

## Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

### STATUTORY CONSULTEES

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	YES/NO	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S / COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Q25. Do you think the Preferred Advertisements is the right approach?</b>						
SC_00020	Chorleywood Parish Council	Yes	This policy covers a wide range of advertising methods and ideas and we have no wish to add to the list of where adverts can or cannot be sited. There is however one more item that we think should be added to the list of policy options under section 4. (g) Advertisements should not cause offence in both their graphic or visual content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is however one more item that we think should be added to the list of policy options under section 4. (g) Advertisements should not cause offence in both their graphic or visual content</li> </ul>	Noted. This is a given.	No action
SC_00023	Croxley Green Parish Council	Yes	Croxley Green Parish Council considers there should be a reference to locally relevant design guidance in Neighbourhood Plans. Otherwise we support the general approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support general approach but reference to be made to locally relevant design guidance in NPs.</li> </ul>	This is an overarching policy and not specific to a particular area and therefore no reference will be made to locally derived design guidance.	No action
SC_00024	Abbots Langley Parish Council	Yes	support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support</li> </ul>	Noted	No action
SC_00030	Highways England	Yes	Highways England is supportive of this policy, but reference should be made to advertisements and the SRN. The display of advertisements is subject to a separate consent process within the planning system. This is principally set out in the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. Most advertisements on land directly facing motorways and trunk roads require the express consent from the relevant local planning authority as well as prior permission from the landowner before they may be displayed lawfully. It is a requirement of the local planning authority to consult Highways England on the road safety aspects of advertisements proposed alongside the SRN. Advertisements that are likely to distract motorists are unlikely to be approved. Highways England should be consulted on any advertisement proposals close to the SRN and Highways England will need to consider its location, if visible from the SRN, its size, brightness/lighting (if any) and its effect on public safety. Most of the SRN within Three rivers is subject to the lighting mid-night to 5 am switch off so there presence of bright internally illuminated signing would for the most part be inappropriate in these settings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	Noted. Consult Highways England on advertisements close to the SRN	Applications for advertisements close to the SRN should consult highways England.

### NON-STATUTORY RESPONDENTS

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	YES/NO	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S / COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Q25. Do you think the Preferred Advertisements is the right approach?</b>						
P1_00002			But how will this be enforced. Should add restrictions on illuminated advertising and sky signs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will this be enforced?</li> </ul>	Through Planning engorcement	None
P1_00003		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00005		Yes	Nothing to add	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None

#### Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

P1_00006	Yes	Control needs to be made on advertising so that the character of the area remains unaltered and safety factors are adhered to.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Control needs to be made on advertising so the character of the area remains unaltered.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00014	Yes	Again, this sounds logical but past experience does not engender confidence. There are far too many notices on roads/pedestrian walkways in print which is far too dense and complex for reading, let alone the advertisements. They are also placed far too close to each other to be read and digested. Less in this instance is more effective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach, but concerns on how it is implemented. Too many notices on roads/pedestrian walkways.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00017	Yes	But estate agents signs are still an eyesore	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Estate agents signs are still an eyesore.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00019	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00020	No	No hoarding should be allowed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Hoarding should be allowed</li> </ul>	Individual advertisement consent applications will be assessed on their merits and whether they would have an effect on the wider area.	None
P1_00021	Yes	Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00023	Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00024	No	I don't feel we need this type of advertising as there's enough advertising through media channels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need more of this kind of advertising</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00025	No	Negative impact on landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Negative impact on landscape</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00026	Yes	Clear Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00027	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00028	Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00032	Yes	It's the right approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00033	Yes	Ideally no new advertisement should be part of any new development, as making maximum use of space, and providing dwellings with suitable windows should be more of a priority. Also advertising may pollute the character of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. No new advertisements should be part of any new development.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00034	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Objection</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00038	Yes	We don't want to end up like America! Advertising should be proportionate and in keeping with the character of the area. Junk foods should not be promoted either.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverts should be proportionate and in keeping with the local area</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00040	No	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00041	Yes	Particularly concerning wildlife habitats.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach, specifically in relation to wildlife habitats</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00045	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00046	No	There are too many banners on railings, which obstruct views	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many banners on railings</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00047	No	This policy is correct.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00048	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00049	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00053	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00054	Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00055	Yes	It seems fine.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None

#### Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

P1_00056	Yes	Maximises Local Authority influence to minimise intrusive advertisements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Maximise local authority influence.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00063	Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00064	Yes	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00066	No	Should not be allowed at all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No advertisements should be allowed at all</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00068	No	Signs can be one of the biggest blots on the landscape! Much street furniture is actually unnecessary and an eyesore - it downgrades an area. The Council should use all available powers to enforce the removal of any sign not merely advertising.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Signs are a blot on the landscape;</li> <li>Much street furniture I actually unnecessary and council should use enforcement powers to remove signs.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00069	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach but no reason given</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00071	Yes	I Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00074	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00076	Yes	The fewer advertisements the better. The area is beautiful because of nature and this shouldn't be invaded by advertisers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Fewer adverts the better.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00077	Yes	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00078	Yes	Yes but restrictions need to be rigorously applied.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Ensure restrictions are vigorously applied.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00080	Yes	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00084	Yes	We do not need or require high visual advertisements or signage in Chorleywood. It's a serene place to live and this would spoil the environment and outlook.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Do not need high visual advertisements or signage in Chorleywood.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00088	Yes	sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree With Approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00089	Yes	We do not have street lighting in Chorleywood at night so no signs should impact the tranquillity of the area we currently live.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00096	Yes	Seems Sensible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00097	Yes	Advertising should not be majorly intrusive and should not distract drivers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Advertising can be intrusive and distract drivers.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00098	Yes	stop asking me to write when I've said yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00099	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00102	Yes	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00106	No	Build in your backyard.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build in your backyard.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00107	Yes	..but advertisements should consist of no more than a name and designation to alert passers-by of the business's presence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Signs should just be a name and designation for drivers passing by</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00108	Yes	Common Sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00110	Not Specified	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00112	Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00113	Yes	No reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00114	No	should include maximum size, limit illumination & power usage, such power usage to require carbon offsetting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details should include maximum size and that any power usage is carbon neutral</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00116	Yes	I agree with the policy as stated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00117	Yes	Fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00119	No	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land is sanctuary for wildlife.</li> </ul>	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment. Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.	None
P1_00120	Yes	Seems Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00121	Yes	Forget the greenbelt - find alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity	None

#### Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

					Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_00123	Yes	It is appropriate - we are not plagued with advertising in Three Rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00127	Yes	/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00130	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00131	No	'Contribute to a safe and attractive environment' – exactly how will any advert do that!?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear how adverts will contribute to a safe and attractive environment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00132	Yes	no harm in being followed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00135	Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00137	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00140	Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00142	No	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00144	Yes	Within reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00147	Yes	Fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00148	Yes	Obvious	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00155	Yes	Agree that advertisements should not be intrusive and should definitely not include any kind of flashing lights which not only light pollution but waste of electricity!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach. Should not be intrusive and should definitely not include any kind of flashing lights.</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00162	Yes	This seems fair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00164	Yes	d. Will this allow you to deal with the advertising along the M25 westbound between 21a (Bricket Wood) and 20 (Kings Langley) which is displayed in a field? Certainly does not make for an attractive environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach. Will this deal with advertising along M25 displayed in a field</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00166	No	Should not be allowed in residential areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverts should not be allowed in residential areas.</li> </ul>	Individual advertisement consent applications will be assessed on their merits and whether they would have an effect on the wider area.	None	
P1_00170	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00174	Yes	Agree with this approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with this approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00181	n/a	No comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00183	Yes	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00184	No	There should be a reference to locally relevant design guidance in Neighbourhood Plans which should be encouraged and supported by Three Rivers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to locally relevant design guidance should be made.</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00186	No	This development will have a significant negative impact on the environment and infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have a negative impact on environment and infrastructure</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00187	No	There should be a reference to locally relevant design guidance in Neighbourhood Plans which should be encouraged and supported by Three Rivers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make reference to locally relevance design guidance in Neighbourhood Plans</li> </ul>	Noted	Examine whether to make this reference in the next stage of the Local Plan.	
P1_00190	Yes	Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00201	No	We get enough advertising on TV and everywhere else - adverts on the motorway would act as a dangerous distraction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No adverts allowed on motorway due to safety concerns</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00206	Yes	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00209	No	Considering the proposed destruction of the local area, this is a minor consideration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only a minor consideration but do not agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
P1_00211	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None	

#### Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

P1_00215	Yes	Really?? A section on advertisements?? Surely that should be discussed with local people at a local level rather than have a plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverts should be discussed at a local level with local people rather than in a plan.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00218	Yes	No comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00219	No	In addition, they should not promote promiscuity or the breaking of the law or the inference of the same. They should comply with the Advertising Standards authority guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to comply with Advertising Standards authority guidelines</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00222	Yes	No Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00223	No	Again, it sounds laudable but the Authority has given permission for things like the huge window advertisements in the Tudor Way Tesco Express which are far too dominating.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst sounding good authority allowed huge window adverts in Tudor Way Tesco Express.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00224	Yes	seems in order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00232	Yes	All Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00233	Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Advertisements is the right approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00234	Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Advertisements is the right approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00236	Yes	Stipulations make sense. I am proud of our country/county/district that the advertising pollution seen on the continent and in the US is resisted outside urban areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00240	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00244	Yes	Fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00252	Yes	This is the right approach to have.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00256	Yes	Seems reasonable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00261	Yes	No need for policy given NPPF. Pointless.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need for policy as this is set out in the NPPF</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00262	Yes	Fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
<b>Q25. Should we have considered alternative options?</b>					
P1_00014	Yes	As before.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach, but concerns on how it is implemented. Too many notices on roads/ pedestrian walkways.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00023	Yes	Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00024	Yes	Consideration should be given to reducing advertising generally.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give consideration to reducing advertising generally.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00025	Yes	No advertisements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No adverts</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00040	No	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00041	Yes	Always consider alternatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider alternatives.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00045	Yes	It might be useful to include a reference to community acceptability. I wouldn't want to live next to a sign advertising a strip club and I doubt it would be acceptable to promote alcohol consumption in a highly Muslim area for example.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Might be useful to include a reference to community acceptability e.g. living next to a sign advertising a strip club</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00046	Yes	Greater legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater legislation.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00066	Yes	Should not be allowed at all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not allow at all</li> </ul>	Noted	None

#### Appendix 4 - REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – Advertisements

P1_00068	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00069	Yes	I quote - "The display of advertisements must not compromise amenity and highway safety." The council has itself added to the proliferation of unnecessary clutter in that many roundabouts and verges now feature a sponsor – yet they are still in the tatty state they were before.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has added many verges now feature a sponsor, but were still in tatty state.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00077			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No alternatives suggested.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00078	Yes	Limiting the size of adverts to be displayed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limit the size of adverts to be displayed.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00106	Yes	Forget about it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forget about it.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00107	Yes	..but advertisements should consist of no more than a name and designation to alert passers-by of the business's presence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverts should only consist of a name and designation to alert passers-by</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00119	Yes	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land is sanctuary for wildlife</li> </ul>	<p>Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment.</p> <p>Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.</p>	None
P1_00121	No	Forget the greenbelt - find alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	<p>The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".</p>	None
P1_00132	Yes	good for council income generation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good for council incomes</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00142	Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00166	Yes	Not sure. Put them elsewhere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Put them elsewhere</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00201	Yes	No advertising	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No advertising.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00209	Yes	It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For Councillors to consider alternatives.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00215	Yes	Very local people should decide the impact on their view and area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local People should decide impact on their view and area</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00219	Yes	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to comply with Advertising Standards authority guidelines</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00223	Yes	The approach should give more consideration to the impact of advertising to the look of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should give more consideration to impact of advertising on the look of an area</li> </ul>	Noted	None