

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

GREEN BELT

Q17. Do you think the Preferred Green Belt is the right approach?					
SC_00 017_C halfont St Peter Parish Council	Chalfont St Peter Parish Council	<p>Significantly both communities also enjoy the benefit of Green Belt protection. Chalfont St Peter's Green belt is currently under threat from development in the form of a motorway service area which would lie between the M25 to the South of Maple Cross and the now defunct West Hyde Lane as far as its junction with Denham Lane. That area includes ancient woodlands and hedgerows and risks linking West Hyde with Chalfont St Peter, eradicating essential Green Belt.</p> <p>The Parish Council is deeply opposed to the MSA development and its Response and Supplemental Response to that development identify its Green Belt arguments. It takes a similar view of overdevelopment of green Belt land from Hornhill Road eastwards as far as the A412 North Orbital Road. Combined with the proposed MSA these developments will remove a massive amount of Green Belt land which (M25 apart) manages to define the leading edge of the London Boroughs and communities inside the M25 from the open fields of the Chiltern Hills.</p> <p>These areas act as a buffer to stop coalescence with Chalfont St Peter on its boundary with Three Rivers. They also act to separate Hertfordshire from Buckinghamshire. Quote preferred policy option 16 (2) “there is a general presumption against inappropriate development that would not preserve the openness of the green belt or which would conflict with the purposes of including land within it”</p> <p>In May 2019 Three Rivers adopted an emergency Climate Change Policy in which it is said “as part of this, the Council has committed to use all practical means to reduce the impact of Council services on the environment, to cut carbon emissions and to reduce impacts on the environment (2.34)”</p> <p>Your Strategic Objective says that you will provide a coherent network of green infrastructure. We do not recognize this coherent network within the sites adjoining Hornhill Road as west east traffic will feed from the M25, crossing into dense housing developments on both sides of the road.</p> <p>We consider the impacts of these developments, or even parts of them, on the environment raises huge concerns for the future of the countryside and open landscapes and will lead to the coalescence of adjoining villages and Counties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chalfont St Peter's Green Belt is currently under threat from a Motorway Service area; Concerned regarding overdevelopment of the Green Belt from Hornhill Road eastwards as far as A412 North Orbital Road. Combined with services will remove a massive amount of Green Belt Land; Area acts as a buffer to stop coalescence with Chalfont St Peter on the boundary with Three Rivers; In May 2019 Three Rivers adopted an emergency climate policy. The Strategic Objective states that you will provide a coherent network of green infrastructure, but do not recognize this coherent network within the sites adjoining Hornhill Road as west east traffic will feed from the M25, crossing into dense housing developments; Consider that the impacts of the developments on the environment raises huge concerns for future of the Countryside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC does not have sufficient available land to meet its housing needs over the plan period and as such has undertaken call for sites exercises and Strategic Housing and Employment Land (SHELA) capacity studies to identify additional sources of land to meet housing needs over the plan period. 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”. Noted. Any development would be required to meet Local Plan policies which seek to address climate change, e.g. by requiring a minimum of 20% less carbon dioxide emissions than Building Regulations requirements, requiring 10% biodiversity net-gain, reducing water consumption etc. Local Plan policies have informed the TRDC Climate Emergency & Sustainability Strategy. 	No action
SC_00 023_C roxley Green Parish Council	Croxley Green Parish Council	<p>The Green Belt within Croxley Green and in the surrounding areas is one of the key features of the settlement and highly valued by most residents. The whole point of the Green Belt is that it is intended to be an enduring feature. Otherwise, the whole character of a place like Croxley Green will be totally changed. Croxley Green Parish Council endorses the comments from Jed Griffiths' statement about not reiterating, and thereby slightly altering, the policies set out in the NPPF. We suggest TRDC should stick to the clear policies in the NPPF and not change the designation of any land within the Green Belt, except in extreme cases or where slight amendment of the boundaries is locally acceptable and does not damage the integrity of the Green Belt. In addition, we suggest there should be a presumption in favour of only using temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to demolish and remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC should not change the designation of any land within the Green Belt, except in extreme cases or where slight amendment of the boundaries is locally acceptable and does not damage the integrity of the Green Belt. In addition, there should be a presumption in favour of only using temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to demolish and remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legally enforceable covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission. 	<p>Noted. TRDC does not have sufficient available land to meet its housing needs over the plan period and as such has undertaken call for sites exercises and Strategic Housing and Employment Land (SHELA) capacity studies to identify additional sources of land to meet housing needs over the plan period. 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> <p>Green Belt policy allows for the redevelopment of buildings in the green belt for regeneration purposes.</p>	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			enforceable covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission.			
SC_00 024_A bbots Langley Parish Council	Abbots Langley Parish Council		The first three pages of this document and the general dismay of the loss of the greenbelt demonstrates that this policy is redundant to all but residents who wish to enlarge their home. 'DO AS I SAY, NOT AS I DO'.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear 	Noted	No action
SC_00 026_H CC Growth and Infrast ructure	HCC Growth and Infrastructur e		<p>Waste Management Unit. The existing waste transfer station and recycling centre at Waterdale, located between the M1 and A405 (Watford Road) is a strategic waste management facility, located within the Green Belt. The facility is also essential to the waste collection and bulking of the district's municipal waste including the processing of recyclables. The site is also shown as an existing waste allocation on the district council's adopted policies map. Waterdale is an important facility handling around 60 percent of Hertfordshire's residual waste and in 2019/20 alone it received nearly 160,000 tonnes of waste rubbish and recycling. The county council has recently purchased the former bus depot, on land immediately south of the site, for the potential expansion of the waste management facilities that currently operate from the Waterdale site (further comments in relation to this are outlined within section 12 of this representation).</p> <p>As Waterdale is a developed site, it is considered that it does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt, as stated within the NPPF. The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development and is also contrary to the NPPF. The county council therefore requests that the Waterdale site be excluded from the Green Belt, prior to the publication of the forthcoming consultation on the Regulation 19 local plan and that the Green Belt boundary is amended to exclude this site on the accompanying policies map. It is further noted that the district council may potentially allocate an additional housing allocation to the south of Waterdale (CFS65: Land North of Bucknalls Lane, Garston). Whilst the county council has made separate comments on this potential allocation within section 12 of this representation, it is considered that the amended Green Belt boundary, through the potential removal of this housing allocation from the Green Belt, could therefore be extended north to exclude the Waterdale waste transfer station and recycling centre, along with the former bus depot which will be incorporated into the Waterdale site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Waterdale is a developed site, it is considered that it does not meet the five purposes of the Green Belt, as stated within the NPPF. The construction of new buildings in the Green Belt is inappropriate development and is also contrary to the NPPF. The county council therefore requests that the Waterdale site be excluded from the Green Belt, prior to the publication of the forthcoming consultation on the Regulation 19 local plan and that the Green Belt boundary is amended to exclude this site on the accompanying policies map. It is further noted that the district council may potentially allocate an additional housing allocation to the south of Waterdale (CFS65: Land North of Bucknalls Lane, Garston). it is considered that the amended Green Belt boundary, through the potential removal of this housing allocation from the Green Belt, could therefore be extended north to exclude the Waterdale waste transfer station and recycling centre, along with the former bus depot which will be incorporated into the Waterdale site. 	Noted. Green belt releases can only be undertaken through a local plan review. 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".	Assess Waterdale against the GB assessment to determine whether it should be released from the green belt.
