

# REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

## LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

Q21. Do you think the Preferred Landscape Character is the right approach?						
SC_00 002_Hi storic Englan d	Historic England	Yes	<p>Landscape Character</p> <p>We welcome the inclusion of this policy and the requirement for landscape enhancement. It is recommended however that the policy be expanded to refer to the role the historic environment has to play in understanding the landscape. Many tracks, green lanes, field boundaries and settlement patterns are remnants of past use and provide evidence of how the landscape has evolved over time. The objective of protecting and enhancing the landscape and recognition of its links to cultural heritage can help improve how the historic environment is experienced an enjoyed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the inclusion of the policy</li> <li>Suggest policy expanded to refer to the role historic environment has to play in understanding the landscape</li> </ul>	Noted. Policy requires landscape assessment which is considered to cover this.	No action
SC_00 009_S arratt Parish Council	Sarratt Parish Council		We strongly support the introduction of a presumption against development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We strongly support the introduction of a presumption against development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</li> </ul>	Noted.	No Action
SC_00 020_C horley wood Parish Council	Chorleywood Parish Council		The protection offered under this policy appears fairly comprehensive. However, there are concerns about the statements: - “unless it can be demonstrated that: a, b and c”. These exceptions create far too great a loophole to allow development to be permitted at the expense of the environment and character of the landscape. The policy could be strengthened, there should not simply be a ‘presumption’ against development as this would invite speculative development. Development in the AONB should be unacceptable. Once lost to development, it will not be clawed back and the quality of the natural environment would be eroded.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of policy is fairly comprehensive</li> <li>Concerns about criteria a, b, c- These exceptions create far too great a loophole to allow development to be permitted at the expense of the environment and character of the landscape.</li> <li>The policy could be strengthened, there should not simply be a ‘presumption’ against development as this would invite speculative development. Development in the AONB should be unacceptable.</li> </ul>	Policy has been amended to provide greater protection for the Chilterns AONB-development within, and the setting of the AONB.	Policy amended to strengthen the protection of the AONB.
SC_00 023_C roxley Green Parish Council	Croxley Green Parish Council		Croxley Green Parish Council considers there should be reference to the importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans. Otherwise we support the approach in general.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support general approach</li> <li>There should be reference to the importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.</li> </ul>	Noted.	No action
SC_00 024_A bbots Langle y Parish Council	Abbots Langley Parish Council		Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>agree</li> </ul>	Noted.	No action
SC_00 026_H CC Growt h and Infrast ructure	HCC Growth and Infrastructure		<p>Preferred Policy Option 20, Landscape Character.</p> <p>With regard to paragraph 1), it is considered that the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) does not sit comfortably within this policy theme. It is suggested that it may be better placed in a policy focused on ‘landscape value’ in line with NPPF paragraph 174 which states that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes...in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 2) references Landscape Regions and it should be noted that ‘A Landscape Strategy for Hertfordshire Volume 1: Background Information’ which was produced in 1997, has since been superseded.</p> <p>A series of landscape character assessments have been produced at a national, regional and local level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural England, National Character Areas (NCAs) 2014: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles#ncas-in-the-east-of-england">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-character-area-profiles-data-for-local-decision-making/national-character-area-profiles#ncas-in-the-east-of-england</a></li> <li>East of England Landscape Typology, Landscape East (2011), Identifies regional landscape types: <a href="http://landscape-east.org.uk/">http://landscape-east.org.uk/</a></li> <li>Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment, The Landscape Partnership, October 2001: Landscape Character Assessment   Hertfordshire County Council.</li> </ul> <p>The level of assessment used should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed change, for example, for the purposes of large-scale strategic plan making it may be more appropriate to refer to the national level assessment, and for the purposes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 1- it is considered that the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) does not sit comfortably within this policy theme. It is suggested that it may be better placed in a policy focused on ‘landscape value’ in line with NPPF paragraph 174</li> <li>Paragraph 2) references Landscape Regions and it should be noted that ‘A Landscape Strategy for Hertfordshire Volume 1, has since been superseded.</li> <li>The level of assessment used should be proportionate to the scale of the proposed change, for example, for the purposes of large-scale strategic plan making it may be more appropriate to refer to the national level assessment, and for the purposes of assessing site allocations and other planning applications, it is considered that the local level assessment is most appropriate. Paragraph 10.11- The approach to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes outside national designations is not clear. It is advised that (where relevant), development proposals should be required to demonstrate how they comply with the strategy and guidelines for change. Landscape character assessment are also a critical evidence base underpinning the development of design codes, and the designation of Local Green Space.</li> <li>It is unclear whether the district has any townscape character assessments. If so, the policy could be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 1- disagree. AONB is about the distinctive, attractive and varied landscapes so fits within this policy.</li> <li>Remove reference to Landscape Regions, which has been superseded.</li> <li>Noted, paragraph 10.11 will be amended to provide further clarity to demonstrate how development proposals will comply with strategy and guidelines for change.</li> <li>DO we have townscape assessments?</li> <li>Noted. Part 2 refers to HCC local character assessments. The level of assessment should be local for assessing site allocations and planning applications.</li> <li>Paragraph 3 will make reference to National Design Guide</li> <li>Agree amendments to Paragraph 10.6, 10.8 and 10.9 to provide greater context.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">What evidence do we have?</a></p> <p><a href="#">Heritage assessment</a></p> <p><a href="#">Hertfordshire local Landscape Character Assessment identifies 3 landscape regions within TRDC.</a></p> <p>Additional policy wording to be added to:</p> <p>‘.....and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes of the AONB designation. <b>A Landscape Visual Impact Assessment is to be submitted with planning applications for developments within the AONB or its setting’.</b></p> <p>Paragraph 10.6 wording in this paragraph should be amended as follows: <b><u>“Public Rights of Way of provide valuable footpath, cycle and bridleway routes within the urban area and out into the countryside. During the 2020 /21 coronavirus pandemic the value of Rights of Way became even more important have been prevalent, providing an extensive network for to access and recreation within the countryside...”</u></b></p>

