC are unwilling to meet our OAN for housing within their districts. Building on the Green Belt within our Borough boundary is the only means of securing the delivery of our OAN in a sustainable way. Building a new town would not enable us to meet our housing target within the plan period and could not be provided within the Borough boundary. Para's 2.49 - 2.52 of the Green Belt Technical Paper provide further details. No change.
457	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Green Belt	Part I of the Green Belt Review identifies area including EC1/7 as making a significant contribution to Green Belt purposes. The proposed allocation has not been adequately justified, exceptional circumstances justifying the Green Belt release have not been adequately demonstrated. It is questionable whether this site is deliverable.	The Green Belt Review Part 2 identifies this site is appropriate for removal from the Green Belt. See also response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
573	767712	Knebworth Estates	Green Belt	Land at J7 should be removed from the Green Belt. SBC have previously considered this site to be suitable for release, revised consideration is wrong and conflicts with Para 5.125. Land to the south of the hotel is a strategic and unique site for a landmark development. This investment should be supported. Land to the north of the hotel could offer complimentary leisure and service facilities to the town, in particular Gunnels Wood.	The Green Belt Technical Paper explains why this land is not being released from the Green Belt. There is no requirement for additional leisure uses, to justify Green Belt release. No change.
1002	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Green Belt	Green Belt should prevent urban sprawl. Proposals for release to the north will engulf Graveley. Object to loss of Forster Country, which is full of wildlife (some red list) and established woodlands and hedgerows. Green Belt also contribute to green infrastructure and improves connectivity between environmentally important areas, urban green spaces and the wider countryside.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 74 (balance between land uses). Our Green Belt Review identifies these sites can be released without damage to the overall Green Belt purposes, including the prevention of urban sprawl. No change.
1268	978665	Mr Dave Stimpson	Green Belt	It has not been explained what the 'exceptional circumstances' are to allow Green Belt release. Adjusting Green Belt for administrative convenience is not justified.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
97	922076	Croudace Homes Ltd	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Support Policy SP10. Important to look beyond 2031, likely that land within NHDC, currently Green Belt, may be required to meet the long-term housing needs of Stevenage.	Welcome support. We will continue to work with NHDC and EHDC to safeguard land in the Green Belt to meet the future housing needs of Stevenage beyond 2031 in their Districts

128	969678	Mr Derek Harrington	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to use of Green Belt.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
140	969697	Ms Margaret Maitland	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Disappointed to hear proposals will threaten Green Belt, particularly Forster Country. Plans would irrevocably change a beautiful and historic area.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
155	341843	Stevenage Society For Local History	Policy SP10: Green Belt	The Society are obviously concerned about the erosion of Green Belt around Stevenage. Some feel the information in the plan around this was confusing.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
159	909233	Mrs Madeline Lovelock	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on Green Belt. Green Belt must be left for us all to enjoy. Discussion around the benefits of protecting Green Belt such as food production, nature and health benefits. Green Belt plays a role in English Heritage and has its own identity.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 74 (balance between land uses). No change.
161	969923	Ms Alison Blanshard	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Green Belt release and proposed building due to lack of infrastructure and compromising emergency access to the hospital. Traffic is already congested from J8, primary schools are oversubscribed. Another supermarket is not required so close to existing provision.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 74 (balance between land uses). No change.
191	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Green Belt release. HO3 reduces accessibility to countryside. Land west of the A1 is less accessible to Stevenage residents and is more suitable for development. No need for a new food store so close to existing. Site should be used for housing and to retain the garden centre.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 74 (balance between land uses). Land West of Stevenage is also being used to meet housing needs. Our evidence demonstrates a need for increased retail provision within the plan period. No change.
204	969971	Ms Karen Bridden	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Strongly object to reviewing Green Belt boundaries. The overall housing target is excessive.	Our evidence suggests this housing target is appropriate. No change.
228	342714	Dr Stephen Skittrall	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to loss of Green Belt. The main purpose of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl. Another purpose is to separate communities. Once land has been designated as Green Belt it should remain so in perpetuity.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release), 74 (balance between land uses) and 1002 (no overall harm). No change.
304	970582	Mr Steve Hilborne	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Building on the Green Belt is inappropriate. There is currently a distinct boundary between Graveley and Stevenage. This will be a terrible loss of valuable rural land, having a detrimental impact on wildlife and the well-being of residents. This is not what people want for this area. We want to protect the Green Belt and protect the benefits associated with it.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release), 74 (balance between land uses) and 1002 (no significant harm). No change.
317	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy SP10: Green Belt	How can SBC protect green spaces within the town and then remove Green Belt? SBC are NIMBYs. Why hasn't the use of Fairlands Valley Park been considered? Exceptional circumstances have not been shown. This is contrary to National Policy.	See response to comment 74 (balance of land uses) and 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
337	922994	North Herts & Stevenage Green Party	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Green Belt release is not justified. The plan is based on assumptions of growth that may not materialise. New towns are a better solution, and if not, then using brownfield sites and being more creative in use of space. Welcome recent brownfield developments. Support the development of the shopping areas to include more housing. It is not obvious that these efforts won't be sufficient to meet demand. The plan does not justify 'exceptional circumstances'. Include a statement that developing green belt land won't be considered until all other sites have been developed.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release), 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 204 (housing target). Support for brownfield development welcomed. The Plan uses a Brownfield first approach, as demonstrated in the Housing Technical Paper. It is considered a completely new town would not enable us to meet our housing target within the plan period. Para's 2.49 - 2.52 of the Green Belt Technical Paper provide further details. No change.
362	342698	Mrs Gillian Shenoy	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on Green Belt. 7,600 is an excessive number of houses to build. This will increase congestion and pollution. The B197 is already congested and accidents are frequent, causing tailbacks in the surrounding areas. This impacts significantly on Graveley residents.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 204 (housing target). Traffic impacts have been assessed. Improvements will be implemented, where required. No change.

376	974007	Mr Richard Aggus	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Stevenage is surrounded by Green Belt, so either it stays the size it is or it expands into Green Belt. A new garden city could address many issues r.e. infrastructure, but this would be on Green Belt land too. Authorities should work together to create a single plan.	Noted. See response to comment 337 (new New Town proposal). SBC has worked closely with neighbouring authorities when preparing the Plan. No change.
385	342129	Mrs Anne Conchie	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to any building on the Green Belt. National guidance says housing needs are not exceptional circumstances.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
411	401300	Mr Jack Rigg	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Green Belt between Stevenage and Graveley strongly fulfils the five purposes. The AMEC report proposes sites to be safeguarded for future development. Green Belt release will result in excessive development / urban sprawl. Strong resistance to a New Town solution. Were such a development be a stated central government priority we believe ways and means would be found to achieve this in a shorter timeframe. Land outside of the Green Belt (5,300 homes) could be used in the interim, to bridge the time needed to approve a New Town, which would cover 14.5yrs.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). The Green Belt Review provides an appropriate, up-to-date evidence base. See responses to comments 74 (balance of land uses) and 337 (new New Town proposal). No change.
426	341576	Graveley Parish Council	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Green Belt between Stevenage and Graveley strongly fulfils the five purposes. The AMEC report proposes sites to be safeguarded for future development. Green Belt release will result in excessive development / urban sprawl. Strong resistance to a New Town solution. Were such a development be a stated central government priority we believe ways and means would be found to achieve this in a shorter timeframe. Land outside of the Green Belt (5,300 homes) could be used in the interim, to bridge the time needed to approve a New Town, which would cover 14.5yrs.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances), 411 (evidence base), 74 (balance of land uses) and 337 (new New Town proposal). No change.
441	771716	Aston Village Society	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Green Belt development. Expansion cannot be sustainable if Green Belt is used. No 'exceptional circumstances' demonstrated. The decisions made to use commercial land, together with the process as outlined in your Green Belt paper, will always lead to the conclusion that you need to use Green Belt land. Support Para 5.130 and decision that other Green Belt land is not suitable for development. Disappointed SBC do not see a new settlement as a 'reasonable alternative'. This should be given a higher priority, as is better than overdevelopment.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 235 (exceptional circumstances). Support welcomed. See response to comment 337 (new New Town proposal). No change.
484	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Support the release of Green Belt land for residential development at North Stevenage and the safeguarding of land in NHDC to meet SBC housing needs beyond the plan period. The SBC Green Belt Review has ensured this approach is appropriate, sustainable and evidence based. Footnote 48 requires dating for clarity.	Support welcomed. Date added to footnote 48.