PL_00 009_C FS13	Savills on behalf of Kebbell Homes		<p>Question 17: Green Belt</p> <p>4.9 The strategic plan-making approach to Green Belt review / release is not considered in the Green Belt chapter of the PPO <i>which instead discusses only the intended development management approach to new development proposals in the Green Belt following the adoption of the plan.</i> We have, however, considered the Council's strategic approach to Green Belt release below. In our response to the Part 2 consultation we discuss the specific approach to Green Belt release in respect of our client's site (CFS13).</p> <p>4.13 We have reviewed the Council's evidence base and note that it does not specifically set out any conclusions with regard to exceptional circumstances (this should be set out in the full in the Regulation 19 Local Plan). Notwithstanding, there are a number of matters raised in the supporting evidence which is relevant to the consideration of exceptional circumstances and in our view demonstrates that such circumstances do exist.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's evidence base or Plan does not specifically set out any conclusions with regard to exceptional circumstances. However, a number of matters raised in the supporting evidence demonstrate that such circumstances do exist. At Regulation 19 stage the Local Plan should set out conclusions on exceptional circumstances. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted and agreed that the Regulation 19 Local Plan should set out the exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt release. 	Add text regarding exceptional circumstances
PL_00 002_A CFS8b	ROK Planning on behalf of Woolbro Group		1.35 The Preferred Policy Option is not considered to be the right approach. This is because an insufficient proportion of Green Belt land is proposed for release as part of the Local Plan to meet OAN for housing. On this basis alone, this	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient Green Belt land proposed for release to meet housing need. Therefore parts 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parts 1 and 2 of the policy apply to designated Green Belt land regardless of the extent of area that is designated and regardless of whether the Council proposes a wider extent of the Green Belt be released 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend policy to reflect NPPF guidance. "In accordance with <u>paragraph 149 part G of the NPPF</u>, the replacement building

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

		<p>option is not the correct approach and parts 1 and 2 of the option require revision.</p> <p>1.36 Additional amendment is also required to ensure accordance with the NPPF. The NPPF sets the national planning policy framework for the Green Belt and as such all Local Plans should comply with this.</p> <p>1.37 The draft plan does not reflect this aspect of national policy and is therefore unjustified and hence unsound. For example, paragraph 149(g) of the NPPF should be replicated within the Local Plan. The suggested wording to be added is set out below. New text is underlined and removed text is struck through where necessary: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>"In the Green Belt, the Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), will be supported which would:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o <u>not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or</u> o <u>not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority"</u> <p>1.38 Additionally, the 'New and Replacement Buildings' Section of the Option identifies three criteria for which replacement buildings in the Green Belt will only be permitted when these are met. TRDC have included an additional criterion to the two included in the NPPF: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The replacement building would not be more harmful to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building". <p>1.39 Revision is therefore required in order to ensure compliance with the NPPF: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear reference should also be made to the entirety of paragraph 149 of the NPPF which sets out the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt; and • Paragraph 7(c) of Preferred Policy Option 16 from the Reg 18 document quote above should be removed as it is not in accordance with national policy): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - o "the replacement building would not be more harmful to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building". 	<p>and 2 of the policy require revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear reference should also be made to the entirety of paragraph 149 of the NPPF which sets out the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt; • Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section should be removed to comply with NPPF (criterion is not included in NPPF) • 'New and Replacement Buildings' Section of the Option identifies three criteria for which replacement buildings in the Green Belt will only be permitted when these are met. TRDC have included an additional criterion to the two included in the NPPF Revision is therefore required in order to ensure compliance with the NPPF. 	<p>for housing allocations. Therefore no suggested amendments to policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted, amend policy to set out exceptional circumstances as per the NPPF. • Criteria is not included in national policy and therefore agreed that this is inconsistent. Suggest removal of Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section. 	<p>would not be more harmful to the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building <u>not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing building"</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section.