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

		<p>of assessing site allocations and other planning applications, it is considered that the local level assessment is most appropriate. The local level assessment identifies local landscape character areas and provides a description and assessment of landscape character, an evaluation of landscape condition and robustness, and a strategy and guidelines for managing change. It is advised that (where relevant), development proposals should be required to demonstrate how they comply with the strategy and guidelines for change. Landscape character assessment are also a critical evidence base underpinning the development of design codes, and the designation of Local Green Space. It is unclear whether the district has any townscape character assessments. If so, the policy could be extended to encompass 'landscape and townscape character.'</p> <p>It is unclear whether "landscape regions" in part (2) of the policy means National Character Areas, HCC landscape regions or local Landscape Character Areas. The LCAs are much more refined and descriptive of local landscape distinctiveness and in themselves are not of a regional scale.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 The policy should ideally refer to the National Design Guide and a requirement for the preparation and agreement of Design Codes for major developments which are in or affect designated or sensitive rural and urban fringe landscapes.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.8 The supporting text prior to Preferred Policy Option 20, does not mention the important topography; therefore, it is proposed to the policy to amend the text as follows: <u>"The landscape of Three Rivers is a complex mix of rural and urban areas, woodlands, wildlife habitats, farmland, water features and other land forms set within the dip slope and river valleys of the Chilterns, North Thames basin and Thames Valley..."</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10.9 It is considered that the text within paragraph 10.9 should also be amended as follows: <u>"The parts of the AONB within the District consist largely of chalk stream river valley and adjacent hillsides and woods and dip-slope woods and pastures."</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10.11 The approach to protecting and enhancing valued landscapes outside national designations is not clear. This is critical, as it can provide the only line of defence for some locally important landscape areas against negative change. This includes local landscape designations, such as Local Green Space Designations (NPPF paragraph 101). The NPPF also provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area' (NPPF paragraph 8).</p> <p>The range of factors that can be considered when identifying landscape value are set out in industry best practice guidance 'Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third edition, Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental management and Assessment' (GLVIA3), and within the recently published 'Technical Guidance Note 02/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations, Landscape Institute' <a href="https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstituteorg/2021/05/tgn-02-21-assessing-landscape-value-outside-national-designations.pdf">https://landscapewpstorage01.blob.core.windows.net/www-landscapeinstituteorg/2021/05/tgn-02-21-assessing-landscape-value-outside-national-designations.pdf</a>.</p> <p>Value can also be expressed within landscape character assessment evaluations, and landscape sensitivity studies. However, it is suggested that the current Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment may benefit from updating in this respect (as an extension to existing LCA or as an add on study). At a site (planning application) level, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) or Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) should be required to provide an assessment of landscape value. Landscape value should be determined through a review of existing assessments, policies, strategies and guidelines and, where appropriate, by new survey and analysis.</p>	<p>extended to encompass 'landscape and townscape character.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unclear whether "landscape regions" in part (2) of the policy means National Character Areas, HCC landscape regions or local Landscape Character Areas.</li> <li>Paragraph 3 -The policy should ideally refer to the National Design Guide and a requirement for the preparation and agreement of Design Codes for major developments which are in or affect designated or sensitive rural and urban fringe landscapes.</li> <li>Paragraph 10.8 The supporting text prior to Preferred Policy Option 20, does not mention the important topography; therefore, it is proposed to the policy to amend the text as follows: <u>"The landscape of Three Rivers is a complex mix of rural and urban areas, woodlands, wildlife habitats, farmland, water features and other land forms set within the dip slope and river valleys of the Chilterns, North Thames basin and Thames Valley..."</u></li> <li>Paragraph 10.9- It is considered that the text within paragraph 10.9 should also be amended as follows: <u>"The parts of the AONB within the District consist largely of chalk stream river valley and adjacent hillsides and woods and dip-slope woods and pastures."</u></li> <li>It is suggested that the current Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment may benefit from updating in this respect (as an extension to existing LCA or as an add-on study).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 10.8 proposed to amend the text as follows: <u>"The landscape of Three Rivers is a complex mix of rural and urban areas, woodlands, wildlife habitats, farmland, water features and other land forms set within the dip slope and river valleys of the Chilterns, North Thames basin and Thames Valley..."</u></p> <p>Paragraph 10.9 be amended as follows: <u>"The parts of the AONB within the District consist largely of chalk stream river valley and adjacent hillsides and woods and dip-slope woods and pastures."</u></p>
SC_00031-Natural	Natural England	<p>Natural England wants to see the character of protected landscapes conserved and enhanced. Therefore, we welcome the criteria set out for appropriate development within or impacting on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), including encouraging enhancement of the AONB and presumption against major developments within the protected landscape. We would recommend a requirement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the criteria set out for appropriate development within or impacting on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), including encouraging enhancement of the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree the requirement for landscape visual impact assessments, as part of developments within the landscape or setting.</li> </ul>	<p>Additional policy wording to be added to:</p> <p>'.....and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes of the AONB designation. <b>A Landscape Visual Impact</b></p>

