

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

STATUTORY CONSULTEES

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	YES/NO	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S / COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
Q27. Do you think the Preferred Sustainable Transport and Travel is the right approach?						
SC_P1_00007_Sport England	Sport England	Yes	In view of the importance attached to planning/designing places to encourage healthy lives in strategic objective 15 of the Local Plan and the focus in policy option 11 on promoting healthy communities through providing the necessary infrastructure to encourage physical exercise, it is surprising that this policy does not have a section specifically on promoting healthier/active communities through design especially as the role of good design in influencing health outcomes is specifically referenced in paragraph 11.7 which supports this policy option. Such a section would be expected to include the principles that developments should incorporate into the design of development to encourage active lifestyles such as connected walking and cycle routes, co-located community facilities, multi-functional open space and active buildings. These are in addition to some of the principles already covered in the policy under different themes that encourage activity which it would not be necessary to repeat (e.g. parts 10, 12, 15, 20, 21 and 22). To support this, specific reference could be made in the policy or reasoned justification to Sport England/Public Health England's Active Design guidance https://www.sportengland.org/howwe-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-costguidance/active-design which sets out principles for encouraging physical activity through the design of development. Such an amendment would also provide greater consistency with paragraph 91(c) of the NPPF.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests that policy includes a section on promoting healthier/active communities through design as specifically referenced in the supporting text at paragraph 11.7. Section should include the principles that developments should incorporate into the design of development to encourage active lifestyles such as connected walking and cycle routes, co-located community facilities, multi-functional open space and active buildings. Principles already covered in the policy (e.g. parts 10,12,15,20,21 and 22) do not need to be repeated. That reference to Sport England's Active Design Guidance should be referred to in the supporting text. 	<p>Preferred Policy 11 Health and Wellbeing states: (1) All development shall be designed to maximise the impact it can make to promoting healthy communities and reducing health inequalities. In particular, regard shall be had to providing the necessary infrastructure to encourage physical exercise and health, including accessible open space, vegetation and landscaping, sport and recreation facilities, cultural facilities and safe, well promoted, walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>Therefore there is no need to repeat this in Local Distinctiveness and Place Shaping policy</p> <p>Policy also refers to the HCC Public Health Department's Hertfordshire Health and Wellbeing Planning Guidance Document (2017) to aid local authorities and developers in the delivery of healthy development and communities</p>	<p>Additional wording to be added to Policy 11 Health and Wellbeing: After 6.10 and before 6.11: Further guidance is also available in Sport England's 'Active Design Guidance available at : https://www.sportengland.org/how-we-can-help/facilities-and-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/active-design</p>
SC_00019_Watford Borough Council	Watford Borough Council	Yes	The policy option could be more positive and reference the Transport Hierarchy to prioritise alternative modes of transport than private vehicle and reduce impact on the environment which is consistent with the aspiration to deliver sustainable development. To support a long-term modal shift, the cycle parking standards set out in Appendix 3 could be more positive, particularly within the sustainability zones where lower car parking standards are proposed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy option could be more positive and reference the Transport Hierarchy to prioritise alternative modes of transport than private vehicle and reduce impact on the environment which is consistent with the aspiration to deliver sustainable development. To support a long-term modal shift, the cycle parking standards set out in Appendix 3 could be more positive, particularly within the sustainability zones where lower car parking standards are proposed. 	Agreed.	Update parking standards in accordance with HCC parking standards.
SC_00017_Chalfont St Peter Parish Council	Chalfont St Peter Parish Council		<p>The two (formerly three) east-west routes referred to in paragraph 4 on page 1 are the only direct means of travel between the two communities and beyond. They are popular routes for people travelling to areas such as Harefield, Mount Vernon Hospital, Watford, Rickmansworth and the M25.</p> <p>A significant factor in the growth in recent years of Chalfont St Peter is the influx of residents who have moved out from the Harrow area and in many cases continue to work there taking a route through these two lanes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large development in Chalfont St Peters will generate large amounts of extra traffic in both directions; Traffic volumes are expected to rise by 15.6% but yet there is no traffic survey data on the roads surrounding the development; 	Representations from the Hertfordshire Highways Authority will be taken in to consideration. The Transport Assessment will identify mitigation measures required and any identified measures will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Move to part 2- this is referencing a site.

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			<p>On the Maple Cross side the initial bends leading from the motorway bridge are narrow and twisting and require passing spaces.</p> <p>A large development here will generate large amounts of extra traffic in both directions. The existing infrastructure is not up to the extra traffic volume. We note your estimate that traffic volumes are expected to rise by 15.6% between 2017-2031. We have noted an absence of traffic survey data on the roads surrounding the particular developments. Presumably this 15.6% increase does not take into account the impact of a large development on the A412 North Orbital Road, Hornhill Road, The Hawthorns and Chalfont Lane.</p> <p>Much the same is true of the only other remaining east-west axis route from Gorelands Lane to Chalfont Lane. To the west Gorelands becomes a narrow country road with barely passing spaces at points for two vehicles. The high density of housing proposed will place significant pressure on both these routes.</p> <p>We have grave concerns that development on this scale across these country lanes will have huge implications for our residents and those of the wider Buckinghamshire area. The North Orbital is already a busy two lane road and housing on this scale will have a massive impact on traffic flow between the A40/M40 and Rickmansworth/Watford. Again, where is the relevant traffic data?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presume the 15.6% does not take account impact of a large development on A412 North Orbital Road; Narrowness of roads cannot accommodate additional development; Have grave concerns that development on this scale across the country lanes will have huge implications for residents and those of wider Buckinghamshire area 		
SC_000 20_Chorleywood Parish Council	Chorleywood Parish Council	No	<p>Whilst the policy contains many elements that have significant merit, in light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy is not strong enough to ensure that new developments have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. To achieve this, the policy should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of either services / facilities or of frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies. It is recommended that this distance be defined as a maximum of 1 mile walked distance where terrain is flat and pavements are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or obstacles the maximum distance should be reduced commensurate with the difficulty these provide. Provide clarity over what qualifies as “safe access” for pedestrians with provision of pavements and footpaths separated from vehicular traffic. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of over 10 dwellings to either services & facilities or to frequent public transport connecting to those facilities & services. More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. Definitions of “safe” requirements, including roads of sufficient width to allow vehicles to pass cyclists safely. No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy is not strong enough to ensure that new developments have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. See Suggested amendments. 	Noted. Representations from the Hertfordshire Highways Authority will be taken in to consideration. The Transport Assessment will identify mitigation measures required and any identified measures will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	Refer to HCC Transport and the Highways Authority representations.
SC_000 23_Croxley Green Parish Council	Croxley Green Parish Council	Yes	<p>Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to sustainable forms of transport with more electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed. We suggest, in particular, further consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of charging points for electric vehicles Support for hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. Support for shared transport and shared car systems. Support for bus transport Protection of and promoting the Croxley Link corridor for sustainable modes. Working with others to make pedestrian crossing of roads safe and easy and Consider introducing 20mph zones in residential areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed. Suggest the need to define “acceptable walking distances” and “safe access routes” for pedestrians and cyclists. And the need for Transport Assessments to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network to provide for all modes as well as the environment and public amenity. Support general approach 	Noted.	No action

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			We endorse the comments from Jed Griffiths' statement about the importance of coordinating transport planning with the Local Plan. In particular the need to define "acceptable walking distances" and "safe access routes" for pedestrians and cyclists. And the need for Transport Assessments to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network to provide for all modes as well as the environment and public amenity. Otherwise we support the general approach			
SC_000 24_Abb ots Langley PC	Abbots Langley Parish Council		The 15.6% rise in transport should be seen as the critical level and we need to set a bar to come below that and set ways of doing it, also localised neighbourhoods with access to shops and infrastructure, as noted in the first three pages, some of the proposed sites fail in this area, demonstrating a contradiction of all these policies when sites have been approved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 15.6% should be seen as the critical level and we need to set policy to stay below this. 	Representations from the Hertfordshire Highways Authority will be taken in to consideration. The Transport Assessment will identify mitigation measures required and any identified measures will be included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action
SC_000 26_HCC Growth and Infrastru cture	HCC Growth and Infrastru cture		<p>Preferred Policy Option 26: Sustainable Transport and Travel</p> <p>HCC supports part 1 and part 2 of this policy. However, with regard to the Development Proposals section in this policy, it is recommended that the text should align closer to Policy 1 of HCC's LTP4.</p> <p>The text within paragraph 4) d) of the policy should be amended as follows, as high quality bus stops are not just about shelters, but are also about accessible design, and infrastructure also includes easy access kerbing and display screens where appropriate: "The provision and improvement of public transport access including layouts to enable convenient access for buses, bus priority <u>where possible and accessible bus stops with high quality infrastructure;</u> and provision of covered waiting facilities where appropriate;"</p> <p>It is also suggested that part 4) e) of the policy could be expanded as to include some set criteria such as a number of developments which may be more relevant and appropriate for this, for example, station forecourts, town centres but not in general and do often represent a single occupancy vehicle which cannot be considered sustainable.</p> <p>The Place and Movement Design Guide should be referenced to part 6 of this policy. In addition, the link to the Travel Plan Guidance sets out criteria for production of Travel Plans can be viewed with the following link: www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/travelplans</p> <p>Paragraph 12.20 It should be noted that high quality bus stops are not only about shelters. The following wording should therefore be added at the end of the paragraph as follows: "<u>...and accessible bus stops with high quality infrastructure.</u>" It is also suggested that this paragraph reference to HCC's Intalink Bus Strategy and the Rail Strategy which set out the county council's approach to working with bus operators and the rail industry to improve networks, access, and encourage usage.</p> <p>Paragraph 12.22 It is considered that Place and Movement Design Guide should be mentioned as part of the reference.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HCC supports part 1 and part 2 of this policy. However, with regard to the Development Proposals section in this policy, it is recommended that the text should align closer to Policy 1 of HCC's LTP4 as suggested. Suggested wording amendments for paragraph 4) d) of the policy. It is also suggested that part 4) e) of the policy could be expanded as to include some set criteria such as a number of developments which may be more relevant and appropriate for this, for example, station forecourts, town centres but not in general and do often represent a single occupancy vehicle which cannot be considered sustainable The Place and Movement Design Guide should be referenced to part 6 of this policy. Suggested wording for paragraph 12.20 Paragraph 12.22- It is considered that Place and Movement Design Guide should be mentioned as part of the reference. 	Agreed	<p>The text within paragraph 4) d) of the policy should be amended as follows, as high quality bus stops are not just about shelters, but are also about accessible design, and infrastructure also includes easy access kerbing and display screens where appropriate: "The provision and improvement of public transport access including layouts to enable convenient access for buses, bus priority <u>where possible and accessible bus stops with high quality infrastructure;</u> and provision of covered waiting facilities where appropriate;"</p> <p>Paragraph 12.20 -The following wording should be added at the end of the paragraph as follows: "<u>...and accessible bus stops with high quality infrastructure.</u>"</p> <p>It is also suggested that this paragraph reference to HCC's Intalink Bus Strategy and the Rail Strategy.</p> <p>Make reference to the Place and movement Design Guide to part 6 of this policy and paragraph 12.22.</p>
SC_000 28_Can al & River Trust	Canal & River Trust		<p>Preferred policy option 26 states that the transfer of road freight to the canals in the district would be supported in principle. The 1968 Transport Act designates the Grand Union canal as a cruising waterway, and there is therefore no obligation on the Trust to facilitate freight. This does not mean that the Trust would not consider the movement of freight on a cruising waterway, but it must be recognised that there is no obligation to do so. The use of the canal to carry freight would largely depend on the extent required and maintenance implications for the waterway.</p> <p>The Trust must be contacted for further discussions as the particular working practises and frequency required, costs, management etc would be key to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Canal Trust must be contacted for further discussions as particular working practices and frequency required, costs, management etc would be key to determining overall suitability of any proposals for freight on the waterway; Policy should be amended to reflect this and the need for consultation with the Canal & River Trust for any proposals relating to the Grand Union canal highlighted; 	Agreed amendment.	<p>Amend policy by taking out the reference to the transfer of road freight to the canal and to reflect the need for consultation with the Canal & River Trust for any proposals relating to the Grand Union canal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the second part of 4c) to ensure it is clear that