PL_00 010_C FS14	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of Finchman Ltd.	<p>Paragraph 8.3 of the draft Local Plan states that, in order to meet the District's need for housing and employment development, together with supporting infrastructure to provide for the growth which is essential to deliver sustainable development and the Government's growth agenda, the Council has no choice but to release some land within the Green Belt to meet these needs.</p> <p>Preferred Policy Option 16 outlines the proposed approach to Green Belt boundary revision and Green Belt development. The policy option notes that the revised Green Belt boundary will be shown on the policies map. We are supportive of the District's general approach to the revision of the Green Belt boundary and support the proposal that site CFS14 is removed from the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of general approach to revision of Green Belt boundary. 	Noted.	No action
PL_00 014_C FS22	ROK Planning on behalf of landowner	<p>In principle, revisions to the Green Belt are supported. However, it is not considered that a sufficient proportion of Green Belt land is proposed for release as part of the Local Plan to meet OAN for housing. On this basis alone, this</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient Green Belt land proposed for release to meet housing need. Therefore parts 1 and 2 of the policy require revision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts 1 and 2 of the policy therefore apply to designated Green Belt land regardless of the extent of area that is designated and regardless of whether the Council proposes a wider extent of the Green Belt 	<p>Amend policy to reflect NPPF guidance. <u>"In accordance with paragraph 149 part G of the NPPE, the replacement building would not be more harmful to the visual amenity and openness of the</u></p>

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

		<p>preferred policy option is not the correct approach and parts 1 and 2 of the option require revision.</p> <p>An additional amendment is also required to ensure accordance with the NPPF. The NPPF sets the national planning policy framework for the Green Belt and as such all Local Plans should comply with this. Paragraph 149 part G of the NPPF states:</p> <p><i>“Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>– not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or</i> <i>– not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.”</i> <p>The draft Plan does not reflect this aspect of national policy and is therefore unjustified and hence unsound. The ‘New and Replacement Buildings’ section of the policy option identifies three criteria for which replacement buildings in the Green Belt will be permitted (part 7 a – c). TRDC have included an additional criterion at part C to the two included in the NPPF (underlined in the extract below): -</p> <p><i>“The replacement building would not be more harmful to the <u>visual amenity</u> and openness of the Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building”</i></p> <p>It is considered that a revision is therefore required in order to ensure strict compliance with the NPPF. Clear reference should also be made to paragraph 149 of the NPPF which sets out the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Proposed amended wording included below (new text underlined, deleted text struck through):</p> <p><u>“In accordance with paragraph 149 part G of the NPPF, the replacement building would not be more harmful to the <u>visual amenity</u> and openness of the Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing building”</u></p> <p>In addition, it is considered that the detailed Green Belt information within Appendix 2 of the draft Plan should reflect the wording of the NPPF, especially in relation to replacement buildings and references to specific paragraphs of the NPPF should be revised to reflect the amendments of the 2021 NPPF.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear reference should also be made to the entirety of paragraph 149 of the NPPF which sets out the exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt • Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section which refers to ‘visual amenity’ should be removed to comply with NPPF (criterion is not included in NPPF) • Appendix 2 should reflect the wording of the NPPF and references to specific paragraphs of the NPPF should be revised to reflect the amendments of the 2021 NPPF 	<p>be released for housing allocations. Therefore no suggested amendments to policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria is not included in national policy and therefore agreed that this is inconsistent. Suggest removal of Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section. • Review Appendix 2 against NPPF (2021), updating any paragraph references. 	<p>Green Belt by reason of its siting than the original building not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing building”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove Paragraph 7(c) under New and Replacement Buildings Section. • Review Appendix 2 against NPPF (2021), updating any paragraph references.
PL_00 019_C FS31	DLA Town Planning on behalf of CALA Homes	Section 8.0 of the draft Local Plan recognises that there is not sufficient land outside of the Green Belt to meet housing needs. Green Belt sites will therefore be required to meet housing need over the plan period and the Council's recognition in this respect is welcomed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that Green Belt sites are required to meet housing need is welcomed 	Noted.	No action
PL_00 030_C FS72	DLA Town Planning on behalf of landowners	4.5 Section 8.0 of the draft Local Plan recognises that there is not sufficient land outside of the Green Belt to meet housing needs. Green Belt sites will therefore be required to meet housing need over the plan period and the Council's recognition in this respect is welcomed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition that Green Belt sites are required to meet housing need is welcomed 	Noted.	No action
PL_00 021_C FS53	Lampro on behalf of Flahive Development s	Flahive acknowledges that the preferred policy option for Green Belt largely aligns with the requirements as set out in the NPPF. However, Flahive considers that some of the more detailed guidance included at Appendix 2 may not be consistent with the NPPF and therefore queries whether its inclusion as part of the Local Plan is appropriate. Notwithstanding this, Flahive considers that a planning application can be an appropriate mechanism for delivering new homes on sites located within the Green Belt in specific	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parts of detailed guidance at Appendix 2 are inconsistent with NPPF so suggests whether inclusion in Local Plan is appropriate. • Flahive considers that a planning application can be an appropriate mechanism for delivering new homes on sites located within the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Review Appendix 2 against NPPF (2021) looking for and amending any inconsistencies. • Noted. Regulation 19 Local Plan should set out the exceptional circumstances that exist to justify proposed Green Belt alterations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Appendix 2 against NPPF (2021). • Regulation 19 plan to set out the exceptional circumstances for GB release.

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

		instances, including when other land uses are proposed as part of a package of 'very special circumstances'. For example, Flahive is of the view that the benefits which would be created through the delivery of new homes, including affordable housing, together with enhanced and publicly accessible open space, a new leisure / sport facility, specialist residential accommodation (i.e. care) and ancillary employment-generating floorspace, as part of the redevelopment of the Site would constitute 'very special circumstances' in the context of the requirements of the NPPF. Flahive therefore welcomes the principle of criterion (2) of preferred policy option 16.	Green Belt in specific instances, including when other land uses are proposed as part of a package of 'very special circumstances'. Therefore welcomes criterion 2.		