528	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Proposals will overpopulate the town. This was never the aim of the New Towns Commission. Object to the Green Belt Review. 'Exceptional circumstances' have not been proven. SBC & NHDC are planning a larger scheme, meaning the release of even more land from Green Belt. The SBC plan does not make this clear and no maps show this. The Plan should define boundaries clearly using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. Part of HO3 Is a conservation area and development will affect the significance of heritage assets.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 235 (exceptional circumstances). The Plan makes reference to the potential to expand the north and west new settlements into NHDC in a number of chapters. Our Proposals Map cannot show proposals for sites outside the Borough boundary. An area of Forster Country has been retained to ensure historic assets are protected. No change.
537	342647	Mr Edward Pugh	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Green Belt release to the north, particularly Forster Country. Object to Green Belt Review conclusion that this area lacks strong connection to the wider Green Belt due to a row of trees restricting the view. The trees are not mature and this is not a natural barrier. Countryside and walking benefits will be lost forever. Will destroy cultural heritage, habitats and wildlife, and last remaining farmland. Will create urban sprawl and coalescence.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release), 411 (Green Belt Review), 74 (balance of land uses) and 528 (heritage protection). Farmland will remain within Stevenage. No change.
592	922156	Pigeon Land Ltd	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Support SP10 and the objective of creating a coherent and connected Green Belt boundary by liaising with neighbouring authorities. If land on the eastern edge of Stevenage (within EHDC) is brought forward, it may be necessary to update the Plan to include reference to this land.	Support welcomed. No change.
663	976323	G C Mehmet	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to the overall loss of Greenbelt land.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
667	976327	Mr and Mrs T and P Morgan	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on Green Belt land.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
691	976491	K F O'Sullivan	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to loss of last remaining Green Belt areas in the countryside around Stevenage.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
696	612038	Miss Pauline Maryan	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to the erosion of the Green Belt.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
713	976536	Mr and Mrs Thorogood	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to the loss of greenfield land.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
730	763103	Central Bedfordshire UA	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Encouraged by proactive measures to boost the supply of housing. Support Green Belt release, to allow for development to the north and south-east of the town in particular.	Support welcomed.
738	341431	Aston Parish Council	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on green belt, unless there are exceptional circumstances which need to be clearly tested. Support proposals to meet housing targets by building on land inside the boundary. Proposals have the unfortunate effect of connecting Hooks Cross to Stevenage. This is a case of ribbon development and therefore bad planning and loses the integrity of Hooks Cross. Consider the green belt to the north of Stevenage has limited impact on Aston.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). Support welcomed. See also responses to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and comment 74 (balance of land uses). No change.
753	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Support Policy SP10. The LEP encourages cross-authority collaboration through agreements to meet the highest standards of urban design and place making where development adjacent to the Green Belt is planned.	Support welcomed.
811	977009	Mrs Hilary C Thompson	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Policy SP10. Building on Green Belt land will lead to the merger of Graveley into Stevenage.	See response to comment 1002 (no significant harm). No change.

816	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Believe 2013 Green Belt Review recommends retention of Forster Country. There is no evidence of co-operation between SBC and NHDC relating to this report.	The 2013 Review was the initial assessment of Green Belt land parcels. The 2015 Part 2 Review assesses the allocated sites. The conclusions of this Review have been followed. NHDC were invited to produce a joint Green Belt Study, but declined. The results have been shared. No change.
836	975231	Catherine Wallwork	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on Green Belt land. This would lead to a permanent loss of sites that provide habitats. The proposals for South East Stevenage state that 'this policy performs poorly against environmental measures'.	See response to comment 74 (balance of land uses). No change.
846	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP10: Green Belt	SBC (and NHDC) have not considered the impact of HO3 on the whole area, and the remaining part of the conservation area.	See responses to comments 411 (evidence base) and 1002 (no overall harm). Our Heritage Impact Assessment identifies that the impact on the heritage assets will not be significant. No change.
849	342633	Mr Stephen Pollock-Hill	Policy SP10: Green Belt	NHDC and SBC used different consultants to produce their Green Belt reviews/studies. No mention that the results of the SBC Review have been communicated to NHDC. A form of collusion has taken place to jointly develop this part of the Green Belt, and Forster Country. Details of discussions should be publicised.	See response to comments 411 (evidence base) and 816 (working with NHDC). No change.
855	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Policy SP10 relies on development of land outside the boundary that has not been formally proposed for development in a Local Plan. No exceptional circumstances demonstrated for removing Green Belt. Dispute claims that this land can be released without damage to the overall purpose of the Green Belt.	No reliance is placed on land outside of the Bourough boundary for housing, but the Plan acknowledges a more coherant and connected Green Belt boundary will be achieved with joint working. Land is identified outside the Borough boundary, in other towns, for employment needs. See also responses to comments 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 1002 (no overall harm). No change.
883	974002	Mr Frank Everest	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Plans for H03, the garden centre conversion and plans in NHDC will result in Graveley being totally consumed into Stevenage. This is completely against the concept of the Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl.	See response to 1002 (no overall harm). No change.
916	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to Green Belt release. Plan does not comply with the NPPF Green Belt purposes or the need to apply a sequential approach to the use of land (i.e. PDL first). Not proven that 'very special circumstances' exist. Graveley will be swallowed up by urban sprawl and the last remaining area of unspoilt farmland would be lost. Housing target is the upper bound of the projections. The OAN calculation should be amended to reflect Green Belt constraints.	See responses to comments 74 (balance of land uses), 235 (exceptional circumstances), 337 (brownfield first) and 1002 (no overall harm). See also response to comment 204 (housing target). No change.
936	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse, designated flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The increased level of traffic has not been considered.	A Level 2 SFRA has been completed for this area. This details areas where development would be unacceptable, or where mitigation might be required. This does not preclude development of any of our allocated sites. See also response to comment 362 (traffic impacts). No change.
954	922235	Eur Ing John C Spiers	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Exceptional circumstances not shown. Objective assessment to justify housing target has not been carried out. Removal of Green Belt to the north (HO3) is against all five NPPF purposes, particularly preventing towns merging. The Green Belt Review is flawed. It merely makes assertions and is unclear about the value of Green Belt to the north. Adding land in NHDC into the Green Belt (para 5.131) has not been tested with NHDC.	Objectively assessed need is calculated within the SHMA. Our Plan does not allocate land outside the Borough boundary. See also responses to comments 204 (housing target), 235 (exceptional circumstances), 411 (evidence base) and 1002 (overall harm). No change.
988	342828	Mrs Jennifer Watson-Usher	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to rolling back the Green Belt as this was put in place to protect the countryside.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.