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

		<p>determining the overall suitability of any proposals for freight on the waterway. The policy should be amended to reflect this and the need for consultation with the Canal & River Trust for any proposals relating to the Grand Union canal highlighted.</p> <p>The canal towpath is an important traffic free route for walking /cycling for both leisure and utility walkers and represents a multifunctional asset, providing linkages to local facilities, recreational opportunities, and a safe, convenient and attractive walking and cycling network to promote health and well-being, consistent with the aims of the NPPF.</p> <p>The plan acknowledges this potential and requires developments to link to and from the towpath. Whilst 'enhancement of existing cycle and walking routes' could include the towpath, it is considered that the second part of 4c) adds some ambiguity, and this would benefit from some amendments to ensure it is clear that developments need to look at enhancements to the towpath and access points, not just the linkages to and from the canal and the proposed development.</p> <p>Improvements to integrate the canal corridor into adjacent development and create / strengthen links to other areas of open space also need to be considered. This could include improvements to the existing towpath, improving signage and creating circular walks or heritage trails.</p> <p>In partnership with Sustrans the Trust is considering projects in the area, with Sustrans already having National Cycle Network routes within the Colne Valley, and further opportunities to enhance the network could be explored and supported within the Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Towpath -Whilst 'enhancement of existing cycle and walking routes' could include the towpath, it is considered that the second part of 4c) adds some ambiguity, and this would benefit from some amendments to ensure it is clear that developments need to look at enhancements to the towpath and access points, not just the linkages to and from the canal and the proposed development. In partnership with Sustrans the Trust is considering projects in the area, with Sustrans already having National Cycle Network routes within the Colne Valley, and further opportunities to enhance the network could be explored and supported within the Plan. 		<p>developments need to look at enhancements to the towpath and access points, not just the linkages to and from the canal and the proposed development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the canal Trust in partnership with Sustrans is seeking projects in the area- will need to be incorporated within the infrastructure plan.
SC_00030_Highways England	Highways England	<p>For Policy 27 concerning transport, reference should be made to Highways England and the SRN</p> <p>We note paragraph 12.7 refers to 'the Highways Agency' and ask this now be updated to reference 'National Highways' which was formally announced on 19th August to be the new name for this organisation. Although reference to Highways England will remain as a common term in a vast majority of correspondence for some time.</p> <p>Highway England is supportive of the text provided and asks that Three Rivers District Council promote strategies, policies and land allocations that will support alternatives to the car and the operation of a safe and reliable transport network. This is reflected in Paragraph 12 of Circular 02/2013 states that 'the preparation and delivery of Local Plans provides an opportunity to identify and support a pattern of development that minimises trip generation at source and encourages the use of sustainable modes of transport, minimises journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities, and promotes accessibility for all. This can contribute to environmental objectives and also reduce the cost to the economy arising from the environmental, business and social impacts associated with traffic generation and congestion.'</p> <p>Highways England welcomes measures to reduce traffic generation at its source and the provision of sustainable transport measures. Whilst Highways England supports a sustainable transport strategy, we also have to realistic in understanding if these measures would discourage vehicle trips travelling on the SRN, which are largely strategic journeys in nature. For Highways England, it is measures such as public transport enhancements i.e. bus, underground, rail, or improved integration of these services that would only realistically affect the number of vehicle trips that would otherwise travel on the SRN. We would be concerned if any material increase in traffic were to occur on the SRN because of planned growth within the District, without careful consideration of mitigation measures. It is important that the Local Plan provide the planning policy framework to ensure development cannot progress without the appropriate infrastructure in place. When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We will</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific reference to the SRN should be included in Policy 27; Change reference in Paragraph 12.7 to National Highways; Highway England is supportive of the text provided and we ask that Three Rivers District Council promote strategies, policies and land allocations that will support alternatives to the car and the operation of a safe and reliable transport network. When considering proposals for growth, any impacts on the SRN will need to be identified and mitigated as far as reasonably possible. We will support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures, if the benefits for managing down demand and reducing the need to travel on the SRN is suitably evidenced. Highway England would request transport evidence and modelling to be undertaken to determine what the cumulative impact of these developments could be on the SRN and therefore, what measures may be required to mitigate these impacts. The transport related evidence base needs to be sufficiently appropriate, up-to-date, transparent and robust, such that it can be deemed sound. The evidence base should cover an appropriate area; for transport this may be beyond the borough boundary. The evidence base should also ensure that it assesses the individual and cumulative impacts of developments within the study area over the whole plan period and, as necessary, at various intermediate dates for interim 	Agreed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make reference to Highways England and the SRN in policy 27. Paragraph 12.7- update reference from the Highways Agency to 'National Highways'. <p>The transport related evidence base needs to be sufficiently appropriate, up-to-date, transparent and robust, such that it can be deemed sound.</p> <p>IDP needs to be undertaken.</p>

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			<p>support a local authority proposal that considers sustainable measures, if the benefits for managing down demand and reducing the need to travel on the SRN is suitably evidenced.</p> <p>Specific reference to the SRN should be included in Policy 27.</p> <p>Paragraph 18 of Circular 02/2013 states that ‘capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated strategic infrastructure needs. Enhancements should not normally be considered as fresh proposals at the planning application stage. Highways England will work with strategic delivery bodies to identify infrastructure and access needs at the earliest possible opportunity in order to assess suitability, viability and deliverability of such proposals, including the identification of potential funding arrangements.’</p> <p>Beyond sustainable transport measures, physical junction improvements may be required. Highways England draws your attention to Paragraphs 9 and 10 of the Circular which refers to development proposals being unacceptable, by virtue of a severe impact, if they increase demand for use of a section of the network that is already operating over-capacity or cannot be safely accommodated within the existing infrastructure provision, unless suitable mitigation is agreed. In such a circumstance, mitigation would be requested. For the Local Plan, this should be presented as an Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS) / Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) or related document. Highway England would request transport evidence and modelling to be undertaken to determine what the cumulative impact of these developments could be on the SRN and therefore, what measures may be required to mitigate these impacts. This should take account of already committed development and infrastructure proposals affecting the SRN. It is therefore unclear at this stage whether it will be possible to sufficiently mitigate the impact of the allocated development locations, or whether the impact will be too great to feasibly ensure that the network operates within capacity at the end of the plan period. Highways England ask to be consulted on all steps in the development / identification of this transport information, able to comment on the appropriateness of the raw data, modelling assumptions and modelling software to be used, etc. A scoping report should be submitted to Highways England in the first instance to agree the modelling and trip generation parameters. Until this has been submitted, Highways England is not in a position to offer further comments as to the soundness of the Plan. We would welcome a conversation on this, if it would be helpful.</p> <p>The transport related evidence base needs to be sufficiently appropriate, up-to-date, transparent and robust, such that it can be deemed sound. The evidence base should cover an appropriate area; for transport this may be beyond the borough boundary. The evidence base should also ensure that it assesses the individual and cumulative impacts of developments within the study area over the whole plan period and, as necessary, at various intermediate dates for interim assessments to show when mitigation action will be required.</p>	<p>assessments to show when mitigation action will be required. Highways England cannot offer more commentary until IDP is submitted</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q27. Should we have considered alternative options?						
SC_000 19_Watford Borough Council	Watford Borough Council	yes	<p>The former Metropolitan Line Extension provides a significant opportunity to improve connections between Watford Junction and the area of Ascot Road which is seeing high density development at present. Watford has explored potential uses of the route including light rail, bus corridor and walking/cycling infrastructure that can all contribute towards achieving a long-term modal shift using sustainable transport modes. The route subject to the exploration of transport options as part of the Croxley Line Safeguarding for Mass Rapid transport Technical Report (2020) terminates at the north end of Ascot Road near the Three Rivers - Watford boundary. It is suggested that potential long-term options be recognised as part of a long-term sustainable transport strategy and this be reflected in policy so policy hook is in place that could maximise the value of the former MLX route and any opportunities that may arise to support sustainable development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is suggested that potential long-term options be recognised as part of a long-term sustainable transport strategy and this be reflected in policy so policy hook is in place that could maximise the value of the former MLX route and any opportunities that may arise to support sustainable development. 	Noted.	Discussions ongoing regarding the metropolitan line extension and new route alignment.