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

Englan d			for Landscape Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA) to be undertaken for developments within the protected landscape or its setting. Also, we would advise consultation with the Chilterns Conservation Board on developments relating to the AONB.	and presumption against major developments within the protected landscape. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would recommend a requirement for Landscape Visual Impact Assessments (LVIA) to be undertaken for developments within the protected landscape or its setting.</li> <li>we would advise consultation with the Chilterns Conservation Board on developments relating to the AONB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Chilterns Conservation Board are already consulted on planning applications that relate to the AONB</li> </ul>	Assessment is to be submitted with planning applications for developments within the AONB or its setting'.
P1_00 002_N Lucey		No	There must be a presumption against development in all these areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presumption against development in these areas</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 003_S Cassid y		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 005_T Foulke s		Yes	Nothing to add	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 006_J Humph rey		Yes	Unique areas of outstanding natural beauty must be protected!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protect AONB's</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 014_A Sams on		Yes	This says environment over expansion. Absolutely – the emphasis should be on changing how society thinks/ operates in relation to our green spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Environment over expansion</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 017_M McGuir k		Yes	Providing you can afford to challenge any planning proposals that don't meet this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach provided can afford to challenge any planning proposals that don't meet this.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 019_G Hought on		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 020_T Grewal		Yes	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 021_R Pawa		Yes	I don't know enough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 023_D r K Macleo d		Yes	ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 024_C Holme s		Yes	There needs to be a balance between urban and rural areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 025_M Beauje ux		No	Will have a negative impact on landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will have a negative impact on the landscape.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 026_P McCaff rey		No	What are the criterions? They are subjective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the criterions? They are subjective.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 027_N Murtag h & C Gregor y		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 028_J Pochet tino		Yes	Protect the AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 032_T Smith		Yes	It's the right approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>	Noted	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

P1_00 033_K Li		Yes	It protects the Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 034_M Richar ds		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 038_P Gibbs		Yes	Essential to maintain and protect the character of the Chilterns.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 040_N Brew		No	Under no circumstances should any building take part on green places. The only building I would support is on brownfield sites - that is places where there has already got buildings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	None
P1_00 041_D James- Saund ers		No	What possible exception could there ever be to build in an AONB?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What exceptions are there to build on an AONB?</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 045_L Fitzpat rick		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 046_S Singer		Yes	But Sarratt should be included in Local Plan as a new garden village	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 047_P Rees		No	Like other policies, this policy sounds good on the surface. However, it should be tougher so that it can prevent the building of hundreds of new homes on green field sites and on the Green Belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy needs to be stronger to prevent building homes in the Green Belt</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 048_R Symm ons		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