991	400604	Greene King Plc	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Support for a housing target that meets OAN. Acknowledge review of Green Belt boundaries is necessary for both SBC and NHDC to meet their OAN. Support new allocations West and North. Unconvinced about South East Stevenage, which is remote from facilities. This should be omitted. Instead an early review of Brownfield capacity should be carried out and capacity increased at North and West Stevenage in association with NHDC.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). NHDC and EHDC are unwilling to meet our OAN for housing within their districts. Building on the Green Belt within our Borough boundary is the only means of securing the delivery of our OAN in a sustainable way. SBC wish to meet their OAN within the Borough boundary. Allocating HO4 for housing is essential to achieving this. No change.
1023	977260	Mrs M Selvage	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Concerned about the loss of Green Belt in the area but understand the need for housing.	Noted. No change.
1069	342862	Mr Ken Wing	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Strongly object to building on Green Belt, once lost its gone forever.	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
1079	974740	Felix Power	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Green Belt should stop sprawl and prevent towns merging. Only to be built on in exceptional circumstances. Assumes reasons cited are to alleviate social housing shortage, but this will not happen with only 30% affordable housing. It should be 70% affordable housing. Development will impact wildlife.	See responses to comments 74 (balance of land uses), 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 1002 (overall harm). The Whole Plan Viability Study demonstrates our affordable housing targets are what can be achieved on these sites, without making schemes unviable. No change.
1086	464410	Mrs Verity Yates-Mercer	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to rolling back Green Belt to the north. Accommodating future growth is not exceptional circumstances. Object to using Green Belt land for a G&T site. This should be within the town centre, preferably on PDL. SBC have chosen to use 7,600 (national projection) instead of 7,300 (OAN). This is contrary to the Localism Bill. The SLAA says needs can be met without Green Belt land. Figures in the plan are misleading and contradictory. Providing land for retail and employment needs is unlikely to constitute exceptional circumstances.	See responses to comments 204 (housing target) and 235 (exceptional circumstances). The SLAA is just one piece of evidence that must be considered. The Housing Technical Paper ties all evidence together and explains how we have got from this to the Local Plan allocations. No change.
1134	974583	Hayley Trampenau	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building new homes on Green Belt. Appreciate need for new homes, but Green Belt should not be used. This will cause increased pressure on infrastructure and flooding. There is already heavy congestion. Wildlife will be destroyed.	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 74 (balance of land uses) and 362 (traffic impacts). No change.
1163	769045	Mr Richard Blake	Policy SP10: Green Belt	There are no identified 'very special circumstances' to justify eroding the Green Belt, particularly around Forster Country, where very little open space will remain.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1168	341965	Mrs Hazel Barnham	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Use of Green Belt to meet housing targets is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to green belt. Green Belt boundaries should be protected to preserve rural nature.	See responses to comments 74 (balance of land uses) and 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1211	976315	Mr R A Robinson	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Green Belt should not be altered. Roads and general infrastructure need to be in place before further building takes place. The Green Belt should be protected, use other brownfield sites.	See responses to comments 337 (brownfield first) and 362 (traffic impacts). No change.
1225	975223	R F Norgan	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on the Green Belt. Very special circumstances not demonstrated. An increase in population is not very special circumstances.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1228	973835	Mrs Cheryl Peers	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Object to building on the Green Belt. Very special circumstances not demonstrated. An increase in population is not very special circumstances.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). No change.
1233	432525	Mr Bob Carter	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Revising St Nicholas/Rectory Lane Conservation boundary and building on part of Forster Country will result in a permanent loss of character. Building on the western side of the valley will dominate views from Rooks Nest. This will in no way reflect the views of E M Forster.	See response to comment 74 (balance of land uses). No change.

1237	342223	Ms Janet Firth	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Use of Green Belt is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt to constitute 'very special circumstances'. Green Belt between Stevenage and Graveley strongly fulfils the five purposes. The AMEC report proposes sites to be safeguarded for future development. Green Belt release will result in excessive development / urban sprawl.</p> <p>Strong resistance to a New Town solution. Were such a development be a stated central government priority we believe ways and means would be found to achieve this in a shorter timeframe. Land outside of the Green Belt (5,300 homes) could be used in the interim, to bridge the time needed to approve a New Town, which would cover 14.5yrs.</p>	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances), 411 (evidence base), 74 (balance of land uses) and 337 (new New Town proposal). No change.
1280	342024	Mr Henry Bracey	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to the use of Green Belt to meet housing needs. This is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. Unmet housing need is unlikely to outweigh harm to the Green Belt. It will reduce access to the countryside, including Forster Country (proposals for a country park are inadequate), destroy arable land, and lead to Graveley being absorbed into Stevenage.</p>	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 74 (balance of land uses). No change.
1290	342154	Mrs Madelaine Crouch	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Green Belt has been overlooked, question what the point was of having a Green Belt if this is to be disregarded.</p>	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
1375	974244	Angela Hepworth	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to Green Belt removal. The plan states "We will ensure that existing open spaces are protected". How can you reconcile that statement with that intention? Green open spaces and historical and cultural heritage should not be destroyed.</p>	See response to comment 74 (balance of land uses). No change.
1390	974207	Mr Roger Acraman	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to the removal of Green Belt to the north. Urban sprawl will occur once protection is lifted.</p>	See responses to comments 7 (requirement for Green Belt release) and 1002 (overall harm). No change.
1408	971985	Mr Robin Dickens	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to building on Green Belt land. Should use existing Brownfield sites for housing. How much unused office/industrial space is available for this purpose. Stevenage is now largely a dormitory town for London and it is already much larger than it was ever originally planned to be.</p>	See response to comment 337 (brownfield first).
1409	976160	Mr James Briscoe	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Green Belt can only be built on in 'exceptional circumstances'. There is still a lot of brownfield sites and the town centre to be redeveloped before Green Belt. The whole area of farmland and public bridleways from North Road to Rooks Nest is invaluable Green Belt and a buffer from North Hertfordshire District Council.</p>	See responses to 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 337 (brownfield first). No change.
1793	778064	Saving North Herts Green Belt	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Against any Green Belt being removed for housing. The residents already in this area are against all developments.</p>	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.
1815	342720	Mr G Smith	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to HO2 (and safeguarded land in NHDC) due to destruction of the Green Belt, which fulfils all five NPPF purposes.</p>	HO2 is not within the Green Belt. No change.
1819	342133	Ms Helen Lumley	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Using Green Belt to meet housing needs is only permitted in exceptional circumstances. The Green Belt between Stevenage and Graveley strongly fulfils the 5 NPPF purposes.</p>	See responses to 235 (exceptional circumstances) and 1002 (overall harm). No change.
1821	976507	Murrell	Policy SP10: Green Belt	<p>Object to building on any Green Belt space.</p>	See response to comment 7 (requirement for Green Belt release). No change.