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

NON-STATUTORY RESPONDENTS

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	YES/ NO	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER' S/COUNCIL' S PROPOSED ACTION
Q27. Do you think the Preferred Sustainable Transport and Travel is the right approach?						
P1_000 01			This policy is totally unrealistic. It has the best intention of encouraging walking and cycling but we know from elsewhere in the country that people still use cars. There will be a least one, possibly two and, dependent on the house size, three or more cars per household. The existing road provision in TRDC already produces regular gridlock and large-scale developments here and in adjoining Local Authorities will only add to the problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is unrealistic, will be at least two car per household; Existing road provision already produces regular gridlock and large-scale developments here and adjoining Local Authorities will add to problem. 	Noted	None
P1_000 02			Good Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	Noted	None
P1_000 03			Any Development should actively discourage car use to reduce impact of traffic on environment - noise, pollution etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	Noted	None
P1_000 05		Yes	Nothing to add	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_000 06		Yes	The council must provide a good transport network within the district. This will encourage people to utilise public transport for both work and pleasure purposes for all. Older members of the area may not have the use of cars and the availability of buses to adjoining towns and medical facilities is essential. The environment benefit too if public vehicles are used and encouraged. Recent surveys show that the local bus service is under used, this may well be the case but we have been through a pandemic and restrictions have directed us not to use public transport! This facility is so import for an area to thrive and consideration must be given for the way forward on this. Pupils must be encouraged to use alternative methods of transport to schools too! The locality is swamped by cars at the start and finish of the school day and in particular the close vicinity to school building experiences great difficulty with the influx of cars causing blockages in roads and parking over residential driveways! Greater emphasis must be given at the time of selection of pupils in local schools! Journeys in and out of the district are multiplied un necessarily at the start and end of the school day and this need reviewing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a good transport link in the district; Encourage public transport links; Encourage public transport to and from school 	Noted	None
P1_000 14		Yes	Makes logical sense. However, we do question the statement that Three Rivers is well serviced by transport links. The reason that there is such high car usage is because the bus routes/timetables and other local transport infrastructure is missing. I would much rather travel on public transport where I can relax and read than have to worry about managing traffic but walking 15-2 0minutes and then waiting for 30 minutes before a bus arrives (if it does) is not the best use of time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach; Question statement that Three Rivers is well serviced by public transport links, when bus timetables and infrastructure is poor 	Noted	None
P1_000 17		No	Where is the infrastructure plan to support this in South Oxhey/Oxhey Lane? You can't mandate bus routes so what is the point? People will use their cars and therefore the traffic levels and jams will increase at Bushey Arches. There is no space for cycle lanes either. You have to work with Watford on this, how they ever allowed residential development at the arches I will never know. From this point alone no development should occur in Oxhey Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where is infrastructure plan to support in South Oxhey/ Oxhey Lane; Traffic levels and jams will increase at Bushey Arches; No development at Oxhey Lane 	Noted	None
P1_000 19		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment 	Noted	None
P1_000 20		No	Public transport and private transport infrastructure should be in place and be adequate. Also the developments will generate additional heavy traffic required for construction,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public and private transport infrastructure should be in place and adequate 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			road closure and noise. This should be considered seriously prior to plans being finalised.			
P1_000_21	Yes		It is not clear enough how much extra public transport will be provided. For example where we are we have twice hourly trains into London. However anybody that lives here will tell you it is regularly cancelled always late and very dirty old trains. This need to serious upgrade. The buses are supposed to run at certain times but I have stood at the bus stop pre-pandemic. I will add and waited for an hour and a half with no bus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has enough how much extra public transport will be provided. 	Noted	None
P1_000_23	Yes		Ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_000_24	Yes		Sustainable transport must be a key priority and investment needs to be increased in this area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. 	Noted	None
P1_000_25	No		Transport is already over run,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport will already overrun 	Noted	None
P1_000_26	Yes		Clear Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	None
P1_000_27			Needs to address provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles. Needs to consider how to support community and shared transport facilities. These are mentioned as an afterthought but are a critical aspect of developing low-energy transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address provision of charging facilities for electric vehicles; Mentioned as an afterthought 	Noted	None
P1_000_28	Yes		Assuming we have more mass transport availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach have more mass transport availability 	Noted	None
P1_000_32	Yes		This approach is admirable but could have perhaps had more about public transport provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, had more about public transport provision. 	Noted	None
P1_000_33	Yes		New developments need to consider safe access for cyclists	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, new developments need to consider safe access for cyclists. 	Noted	None
P1_000_34	Yes		No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Objection 	Noted	None
P1_000_35	Not Specified		Cycle paths to promote cycling and healthy living. Wide ones as in Copenhagen would be good!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to promote cycling and healthy living. 	Noted	None
P1_000_38	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_000_40	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"> Do not develop Green Belt Land 	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

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

P1_000_41	Yes		• No Comment	Noted	None
P1_000_45	Yes	This is appropriate.	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_46	Yes	Footpaths are so important, especially under lockdowns	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_47	Yes	This policy is correct.	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_48	No	People will own cars and sufficient parking spaces need to be provided in any new developments. Transport Plans and other policy documents will not make people give up their cars. Provision for electric car charging should be incorporated.	• Transport Plans and documents will not make people give up cars. • Provision for electric car charging should be incorporated.	Noted	None
P1_000_49	Yes	Consultation with residents should be frequently carried out to monitor transport needs.	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_53	No	It's the right approach but no thoughts or plans for surrounding roads etc has been published as part of the plan (especially in regards to Toms Lane) which will result in huge amount of traffic and congestion.	• Right approach but no thought/ plans for surrounding road has been published as part of plan, such as Tom's Lane	Noted	None
P1_000_54	Yes	Public transport is poor. Pathway are often in poor condition with low hanging branches from tree a hazard in many areas of Croxley Green. Cars park on pavements which makes thing difficult for pedestrians. Road often not safe for cyclists.	• Agree with public transport is poor, pathway in poor condition and roads not safe for cyclists.	Noted	None
P1_000_55	Yes	Future needs considered	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_56	Yes	Strategically correct. However, TRDC is quoted as supporting the Herts Rapid Transport Scheme, which should include maximising the re-use of the tracked of the LNWR Croxley Green branch as far the old Croxley Green Station as part of that scheme.	• Agree with approach, Herts Rapid Transport Scheme, maximising re-use of the tracked of the LNWR Croxley Green branch.	Noted	None
P1_000_58		New developments will increase the pressure on our infrastructure - especially road traffic. Our roads are narrow and not suited to increased pressure. It is already under pressure with traffic, causing damage, leading to further frustration and delays due to repeated repair work. This is specifically on Oxhey Lane from the golf course, leading to Bushey Arches.	• Roads are narrow and not suited to increase pressure, already under pressure with traffic, especially on Oxhey Lane.	Noted	None
P1_000_63	Yes	Agree	• Agree with approach	Noted	None
P1_000_64	Yes	xxx	• No Comment	Noted	None
P1_000_66	No	You must stop the amount of cars in the area, average 2 per household will increase by over 5000 with your plan. NONE OF THE DESIGNATED AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT ARE CLOSE ENOUGH FOR SHOPS TO USE ALTERNATIVES EG WALKING OR CYCLES. Any new development must be within an agreeable distance from a large supermarket or we will have even more traffic and pollution due to home deliveries which will be a disaster for the whole area	• Stop the amount of cars in the area, will increase by 5,000 with the plan; • Any new development must be within an agreeable distance from a large supermarket	Noted	None
P1_000_67		Also our roads cannot take much more traffic!	• Roads cannot take more traffic.	Noted	None
P1_000_68	No	There will be many problems to solve in transport and movement in future - the Council will not solve many of them by repaving the Grand Union towpath or trying to ponder over such clauses as -"It makes adequate provision for all users, including car and other vehicle parking, giving priority to people with mobility difficulties, pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians, and to low and ultra-low emission vehicles". That to me seems like a list someone has plucked from somewhere and compiled another just to say - there, that's that covered!	• Will be many problems to solve in transport and movement in future; • Council will not solve these issues just by repaving Grand Union towpath.	Noted	None
P1_000_69	No		• No Comment	Noted	None
P1_000_71	No	In the case of transport, I believe it's unrealistic to claim these objectives will be met without addressing them as part of any housing plans and demonstrating what can be done as part of the housing plan. There are many examples of narrow roads in and around Chorleywood that are 'overloaded' by vehicle use now and access to the Station and parking near the station is an issues at peak times. You won't carry hearts and	• Unrealistic to claim objectives will be met without addressing as part of any housing plans and demonstrating what can be done as part of the housing plan.	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			minds unless infrastructure limitations are properly recognised and used to guide where and how much new housing is located.			
P1_000 74	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_000 77	Yes	Y		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_000 78	Yes	It's the only way forward.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_000 80	No	People will still use their cars no matter how good the transport system is. If the roads are already bad then why add more houses to make it worse		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People will still use cars and will make roads work. 	Noted	None
P1_000 81	No	I have been reviewing the new local planning consultation on the three rivers website and do not see anything focused on Electric charging points for residential and non-residential buildings/ locations in accordance with government guidelines. I have attached the government document related to this. I recently invested In the New Build South Oxhey development, and have struggled to charge my car EV car as there are no Charing points in the area and none in my car parking bay, being a EV car owner for over 3 years I reached out about installing one in my car parking space. To my dismay have, found no effort has been made to address this. Furthermore I have been ignored by the developer Countryside properties and management company Home group when asked to how they plan to address these EV requirements.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No focus on electric charging points for residential and non-residential use; Been ignored by developer Countryside properties and management company Home group when asked to how they plan to address these EV requirements regarding South Oxhey development 	Noted	None
P1_000 84	Yes	We are not a commuter town and this would affect the area greatly so we need to be sympathetic any changes.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, would need to be sympathetic to any changes. 	Noted	None
P1_000 88	No	The above, once again fails to understand that lower wage earners need parking and facilities for their tools and items for work. My neighbours both opposite me and next door drive medium vehicles for work. If people do not have someone to park their work vehicle, they won't take the job!		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not take into account lower wage earners who need parking and facilities for tools and items for work. 	Noted	None
P1_000 89	Yes	We need to make sure a planning of house or development in Chorleywood is aided by the Infrastructure to support it. We already have commuters parking in roads making residents not able to park, sometimes up to 12hrs per day.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Ensure planning of house/ development in Chorleywood aided by infrastructure to support it. 	Noted	None
P1_000 91	Yes	It should support more ultra-low emission vehicles and sustainable transport		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_000 96	Yes	Seems sensible		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_000 97	Yes	But important to maintain station car parks because stations serve people who live a distance from the stations or live in surrounding villages who cannot walk or cycle to a station.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Maintain station car parks as serve people who live distance from stations 	Noted	None
P1_000 98	No	There is no empirical evidence here. There are no numbers, it is all qualitative and therefore down to individual assessment of each case. That is not rigorous in any way and this is a shambles. What are the targets? What are the goals and numbers? How do you measure this over time?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No empirical evidence here, no numbers provided, all qualitative and down to individual assessments. No targets provides or goals 	Noted	None
P1_000 99_A Michael s (councill or)	No	No, not targets, not details- won't achieve anything. Why is this so lose and un specific?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No target and no details and will not achieve anything; Query why policy is so loose and unspecific. 	Noted	None
P1_001 02	Yes	Transport has a huge impact on climate change. All new development must provide sustainable means of transport and travel and have easy access to public transport.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Transport has huge impact on climate change. 	Noted	None
P1_001 06	No	Could not be changed, would just cause more impact on traffic, which is already heavy.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could not be changed would just cause more impact on traffic. 	Noted	None
P1_001 07	Yes	..as long as any associated development doesn't reduce the greenbelt.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, long as does not reduce Green Belt. 	Noted	None
P1_001 08	Yes	we need a lot more public transport		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