PL_00 027_C FS64	Nexus Planning on behalf of Inland Homes	<p>7.1 Paragraph 2.49 of the Consultation Document identifies that exceptional circumstances exist to review the District's Green Belt boundaries – a position we support. However, the amendments identified through the site allocations within the Part 2 Consultation Document are not justified as they do not result in the Plan providing sufficient land to meet the District's minimum standard method figure in full.</p> <p>7.2 In this context, we note that the detailed assessment of land controlled by Inland Homes at Chalfont Lane, West Hyde within Appendix 7a of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment discounted the site primarily due to it being "washed over by the Green Belt and is not located within or at the edge of a higher tier settlement or an inset village." However, the Site was not assessed as part of the Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment, and despite Inland Homes submitting the Site for consideration through a call for sites' exercise in 2019 the Council still has not undertaken an assessment of its contribution towards the purposes of including land within the Green Belt (paragraph 138 of the Framework). As demonstrated within our representations to the Part 2 Consultation Document, the Site does not perform strongly against the Green Belt purposes and would be suitable for release from the Green Belt along with the inseting of West Hyde from the designation – a matter which has not been considered.</p> <p>7.3 Until the Site is properly assessed by the Council, the Plan cannot be considered to be "based on proportionate evidence" as required by paragraph 35b) of the Framework, and accordingly would not be sound.</p> <p>Recommended Changes 7.4 The Plan's evidence base should robustly assess the option of removing West Hyde from the Green Belt, consistent with its assessment of other villages within the Village Analysis at Appendix C of the Green Belt Review Strategic Analysis (Stage 1) (2017). This should also take into account the impacts of the HS2 works to the west of the Site.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support position of Council that exceptional circumstances exist to review Green Belt boundary. Amendments are not justified as the site allocations do not meet housing need in full. CFS64 was discounted due to it being "washed over by the Green Belt and is not located within or at the edge of a higher tier settlement or an inset village." (SHELAA, 2020) but the site was not assessed in the Stage 3 Green Belt Review. Site would be suitable for release from the Green Belt (as per Inland Homes assessment against Green Belt purposes) and West Hyde would be suitable for inseting. Inseting of West Hyde has not been considered. The Plan cannot be considered as based on proportionate evidence and would therefore not be sound. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Paragraph 3.17 of the Stage 2 Green Belt review states that: "The intention of the Stage 2 study was to extend the analysis outwards from inset edges as far as was necessary to capture the variations in contribution to the Green Belt purposes. The extent of the assessment area was therefore determined incrementally through the analysis process, starting with all Green Belt land within Three Rivers and Watford adjacent to inset settlements or to Bedmond, extending out to boundary features beyond which release of land was considered to result in an increase in harm level. Where this increased harm level was rated less than high, land extending out to the next significant boundary feature was assessed as a separate land parcel, but where a boundary was judged to mark a change to high or very high harm this rating would apply to all land beyond that boundary, so no further parcel subdivision was required." This means that the release of any land outside the assessment area would result in at least high harm to the Green Belt, which includes the land on which Site CFS64 is located. As stated above, the release of the land on which Site CFS64 is located would result in at least high harm to the Green Belt as per the Stage 2 Green Belt Review. The SHELAA (2020) assesses the site as unsuitable for residential development. West Hyde is in the rural hinterland of Three Rivers. The rural hinterland of Three Rivers District contains the large village of Chorleywood (of which Heronsgate is a significant built area), smaller villages of Sarratt and Bedmond and a range of hamlets and isolated dwellings. West Hyde is not classified as a Village in the Settlement Hierarchy (Core Strategy) or a significant built area which forms part of a larger settlement (such as Heronsgate) and was therefore an analysis as to whether inseting of West Hyde was appropriate was not undertaken in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review. All "Other Settlements" in the Settlement Hierarchy (i.e. hamlets such as Chandlers Crosss, Loudwater, Pimlico, etc.) were also not assessed as options for inseting in the Stage 1 Green Belt Review. 	No action
PL_00 029_C FS69		For land that remains in the Green Belt following the adoption of the Local Plan, it is right for the local policy to reflect and make reference to national policy. The full wording does not need to be repeated in the policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is right for local Green Belt policy to reflect and refer to national policy. The full wording does not need to be repeated in the policy. 	Noted.	No action
P1_000 01		Item (5) should have "other than those specified in national policy except in very special circumstances." deleted, as national policy is based on outdated population predictions and "very special circumstances" are too vague to be used in policy options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delete "other than those specified in national policy except in very special circumstances" from Item 5 as national policy based on outdated projections. 	Noted	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_000 02			The boundaries from Abercrombie's plan after WWII shall not be amended. The green belt boundary does not need to be redrawn and any policy amending these boundaries is wrong. There is strong local disgust at the attempts to remove the green belt. The local policy must not change these boundaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt Boundaries in Abercrombie's plan do not need to be amended; Strong local residence to changes to the Green Belt 	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".	No action
P1_000 03		Yes	Important to protect the green belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the Green Belt 	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".	No action
P1_000 06		Yes	Green belt needs to be protected but if it must be used in some small way the council must be able to directly influence its development for the benefit of the locality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect Green Belt as first priority but if it must be used in some small way the council must be able to directly influence its development for the benefit of the locality. 	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".	No action
P1_000 14		Yes	As mentioned before - are we really expecting the population to grow so much? We do not yet know what the impact of leaving the EU will have on social, cultural and population density. Green belt should be protected at all costs. Once it's gone we cannot get it back. How society constructs itself should be of greater priority and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population will not grow by as much due to leaving EU; Protect Green Belt Land at all cost. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			consideration. We should be adapting to our green environment not the other way around.		significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release.	
P1_000 17		Yes	<p>Providing you can challenge developments successfully. But why are your proposals using green belt land. This is not joined up.</p> <p>Don't build at all on green belt and if structures within the belt are abandoned or derelict they should be replaced with similar structures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided TRDC can challenge developments successfully; • Query why Green Belt land is used; • Not 'joined up' approach 	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.	No action
P1_000 19		No	All green belt land should be protected and not built on.	<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".	No action
P1_000 20		No	Must ensure least use of any green belt, the infrastructure is lacking and will increase traffic and parking requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure least use of Green Belt Land; • Infrastructure is lacking and will increase traffic and parking needs. 	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 action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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. 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. Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
P1_000 21		No	I do not think the policy goes far enough to protect in greenbelt There are little polls	<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".	No action
P1_000 22		No	<p>I do not agree with this statement: "The need for housing and employment development together with supporting infrastructure to provide for the growth which is essential to deliver sustainable development and the Government's growth agenda means that the Council has no choice but to release some land within the Green Belt to meet these needs I think the Three Rivers area is already overcrowded, with insufficient amenities available for residents, so further development will result in further overcrowding. Too many people and too many cars will lower the standard of living for residents.</p> <p>Green Belt land is assigned Green Belt for a good reason. Stronger moves should have been taken to retain that status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three Rivers is already overcrowded with lack of amenities; Further development will result in more overcrowding and insufficient infrastructure/ amenities which will lower standard of living. 	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.	No action