1842	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy SP10: Green Belt	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse, designated flood risk zone 3, has not been adequately assessed. Sites are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on current floodplain and water attenuation areas. The increased level of traffic has not been considered.	See responses to comment 936 (SFRA) and 362 (traffic impacts). No change.
178	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy GB1: Green Belt	NHDC & SBC wish to devour all Green Belt and replace it with urban sprawl, contrary to the NPPF. Forster Country should be afforded complete protection. This offers amenity space and is an integral part of the defining fabric and integrity of the town. Its uniquely significant heritage merits should be protected. It forms a barrier between the concrete centre of the New Town and it's sprawling featureless suburbs. Traffic issues have not been addressed. Additional traffic will adversely impact wildlife and ecology and will damage the green lung that prevents urban sprawl.	See response to comment 235 (exceptional circumstances). The remainder of Forster Country will be protected via proposals for a Country Park on this site. Highways impacts have been assessed. Improvements will be implemented, where required. Biodiversity offsetting will help to mitigate the environmental impacts of the plan. No change.
456	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy GB1: Green Belt	Object to EC1/7. Part I of the Green Belt Review identifies this area as making a significant contribution to Green Belt purposes. The proposed allocation has not been adequately justified, exceptional circumstances justifying the Green Belt release have not been adequately demonstrated. It is questionable whether this site is deliverable.	See response to comment 457. No change.
572	767712	Knebworth Estates	Policy GB1: Green Belt	Object to the inclusion of Norton Green within the Green Belt boundary. This is already a developed settlement. It will leave the village-like character exposed to the A1(M). The way to protect this community is with sensitive development that shields it from the A1(M). This is a misguided and regressive addition to the Plan's Green Belt policy.	Including Norton Green within the Green Belt will enable further control on development and mitigate against loss of Green Belt elsewhere. It will not preclude development altogether. No change.
1265	758229	Ms Karen Robinson	Policy GB1: Green Belt	Welcome addition of land to Green Belt, particularly Norton Green. Norton Green should have a limitation on permitted development with regard to conversion of garage/parking space.	Support welcomed. Permitted development rights are not dealt with through the Local Plan. No change.
479	405069	North Hertfordshire District Council	Policy GB2: Green Belt settlements	Object to the flexible approach, allowing infill development within the Green Belt at Todd's Green. Part of Todd's Green is also within NHDC where the policy approach will be more restrictive. Request reliance on the NPPF as NHDC intend to do.	Our approach to development at Norton Green and Todd's Green allows for small scale development, which the Borough Council is supportive of. No change.
841	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	Policy GB2: Green Belt settlements	The only exceptions that would normally allow inappropriate housing in the Green Belt, relate to rural exception sites for affordable housing. Para's 12.4 and 12.5 are reasonable, but this is not what the second clause in 'a' of Policy GB2 would allow. The wording is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF. Amended wording suggested. The wording of the final Policy paragraph implies there are exceptions in the NPPF to 'inappropriate development that will not be permitted'. Should be amended to avoid confusion.	See response to comment 479. No change.
1289	977162	S T Smyth	Policy GB2: Green Belt settlements	Todd's Green is a 'washed over' settlement in the Green Belt. It is accessible and utilities are available. Todd's Green should be taken out of the Green Belt and be allowed to expand. If not taken out of the Green Belt, it should become an 'excluded' village.	See response to comment 479. The results of our Green Belt showed that this site was not suitable for Green Belt release. No change.
1803	977246	The Greens & Great Wymondley Residents Association	Policy GB2: Green Belt settlements	The Chesterton Report should be implemented and Todd's Green expanded. The settlement is easily accessible.	See response to comment 1289. No change.

Climate change, flood risk and pollution

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
278	341391	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Support para's 5.142, 13.46 and 13.47. Consider any particular measures required to mitigate against the impacts of noise associated with flights to and from LLA that cross the town. Essential that full and proper consideration be given to whether there are any particular measures required to mitigate against the impacts of noise associated with flights to and from LLA that cross the town.	Welcome support.
321	452235	Mr Robert Howard	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Do not believe SBC has conducted a sound and genuine flood risk assessment for Little Wymondley and the impact of building. SBC claim they are 'unaware' of a flood problem in Little Wymondley, therefore they cannot have carried out their duty of care in constructing their plan and it would suggest they have not consulted with the Environment Agency.	SBC have carried out a SFRA for Stevenage (Little Wymondley is covered by NHDC's SFRA) to assess the impact of development on areas at risk of flooding in the Borough and to ensure that flooding is not exacerbated elsewhere. SBC are aware of the flooding issues in Little Wymondley and have been in constant discussions with the EA. No change.
491	619933	Natural England	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Policy SP11 Climate change, flooding and pollution: Natural England is generally supportive of this policy. However, we suggest that it could be strengthened by recognising the role that the provision of greenspace can play in addressing climate change impacts.	Welcome support. Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
755	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Support Policy SP11.	Welcome support.
786	636011	Environment Agency	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Section 5 - Climate Change flooding and pollution - Policy SP11 should have the following added to point a: wildlife and biodiversity, watercourses and open water Paragraph 5.135 should also seek to create new habitats and provision for biodiversity. Paragraph 5.139 should include considerations for biodiversity enhancement in any new flood storage areas.	Policy SP11 states that developments 'consider matters relating to (but not necessarily limited to)' to prevent the Policy from becoming longwinded. Policy SP12 addresses issues of wildlife and biodiversity. No change
810	977009	Mrs Hilary C Thompson	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Object to new development near Graveley as it would affect runoff from surrounding fields and could lead to flooding in the town and a repeat of 1968 floods.	Policy FP2 will require surface water management on site through the use of SuDS, including on site attenuation. Development at HO3 may well improve the overland flow issues raised here. No change.
937	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are being built over the watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. This loss of capacity will have serious consequences in Little Wymondley. HCC study shows Ash Brook has a flood risk frequency of 1 in 4. Increased traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey. Do not consider plan is prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate or has met the legal/procedural requirements.	No change proposed. EC1/7, EC1/4 and HO12 are not building over the Ash Brook. Development on EC1/7 will be either side of the Ash Brook. Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been carried out for EC1/7 to assess flood risk. Satisfactory Flood Risk Assessments will be required for development on these sites.