P1_001 10_CPR E Herts	Not Specified	With regard to transport generally, the Local Plan (para 12.2) should be more aspirational and acknowledge, for climate and related reasons, that we need to reverse patterns of increasing car dependency and ownership with a modal shift to sustainable transport modes. Car dependent sprawl and high car ownership are promoting the loss of green space, countryside and encroachment into the Green Belt. Forecast traffic growth (15% is mentioned) is unsustainable if climate obligations are to be met. The Local Plan should highlight and aim to address a number of main roads that are noisy, polluting and hostile; detrimental to health and the quality of places. These need to be addressed with a shift to prioritise sustainable movement and greener liveable environment, for example, the A404 in Rickmansworth. PPOs 26 and 27 should stress that: <input type="checkbox"/> development should be located to maximise sustainable transport modes. <input type="checkbox"/> new development should embrace the 15-minute neighbourhood, demonstrate how the majority of daily trips are possible by sustainable modes with the aim of minimising the impacts of motor vehicles <input type="checkbox"/> new uses, which enhance the diversity and mix of neighbourhoods, and reduce the need to travel, will be viewed positively and encouraged proactively by place making initiatives <input type="checkbox"/> development should demonstrate planned sustainable modal share with review mechanisms for payments for sustainable transport if these are not subject to Section 106 agreements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Plan should be more aspirational and acknowledge and reverse patterns of increasing car dependency; The Local Plan should highlight and aim to address a number of main roads that are noisy, polluting and hostile; The policy should stress that: development should be located to maximise sustainable transport modes. Embrace 15-minute neighbourhood, majority of daily trips are possible by sustainable modes, minimising the impacts of motor vehicles; New uses which enhance diversity and mix of neighbourhoods, reduce need to travel, will be viewed positively; Demonstrate sustainable modal share with review mechanisms for payments for sustainable transport if these are not subject to Section 106 agreements. 	Noted	None
P1_001 12	No	It's unrealistic! Nobody is going to reduce the use of their car. With the wider use of electric vehicles it is likely to increase. Public transport is not accessible to some of us who live in rural locations. A car is my only option.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unrealistic. Nobody is going to reduce use 	Noted	None
P1_001 13	No	All cars will be electric soon. The availability of charging points is abysmal. There are loads of spaces where they could be set-up and also provide revenue where people using motorways etc pull off to get charged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of electric cars, loads of spaces where they could be set-up and also provide revenue. 	Noted	None
P1_001 14	Yes	largely concur	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001 16	Yes	I agree with the policy as stated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001 17	No	Avoid penalising car drivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not penalise car drivers 	Noted	None
P1_001 19	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"> Land is sanctuary for wildlife. 	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_001 23	Yes	It covers the basic points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001 27	No	You should follow your own rules and make sure all developments have adequate cycle parking and storage and lose the reliance on cars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up own rules; make sure development have adequate cycle parking, lose reliance on cars. 	Noted	None
P1_001 28	No	Increasing the local population by such a significant amount would put massive pressure on the local transport - buses, trains, road network etc. At the moment Kings Langley station does not have capacity for the current population (when in non covid times) and there is no proposal to improve this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	Noted	
P1_001 30	No	Doesn't mention anything on expanding the current transport links especially rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of expanding current transport links. 	Noted	None
P1_001 31	No	No specific mention of provision for electric scooters, electric bikes and 'mobility scooters'. Pavements are becoming increasingly crowded with these new vehicles in addition to old fashioned skateboarders, walkers and cyclists. It may be illegal (at present) for many of these to use pavements but they do. Provision of 'cycle lanes'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention for electric scooters, bikes and mobility scooters; Need more cycle lanes to accommodate accordingly 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			should be beefed up accordingly. Also, no mention of beefing up local side roads to allow for the umpteen vans using them these days for home deliveries. Such roads are often blocked by said vans. Over the Herts CC to sort it out?			
P1_001_32	Yes	important for future		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_35	No	Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how they sit within the road network is required. The policies should explicitly mention the provision of electric charging points and support hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. It should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need recognition of electric cars as sustainable transport modes; Should mention provision of electric charging points and support hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. Support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs. 	Noted	None
P1_001_36	No	For local shops and other aspects of community life; and if there is more than 1 mile between a house and the local shops, residents will continue to need and use cars. Other local provision: There is not much detail on the provision of better roads (current ones are near capacity), shops, schools etc.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not much detail on the provision of better roads (current ones are near capacity), shops, schools etc. 	Noted	None
P1_001_37	Yes	I agree to a certain extent to the above but the realistic picture is that with young families taking alternative transport methods, through cycling and buses, it is often difficult to implement! As so many more families are double income, the necessity is to drop children off to school/nursery then travel onto work. So many families are two, or if not more, car owners. The above modes of transport I think often reflects the retired community, who have more time on their hands!		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree to a certain extent; Young families take different transport methods, through cycling and buses, it is often difficult to implement. 	Noted	None
P1_001_40	Yes	This would be an absolute necessity especially when a development arises in already space confined areas such as Hampermill Lane. Already the road network is overwhelmed. Additional traffic would render the road network a nightmare.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_42	No	.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_001_44	No	And high rise makes this easier to achieve		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High rise makes it easier to achieve. 	Noted	None
P1_001_47	Yes	Encourage use of more electric transport and enable more bikes, scooters etc to be stored at stations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_48	Yes	Preserving the local environment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_49	No	I agree with Chorleywood Residents Association position: Whilst the policy contains many elements that have significant merit, in light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy is not strong enough to ensure that new developments have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. To achieve this, the policy should: Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of services / facilities and / or frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies. It is recommended that this distance be defined as a maximum of 1.5 km walked distance provided that the terrain is flat and pavements are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or other obstacles the acceptable distance should be reduced commensurate with the difficulty these provide. Provide clarity over what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, to include provision of pavements and footpaths separated from vehicular traffic, along with police evaluation of the safety of any elements not along public roads. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of over 10 dwellings to either services & facilities or to frequent public transport connecting to those facilities & services. More detail is needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. Definitions of safe requirements, including roads of sufficient width to allow vehicles to pass cyclists safely. No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is not strong enough in light of the climate emergency; Definition of distance as a maximum of 1.5km walked distance; Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of over 10 dwellings to either services & facilities or to frequent public transport connecting to those facilities & services; No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused. 	Noted	None
P1_001_50	No	In light of the Climate Emergency declared by the Council, this PPO it is not strong enough. As explained below, it does not fully ensure that new developments will have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. In order to establish a co-ordinated and		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			<p>enhanced transport system, the Council will need to work closely with Hertfordshire County Council, Highways England, and transport providers, which include Transport for London. With regard to transport planning, current policy is contained in the recent Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which contains specific policies and proposals for South West Hertfordshire, including Three Rivers. There is no mention of LTP4, but these specific elements should be shown in the Local Plan, which should be part of a co-ordinated approach to transport planning across South West Hertfordshire. It is not enough to defer to the Infrastructure Development Schedule to show the specific proposals for development, as suggested in paragraph (2). The development management policies do not go far enough. First, policy should require all major developments to be within acceptable walking distance of facilities and services or connecting public transport services. Where terrain includes significant slopes or obstacles, the walking distance should be shortened appropriately, especially for elderly or disabled who are expected to form an increasing proportion of the population. Second, the policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, with provision of pavements and paved footways separated from vehicular traffic. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services. Third, for large-scale developments, the Council must follow the National Planning Policy Framework requirement (NPPF 2021, paragraph 104) and ensure Transport Assessments are produced to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network, as well as the environment and public amenity. Developments without a satisfactory Transport Assessment should be refused. Finally, the proposal in paragraph (3) to transfer road freight to railways and canals in the District is unrealistic and impractical.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to work with HCC, Highways England and other Transport providers to provide a co-ordinated approach; • No mention of Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which contains current policy on transport; • Not enough to defer to Infrastructure Development Schedule for specific proposals for development in paragraph (2) • Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility; • Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; • For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced. 		
P1_001_51	Yes		<p>Because a reduction in car use will be necessary to reduce climate change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_54_Three Rivers Joint Residents Association	Not Stated		<p>44. Whilst Preferred Policy Option 26 contains many elements that are of significant merit, in the light of the Climate Emergency declared by the Council, it is not strong enough. As explained below, it does not fully ensure that new developments will have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. At the strategic level, the Associations recognise that, in the compilation of the policies, there is a dilemma for the District Council, acknowledged in paragraph 12.5, in that it is not the highways authority. Nevertheless, in order to establish a co-ordinated and enhanced transport system, the Council will need to work closely with Hertfordshire County Council, Highways England, and transport providers, which include Transport for London.</p> <p>45. For almost 50 years, transport planning in Three Rivers has been considered as part of an overall strategy for South West Hertfordshire, which corresponds to the distinctive Journey-to-Work Area. Current policy is contained in the recent Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which contains specific policies and proposals for South West Hertfordshire, including Three Rivers. There is no mention of LTP4, but these specific elements should be shown in the Local Plan, which should be part of a co-ordinated approach to transport planning across South West Hertfordshire. It is not enough to defer to the Infrastructure Development Schedule to show the specific proposals for development, as suggest in paragraph (2).</p> <p>46. Although the development management policies are generally sound and reflect the principles of sustainable transport as set out in the NPPF, they do not go far enough. The Associations have a number of suggestions for enhancing these policies. First, policy should require all major developments to be within acceptable walking distance of facilities and services or connecting public transport services. Definitions of acceptable should be defined in the policies. It is recommended that this distance should be a maximum of 1 Kilometre where terrain is flat and paved footways are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or obstacles, the walking distance should be shortened appropriately, especially for elderly or disabled who are expected to form an increasing proportion of the population.</p> <p>47. Second, the policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes “safe access” for pedestrians, with provision of pavements and paved footways separated from vehicular traffic. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services. Definitions of “safe” requirements should include roads of sufficient width to allow motor vehicles and cyclists to pass safely. No developments of 10 dwellings or more should be permitted on single-track roads without pavements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; • Need to work with HCC, Highways England and other Transport providers to provide a co-ordinated approach; • No mention of Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which contains current policy on transport; • Not enough to defer to Infrastructure Development Schedule for specific proposals for development in paragraph (2) • Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility; • Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; • For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced. 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			48. Third, for large-scale developments, the Association expects the Council to follow the National Planning Policy Framework requirement (NPPF 2021, paragraph 104) and ensure Transport Assessments are produced to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network, as well as the environment and public amenity. Developments without a satisfactory Transport Assessment should be refused. Finally, the proposal in paragraph (3) to transfer road freight to railways and canals in the District, however, is unrealistic and impractical.			
P1_001 55	Yes		Encouraging the use of walking as a mode of transport is excellent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001 57	No		Any new developments should have sustainable transport and travel capabilities. The Policy is not worded strong enough for this. The Council would need to work with HCC, Highways England as well as transport providers, including TfL. All major developments should be within acceptable walking distance of facilities and services, especially important for an ageing population. The policy should clarify what is meant by 'safe access' for pedestrians e.g. pavement provisions and paved footways. The proposal to transfer road freight to railways and canals in the district is completely unrealistic and impractical.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy not worded strongly enough; All major developments should be within walking distance of facilities and services, Policy should clarify what is meant by 'safe access' for pedestrians 	Noted	None
P1_001 62	Yes		Getting more things off roads onto the railway is needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More things off road onto railway is needed. 	Noted	None
P1_001 64	Yes		Discourages wider use of cars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Discourage wider use of cars 	Noted	None
P1_001 66	Yes		More walking and cycling, ie less buildings and more space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More walking and cycling, less building and more space 	Noted	None
P1_001 67	Not Sta ted		Cycle routes are a clear problem in and around Rickmansworth and the Uxbridge Road which require some creative thought and action. The introduction of warehouses down the road will make this worse. What about traffic calming measures in some centres?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cycle routes are a clear problem in and around Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Road which require some creative thought and action. 	Noted	None
P1_001 68	No		Much too weak in its treatment of the requirements for sustainable transport links for new developments. There must be a bar on the approval of new developments which cannot demonstrate that (i) existing road connections will not be significantly adversely affected by the increased traffic resulting from the new development and (ii) there are sufficient environmentally-sustainable transport options connecting the new development with services, commerce, amenities etc that the new development will not result in a material rise in car use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refuse developments which cannot demonstrate (i) existing road connections will not be significantly adversely affected by the increased traffic resulting from the new development and (ii) are sufficient environmentally-sustainable transport options connecting new development with services, commerce, amenities etc that the new development will not result in a material rise in car use. 	Noted	None
P1_001 69	Yes		Encouraging movement other than by carbon (petrol/diesel) motor vehicle should be encouraged. There should be a target/requirement electric charging points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encouraging movement other than carbon (petrol) should be encouraged. 	Noted	None
P1_001 70	No		Nice Words but not actioned, Clause 2.19 states that "Access to, and parking at stations are under pressure", yet one of your proposals is to build over Chorleywood Station Car Park, hardly a promotion of the use of Sustainable Public Transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not actioned, example is that Clause 2.19 states that 'Access to and parking at stations under pressure, but propose to build over Chorleywood Station 	Noted	None
P1_001 74	Yes		Good approach but why are electric car charging stations not mentioned specifically here? This will be a major requirement for all new developments as new fossil fuelled cars are phased out in the coming years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need reference to electric car charging points 	Noted	None
P1_001 81_Chilt ern Society	Not Sp ecif ied		This policy needs to recognise the increase in home working and flexible work patterns as a result of the pandemic. People are likely to be travelling less for work, if at all. This requires home working and internet provision to be considered in the design of new homes. In larger developments, opportunities should be considered to provide 'hubs' containing shared workspaces and facilities such as cafes, gyms and shops for home workers to be able to utilise during the working day.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy needs to recognise increase in home working and flexible work patterns as a result of the pandemic; Larger developments should be considered to provide 'hubs' containing shared workspaces 	Noted	None
P1_001 82	No		I think the opening statement "New development must contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system" is not enough. New developments must ensure this, otherwise short cuts and compromises will result. Similarly "New development should integrate means of travel" would be meaningful if they must do it, not should do it. We need a plan for more car charging points as more switch to electric vehicles. We need integrated cycling paths and better maintained footpaths. We need a proactive approach to encourage less car use for short journeys. It is currently really difficult	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening statement "New development must contribute to the delivery of an integrated, accessible and safe transport system" is not enough. New developments must ensure this; Car speed within the Rickmansworth area should be limited to 20 mph. Dual carriageways in the centre should be removed as they encourage speed. 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			cycling within the area particularly if you wish to cross from one side of Rickmansworth to the other. I would love to see a strategy like the Dutch approach where cyclists and pedestrians are the centre of the community and things are built around them, not cars and roads which is what we have. Car speed within the Rickmansworth area should be limited to 20 mph. Dual carriageways in the centre should be removed because they encourage speed. Car parking spaces should be then removed progressively over time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking spaces should be then removed progressively over time. 		
P1_001_83	Yes		as above except for Smart Motorways - too dangerous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach apart from Smart Motorways, too dangerous 	Noted	None