P1_00 049_S Harala mbou		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 053_C Anders on Bergda hl		Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 054_A Wrangl es		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 055_B Pegg		Yes	Preserving Landscape a priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 056_D Luddin gton		Yes	It recognises the importance of protecting the character of the local landscape, but should place greater emphasis on exclusion of developments which are out of character with the local area due to their height, density or bulk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach;</li> <li>Place greater emphasis on exclusion of developments which are out of character with the local area due to height, density or bulk.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 063_J Putcha		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 064_B Patel		Yes	xxx	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 066_R Franks		Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 068_A Clark		No	It is totally at odds with previous Council declarations – you are either in favour of concrete or the natural environment - you cannot have both! I also put it to you that in a more usual rural landscape, let alone an AONB - the sight of one man made object and it's ruined.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At odds with previous Council declarations, either in favour of concrete or the natural environment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 069_F Esma		No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach but no reason given.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 074_I Mercer			<b>Yes but it should also apply to conversions and demolish / rebuild, some of these are simply ghastly.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach;</li> <li>Should also apply to conversion and demolition and rebuilds.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 076_L Hull		Yes	This is an absolute priority in an area where the natural environment is its main asset.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 077_G Lean		Yes	Y	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 078_A Prior		Yes	Yes as the overall amenity value for the majority is the prime consideration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 080_J Brooks -Martin		Yes	So don't build on it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 084_M Hampt on		Yes	We need to protect the AONB and green belt land for future generations. We do not want to be living in a city environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 086_E Kirkma n		No	AONB should not be touched. People need this. And it needs to be unspoilt. once you start changing it - it won't stop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop AONB.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 088_C Green		Yes	Sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 089_S Pettifer		Yes	Although it would be criminal to build up on hectares of Green Belt land as once one planning application gets approved, more will follow, like the 300-800 planning application that is being sought by landowners, this is detrimental to all.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If allow small development on Green Belt at first, detrimental to all.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 094_L Farma n		Yes	We (Sarratt Parish Council) strongly support the introduction of a presumption against development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

P1_00 095_A Case			Each year, in May, Swifts, (Apus Apus) arrive and build nests for the summer. There is a colony around Springfield Avenue and one near the Town Centre in the Rickmansworth Area. That they still nest here is evidence that the materials used around the Eaves of houses the birds nest in remain of the same kind, and the chance that a nestling falls out to the ground, and is lost, is low. Even to a fledged swift, the ground is a perilous place. There are inexpensive swift bricks or swift boxes that builders can use in all house extensions and new buildings of two or more storeys. I would like house planners to adopt this, the use of swift brides and boxes in the Local Plan for Three Rivers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swift boxes with new houses and extensions.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 096_S Carpen ter		Yes	Seems reasonable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 097_N Ross		Yes	The AONB and Green Belt should be protected in all but the most exceptional circumstances.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 098_A Michae ls		Yes	Only if it aligns with the above and is actually monitored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach if monitored</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 099_A Michae ls (counci llor)		Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 102_K Allen		Yes	Landscape character must be protected at all costs and preferably enhanced.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 106_L Crosby		No	Destroying the area. No thank you.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will destroy the area.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 107_R Webst er		Yes	Allowing development of any kind will be artificial, and therefore not an improvement. More 'park rangers' managing the land would help though.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be artificial;</li> <li>More park rangers would help.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 108_J Cahill		Yes	common sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 110_C PRE Herts		Not Specifi ed	In respect of the presumption against major development in the AONB, site-by-site assessment should also include cumulative effects, as required in para 1d of PPO20.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>site-by-site assessment should also include cumulative effects, as required in para 1d of PPO20.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 112_L Head		Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 113_T Foley		Yes	No Reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 114_D Twinbe rrow		No	the proposals should define 'major development' should also define what is a minor development and that such minor developments cannot be done in a ribbon development of multiple minor developments that over time have the effect of being a major development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Define what minor development is so they cannot be done cumulatively and classed as major development</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 116_P Newin g		Yes	I agree with the policy as stated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 117_A Hamilt on		Yes	Avoid development in these areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 119_J Lovear d		No	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land is sanctuary for wildlife.</li> <li>Local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.</li> </ul>	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

					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.	
P1_00 120_G Nunn		Yes	Seems sensible but who does the assessment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 123_D Thoma s		Yes	Very good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 127_M Clarke		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 128_L Clarke		No	A potential site of 893 homes plus a primary school at Numbers Farm would dramatically alter the landscape and completely change the local area in a negative way e.g. pressure on traffic, amenities, parking.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential site of 893 homes and primary school at Numbers Farm would alter landscape and change the area.</li> </ul>	Noted – See Part 2 for more detailed response to this site.	None
P1_00 130_E Ad		No	It is not the right approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not the right approach, but no alternatives suggested.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 131_P Harris		Yes	Logical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 132_H Sahota		Yes	balance approach is best	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 133_A Stanle y		Not Stated	The Landscape Character Assessments provide a guide as to for example, ‘Improve and maintain’. It would seem joined up if this policy adopted that assessment as a minimum to achieve – otherwise why have the assessment in the first place?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Landscape Character Assessments are the minimum to achieve, otherwise no point in having an assessment.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 135_W Stephe ns		Yes	Fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 137_S Hall		No	Running alongside AONB is the prime consideration of whether the infrastructure can cope with the increase of cars and the detrimental effect that this has on the environment, demands on increased numbers in school, parking within the local area, increased traffic demands along narrow roads and access to the M25, increased parking demands at Chorleywood station, increased numbers at the local doctors surgeries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Query whether infrastructure can cope with increased population.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 140_M Mavadi a		Yes	So long as development is controlled maintenance of landscape character is maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 142_Y Lloyd		No	Do not agree.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach but no reason given.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 144_D Thorpe		No	If we want more housing a compromise is needed. Use greenbelt or build higher. The visual impact of high rise must be balanced with loss of vital green belt land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Want housing need a compromise between high rise and loss of Green Belt.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 145_C Bessan t		Not Specifi ed	<b>I do not agree with this as you have missed off The Colne Valley Regional Park. This Park is of high importance to those people who not only live in TRD but the 3 million people who live within 10 miles of it, in West London. It is the nearest available site for many of them to gain access to open countryside for their health and mental wellbeing. The following should be added to the policy as the next section:</b> (2) Planning permission will only be granted for development within <b>The Colne Valley Park</b> if it: a) Conserves and enhances the special qualities, distinctive character and natural features which contribute to the natural beauty of the Colne Valley Park. b) Protects the biodiversity of the park c) Protects the green and blue space of the park for the recreational purposes of residents not just of TRD but also of West London. 10.14 You refer to the Hertfordshire County Council’s Landscape Character Assessments and quote ‘These landscape regions contain a variety of landscape character areas for which assessments have been produced identifying key characteristics and influences. A Landscape Strategy has been produced which includes suggestions for managing future change’. <b>However, these assessments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Missed Colne Valley Regional Park;</li> <li>Need to consider adding a policy to Colne Park;</li> <li>Should make reference to HCC’s Landscape Character Assessment and directly quote from it</li> </ul>	Noted	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