1843	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy SP11: Climate change, flooding and pollution	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are being built over the watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. This loss of capacity will have serious consequences in Little Wymondley. HCC study shows Ash Brook has a flood risk frequency of 1 in 4. Increased traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey. Do not consider plan is prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate or has met the legal/procedural requirements.	See response to comment 937
785	636011	Environment Agency	Climate Change	Infrastructure and developer requirements Paragraph 8.19: add 'to mitigate and offset any impact on the SPA'.	We feel that para 8.19 is clear without the addition of the proposed wording. No change
791	636011	Environment Agency	Climate Change	Section 13 Flooding and pollution Paragraph 13.4 We would suggest you add the following wording to paragraph 13.4: All new development should ensure that stringent water management systems are incorporated into their design, contributing to water efficiency and to safeguard water quality.	We feel that para 13.4 is clear without the addition of the proposed wording. No change
212	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy FP1 Climate change	Plan overplays development issues at the expense of retention of the natural environment. The Plan advises builders to use energy efficient technologies. It should be compulsory that new development will not increase the carbon footprint.	Noted. No change.
502	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy FP1 Climate change	Bellway/Miller support the thrust of Policy FP1, but request the removal of the requirement for 'improving energy performance of buildings'. This is no longer a planning requirement and is only to be governed by Building Regulations.	Welcome support. FP1 encourages new developments to include measures such as 'improving energy performance of buildings' it is not set out as a requirement. No change.
628	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy FP1 Climate change	Policy should reference viability and not replicate building regs. Para 13.6 SUDS is not always appropriate due to hydrological/ground conditions.	A form of SuDS can be implemented on all developments to some degree. No change.
793	636011	Environment Agency	Policy FP1 Climate change	Policy FP1 Climate change We are very pleased to see the inclusion of water efficiency policy requiring 110 litres per person per day. However we believe the wording of the policy should be stronger than 'encouraged'.	Welcome support. 110lpppd is the tighter Building Regs optional requirement. We are unable to replicate Building Regs requirements in Policy, therefore, the Policy is worded 'encouraged'. No change.
794	636011	Environment Agency	Flood Risk	Paragraph 13.17 Pleased to see mention of maximising SuDS. Paragraph 13.24 River corridors and FSRs also provide essential habitat for animals, fish, invertebrates and plants. These must be protected and enhanced. Paragraph 13.26 The FSRs should also be managed to provide as much biodiversity value as possible through land and vegetation management. This will help reach England's Biodiversity 2020 targets.	Welcome support. We note that the FSR's provide essential habitat. No change.
1184	975391	Nicola Kendrick	Flood Risk	Proposed plans will have a negative impact on homes in Wymondley due to increased flood risk.	Plan will not increase flood risk in Wymondley. Level 2 SRFA has been undertaken to identify areas of flood risk and sites will be subject to site specific FRA's. No change.

1185	975393	Mr James Todd	Flood Risk	Flood risk from new development is a real concern. Any development in the area could increase flood risk. Difficult to see mitigation for the increased runoff risk. Would be detrimental to lives and surrounding area.	Plan will not increase flood risk in Wymondley. Level 2 SRFA has been undertaken to identify areas of flood risk and sites will be subject to site specific FRA's. No change.
263	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy FP2: Flood risk in Flood Zone 1	Will Corey's Mill flood storage reservoir remain when the area is redeveloped? Want a larger storage area.	No proposals to develop in the area of Coreys Mill FSR.
766	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy FP2: Flood risk in Flood Zone 1	Policy FP2: Flood risk in Flood Zone 1 Thames Water support the requirement to use SuDS and that the use of SuDS should be maximised on site so as not to increase flood risk and to reduce flood risk where possible. The use of SuDS and would like to see their use to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. However, in relation to Policy FP2 it is considered that the requirement to use SuDS should apply to all major development as set out in Paragraph 079 of the Planning Practice Guidance and not just development sites of over 1 hectare.	Welcome support. Whilst the Council does not believe that Thames Water's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
999	342203	Jocelyn and Brian Eldridge	Policy FP2: Flood risk in Flood Zone 1	Flooding from meadow to the rear of property. Proposed North Stevenage build is on the high point of important flood plains that soak up excess water. The ditches will become full to overflowing much quicker and directly effect properties in Matthews Close. Floods have occurred 7 times in the last 18 years at Matthews Close. Area is in a high risk of surface water flooding as shown on the EA surface water map. Can't stop proposals but want to input on the details like drainage issues. Want flooding issues in the area addressed properly and resolved through joint working (HCC, SBC, NHDC and EA).	See response to comment 810
767	341857	Thames Water Property	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3 Thames Water support the requirement to use SuDS and that the use of SuDS should be maximised on site so as not to increase flood risk and to reduce flood risk where possible. The use of SuDS and would like to see their use to reduce the risk of surface water and sewer flooding. However, in relation to Policy FP2 it is considered that the requirement to use SuDS should apply to all major development as set out in Paragraph 079 of the Planning Practice Guidance and not just development sites of over 1 hectare.	See response to comment 766
792	636011	Environment Agency	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Good policy with inclusion of deculverting and need for buffer zones. Strengthen FP3 policy wording to be clear about what will make the FRA acceptable to grant planning permission. It currently suggests that Planning permission would be granted if these issues were addressed regardless of whether the results were acceptable. Changes to three criteria of the wording to read: ii. That the development will not increase flood risk elsewhere; iii. That the measures proposed to deal with these effects and risks are appropriate; v. That the development will be safe and pass the Exception Test, if applicable.	Welcome support. Whilst the Council does not believe that the EA's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.

938	966590	Mr Simon Martin	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are being built over the watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. This loss of capacity will have serious consequences in Little Wymondley. HCC study shows Ash Brook has a flood risk frequency of 1 in 4. Increased traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey. Do not consider plan is prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate or has met the legal/procedural requirements.	See response to comment 937
1115	974224	Mr Adrian Hawkins	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. The impact on the Ash Brook has not been adequately assessed. Sites EC1/7, EC1/4 and HO12 are proposed to be built over the existing watercourse and on the flood plain. The loss of this capacity to deal with water run off will have consequences downstream in Little Wymondley. SBC should have carried out an Environmental Impact Assessment and a Flood Risk Assessment for neighbouring areas.	See response to comment 937
1123	973077	Mr Chris Turvey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1132	974297	Hayley Ward	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1416	977318	Mr Ray Elmes	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1420	975864	Nicky Gilbert	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1424	974622	Caroline McDonnell	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1428	977211	K Davies	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1432	977221	Ms M Garrett	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1436	977228	M Scallan	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1440	977231	B M Rumney	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1445	977234	Mr Alan McCarley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1450	977235	Ms Annette Fisher	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1454	977294	Mrs Marjorie McCarley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1458	977296	B Shadbolt	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1463	977302	Ms Janet Fraser	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1467	977305	M K Issac	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1471	977306	H Cussens	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1475	977322	J M Roberts	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1479	977323	Mrs Vivian Snowdon	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1483	977690	Ms Tracy Wicklow	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1487	977691	Daljit Dale	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1491	975881	Mr David Jackson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1495	977618	Ms Anne-Lise Domeisen	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1499	975830	Victoria Jackson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1503	977300	Ms Una Bracey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1507	977332	Ms Tracey Owen	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1511	342785	Mrs Nina Turvey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1515	977618	Ms Anne-Lise Domeisen	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1519	977201	Mr Stephen Westwood	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1523	976087	Mrs Josie Norledge	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1527	977203	Mr Jonathan McCarley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1535	977207	Ms Anne Larkins	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1539	342082	Mr Carter	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1543	342081	Mrs Cherry Carter	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1547	977214	P Smith	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1551	342433	Mr & Mrs Kennedy	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1555	977219	R Frosterick	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1559	977220	C Briggs	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1564	977230	Ms Lucy Rayer	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1568	977289	Mrs Kathleen Matthew	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1572	977291	Ms Clare Hancock	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1576	977292	Mr Ivor Hancock	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1580	977324	Mrs M Bartrip	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1584	977326	Mr D E Bartrip	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1588	977329	Ms Valerie Day	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1592	977331	R Taylor	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1596	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1600	977333	Mr Mark Santacreu	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1604	977335	A L Brown	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1608	977337	Mr John Day	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1612	977338	Mr John Berry	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1616	977340	Mr Nigel Pointing	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1620	977343	Mr Steven Young	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1624	977344	Mr Kenny Crowe	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1628	977345	Mr Ian Hyde	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1632	977350	Mr Brad Watts	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1636	977352	Mr Wayne Shambrook	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1644	977355	Mr R Fautley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1648	977356	J Fautley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1656	977360	S Fairey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1660	977361	Mr M Anstiss	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1664	977362	Mr Stephen Osburn	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1668	977364	Ms Jane Osburn	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1676	977366	Ms May Emson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1680	977371	Mr David Wiggins	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1684	977612	Ms Nancy Bidmead	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1688	977613	Mr Robin Baker	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1692	977614	Mrs Caroline Kumar	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1696	977616	Mr Navin Kumar	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1700	979347	Mr K Crowe	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1704	977620	Ms C Kerry	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1708	977621	E Farey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1712	977622	N Farey	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1716	977624	Mrs S Tribe	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1720	977626	Mr R Tribe	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1724	977692	Zena Connell	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1728	975681	Mr Colin Rafferty	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1732	974290	Jennie Hawkins	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1736	974350	Mr Adam Connell	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1740	342532	Mr Tom McCall	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1744	974373	Ms Kimberley Richardson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1748	974438	Mr Martin Charles	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1752	974521	Mr Barry Bunningham	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1756	974600	Jessica Simpson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1760	974657	Sheila Marvell	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937