P1_001_84	No		<p>Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed.</p> <p>Please consider further consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of charging points for electric vehicles Support for hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. Support for shared transport and shared car systems. Support for bus transport Protection of and promoting the Croxley Link corridor for sustainable modes. Working with others to make pedestrian crossing of roads safe and easy. Consider introducing 20mph zones in residential areas. <p>There is a need to define “acceptable walking distances” and “safe access routes” for pedestrians and cyclists. And the need for Transport Assessments to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network to provide for all modes as well as the environment and public amenity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need greater provision of electric charging points; Support for bus transport; Consider introducing 20mph zones in residential areas; Need to define acceptable walking distances and safe access routes. 	Noted	None
P1_001_86	No		As someone who commutes to London every day, the current transport system cannot cope with current demand let alone more homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current transport cannot cope with current demand let alone more homes. 	Noted	None
P1_001_87	No		<p>Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed.</p> <p>Please consider further consideration of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of charging points for electric vehicles Support for hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. Support for shared transport and shared car systems. Support for bus transport Protection of and promoting the Croxley Link corridor for sustainable modes. Working with others to make pedestrian crossing of roads safe and easy. Consider introducing 20mph zones in residential areas. <p>There is a need to define “acceptable walking distances” and “safe access routes” for pedestrians and cyclists. And the need for Transport Assessments to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network to provide for all modes as well as the environment and public amenity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need greater provision of electric charging points; Support for bus transport; Consider introducing 20mph zones in residential areas; Need to define acceptable walking distances and safe access routes. 	Noted	None
P1_001_90	Yes		Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_91	Yes		Plans promote healthy living and minimises uses of motor vehicles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_001_92	No		<p>Whilst the policy contains many elements that have significant merit, in light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy is not strong enough to ensure that new developments have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. To achieve this, the policy should: Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of services / facilities and / or frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies. It is recommended that this distance be defined as a maximum of 1.5 km walked distance provided that the terrain is flat and pavements are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or other obstacles the acceptable distance should be reduced commensurate with the difficulty these provide. Provide clarity over what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, to include provision of pavements and footpaths separated from vehicular traffic, along</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility, maximum of 1.5km; Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			with police evaluation of the safety of any elements not along public roads. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of over 10 dwellings to either services & facilities or to frequent public transport connecting to those facilities & services. More detail is needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. Definitions of safe requirements, including roads of sufficient width to allow vehicles to pass cyclists safely. No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced; More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. 		
P1_002_01	Yes		Access to sustainable transportation is essential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to sustainable transport is essential. 	Noted	None
P1_002_05	No		The Policy should also require development to adhere to the other policies in particular demonstrating that access and transport and travel links to the development will not be contrary to the policy protecting Conservation Areas and other historical sites within the area covered by the Local plan and will not exacerbate traffic congestion in the locality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to demonstrate that access and transport links to development not be contrary to policy protecting Conservation Areas and historical sites. 	Noted	None
P1_002_06	Yes		Yes, but this is more than likely to be ignored. Local train stations are already at capacity during rush hour. Any new stations being built?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will be more than likely to be ignored. 	Noted	None
P1_002_09	No		The reality is that there is insufficient public transport in the carpenders park area for such a huge increase in population (and schools traffic) and the recent improvements to the rail service has not increased capacity. Cars will dominate and the area is at gridlock during most of the day already. As the school(s) are due to be built before the housing, it can only be assumed that the school is for people outside of the local areas, thereby adding even more traffic to local roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient public transport in Carpenders Park Area for such huge increase in population School is for people outside area and school built before housing, will cause more traffic. 	Noted	None
P1_002_10			In light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of services / facilities and / or frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies, possibly as 1.5km. Provide clarity over what constitutes "safe access" for pedestrians, to include provision of pavements and footpaths separated from traffic, along with police evaluation of the safety of any elements not along public roads. More detail is needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility, maximum of 1.5km; Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced; More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. 	Noted	None
P1_002_11	No		Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how they sit within the road network is required. The policies should explicitly mention the provision of electric charging points and support hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. It should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs. The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need significant shift to electric vehicles, include bicycles and scooters; Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how sit within the road network is required; Should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs. 	Noted	None
P1_002_15	No		Look at how we travel now. Typically people will jump in a car because it's cheaper or quicker. If you want to create ecologically sound and sustainable transport and travel options look at how that can be achieved - do we need something new?? Do we improve and expand public transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If creating ecologically sound and sustainable transport, look at how that can be achieved 	Noted	None
P1_002_18	Yes		Everything needs to be done to ensure that the prediction of growth in traffic by 15.6% by 2031 does not come true. The ideas contained in this section of the plan are good, but will they be enough to stop the growth? The reduction in peak commuting has already had an impact on our quality of life, but this is due to the pandemic and people working from home, not management by design. Shuttle buses to and from railway stations like Kings Langley station up to Abbots Langley and Bedmond could help here. More vehicle re-charging points should be provided, maybe on TRDC land like the village car parks. It should be the norm to walk or cycle for short journeys the 15-minute neighbourhood, and this only becomes the norm when people see people like us using	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure growth in traffic of 15.6% by 2031 does not happen; Ideas contained in this section of the plan are good, but will they be enough to stop the growth; More vehicle re-charging points should be provided, Should be the norm to walk or cycle for short journeys the 15-minute neighbourhood Dual cycle / walking paths are needed 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			their bikes or walking. Dual cycle / walking paths assist with this, as many people are fearful of cycling on the roads. Priority use of roundabouts for cyclists and pedestrians should be established, as local, well national norm!			
P1_002_19		Yes	Appropriate but, I suggest impossible to impose.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate but impossible to impose. 	Noted	None
P1_002_20_Moor Park Residents Association		Not stated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst Preferred Policy Option 26 contains many elements that are of significant merit, in the light of the Climate Emergency declared by the Council, it is not strong enough. As explained below, it does not fully ensure that new developments will have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. At the strategic level, the Associations recognise that, in the compilation of the policies, there is a dilemma for the District Council, acknowledged in paragraph 12.5, in that it is not the highways authority. Nevertheless, in order to establish a co-ordinated and enhanced transport system, the Council will need to work closely with Hertfordshire County Council, Highways England, and transport providers, which include Transport for London. For almost 50 years, transport planning in Three Rivers has been considered as part of an overall strategy for South West Hertfordshire, which corresponds to the distinctive Journey-to-Work Area. Current policy is contained in the recent Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which contains specific policies and proposals for South West Hertfordshire, including Three Rivers. There is no mention of LTP4, but these specific elements should be shown in the Local Plan, which should be part of a co-ordinated approach to transport planning across South West Hertfordshire. It is not enough to defer to the Infrastructure Development Schedule to show the specific proposals for development, as suggest in paragraph (2). Although the development management policies are generally sound and reflect the principles of sustainable transport as set out in the NPPF, they do not go far enough. The Associations have a number of suggestions for enhancing these policies. First, policy should require all major developments to be within acceptable walking distance of facilities and services or connecting public transport services. Definitions of acceptable should be defined in the policies. It is recommended that this distance should be a maximum of 1 Kilometre where terrain is flat and paved footways are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or obstacles, the walking distance should be shortened appropriately, especially for elderly or disabled who are expected to form an increasing proportion of the population. Second, the policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes “safe access” for pedestrians, with provision of pavements and paved footways separated from vehicular traffic. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services. Definitions of “safe” requirements should include roads of sufficient width to allow motor vehicles and cyclists to pass safely. No developments of 10 dwellings or more should be permitted on single-track roads without pavements. Third, for large-scale developments, the Association expects the Council to follow the National Planning Policy Framework requirement (NPPF 2021, paragraph 104) and ensure Transport Assessments are produced to consider the impact on the capacity of the local network, as well as the environment and public amenity. Developments without a satisfactory Transport Assessment should be refused. Finally, the proposal in paragraph (3) to transfer road freight to railways and canals in the District, however, is unrealistic and impractical. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility, maximum of 1.5km; Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced; More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. 	Noted	None
P1_002_22_Three Rivers Green Party		No	<p>Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters. Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how they sit within the road network is required.</p> <p>The policies should explicitly mention the provision of electric charging points and support hydrogen infrastructure when appropriate. It should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need significant shift to electric vehicles, include bicycles and scooters; Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how sit within the road network is required; Should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs. 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed. A policy for 20mph zones in residential areas should be included.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a policy of 20mph in residential area 		
P1_002_23	Yes		This is fine as long as the Authority sticks to it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_002_24	Yes		as long it takes into consideration all other issues. The car mustn't rule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As long as takes into consideration all other issues. 	Noted	None
P1_002_27	No		Travel and transport are currently one of the major sources of carbon emissions. There will need to be a significant shift to sustainable forms of transport with more electric vehicles, including bicycles and scooters and much greater emphasis on public or shared transport, rather than individual car use. The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address the scale of the changes that will be needed. There should be a Transport Assessments to consider the impact of any development on the capacity of the local network including all modes of transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need significant shift to electric vehicles, include bicycles and scooters; Recognition of electric scooters as sustainable transport modes and how sit within the road network is required; Should also support the provision of shared transport such as e-car clubs. 	Noted	None
P1_002_30	Not Stated		<p>1. Given the Climate Emergency which was declared by the Council this Policy is not strong enough. It does not fully ensure that new developments will be able to deliver truly sustainable travel and reduce car dependence.</p> <p>2. The Policy needs to be much more proactive in promoting alternative forms of transport to the car such as improved and better integrated public transport systems, joining up the bus and rail network, better east – west connections and more circular routes connecting rail stations, health and other key services. Also community transport schemes, car pools and car share schemes should be considered. Need to ensure safe and integrated cycling networks and well maintained and better connected rights of way.</p> <p>3. Transport Assessments should be required for all developments to consider the impact on the local network, as well as the environment and the community. These should not only be site specific assessments but take into account all proposed development in an area, including those in neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>4. Noise and air pollution arising from main and major roads needs to be addressed urgently. This is particularly important in areas which are close to the M1 and M25. These roads are detrimental to the health and wellbeing of residents, a blight on the character of the area and impacts on the environment and wildlife. Sustainable travel needs to be prioritised. Additional housing will only exacerbate existing problems.</p> <p>5. The 15 minute neighbourhood should be used for new developments which should be located so as to maximise methods of sustainable transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Policy needs to more proactive in promoting alternative forms of transport to the car such as improved and better integrated public transport systems, joining up the bus and rail network, better east-west connections; Transport Assessments should be required for all developments; Noise and air pollution arising from main and major roads needs to be addressed urgently. Particularly important in areas which are close to the M1 and M25; . Noise and air pollution arising from main and major roads needs to be addressed urgently. This is particularly important in areas which are close to the M1 and M25. 	Noted	None
P1_002_32	Yes		All Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_002_33	Yes		I agree that Preferred Policy Option for Sustainable Transport and Travel is the right approach. However, I must highlight that this policy is one of the key objections to the proposed sites CSF11/CSF69A and PCS47. The development on these sites would be in direct contradiction to this policy!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. However policy one of the key objections to the proposed sites CSF11/CSF69A and PCS47. Development here would be in direct contradiction to this policy! 	Noted	None
P1_002_34	Yes		I agree that Preferred Policy Option for Sustainable Transport and Travel is the right approach. However, I must highlight that this policy is one of the key objections to the proposed sites CSF11/CSF69A and PCS47. The development on these sites would be in direct contradiction to this policy!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. However policy one of the key objections to the proposed sites CSF11/CSF69A and PCS47. Development here would be in direct contradiction to this policy! 	Noted	None
P1_002_36	Yes		Supporting more sustainable transport will become ever more critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting more sustainable transport will become more critical. 	Noted	None
P1_002_40	Yes		Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_002_43	Not stated		<p>In light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of services /facilities and / or frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies, possibly as 1.5km. Provide clarity over what constitutes "safe access" for pedestrians, to include provision of pavements and footpaths separated from traffic, along with police evaluation of the safety of any elements not along public roads. More detail is needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility, maximum of 1.5km; Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced; • More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. 		
P1_002 44	No	This seems to take a far too accepting view of existing public transport. See below.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take a far too accepting view of existing public transport. 	Noted	None
P1_002 51	No	No projections for transport use based on the plan to enable a strategic transport plan.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No transport use projections based on plan to enable strategic transport plan. 	Noted	None
P1_002 52	Yes	Transport links to local communities is vital for everyone. Having a forward thinking approach and policy in needed to maintain and improve on local infrastructure is needed if future prosperity and wellbeing is to be achieved.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach. 	Noted	None
P1_002 56	Yes	Seems reasonable		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_002 61	No	Parking should be constrained to improve design outcomes. Levels should be linked to public transport access and access to facilities. Also there should be reference to council policy regarding parking control so for instance around Croxley Green Station can you have a greater density of development with sites having no car parking?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking should be constrained to improve design outcomes. 	Noted	None
P1_002 62	No	more bus routes, later timetable provision		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More bus routes, later timetable provision. 	Noted	None
P1_002 65	Yes	I support this section but feel it is not strong enough		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted	None
P1_002 94	Not Sta ted	With the exception of Green Street and Common Road (which require use of either the single track Shepherds Bridge or the narrow and restricted height Shire Lane railway bridge to access the village) all roads into Chorleywood are single track lanes which are totally unsuitable for heavy goods vehicles (such as construction traffic). These roads do not have pavements and are neither suitable nor safe for pedestrians or cyclists and cannot accommodate full sized buses. Any development that can't provide a satisfactory transport statement should be automatically refused, and any development which necessitates vehicular access for the only safe transportation of residents should not be permitted.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads into Chorleywood are too narrow and cannot be improved either for cycling and waling either; • Any development that can't provide a satisfactory transport statement should be automatically refused, 	Noted	None
P1_002 96	No	<p>Whilst the policy contains many elements that have significant merit, in light of the Climate Emergency declared by the district the policy is not strong enough to ensure that new developments have truly sustainable transport and travel capabilities. To achieve this, the policy should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require any new developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of services / facilities and / or frequent public transport connecting to them. Definitions of acceptable should be defined within the policies. It is recommended that this distance be defined as a maximum of 1.5 km walked distance provided that the terrain is flat and pavements are provided. Where terrain includes significant slopes or other obstacles the acceptable distance should be reduced commensurate with the difficulty these provide. • Provide clarity over what constitutes "safe access" for pedestrians, to include provision of pavements and footpaths separated from vehicular traffic, along with police evaluation of the safety of any elements not along public roads. Such safe routes should be a requirement to link new developments of over 10 dwellings to either services & facilities or to frequent public transport connecting to those facilities & services. • More detail is needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. Definitions of "safe" requirements, including roads of sufficient width to allow vehicles to pass cyclists safely. • No developments of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes without pavement connection to services & facilities or frequent public transport links to them. • Developments that cannot provide satisfactory Transport Statements / Assessments should be refused. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not strong enough in light of climate emergency; • Development management policies do not go far enough, as should require all developments to be within an acceptable walking distance of facility, maximum of 1.5km; • Policy should provide clarity as to what constitutes safe access for pedestrians, safe routes should be a requirement to link developments of 10 dwellings or more to facilities and services; • For large-scale developments, Council must follow NPPF 2021, para 104 and ensure Transport Assessments are produced; • More detail needed on provision of safe cycling routes to services and facilities. 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