P1_000 23		NO	The Green Belt review appears arbitrary in its assessment of impact on the green belt for each area considered. The grading system used appears not to have been applied consistently across all areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt grading system appears not to have been applied consistently across all areas. 	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 action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_000 24		Yes	I think we should avoid extensive building on green belt land wherever possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Avoid extensive development on the Green Belt. 	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".	No action
P1_000 25		No	This will significantly reduce the size of green belt land	<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".	No action
P1_000 26		No	No definition or examples as to what these special circumstances are.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No definition/ example of special circumstances. 	Noted. NPPF identifies exceptional circumstances.	No action
P1_000 27		No	I do not agree that Green Belt land should be allocated for development – the purpose of designating areas as Green Belt is "to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allocate Green Belt land for development, meant to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_000 28		No	Do not build on Numbers farm. This is precious and against every one of these that you are supposed to uphold: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no special circumstances for Green Belt release. 	Noted – See Part 2 responses to this site	No action
P1_000 32		Yes	It's the right approach to preserve the Green Belt as far as possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_000 33		Yes	Major alterations to buildings should also be subject to new regulations and standards, as new dwellings are. There should also be an impact report on the Green Belt regarding access and the strain on wildlife, and environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major alterations to buildings should be subject to new regulations/ standards; Impact report on the Green Belt regarding access and strain on wildlife and environment. 	<p>Noted. A number of assessments have been undertaken including the Green Belt Assessment and an open spaces, sports and recreation study which have informed new policies in the plan.</p> <p>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. Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	No action
P1_000 34		No	The vast tracts of Green Belt outlined in many areas (especially Maple Cross) are not suitable for residential building and should be preserved. After all we are all told we shouldn't concrete our gardens to make car parking spaces, don't build more houses with more cars!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vast areas of Green Belt (esp. Maple Cross) not suitable for development; Told not to concrete gardens for parking spaces, don't build more houses with more cars. 	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”.	No action
P1_000 38		Yes	Essential to maintain the character of the Green Belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain character of the Green Belt 	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”.	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

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".	No action
P1_000 41		Yes	Largely, I agree. However, I believe that there can be no reason for ever allowing our precious green belt to be built on. Developers need to 'infill' and build on brownfield sites. Councils need to make this absolutely clear to anyone wishing to build in the area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally agree with approach; No reason for allowing Green Belt Land to be developed; Developers need to 'infill' and build on brownfield sites. 	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".	No action
P1_000 45		No	I would favour a policy that was far more hard core in resisting change of use. Three Rivers is exactly the sort of district where a Green Belt policy is needed and we are seeing the consistent erosion of the resource.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a stronger policy to prevent the development of 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".	No action
P1_000 46		Yes	The green belt is neither inviolable nor sacrosanct. It was formed at a time when house building was beginning, and is far less relevant today. People need homes more and more, if we need to build on green belt then we should.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_000 47		No	The policy on the Green Belt should expressly prohibit the building of new houses on Green Belt land. If the purpose of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy should expressly prevent building houses in the Green Belt; 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			the Green Belt is to preserve a sense of openness, to protect views, to prevent a massing of housing, and to prevent towns and villages merging than no development should be allowed in Green Belt areas. Otherwise, little-by-little, bit-by-bit, all the Green Belt land in Three Rivers will eventually be released over time - leading to 'a death by a thousand cuts' and the concreting of the countryside.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This approach will lead to more and more Green Belt release and 'death by a thousand cuts' 	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".	
P1_000_48_	Yes	However, the 'special circumstances' criteria needs to be more robust in order to protect the green belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special circumstances need to be more robust. 	Noted.	No action	
P1_000_49	No	There should be no special circumstances for conversion of Green belt and should be protected. You are not doing enough to protect green belt. We have elected councils to come up with solutions or find a way of not building on Green Belt.	<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".	No action	
P1_000_50	Yes	It is vital to protect the green belt and not lose the character of the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Protect the Green Belt and do not lose character of the area. 	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".	No action	
P1_000_53	No	Huge amounts of developments in the Greenbelt area is suggested (Numbers Farm) in addition to this no 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 which will have	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No plans for roads have been published (especially regarding Tom's Lane); Will result in traffic and congestion impacts; 	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. Infrastructure requirements will be identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			additional negative effects on the green belt area and local surroundings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will have an additional negative impact on the Green Belt. 		
P1_000 54		Yes	Green belt need be conserved for everyone's well being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Green Belt needs to be conserved for everyone's wellbeing. 	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".	No action
P1_000 55		Yes	The Green Belt should be protected at all times. We recently opposed the development of Killingdown farm (CFS21) for multiple reasons. People living here feel very strongly about being robbed of their walks and healthy environment by developers who want to use a pretty local Lane as an entrance to a High-specification housing development so that they can make more money.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt should be protected at all times. Objected to Killingdown Farm (CFS21) as want to use pretty local lane as an entrance to a high spec development. 	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".	No action
P1_000 56		Yes	WITH RESERVATIONS: Should not be deployed as a means of increasing pressure to build high / dense as a means of meeting target dwelling numbers in other areas: It is the target which is wrong.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally agree with approach. Should not be an excuse to build high/ dense as to meeting housing targets. 	DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage. Policy on internal and external amenity space standards included in the Local Plan.	No action
P1_000 57		Yes	Green belt must be protected to maintain health, well-being, and help to reduce pollution and climate change.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the Green Belt 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_000 61		Not Specified	In this area, we are after all guardians of the 'greenbelt' and must remain steadfast in that guardianship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_000 63		Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	No action
P1_000 64		Yes	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Approach 	Noted	No action
P1_000 66		No	Only development of existing buildings in Green Belt designated areas be allowed if it does not spoil the look. We should not give any areas of green belt land to development as soon as we do the stampede is on and eventually we will just become a superb of the London great sprawl.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only development of existing buildings should be allowed; Do not develop anymore 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".	No action
P1_000 67			We, as yourselves appreciate that people need housing, but, not at the expense of using the green belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand that new housing is needed, but not at the expense of using the Green Belt. 	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".	No action
P1_000 68		No	Be honest! The Council has had an agenda ever since the M25 was built - to commandeer all the land up to it for its	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			self-aggrandisement - more front doors, more tax, more voters. The Free Reach School was plonked down at the extreme edge of its catchment - now you want to plan for 1800 new houses - most of which will likely be the sort to be home to children. Green Belt Pah!	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free Reach school is at the end of the catchment, now building the homes for the school. 	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".	