			<b>were made in 2003/4 and so are now completely out of date and using any strategies for managing future change are not fit for purpose.</b> 10.15 The Council will seek to ensure that development complements the surrounding local landscape of Three Rivers <b>as identified in the current Local Character Assessments produced by Hertfordshire County Council</b> , through siting, layout, design, appearance and landscaping of development. But as remarked above these Local Character Assessments produced by Hertfordshire County Council <b>were dated 2003/4 and so are completely out of date!</b>			
P1_00 146_P Ward		No	AS far as I can see there is no coherent vision for the district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No coherent vision for the district</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 147_N Hoad		Yes	Seems fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 148_S Dilworth		Yes	To create a balanced environment where people want to live	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach. Will create a balanced environment.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 151_A Peat		Yes	Because this seeks to maintain the character of the area and its beauty,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 155_C Sears		Yes	When thinking about housing we are ultimately talking about homes and the natural landscape is what makes a home for many people, many houses are purchased just for the view! Therefore the protection of areas of natural beauty is so important, this connection is important for mental health and Well-being. Homes aren't just about access to shops, easy commutes or even outdoor spaces for exercise, they are also about having connection to the natural world which we are part of and reliant upon. It's where the life is, and we underestimate it at our peril.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protection of areas of natural beauty is very important and important for mental health.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 162_E Foulkes		Yes	This is sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 163_J Dickins		No	As you say, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, must be conserved. There should be little if any development in the AONB, unless absolutely necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should be little to no development in the Chilterns AONB, unless absolutely necessary.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 166_T Turner		Yes	Need to retain features of our beautiful local areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 167_J Passingham		Not Stated	Why is the Colne Valley Park not included on this list?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is Colne Valley Park not included in the list?</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 170_N Hutchinson		Yes	See Below	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 174_E Nathan		Yes	Agree with this policy - a presumption against major development in the AONB. We need such places to remain "undeveloped" as they are the last true safe havens for wildlife, and provide immense benefit to human wellbeing and enjoyment of the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 181_C Chiltern Society		Not Specified	The Society welcomes the inclusion of a policy relating to the AONB, particularly with it being considered for potential National Park status as part of the Glover Review in 2019. The references to the AONB Management and the Chilterns Design Guide in the policy are also welcome. The policy should also include protection for the setting of the AONB, in accordance with paragraph 176 of the 2021 version of the NPPF. The Chilterns landscape outside the AONB is also important and we are pleased to see this also reflected in the Preferred Policy Option. Again, clarity is required as to what is meant by 'high-quality design' and how it would be judged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarity is required as to what is meant by 'high-quality design' and how it would be judged.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 183_M Allum		No	NO MORE PLANNING PERMISSION SHOULD BE GRANTED IN AONB SITES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not grant more planning permissions in AONB</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 184_M Mitchell		No	There should be reference to the importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 186_J Parkhurst		Yes	This development will have a significant impact on the character of the local area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None



## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

P1_00 187_C Mitchel I		No	There should be reference to the importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 190_I Starr		No	Too much preference given to ANOB over the rest of the open spaces in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much preference given to AONB other open spaces.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 201_A Green		No	Should not be building in the AONB - we should be protecting those areas from development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not build on the AONB</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 206_D Worrell		No	This that define the 'exceptional circumstances' are not the ones being impacted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Those that define what the 'exceptional circumstances' are not the ones being impacted.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 209_G Bown		No	I don't see how building housing estates on some of the highest areas of local land (to Carpenders Park) will not 'Lead to the removal or a reduction in the impact of existing structures and land uses that are detrimental to the visual quality of the landscape'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on some of the highest areas will lead to unacceptable impact on the landscape.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 211_J Pumm ell		Yes	No Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Comment</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 214_N atural Englan d		Not stated	Natural England supports the protection given to statutory sites as we encourage allocations that avoid impacts to designated sites and targeted towards land with the least environmental value. We therefore welcome the clear criteria set out for developments that would affect nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) or protected species within Three Rivers District. We would advise that developments that would affect designated sites located outside, but adjacent, to Three Rivers District are also considered. Government policy is progressing to reverse the trend in biodiversity decline, which has continued to occur despite planning policy aimed towards no residual loss in biodiversity. This includes the revised NPPF which sees a strengthening of provision for net gain through development. We therefore welcome the inclusion of a requirement for applicants to be required to use the Defra Biodiversity Metric to demonstrate net gain in biodiversity within their developments. Please note that the preferred metric is the recently launched Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise that developments that would affect designated sites located outside, but adjacent, to Three Rivers District are also considered.</li> <li>Please note that the preferred metric is the recently launched Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.0.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 215_L Horne		Yes	Its only valid if you follow up and don't destroy what we have.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 218_M Chabre I		Yes	Completely support this policy that habitats are not fragmented and devalued. However with the scale of development proposed, there will inevitably be a reduction in biodiverse habitats, therefore guidance should be provided to improve the biodiversity of known habitats and green spaces. It should be expected that developers seek to implement a net biodiversity gain on adjacent land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach;</li> <li>With scale of development proposed will lead to a reduction in biodiverse habitats;</li> <li>Guidance therefore needed to improve biodiversity of known habitats.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 219_S Talbott		Yes	Appropriate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 222_T hree Rivers Green Party		Yes	No Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 223_D Green		No	The Chilterns should be protected and conserved for future generations. There should be NO development in this area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development in this area.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 224_J Ford		No	no.... we need to save our countryside.... look at how HS2 has impacted on the landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with approach, need to save the countryside given how HS2 has impacted the landscape.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 227_K Gallag her		No	There should be reference to the importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to importance of local landscapes and explicit support of local landscape characteristics identified in Neighbourhood Plans.</li> </ul>	Noted	
P1_00 232_A Britton		No	I agree that development should result in a net gain of biodiversity value, however, there needs to be a specific target set. It is suggested that a 10% biodiversity net gain in line with the forthcoming Environment Bill would be suitable. Guidance and access to datasets should be provided and advertised to applicants regarding the most suitable habitats for each locality. A methodology should be established for determining the most suitable alternative off-site provision. This could be done by referencing the Herts Ecological Network Map or a future Local Nature Recovery Strategy (which counties will be required to produce under the new Environment Bill). Designers should be provided with guidance on how to incorporate specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need a specific 10% net gain in biodiversity added;</li> <li>A methodology should be established for determining the most suitable alternative off-site provision;</li> <li>Need guidance on how to incorporate specific measures such as bat and swift boxes and bricks into buildings;</li> <li>Issue with applicants/developers removing vegetation prior to planning approval</li> </ul>	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

			measures such as bat and swift boxes and bricks into buildings. There should be a recognition of tree and hedgerow lines that maintain connectivity between habitats. Lines should always be maintained where possible. The importance of a hedge should be acknowledged with the use of 'hedge dating' techniques. There is an issue with applicants/developers removing vegetation prior to planning approval. It is suggested that where felling has happened in the recent past, prior to application, the applicant will be expected to replace trees and hedges lost and a fine imposed			
P1_00 233_A Limerick		Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Landscape Character is the right approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 234_A O'Sullivan		Yes	I agree Preferred Policy Option for Landscape Character is the right approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 235_C Maclea n		Yes	yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 236_E Talbot		Yes	Stipulations make sense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 240_K Butler		Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 244_P Phillips		Yes	This is fine. But see below.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 253_J Daniels		Not Stated	We support the policy text at part 2 of PPO 20 which states that the council will support proposals which (a) lead to the removal or a reduction in the impact of existing structures and land uses that are detrimental to the visual quality of the landscape; (b) enhance public access and recreation opportunities without detriment to the landscape or wildlife; and (c) contribute to the delivery of Green Infrastructure. However, the policy should go further to acknowledge that weight will be given to these benefits in the decision making exercise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with wording of the policy;</li> <li>Should go further be giving greater weight to the policies in the decision making process.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 256_M Within gton		Yes	Seems reasonable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 261_G Cooper		No	Reference to the clone valley Park is missing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 262_L Mead		No	TPO for key trees should be able to be placed on any tree, regardless of how many people can see it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TPO for key trees should able to be placed on any tree.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 266_C Weston		Not Stated	Landscapes identified by Herts CC fall into three parts and simply ignores landscapes in local areas that are treasured as part of our historic inheritance. These must also be included in this Policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simply ignores landscapes in local areas that are treasured as part of our historic inheritance. These must also be included in this Policy.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 267_D Lewis		No	This policy does not go far enough to protect local ecology. It all hinges on the sentence '[Development will be allowed if] the need for the development would outweigh the need to safeguard the biodiversity of the site'. This is a get-out clause, and is clearly biased towards the council and Developers who have a vested interest in development. I am surprised that there are only three regions deemed to be of key areas of biodiversity in this entire geographical region. You say 'all development must conserve, enhance and, where appropriate, restore biodiversity.' This is nonsense - Urban development cannot but destroy these very aspirations. Similarly, you say construction will be allowed if 'Adverse effects can be satisfactorily minimised through mitigation' etc. Exactly what does this mean in practice? How is possible to agree on what is satisfactory in this case? I believe that these 'weasel words' are yet another example of bias towards development in your policies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy does not go far enough;</li> <li>Worded in a way that developers can get around the policy;</li> <li>'Adverse effects can be satisfactorily minimised through mitigation' etc. What does this mean in practice and is possible to agree what is satisfactory in this case?</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 271_S Wallace		Yes	Seems sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 282_A Jenkins		No	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None

REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

P1_00301_C hilterns Conservation Board		Not Stated	<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board strongly supports the inclusion in the plan of a suite of policies relating to landscape character, and particularly the inclusion of a specific policy relating to the Chilterns AONB, which is clearly based on our published model local plan policy. We consider that the policy could be enhanced, and strongly recommend that the council considers the inclusion of our model local plan policy in full (the policy and justification can be downloaded here – some of the references in this document require updating).</p> <p>The particular additional benefits of the full model policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Application to the setting of the AONB, and not just development “within” the designated area.*</li> <li>• Reference to the tranquillity of the area, which links to the plan’s other policies on noise and light pollution.</li> <li>• Reference to the economic and social (as well as environmental) well-being of the area and to development that is desirable for the understanding and enjoyment of the AONB.</li> <li>• Requiring compliance with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (and other guidance), rather than merely having regard to it.</li> </ul> <p>It is increasingly important that all local authorities across the Chilterns should present a consistent approach to planning policy across the AONB and its setting, and we therefore strongly recommend inclusion of the full model policy as presented.</p> <p>* Note that the 2021 update of the NPPF now expects that “development within [AONBs’] setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.” It is clear that government is more serious now than previously about managing the impact of development in the setting of AONBs, so it is important to reflect this in the local plan.</p> <p>We would strongly recommend including a note in the supporting text to the policy explaining the potential for the boundary of the AONB to be extended during the plan period, in line with Natural England’s announcement on 24 July this year. With regard to para 10.16, we suggest considering the point made in response to Q7 above that the Chilterns Building Design Guide could have relevance outside of the designated AONB and its immediate (current) setting, including in the district’s other character areas or landscape regions, which have a similar underlying geology and vernacular heritage.</p> <p><b>Minor note:</b> The policy and supporting text makes reference to the ‘Landscape Regions’ defined in the Hertfordshire County Council landscape assessment. It might be beneficial to explain how these three regions relate to the three National Character Areas (Chilterns, Northern Thames Basin and Thames Valley).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach, policy should also include:</li> <li>• Application to the setting of the AONB, and not just development “within” the designated area;</li> <li>• Reference to the tranquillity of the area;</li> <li>• Reference to the economic and social (as well as environmental) well-being of the area;</li> <li>• Compliance with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (and other guidance), rather than merely having regard to it.</li> <li>• Recommend including note in the supporting text explaining the potential for the boundary of the AONB to be extended during the plan period;</li> <li>• Policy and supporting text makes reference to the ‘Landscape Regions’ defined in the Hertfordshire County Council landscape assessment. It might be beneficial to explain how these three regions relate to the three National Character Areas (Chilterns, Northern Thames Basin and Thames Valley).</li> </ul>	Noted	None
Q21. Should we have considered alternative options?						
P1_00014_A Samson		Yes	As before	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with approach. Environment over expansion</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00017_M McGuirk		Yes	Mandatory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make it mandatory</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00023_D r K Macleod		Yes	ok	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No alternatives suggested</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00025_M Beaujeux		Yes	Less high rise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less high rise</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00040_N Brew		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"> <li>• Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