1764	975352	Mr Trevor Beard	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1768	975702	Hannah Kimberley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1772	975778	Elsbeth Jackson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1776	975819	Ms Patricia Rumpus	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1780	975870	Mr Ross Jackson	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1784	973079	Mr Paul Watts	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1788	976079	Mr Robin Norledge	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Representation to FP3 Flood Risk in Zone 2 and 3. Ash Brook - Group response from Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum. As Adrian Hawkins 974224.	See response to comment 937
1838	974232	Kim Tulley	Policy FP3: Flood risk in Flood Zone 2 and 3	Impact on Ash Brook watercourse has not been adequately assessed. EC1/4, EC1/7 and HO12 are being built over the watercourse and on floodplain and water attenuation areas. This loss of capacity will have serious consequences in Little Wymondley. HCC study shows Ash Brook has a flood risk frequency of 1 in 4. Increased traffic as a consequence of EC1/7, has not been considered. SBC should have carried out an EIA, a FRA for neighbouring areas and a traffic survey. Do not consider plan is prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate or has met the legal/procedural requirements.	See response to comment 937
273	341391	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd	Pollution	Supports para's 5.142, 13.46 and 13.47. Full and proper consideration be given to whether there are particular measures required to mitigate against the impacts of noise associated with flights to and from LLA that cross the town. Supports further growth at Stevenage, provided it is brought forward in a managed way. Essential that full and proper consideration be given to whether there are any particular measures required to mitigate against the impacts of noise associated with flights to and from LLA that cross the town. Propose amendments to para 13.47 (London Luton Noise Action Plan 2010 - 2015 is updated to London Luton Noise Action Plan 2013 - 2018).	Welcome support. Amendment to up to date Noise Action Plan noted. Minor change.

720	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Pollution	<p>Poor air quality impacts directly on health and wellbeing. Concerned there is no stand-alone policy for air quality. The Borough does not have an AQMA, however, this could change in the future, so the inclusion of a policy is important. There is a significant level of development being proposed that should be considering air quality from an exposure and mitigation perspective. West of Stevenage (HO2), in particular, adjacent to the A1(M), should make reference to air quality.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the spatial location of certain facilities, i.e. schools, playing fields and sheltered housing, at the masterplanning stage. The Air Quality Strategic Plan for Hertfordshire should be taken into account, particularly with regards to the reduction of PM2.5.</p>	<p>Air quality and air pollution is covered in Policy FP7. There are no AQMA's in Stevenage and Policy FP7 precludes development that cannot demonstrate its impacts on the natural environment including air quality. No change.</p>
795	636011	Environment Agency	Pollution	<p>Paragraph 13.35. Pleased to see the inclusion of SPZs in your plan. May be useful to direct applicants towards our Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice document which outlines those developments which are unacceptable in a SPZ1.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.44. Lighting should be maintained at suitably low background levels at night to prevent disturbance to nocturnal animals such as bats.</p>	<p>Welcome support. Para 13.44 already makes reference to ensure that light pollution is minimised.</p>
796	636011	Environment Agency	Policy FP7: Pollution	<p>Policy FP7 Pollution This should also include water pollution.</p>	<p>Whilst the Council does not believe that the EA's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.</p>
276	341391	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd	Policy FP8: Pollution sensitive uses	<p>Support Policy FP8 but Para 204 should refer to 'planning obligations' rather than 'contributions'. This policy again should enable both the development of Stevenage and the expansion of LLA to continue without significant impacts from noise impeding the interests of either party. Schedule of superseded policies (note incorrect spelling in consultation document) - suggest policy EN28: Aircraft Noise be replaced by policy FP8 not FP7.</p>	<p>Welcome support. Whilst the Council does not believe that LLAOL's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed. Minor change.</p>

The natural and historic environment

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
486	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	The natural and historic environments	Amendments suggested to para's 5.157 and 5.159 to reflect that some harm will occur, but this is outweighed by other benefits, and that the setting comprises more than the fields to the north alone. Welcome acknowledgement in para 5.159 that housing allocations, including HO3, will designate some sites within or adjacent to conservation areas.	The plan (and evidence base) has fully considered the impact of development on the conservation area and its setting. Further detail, as suggested, is provided under the HO3 policy allocation. No change.
493	452235	Natural England	The natural and historic environments	Para 5.145. Prefer the word 'conservation' to 'preservation'. This better reflects actions which may need to be taken to ensure a site is managed to its full environmental potential. Para 5.149 should recognise Knebworth Woods SSSI, Rye Meads SSSI and the Lee Valley SPA, as the plan has the potential to impact on these sites.	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
801	341498	CPRE Hertfordshire	The natural and historic environments	Para 5.159 should reflect the true impact on the character of Forster Country, and require more sympathetic landscape conservation measures. Consider the 'mitigation measures' would be ineffective, and contribute to a detrimental change in the landscape.	Our evidence assess the impact of the North Stevenage proposal on Forster Country. It is accepted there will be an impact on this area, but that social and economic needs outweigh this. No change.
59	768523	Sport England	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Support Policy SP12. It protects parks and recreation grounds which incorporate outdoor sports facilities. Consistent with evidence base. Proposal provides multi-functional green space and sports facilities in new developments, consistent with the planning principles of the new town.	Support welcomed.
192	770867	Mr David Yates-Mercer	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Recognise Forster Country by giving it better protection. Building on Forster Country will destroy it and reduce access to countryside.	Noted. No change proposed.
325	962731	Mr Robert Howard	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Policy SP12 is proposed, but Green Belt is to be removed. This is hypocritical behaviour and NIMBYism. SBC should build on its own green spaces.	Green Belt release is required to meet, inter alia, our objectively assessed housing needs. Our Green Belt Technical Paper identifies the Exceptional Circumstances that exist to justify rolling back the Green Belt.
492	619933	Natural England	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Policy SP12 should be strengthened. Amend to reflect the need to identify a strategic approach for the creation and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure.	Further discussions have been ongoing with NE to address their concerns. Whilst the Council does not believe that NE's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed
756	975816	Hertfordshire LEP	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	The LEP seeks a redefinition of the scope of this policy. There is a need to go beyond recreational and biodiversity aspects to include water, sewage waste management and climate change factors as part of a countywide green infrastructure plan.	No change is proposed as the comments in the representation are already represented adequately in the NPPF.
788	636011	Environment Agency	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Policy SP12 should include blue infrastructure including Stevenage Brook, Aston Brook and any other watercourses and open water. Section b should also include river corridors and riparian habitats. Paragraph 5.149 should also recognise the importance of the rivers and need to improve them under EU Water Framework Directive.	No change is proposed as the comments in the representation are already represented adequately in the NPPF.
861	977188	Mrs A Palmer	Policy SP12: Green Infrastructure and the natural environment	Object to loss of biodiversity as do not believe 'Biodiversity offsetting' will be of benefit or will work.	Comments noted. Paragraph 5.151 explains that biodiversity offsetting would be assessed site by site