P1_000 69	No	Do not Support		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not Support 	Noted	No action
P1_000 70	Not Specified	The truth is also this. We could build the thousands of New Homes that the Government Demand, and say goodbye forever to much of our Green Belt, but not very many of our children's generation can actually afford to buy property within the Three Rivers District. So where are all these thousands of Wealthy Families that wish to live here coming from? or is this just a ploy to help the Construction Industry get Richer?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Release of Green Belt is irreversible, just a ploy to help the Construction Industry get richer. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_000 71	No	As per my earlier comments, I'm not persuaded that the proposals the amount of additional housing proposed in TRDC Local Plan is justified. It follows that the impact on the existing Green Belt needs to be re-assessed once a revised Local Plan is produced.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amount of housing proposed is not justified which is the reason for the Green Belt release. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_000 74			I guess that the Green Belt land is all we have that is big enough to accommodate all these new houses, I hope the words are adequate to protect it as much as possible.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Hope wording is adequate to protect the Green Belt. 	Noted	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_000 76		No	The sentence 'Such development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances exist' means that you can completely ignore the policy and completely undermine it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to 'special circumstances' existing can ignore policy/ undermine it. 	Noted. NPPF sets out exceptional circumstances and all development wanting to build in the green belt will need to demonstrate this.	No action
P1_000 77		Yes	It's sensible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_000 78		Yes	The Green Belt contributes to the area being the way it is and must be protected from developers looking for easy builds and maximum profit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Green Belt must be protected from developers. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_000 80		Yes	Only if you stick to your words within the policy that you will not build on green belt land	<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".	No action
P1_000 84		Yes	We need to protect our Green Belt land for future generations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach but protect Green Belt. 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_000 86		Yes	making good use but without change or impact is the way	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Make best use without change or impact is the way. 	Noted.	No action
P1_000 88		No	I disagree that there is a need for the policy option in the first place. It is predicted that the world population will reach a peak at the end of this century, that's only 79 year away and so I question why we are building so many homes when the population will begin to go down after this. We should be putting nature first, not man.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population will decrease at end of century so query why so many homes are being built. 	Noted. The Local Plan is a statutory document which needs to plan for future development over the next 10 years. Current assessments indicate the need for more housing due to smaller families, growing elderly population and specialist housing.	No action
P1_000 89		Yes	We need to exhaust the brown belt and build on those areas first without impact to the Green Belt land, once built on there is no turning back and the countryside is lost forever. We have been through a complete change in our lifestyles over the last 18 months and it will continue for a many few years so outdoor space and Green belt land unspoilt is priority for all, health & wellbeing of all, younger and older generations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhaust Brownfield options first, once Green Belt is gone it is lost forever; Due to changes in past 18 months outdoor space and Green Belt is more important than ever. 	Noted. 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*.	No action
P1_000 91		Yes	The green belt is an essential part of the county, we need to preserve it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve the Green Belt 	Noted. 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*.	No action
P1_000 96		No	I would not agree with ANY re-definition of the existing extent/boundaries of green belt within Three Rivers, all our existing rural surrounding must be preserved, otherwise it makes a mockery of its original purpose and, when violated even once will progressively destroy the nature of the area.	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_000 97		Yes	The Green Belt should be strictly protected and is vital to maintaining the separation of different settlements. It should NOT be eroded.	<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".	No action
P1_000 99		Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	No action
P1_001 02		No	Although I agree with the conditions for re-use and alterations for existing buildings, Green Belt land should be considered sacrosanct - its removal defeats the purpose of having it in the first place.	<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".	No action
P1_001 07		No	Again the council's aims of providing 10,000+ homes is in direct conflict with maintaining the greenbelt. Also change of use of properties on greenbelt sites, as we all know, just leads to further development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land; Change of use of properties leads to further development. 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_001 08		No	You have allowed an enormous care home to be built on Oxhey Lane and are considering giving approval to building behind it on Green belt land which is home to many species of wildlife. It is a natural green corridor which needs to be preserved. Why did you allow such an ostentatious care Home? Have you already given permission to the developer to continue developing that area? It would appear so.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowed a care home to be built on Oxhey Lane and considering giving approval on Green Belt Land behind it; Appear to have given permission to the developer to carry on developing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The particulars of a planning application do not form part of this consultation. Other policies in the Plan safeguard green infrastructure and biodiversity. 	No action
P1_001 10		No	<p>No. We have commented above with regard to the lack of protection afforded to the Green Belt in the Local Plan and object strongly to its release. An essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its permanence and there is a growing inconsistency between public statements by ministers and others, and the interpretation of planning policy as stated in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. The only basis for alteration of Green Belt boundaries should be clear evidence that there is no reasonable alternative and this has not been provided.</p> <p>The NPPF permits councils to apply planning policy relating to the prevention of inappropriate development in designated protected areas such as Green Belt and AONB, notwithstanding the objective assessment of housing need. With such a high proportion of Green Belt as a key characteristic of the District, offering the means to achieve a wide range of environmental objectives, it is entirely inappropriate to promote market housing development in designated protected areas.</p> <p>PPO18 should include reference to a limitation on buildings associated with appropriate Green Belt uses such as recreation and leisure to those essential to that appropriate use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No protection given to Green Belt in this plan and object to its release. Should include reference to limitation on buildings associated with appropriate Green Belt uses such as recreation and leisure. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 12		Yes	Sadly this has not always been adhered to in the past.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_001 13		Yes	No reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support 	Noted	No action
P1_001 14		Yes	Provided there is no watering down, or back door green belt intrusion - that 'very special circumstances' mean precisely what a reasonable minded person would consider very special i.e. a very high bar of requirement that in of itself does not set any precedent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach provided special circumstances are applied correctly and policy is not watered down. 	Noted	No action
P1_001 16		No	<p>There seems to be a general theme that the Green Belt needs to be protected in the future. The Green Belt needs to be protected now otherwise there will be an ongoing erosion of the Green Belt. Developers will seek to leverage previous planning approvals to further erode the Green Belt. People</p> <p>Want to live in Three Rivers precisely because it has a high percentage of open, accessible, public space. This should be protected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt needs to be protected now and not 'in the future' 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 1		No	Make smarter use of brownfield sites. Developers Shouldn't build on green belt in order to maximise their profits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land 	Noted. 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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_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 	<p>Noted. 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> <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>	No action
P1_001 20		No	The item '1' should be removed. As stated above 'A key purpose of Green Belt is to keep a sense of openness between built up areas (in this case around London), together with other factors such as protecting the countryside from development and supporting urban regeneration. Green Belt also provides opportunities for people to access the countryside, to grow food and support nature conservation. As set out in national policy, the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence, and Green Belts serve five purposes: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. It is clear that these essentials cannot be upheld if the Green Belt Boundary is revised so any proposed development site requiring a change of boundary should be struck off the list, and item '1' removed. The five purposes are vital to the local communities and if they cannot be maintained then the impossible figures for housing need cannot be met and the 'targets' should be substantially reduced. The other adjoining local authorities are in the same position, and do not have spare capacity either. They are also unable to reach their enormous housing targets without building many high rise blocks which would detrimentally alter the area for the residents of Three Rivers as well as for their own residents.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Item 1 should be removed as essential purpose of Green Belt cannot be upheld if boundary is amended; Neighbouring authorities also unable to reach their enormous housing targets without building many high rise blocks which would detrimentally alter the area for the residents of Three Rivers as well as for their own residents. 	<p>Noted. 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>	No action