					need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_00 041_D James- Saunders		Yes	Don't consider building on AONB.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 045_L Fitzpatrick		Yes	Thought should be given to designating certain additional areas as significant. For example the hills around Rickmansworth or Kings Langley are important features of our district and should benefit from additional protection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Designate additional areas, such as Hills around Rickmansworth or Kings Langley</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 046_S Singer		Yes	Sarratt to be included	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sarratt should be included.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 047_P Rees		Yes	A tougher approach should be taken which would prevent the building of hundreds of new homes on green field sites and on the Green Belt under the Local Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tougher approach to prevent development on the Green Belt</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 068_A Clark		Yes	You should rule out absolutely all developments liable to be classed as "blots on the landscape" and make it understood that no proposals will be considered until all other avenues have been exhausted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developments classed as "blots on the landscape", make it understood that no proposals will be considered until all other avenues have been exhausted.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 076_L Hull		Yes	Not building on the greenbelt as previously explained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop Green Belt Land</li> </ul>	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land, and an exhaustive search of potential sites to accommodate development needs has been carried out as part of the SHELAA (2020) and Urban Capacity Study (2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

					development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_00 106_L Crosby		Yes	Yes, just forget about it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not develop at all</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 107_R Webster		Yes	Manage green spaces to encourage native wildlife, and encourage diversity of wildlife habitat. Where feasible connect green sites together to create larger natural areas of habitat. Don't build on greenbelt land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manage greenspaces to encourage wildlife. Do not build greenbelt land.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 114_D Twinberrrow		Yes	Any development in AONB precludes any other building within x miles of said development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development in AONB precludes any building.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 119_J Loveyard		Yes	This land is a sanctuary for horses, plants, trees, wildlife and local people. This area has been developed enough and the local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land is sanctuary for wildlife.</li> <li>Local infrastructure will not be able to support yet more housing.</li> </ul>	Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. If such works require planning permission, they will be required to submit an application which will be considered on its merits and whether the proposals would have an acceptable or unacceptable impact on the environment. Requirement for a net gain in biodiversity would be applied. Policies provide for the retention of trees and hedgerows where possible and replanting.	None
P1_00 127_M Clarke		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No alternatives suggested.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 128_L Clarke		Yes	Consider all brownfield sites and provide an accurate assessment of housing needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider Brownfield sites</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 132_H Sahota		Yes	Collaborate with neighbouring councils	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborate with other council's</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 137_S Hall		Yes	By building a new development/town whereby the infrastructure is put into place before house building starts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build infrastructure before housing.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 142_Y Lloyd		Yes	.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No alternatives suggested</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 144_D Thorpe		Yes	High Rise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Rise</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 146_P Ward		Yes	One which would give a clear character to the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give a clear character to the area</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 163_J Dickins		Yes	There should be little if any development in the AONB unless absolutely necessary, as it is important to preserve it for the sake of wildlife and people alike. It cannot be reinstated once developed!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development in the AONB unless absolutely necessary.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 170_N		Yes	The recent planning application on Lower Green Street should be resurrected, in accordance with these comments, but with slightly fewer than the 800 homes so	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resurrect planning application at Lower Green Street but with fewer than 800 homes.</li> </ul>	Noted – See response to Part 2 comments in relation to site allocations	None

## REPRESENTATIONS – Local Plan Regulation 18 Preferred Policy Options Consultation – All Consultee Representations

Hutchinson			there would be space to include integrated local facilities. This is essentially a ploughed field, so it is a stretch to term it an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.			
P1_00 174_E Nathan		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No alternatives suggested</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 183_M Allum		Yes	NO MORE PLANNING PERMISSION SHOULD BE GRANTED IN AONB SITES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No planning permission in AONB</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 190_I Starr		Yes	A more varied approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More varied approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 201_A Green		Yes	Build elsewhere and not consider building on AONB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build elsewhere, do not build on AONB</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 206_D Worrell		Yes	No changes to AONB or greenbelt - period!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No changes to AONB or Green Belt</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 209_G Bown		Yes	It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For councillors to consider sensible, alternative options.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 224_J Ford		Yes	listening to the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listen to local community</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 244_P Phillips		Yes	The responsibility of farmers / landowners in their role as custodians of the land should feature here. What incentives are planned to encourage farmers / landowners to, for example, reduce the use of fertilisers, increase the size of hedgerows and allow the re-wilding of edges of fields?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responsibility of farms/ landowners in role as custodians of the land should be referenced here.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 262_L Mead		Yes	residents should be able to protect trees, hedges and streams even when they are not on their property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents should be able to protect trees, hedges and streams</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 267_D Lewis		Yes	Your options should be to prioritise existing wildlife habitats over development. An ecology-first approach would include policies such as 'if it is demonstrated that development will cause habitat loss then it shall not go ahead and alternative locations will need to be considered'. This doesn't mean no building can go ahead. Instead it will favour the only realistic long-term solution to increased population which is compatible with your ecological objectives – significant redevelopment of brownfield sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritise wildlife habitats over development;</li> <li>Need an ecology-first approach;</li> <li>Favour only realistic long-term solution to increased population compatible with ecological objectives redevelopment of brownfield sites.</li> </ul>	Noted	None
P1_00 282_A Jenkins		Yes	See above.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with approach</li> </ul>	Noted	None