P1_003_02	No	Further developments accelerate Kings Langley infrastructure problems and demands on overstretched services. TRDC totally degraded basic human needs to live in a safe uncongested environment with access to Green Belt spaces this is a human right.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further developments accelerate Kings Langley infrastructure problems and demands on overstretched services; 	Noted	None
P1_003_04	No	Having purchased a house in this area because of the nature of the area, which will be dramatically changed for the worse, by the plans that the council is proposing. Given that the infrastructure (roads, health, education and public transport) are already stretched and in some cases overwhelmed (try travelling on the Met line during peak times or trying to get an appointment with the GP and its immediately obvious our services fall short of existing demands let alone increased ones). There doesn't seem to be any thought being given to the regeneration of Rickmansworth town centre itself both in terms of housing and amenity (apart from moving the library to a much less practical locations, which is one of the options that I strongly object to). Very short sighted I feel as this is essential to so many of our community's well-being. This feels like an opportunity that has been neglected for years and continues to be so.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure is already overwhelmed, development will make it worse; No thought given to the regeneration of Rickmansworth town centre itself both in terms of housing and amenity; Library has been moved to a less practical location, therefore is an opportunity lost to address this. 	Noted	None
P1_003_05	No	Lack of infrastructure, specifically roads. I have lived in the local area for over 60 years (Sarratt, Chipperfield, Chorleywood) and the only significant road changes have been the M25 and slight widening of the Chorleywood Road. Most of the 'lanes' are as small as they were 60 years ago, whilst the cars have got bigger, vastly increased in number, road conditions have become much worse with potholes, blocked drains and overgrown hedges everywhere. Before ANY MORE houses other than minor infill are considered, roads need to be widened, properly maintained and preferably have cycle / pedestrian paths wherever possible. I am particularly concerned about proposals in Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood, which is already too narrow and overcrowded and also in proposed developments in and around Chorleywood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a lack of infrastructure; Lanes around Sarratt, Chipperfield, Chorleywood are too narrow and cannot accommodate more traffic; Before ANY MORE houses other than minor infill are considered, roads need to be widened, properly maintained and preferably have cycle / pedestrian paths wherever possible. Concerned about proposals in Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood, which is already too narrow and overcrowded 	Noted	None
P1_003_08	No	There is also the problem increased congestion that increases pollution in terms of noise and reduction in air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problem increased congestion that increases pollution in terms of noise and reduction in air quality. 	Noted	None
P1_003_09	No	Local traffic often grinds to a halt as the existing roads were not built to take the current amount of traffic that uses these roads.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads cannot take existing traffic, cannot take more traffic. 	Noted	None