P1_001 22		No	We want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, which is London. We want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC needs to uphold the Green Belt Policy and resist inflated housing numbers 	<p>Noted. 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</p>	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 23		Yes	It is the best the Tory government allows you to do	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Best the government will allow you to do. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 25		Not Specified	You make statements that the Green Belt is essential to be protected and reserved for only agricultural development. Then you propose removing sections from the Green Belt, which then are proposed for development. This is duplicitous. It is a "thin end of the wedge" and sets a precedent to "nibble away" at the Green Belt, ruin the special character of the area, and negatively impact addressing the Climate Emergency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC are nibbling away at the Green Belt which would ruin the special character of the area. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 27		No	You are proposing 833 houses on green belt in Kings Langley and there are no special circumstances for this planning permission to be granted. The Green Belt was designed as exactly that, a green belt to stop villages merging as would happen with Kings Langley & Bedmond. This development is entirely inappropriate and has to be stopped at all costs until all brownfield options have been developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposing 833 houses on green belt in Kings Langley and there are no special circumstances for this planning permission to be granted 	Noted – See Part 2 Responses for response to specific sites	No action
P1_001 30		No	This will destroy the green belt as we know it	<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,	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 31			Quote from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government website 'we recognise that not everywhere will be able to meet their housing need in full - for example, where available land is constrained due to the Green Belt and an area therefore has to plan for fewer new homes' (thanks to Dean Russell MP for pointing that out). You appear to be redrawing the Green Belt map to get around the constraint rather than just sticking to brown field and other re-use? There's likely to be a lot of retail and office sites 'going spare' following shopping and working from home changes post Covid?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government recognise that not everywhere will not be able to meet housing needs in full; TRDC are redrawing Green Belt map to get around constraint rather than just sticking to brown field and other re-use 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 32	Yes	balance approach best		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_001 35	No	Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. This would lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the wording in the policy is different than that in the NPPF, which will lead to confusion and developers will circumvent the policy. 	Noted. Amendments to the policy will be made to reflect NPPF guidance.	Amend policy to reflect NPPF guidance.
P1_001 37	Yes	Yes, brown fill sites or upgrade empty buildings. a good example of this is the 'old' post office in Chorleywood. Plans were put into to knock this down and build flats as a replacement, but through appeals against this through local residents, careful design has enabled the building to be repurposed into ground floor flats which are within keeping to the surrounding shops and houses along Lower Rd. We need to keep these areas as they are, as once they are gone for development they will NEVER be replace!		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep areas as they are, as can never be replaced. Brownfield sites or upgrade empty buildings, such as old post office in Chorleywood. 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 40	Yes	Greenbelt areas should be protected under any circumstance for obvious reasons. Greenbelt development should not even be considered whilst there are alternative options such as unused industrial area, brownfields etc.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the Green belt under any circumstance and should not be considered. 	Noted. 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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 42		No	DO NOT BUILD ON OUR GREEN BELT LAND – PLEASE DON'T BE SO TUNNEL VISIONED AND SHORT SIGHTED DO NOT BUILD HERE WE DON'T WANT IT. If you take it now, we'll never get it back ~ it is already serving its most beneficial purpose. Don't try to 'improve' anything - leave it as it is and stop wasting money and time, there is nothing broken to be fixed by you - leave it alone it is GREEN BELT LAND As set out in national policy, the fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their OPENNESS and their PERMANENCE	<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".	No action
P1_001 44		No	High rise would hold back the need to use green belt land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need high rise to prevent Green Belt Land 	Noted. 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".	No action
P1_001 45			In the current situation with the climate emergency, I do not agree to green belt being built on under any circumstances. I suggest you go back to the government and point this out to them. On the 21st June 21 the Housing Minister Christopher Pincher stood up in parliament and said 'We made a manifesto commitment to the green belt as a means of protecting against urban sprawl and we mean to keep to it. Local authorities should not develop on the green belt, save in exceptional circumstances and local plan making should recognise the green belt as a constraint on numbers, as my letter to Members of Parliament in December last year made clear.'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With current climate emergency , do not develop Green Belt under any circumstances; Housing Minister states that local plan making should recognise the green belt as a constraint on numbers 	Noted. 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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release”.	
P1_001 47		Yes	The aspirations look fine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with approach 	Noted.	No action
P1_001 48		Yes	Protecting the green belt is the most important part of a sustainable development. Without green open spaces the population’s wellbeing and health will soon deteriorate making population growth unsustainable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting Green Belt is most important part of a sustainable development. 	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”.	No action
P1_001 50		No	No, I fundamentally disagree this is the right approach. Almost all local residents want the Green Belt protected. Successive Government Ministers have pledged their support for the Green Belt it, but at the same time preside over its removal for housing developments. The dilemma has been highlighted in a recent report from the Council to Protect Rural England (CPRE) The Green Belt is under greater threat than ever before (February 2021). Three Rivers District Council must uphold Green Belt policy and resist the inflated housing numbers. Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF 2021, and has been a key element of planning legislation since 1955. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. This will lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy. Accordingly, the Council is urged to delete paragraphs (5) to (11) of the Policy Option, and to retain paragraphs (1) to (4), with a clear cross-reference to the NPPF. Although the Council states, in paragraph 8.10 of the supporting text, that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option. The Council should also consider whether the guidance in Appendix 2 is strictly necessary. From a study of other Local Plans in Hertfordshire and the Home Counties, it is clear that the above approach is the norm. In a sensitive topic area such as Green Belt, consistency of interpretation and delivery in Local Plans is paramount. It is important to remember that the Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt its primary purpose is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, which is London. That is why consistency across the region is essential. In the context of the South West Hertfordshire sub-region, it is essential that Three Rivers should take full account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities, to secure a strategic and consistent approach. It must be remembered that an essential characteristic of the Green Belt is its permanence and there is a growing inconsistency between public statements by ministers and others, and the interpretation of planning policy as stated in the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance. The only basis for alteration of Green Belt boundaries should be clear evidence that there is no reasonable alternative and this has not been provided. The NPPF permits councils to apply planning policy relating to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All residents want to protect the Green Belt; • Only releasing Green Belt Land due to inflated housing numbers; • Paragraph 8.10 of the supporting text, that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option; • Only basis for alteration of Green Belt boundaries should be clear evidence that there is no reasonable alternative and this has not been provided. 	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”.	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			the prevention of inappropriate development in designated protected areas such as Green Belt and AONB, notwithstanding the objective assessment of housing need. With such a high proportion of Green Belt as a key characteristic of the District, it is entirely inappropriate to promote housing development in designated protected areas.			