718	976042	Hertfordshire County Council (Public Health)	Green Infrastructure	Encouraging to see the Plan makes reference to 'spaces left over after planning'. However, it is not clear how this translates into the requirements and expectations placed on developers.	Welcome support
775	636011	Environment Agency	Green Infrastructure	Would be good to see a key aspiration based around environmental enhancement and improvement of biodiversity. All new developments should provide built-in bat & bird bricks/boxes - you should seek the creation of new habitats through the Local Plan.	This is interpreted as a statement of support which repeats recommendations that are already represented adequately in the NPPF.
904	341949	Mrs Lesley Bacon	Green Infrastructure	Concerns regarding the impact of these proposals on wildlife. There should be some green space for them.	This is interpreted as a statement of support which repeats recommendations that are already represented adequately in the NPPF.
69	768523	Sport England	Policy NH1: Principal Open Spaces	Support NH1. Seeks to safeguard Stevenage's network of Principal Open Spaces which have a number of functions. The approach to small scale recreation and leisure developments is welcomed.	Welcome support
120	969666	Mr Graham Barnes	Policy NH1: Principal Open Spaces	Fairlands Valley Park is a wonderful leisure area. Very few places have the availability of such a convenient and beautiful place. The Stevenage roundabouts are glorious.	Welcome support
797	636011	Environment Agency	Policy NH1: Principal Open Spaces	It would be useful to highlight what proportion of these sites contains priority BAP habitats.	The measurement of habitat areas would be appropriate subject for the Annual Monitoring Report.
11	866619	HMWT	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Support Policy NH2, important to define exactly what is "substantive loss or deterioration of a wildlife site".	The existing wording and supporting text is considered to provide sufficient protection to Wildlife Sites.
232	973034	Hart	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Areas of woodland and wildlife sites plans are unclear. Vague wording in the plan will mean a developer can decide they want to build and therefore destroy ancient woodland.	This is not agreed. The relevant areas of wildlife protection (as with other areas of special planning control) are designated on the 1:10000 ordnance base Policies Map which accompanies the local plan.
389	967411	Mr Neil Evison	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Shocked to see that the woodland opposite Lister Hospital (site 21/024 in the biodiversity report produced by the council) and the wooded area which was once part of Whitney Wood (21/047) are now deemed suitable for development.	These areas are not allocated for development in the Local Plan.
798	636011	Environment Agency	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Suggest you add a point c. "create new buffers around or linkage wildlife corridors between existing wildlife sites".	The proposed amendment is covered by point b.
1020	977238	Professor Emeritus David Noakes	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Delighted that the remaining parts of Whitney Wood have been designated as a wildlife site which will hopefully prevent any further development of the site.	Welcome support
1405	973937	Jacqueline Pond	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Proposal NH2/35 (Whitney Wood) clearly indicates a loss of the green corridor. The loss of limited Grade 3 agricultural land is an issue.	Noted. No change proposed
1822	758229	Ms Karen Robinson	Policy NH2: Wildlife Sites	Norton Green is Country Wildlife Site and SSSI. This land should also covered by NH2.	Wildlife sites are designated by the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust. Our allocations follow their guidance. No change.
799	636011	Environment Agency	Policy NH3: Green Corridors	Suggest the heading is changed to Green and Blue Corridors and we propose adding in Stevenage Brook and Aston Brook	Noted. No change proposed. It is considered that the meaning of Green Corridor also includes open verdant watercourses.

1064	973919	Mr David Inward	Policy NH3: Green Corridors	Proposals for green links are welcome, but should recognise their role to enable species to move in response to climate change. Transport corridors restrict movement across them, but permit some movement along them.	Noted. No change proposed
12	866619	HMWT	Policy NH4: Green links	The BIAC should also be the measure by which impacts on wildlife value are assessed. Amended wording suggested.	Noted. No change proposed. It is considered that the policy wording read together with the NPPF para 116 covers the suggestion regarding impact assessment.
13	866619	HMWT	Policy NH5: Trees and woodland	All judgements on biodiversity value of a woodland should be measured by reference to the BIAC. Without utilising this system judgements are based on opinion rather than measurable value.	Noted. No change proposed. It is considered that the policy wording read together with the NPPF para 116 covers the suggestion regarding impact assessment.
14	866619	HMWT	Policy NH6: General protection for open space	HMWT seek a new policy (wording suggested) between NH5 and NH6 that specifically relates to conserving and enhancing biodiversity.	Noted. No change proposed. It is considered that the supporting text to NH4 at 14.28 read together with the NPPF and the appropriate and proportionate application of best practice in development management would address the biodiversity issue.
38	969601	Ms Sheila Little	Policy NH6: General protection for open space	Why should Stevenage lose every green space so that private landlords can make a mint? Parks are generally run down or have had the play equipment removed. No doubt they will be built on.	This comment is not accepted. The local plan make it clear that open spaces, allocated or not, are expressly protected.
631	772897	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Policy NH7: Open space standards	The policy should allow for greater flexibility in terms of the requirements particularly having regarding to maximising development potential where a balance has to be had, given the plans other policies such as density, aspirational housing and self build housing.	The viability point is covered by NPPF. No change.
214	342737	Mr David Stone	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	Forster Country is not a sports field. Stevenage has an over supply of this type of space. It is more important to recognise the distinction, heritage and unique rural openness, which Forster Country offers. The area covered is not big enough. It should encompass all of Forster Country. The Local Plan is seeking to manipulate consumption of green belt land and adjoining areas of rural character and heritage for misguided reasons	As a under bounded town Stevenage is obliged to consider options for accommodating growth including reallocation of designated green belt where justified by evidence. No Change.
260	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	North Stevenage Country Park is woefully inadequate. The historic setting will not be maintained by surrounding a small park with housing. A much bigger area so the setting is genuinely preserved.	The possible country park is of significant size. No change.
350	974000	Historic England	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	Historic England recommends that policy NH8 includes reference to "historic landscape character assessment" in the formulation of future management policies.	No change proposed. It is felt that the reasoning in paragraphs 14.50 - 14.52 address the issues of landscape and historic character and thereby form the agenda for further assessments of heritage impact.
482	922492	Bellway and Miller Homes	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	Do not object to the principle of designating a country park, which could comprise open space provision for the North Stevenage development. Amend para 14.52 to be consistent with para 9.33 - stating that this will comprise the open space provision for the North Stevenage development, but could also allow for some offsetting of open space requirements arising from other developments.	Noted. There is no conflict between these paragraphs. Not necessary to repeat text in para 9.33. No change.