Q27. Should we have considered alternative options

P1_000_01		Any major new development should be subject to transport forecasts based on a realistic level of vehicle use from within TRDC and immediately surrounding areas. Additional road infrastructure should be put in place before any building work commences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development should be subject to transport forecasts based on a realistic level of vehicle. 	Noted	None
P1_000_02		Would remove transfer of freight to canals as this is neither viable nor advisable in the local context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove transfer of freight to canals as this is neither viable nor advisable in the local context 	Noted	None
P1_000_03	Yes	Zero car options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted 	Noted	None
P1_000_14	Yes	As before	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach; Question statement that Three Rivers is well serviced by public transport links, when bus timetables and infrastructure is poor 	Noted	None
P1_000_17	Yes	No build in areas of with high traffic levels.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development in areas with high traffic levels. 	Noted	None
P1_000_20	Yes	Reconsider the impact on local population and residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconsider impact on local population and residents. 	Noted	None
P1_000_21	Yes	More and better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more and better. 	Noted	None
P1_000_23	Yes	Care should be taken in promoting cycling on the canal towpath as this needs to take account of pedestrians and boat owners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take care promoting cycle paths in canal towpaths as there are other users of the towpath. 	Noted	None
P1_000_24	Yes	The frequency of buses needs to be increased and fares capped. Local roads are often heavily congested and this is likely to worsen with the addition of extra homes and cars. Bus lanes should be considered to help enable buses to keep to time, this is particularly important during peak times. I think we also need better parking at railway stations. Kings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase frequency of buses and cap fares; Consider installing bus lanes; Kings Langley Station should be within Oyster Zone to support commuters 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			Langley Station should also be within the Oyster card Zone to support commuters working in the capital.			
P1_000 32	Yes	This approach is admirable but could have perhaps had more about public transport provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more information on public transport 	Noted		None
P1_000 40	Yes	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"> Do not develop Green Belt Land. 	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_000 41	Yes	What alternatives could be considered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What alternatives could be considered 	Noted		None
P1_000 45	Yes	1) I would favour an aggressive stance on limiting car parking at new developments. 2) The council should make a presumption in favour of proposals that promote new bus infrastructure where relevant (e.g. depots, bust stands and shelters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Favour aggressive stance on limiting car parking at new developments. 2. TRDC should make a presumption in favour of proposals that promote new bus infrastructure where relevant 	Noted		None
P1_000 48	Yes	See above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport Plans and documents will not make people give up cars. Provision for electric car charging should be incorporated. 	Noted		None
P1_000 49	Yes	Working more closely with TFL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work more closely with TFL 	Noted		None
P1_000 53	Yes	See Above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right approach but no thought/ plans for surrounding road has been published as part of plan, such as Tom's Lane 	Noted		None
P1_000 56	Yes	See above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach, Herts Rapid Transport Scheme, maximising re-use of the tracked of the LNWR Croxley Green branch. 	Noted		None
P1_000 64	Yes	Should contain provision of electric vehicle charging points.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contain provision of electric vehicle charging points 	Noted		None
P1_000 66	Yes	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stop the amount of cars in the area, will increase by 5,000 with the plan; Any new development must be within an agreeable distance from a large supermarket 	Noted		None
P1_000 68	Yes	What if the envisioned expansion doesn't happen? What if the little Swedish girl is correct and the sky falls in? I don't believe that "sustainable" anything is all that sustainable - especial the drive towards everything being electric – the pollution just occurs somewhere else.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will not be sustainable, will just move problem elsewhere. 	Noted		None
P1_000 76	Yes	Many of the new developments are along narrow lanes and this policy won't be possible to adhere to. Berry Lane and Long Lane especially.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most development along narrow lanes 	Noted		None
P1_000 88	Yes	Parking is essential for many manual workers and lower paid.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking is essential for many manual workers 	Noted		None
P1_000 91	Yes	High car usage should be discouraged, we should make cycling and public transport easier to encourage people to only use cars when absolutely necessary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High car usage should be discouraged, make cycling and public transport easier to encourage people only use cars where necessary. 	Noted		None
P1_001 02	Yes	Three Rivers should work with the County Council and local transport providers to improve the public transport options in the area, particularly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with county council and local transport providers; 	Noted		None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			with regard to transport to other districts. Bus routes in particular need improving if people are to be encouraged to use public transport instead of their cars.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bus routes need improving 		
P1_001_06	Yes	Yes	Yes, forget about it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forgot about it. 	Noted	None
P1_001_08	Yes	Yes	Bring back night time street lighting to make the area safer for walking and cycling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bring back night time street lighting to make area safer for walking/ cycling 	Noted	None
P1_001_12	Yes	Yes	Ensure that adequate parking is provided for all developments commercial, industrial and residential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure adequate parking is provided 	Noted	None
P1_001_13	Yes	Yes	As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of electric cars, loads of spaces where they could be set-up and also provide revenue. 	Noted	None
P1_001_14	Yes	Yes	statement on, targets for replacement of fossil fuel powered vehicles restrictions on polluting vehicles from town centre areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> statement on targets for replacement fossil fuel vehicles restrictions on polluting vehicles from town centre 	Noted	None
P1_001_19	Yes	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"> Land is sanctuary for wildlife 	<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_001_21	No	No	Forget the greenbelt - find alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt 	<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_001_23	Yes	Yes	Look, I know you can't do much about this, but the major cause of congestion in this area is parents dropping off their children at local schools. It would be good for TRDC to work with other authorities to address this problem. I used to walk or cycle to school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cause of congestion is parents dropping of children at schools 	Noted	None
P1_001_28	Yes	Yes	When proposing additional housing, there needs to be additional infrastructure to cope with this. Abbots Langley and Kings Langley are small villages that wouldn't be able to cope with such an increase in population.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need additional infrastructure, particularly at Abbots Langley and Kings Langley 	Noted	None
P1_001_32	Yes	Yes	impacts other areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts other areas 	Noted	None
P1_001_35	Yes	Yes	The A 412 from Ebury roundabout to the Reach School should be only for local traffic, everything else should be using the M25 The policies to support sustainable transport and travel do not seem to address in any sensible way the scale of the changes that will be needed. A policy for 20mph zones in residential areas should be included.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A412 from Ebury roundabout to Reach School should be only for local traffic, everything else should be use M25; 20mph zone in residential zone. 	Noted	None
P1_001_37	Yes	Yes	I'm not sure what the alternative options are but certainly they need to be realistic - possibly with more people working from home may improve car usage?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine alternative options 	Noted	None
P1_001_42	Yes	Yes	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

P1_001 47	Yes	encourage more secure storage of bikes and other modes of transport at stations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage more secure cycle parking and other modes of transport 	Noted	None
P1_001 66	Yes	Less building and more accessible routes through our villages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less building and more accessible routes 	Noted	None
P1_001 68	Yes	see the comment above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refuse developments which cannot demonstrate (i) existing road connections will not be significantly adversely affected by the increased traffic resulting from the new development and (ii) are sufficient environmentally-sustainable transport options connecting new development with services, commerce, amenities etc that the new development will not result in a material rise in car use. 	Noted	None
P1_001 70	Yes	Chorleywood Station Car Park should be expanded not built over.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chorleywood station should be expanded not built over. 	Noted	None
P1_001 74	Yes	Inclusion of electric car/bike charging points.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include electric bike/ charging points 	Noted	None
P1_001 82	Yes	Using words such as 'must' is very vague! Maximising sustainable transport modes could mean a single cycling lane! A more active and integrated plan is required to reverse damage that has already been done within our area. Herts CC are responsible for the Growth and Transport plan and TRDC are not responsible for the local transport network. It is hard to expect them to be integrated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy is too vague; More active/ integrated plan is required to reverse damage that has already been done 	Noted	None
P1_001 91	Yes	TRDC should work hard with TfL and WDC to resolve outstanding issues about the Croxley Rail link and plan to have it completed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC should work hard with TfL and WDC to resolve outstanding issues about the Croxley Rail link 	Noted	None
P1_001 92	Yes	Whilst the encouragement of walking, cycling and use of public transport is laudable and essential, any policy also needs to reflect that a large proportion of people will still choose to drive their car to their destination instead. Thus, all assessment of new planning applications need to take this into account. A significant proportion of the District is currently served by single track roads which are already frequently gridlocked and unfit for purpose at peak times adding to carbon emissions from inefficiently driven vehicles and detracting from the quality of life of road users and local residents. A number of proposed sites for development are served by single track lanes. The policy modification suggested above therefore should be further strengthened: - No development of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy needs to reflect that a large proportion of people will still choose to drive their car to their destination; Number of proposed sites are served by single track lanes, not suitable; No development of over 10 dwellings to be allowed on single track lanes. 	Noted	None
P1_002 05	Yes	See comment above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to demonstrate that access and transport links to development not be contrary to policy protecting Conservation Areas and historical sites. 	Noted	None
P1_002 09	Yes	It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Councillors to consider alternatives 	Noted	None
P1_002 11	Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	None
P1_002 15	Yes	What other modes and methods of transport are being developed? What has the impact of Covid had on the need to travel? What has the impact of online shopping had on the need to travel?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other modes are being developed; Impact of COVID and need to travel 	Noted	None
P1_002 18	Yes	Shuttle buses to and from railway stations like Kings Langley station up to Abbots Langley and Bedmond could help here. More e-vehicle re-charging points should be provided, maybe on TRDC land like the village car parks. It should be the norm to walk or cycle for short journeys the 15-minute neighbourhood, and this only becomes the norm when people see people like us using their bikes or walking. Dual cycle / walking paths assist with this, as many people are fearful of cycling on the roads. Priority use of roundabouts for cyclists and pedestrians should be established, as local, well national norm!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shuttle buses to and from railway stations like Kings Langley station up to Abbots Langley and Bedmond; More electric charging points Dual/cycle walking paths needed; Priority use of roundabouts for cyclists and pedestrians should be established. 	Noted	None
P1_002 44	Yes	There needs to be a significant increase in routes and improvement in frequencies of bus services. People will only use buses if they are frequent. Buses are also too expensive. My feeling is that a much more	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant increase in routes and frequencies of bus services; More root and branch transport policy is needed 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

			root and branch transport policy is needed. This includes, for example, the impact of large supermarkets as they encourage private car use.			
P1_002 56	No		Restarting the MLX or a light rail alternative with access to Watford Junction, St Albans other Hertfordshire towns as an East-West link should be pursued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restarting MLX or light rail alternative with access to Watford Junction, St Albans other Hertfordshire towns as an East-West link should be pursued 	Noted	None
P1_002 62	Yes		adopt Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt Low Traffic Neighbourhood schemes 	Noted	None
P1_002 65	Yes		Whilst the council is concerned about climate change and has intact invited time and energy in declassing a Climate Emergency the corresponding sections of the proposal are not strong enough to deliver any meaningful support. There seems to be little mention of the overall transport plan which as I understand needs to be coordinated/agreed/combined with that for South West Herts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy not strong enough in light of climate emergency; Little mention of overall transport plan, needs to be coordinated/ agreed/ combined with that for SW Herts. 	Noted	None
P1_002 67	Yes		It is a shame that your assessments of individual sites do not appear to reflect this at all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of individual sites do not reflect this 	Noted	None
P1_002 71	Yes		Seems sensible. Just hope it is implemented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hope it is implemented 	Noted	None
P1_002 81	No		Public transport in this area is an unreliable expensive joke.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport is unreliable and expensive at present 	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT AND TRAVEL

Promoters / Landowners

REPRESENTATION REFERENCE	REPRESENTOR	REPRESENTATION	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATION/MAIN ISSUES RAISED	OFFICER/COUNCIL RESPONSE	OFFICER'S / COUNCIL'S PROPOSED ACTION
PL_00 002_A CFS8b		1.44 It is considered that this is the right approach. However, the policy needs to confirm that development will be supported which maximises the use of public transport and that is located close to public transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right approach. Policy needs to confirm that development will be supported which maximises the use of public transport and is located close to public transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. It is a requirement that all new development maximises the use of sustainable transport modes and the use of public transport (part A of Preferred Policy Option 26). The supporting text to the policy states that "We will seek to focus growth to locations which are or can be made sustainable to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling." Therefore it is already recognised that the policy supports development which make the fullest use of public transport possible and this is complemented by Preferred Policy Option 3 (Housing Density) which states that higher densities will be expected in areas well served by public transport. However it is acknowledged that the policy would benefit from explicitly stating that "development that maximises the use of public to the fullest use possible will be supported". 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the Development Proposals section of the policy, add new criterion stating that: <i>"Development that maximises the use of public transport to the fullest use possible will be supported"</i>.
PL_00 014_C FS22		It is considered that this is the right approach. However, the policy needs to confirm that development will be supported where it is located close to public transport and promotes sustainable transport choices, such as public transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right approach. Policy needs to confirm that development will be supported which maximises the use of public transport and is located close to public transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. It is a requirement that all new development maximises the use of sustainable transport modes and the use of public transport (part A of Preferred Policy Option 26). The supporting text to the policy states that "We will seek to focus growth to locations which are or can be made sustainable to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling." Therefore it is already recognised that the policy supports development which make the fullest use of public transport possible and this is complemented by Preferred Policy Option 3 (Housing Density) which states that higher densities will be expected in areas well served by public transport. However it is acknowledged that the policy would benefit from explicitly stating that "development that maximises the use of public to the fullest use possible will be supported". 	No action