529	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	The Country Park is far too small and insignificant. It in no way compensates for the loss of Forster Country Green Belt. EM Forster lived at Rooks Nest House from 1883 to 1893. Previously, it had been known as 'Howards', which Forster took for the title of his novel.	The reasoning in paragraphs 14.50 -14.52 address the issues of landscape and historic character and thereby form the agenda for further assessments of heritage impact.
1082	974740	Felix Power	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	Proposed park is a joke. The character of the countryside will be ruined with developments and view from the proposed park area.	The possible country park is of significant size. No change.
1218	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	Policy NH8: North Stevenage Country Park	The Country Park is far too small and insignificant. It in no way compensates for the loss of Forster Country Green Belt. EM Forster lived at Rooks Nest House from 1883 to 1893. Previously, it had been known as 'Howards', which Forster took for the title of his novel.	The reasoning in paragraphs 14.50 -14.52 address the issues of landscape and historic character and thereby form the agenda for further assessments of heritage impact.
344	974000	Historic England	Policy SP13: The historic environment	Support inclusion of a heritage specific policy or policies. Additional/amended wording suggested to a number of supporting text paragraph's.	Support welcomed. The majority of amendments suggested would be repeating national guidance and legislation, which is unnecessary in local planning policy. It would also add considerable unnecessary length to the plan document. No change.
522	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy SP13: The historic environment	Forster Country should be protected within a permanent Green Belt. Do not agree the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the impact of development on Forster Country, Rooks Nest or the 'fields to the north that provide their setting'.	The Plan recognises the importance of heritage assets and ensures that part of Forster Country will remain and be protected. No change.
1219	341822	Ms Margaret Ashby	Policy SP13: The historic environment	Forster Country should be protected within a permanent Green Belt. Do not agree the proposed mitigation measures will minimise the impact of development on Forster Country, Rooks Nest or the 'fields to the north that provide their setting'.	See response to comment 522.
349	974000	Historic England	Policy NH09: Areas of Archaeological Significance	Support Policy NH09.	Support welcomed.
1823	758229	Ms Karen Robinson	Policy NH09: Areas of Archaeological Significance	Norton Green should also covered by NH9 - the Common and adjoining fields are of historical significance.	Policy NH09 identifies areas of archaeological significance as recorded by the Hertfordshire Historic Environment Record (HER) database. No change.
267	973580	Ms Felicity Power	Policy NH10: Conservation areas	Developments will impact wildlife and conservation areas particularly HO3.	Noted. No change.
348	974000	Historic England	Policy NH10: Conservation areas	Support NH10. The Council has a comprehensive evidence base for all conservation areas. Support the analysis and agree that the improved setting of the Town Square from the bus station is an important objective.	Support welcomed.
819	922051	Friends of Forster Country	Policy NH10: Conservation areas	Development of HO3 will cause significant negative impact on the conservation area, visually and in terms of traffic increase along Rectory Lane, with associated congestion, noise, pollution and litter.	It is considered the harm will be outweighed by social and economic benefits. Infrastructure will be improved to support the scale of growth being proposed. No change.

Delivery and monitoring

Comment No.	Person ID	Full Name / Organisation	Plan section / Policy	Summary	Officer response
560	975728	Hertfordshire County Council (Estates)	Delivery and monitoring	Support the co-ordinated approach to new infrastructure to ensure all development contributes. Welcome the opportunity to continue joint working, to ensure services are delivered in a timely and efficient manner. Encourage the implementation of CIL at the earliest opportunity. Encourage the development of masterplans for strategic sites, particularly where there may be cross-boundary issues. Amendments to the table in Chapter 15 suggested: Secondary healthcare and Adult Social Care sections.	Support welcomed. CIL will be progressed alongside the Local Plan. Masterplans are a requirement of the new settlement policies. The IDP will be updated based on further detail provided by infrastructure providers. Whilst the Council does not believe that HCC's representations raise issues of fundamental soundness, if the Inspector were minded to disagree an alternative form of words could be agreed.
632	452235	Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon	Delivery and monitoring	Not clear in many instances which developers / developments will be responsible for funding the various elements of infrastructure identified. The table requires further detail on funding. Greater clarity is required as to what, if any, infrastructure provision is likely to be sought from West of Stevenage, over and above those items specifically identified in the policy.	See response to comment 584.
886	973781	Mr Loyd Davies	Delivery and monitoring	Chapter 15 appears to be a list of already committed and low level developments. Stakeholders, potential partners and sources of funding should be identified. The plan contains no costing and strategy for attracting investment for the town centre. Costs and monitoring should be added. Chapter 15 mentions a review of the Old Town Gyratory is an unfunded activity for HCC. If not planned then why is it in the plan? This scheme should be encouraged.	See response to comment 1200 (costing town centre proposals). The Stevenage Central Framework evidence has informed the local plan policies. The whole plan has been viability tested, see Whole Plan Viability Study. Considering the future of the Old Town Gyratory System is a live project which HCC are committed to. It is identified in the IDP as a desirable project. See response to comment 560 (IDP).
277	341391	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd	Superceded policies	Schedule of superseded policies (note incorrect spelling in Plan) - policy EN28: Aircraft Noise is replaced by policy FP8 not FP7.	Spelling error corrected. Minor change to plan - reference amended to FP8.
536	401221	Origin Housing Group	Superceded policies	Spelling of 'superceded' should be corrected to 'superseded'.	See response to comment 277.
283	970870	Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Infrastructure and Delivery	Welcome and support acknowledgement that development will impact on the local road network. Concerned about impacts on northern parts of Welwyn Hatfield. Welcome the recognition and proposed enhancement of the cycle corridor south from Stevenage towards and into Welwyn Hatfield. Significant reliance is placed on SMART motorway.	Noted. Support welcomed. Transport proposals in the plan have been modelled and we continue to work with Hertfordshire County Council and Highways England. The smart motorway scheme has funding committed, as IDP para 2.20 and 2.21.
542	975798	NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG	Infrastructure and Delivery	The IDP figures do not appear to correlate with the CCGs and NHS England's own calculations on the latest development data in the plan. Revised costs provided. Wish to help bolster the health sections of the plan and IDP, and to correct any technical inaccuracies pertaining to health.	Revised costs incorporated into Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Minor change to plan at para 5.109 - reference corrected to NHS England.
800	636011	Environment Agency	Monitoring	Monitoring of green infrastructure (table in chapter 15) focuses only on maintaining status quo. It should protect and enhance, where possible.	Noted. Our policies seek to protect existing green infrastructure, which is reflected in our monitoring targets. No change.