P1_001 51		No	Some large areas of Green belt land have been identified for housing development, especially on the borders of Rickmansworth, Maple Cross, and Abbot's Langley. I think the council should challenge the housing need projections and seek to develop further within already existing developments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large areas have been identified only due to inflated housing numbers 	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".	No action
P1_001 54		Not Stated	<p>In previous responses to consultations on the Local Plan, the Associations have confirmed their unwavering support for the Green Belt and its protection and enhancement. Successive Government Ministers have pledged their support for it, but at the same time preside over its removal for housing developments. The dilemma has been highlighted in a recent report from the Council to Protect Rural England (CPRE) <i>The Green Belt is under greater threat than ever before</i> (February 2021). In line with the report's findings and recommendations, the Associations call on Three Rivers District Council to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers (see answer to Question 1).</p> <p>32. Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF 2021, and has been a key element of planning legislation since 1955. Accordingly, the Associations do not see the need for duplicating the NPPF policies in the Local Plan. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. In the view of the Associations, this would lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy. Accordingly, the Council is urged to delete paragraphs (5) to (11) of the Policy Option, and to retain paragraphs (1) to (4), with a clear cross-reference to the NPPF. Although the Council states, in paragraph 8.10 of the supporting text, that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option. The Council should also consider whether the guidance in Appendix 2 is strictly necessary.</p> <p>33. From a study of other Local Plans in Hertfordshire and the Home Counties, it is clear that the above approach is the norm. In a sensitive topic area such as Green Belt, consistency of interpretation and delivery in Local Plans is paramount. It is important to remember that the Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt – its primary purpose is to "check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas", which is London. That is why consistency across the region is essential. In the context of the South West Hertfordshire sub-region, it is essential that Three Rivers should take full account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities, to secure a strategic and consistent approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All residents want to protect the Green Belt; Only releasing Green Belt Land due to inflated housing numbers; Paragraph 8.10 of the supporting text, that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option; Only basis for alteration of Green Belt boundaries should be clear evidence that there is no reasonable alternative and this has not been provided. Essential that Three Rivers should take full account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities, to secure a strategic and consistent approach. 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_001 55		Yes	I support the re-use of buildings and redevelopment of existing buildings within the same footprint when in the Greenbelt. I agree that building permission on greenbelt land should only be given in exceptional circumstances, once a field has houses on it, it will never be a field again. We need to consider how we are shaping and impacting the landscape for future generations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Green Belt should only be developed in exceptional circumstances. 	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".	No action
P1_001 57		No	The Green Belt is hugely important, both for recreation and for residents' wellbeing, something that has been strongly emphasised during the pandemic. It was created to restrict the spread of built-up areas; if it's allowed to be built-on or developed in other ways, there will be no definition between one town and/or village and another. The places that residents have come to cherish will be gone forever. Three Rivers should take account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to enable South West Herts. To be consistent in its approach to this matter.	<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".	No action
P1_001 60		Not Stated	At paragraph 8.1, the plan sets out the national policy and the fundamental aim of the Green Belt. It states "Great importance is attached to the Green Belt in Three Rivers, and as highlighted by the National planning Policy Framework (NPPF), established Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances and only when a Local Plan is being prepared or reviewed". As a result of using out of date data in preparing the draft plan, the CPRE report presented to TRDC states that 80% of the new dwellings will fall within the Green Belt. This is appalling and does not conform remotely to the sentiments expressed above by the Council. 1) Three Rivers is fairly unique in having 76% of land designated as Green Belt. Green Belt is the inheritance for future generations and should be preserved at all costs. Housing requirements must be re-calculated using the most up to date figures in order to save the Green Belt. 2) Three Rivers is comprised of many small villages and settlements. The Green Belt allows these areas to keep their identity and prevents urban sprawl. The integrity of this principle must be maintained. 3) The CPRE report presented to TRDC stated that contrary to Council opinion, the supply of previously developed land (pdl) is continually increasing not falling. Covid 19 has set in place trends which may never be completely reversed. More people are working from home. High streets are changing and many more commercial properties are becoming vacant. This pdl is therefore ripe for conversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing requirements need to be recalculated based on most up to date figure; Loss of Green Belt will lead to more coalescence of towns and villages; Supply of Brownfield land is increasing not decreasing in report provided by CPRE. Most people are working from home and commercial properties are now available. 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			and would ease the demand for any development within the Green Belt.			
P1_001_61		Not Stated	Pages 3-42 discuss the Green Belt Review and not the policies contained in the Local Plan. Pages 44-58 focus on focuses on Bedmond Village Inset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to Green Belt Review and Bedmond Village 	Noted – See Part 2 Responses for response to specific sites.	No action
P1_001_62_		Yes	This seems a sensible approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action
P1_001_63		Yes	It is so vital to protect the Green Belt for the reasons you give. It should only be encroached on where absolutely necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	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".	No action
P1_001_64		Yes	My only caveat, as chair of governors of a primary school within the green belt is that it has become very difficult to get permission for additional school buildings. I have not heard any proposals for new Primaries to house the increasing numbers of children who are likely to live in the TRDC area, so presumably existing schools will need to expand. Even without new classrooms, there is the need for more one to one or small group teaching space as we now have 8 children in 210 who need individual support away from their classrooms - add in advisors coming to assess them, or to meet with the SENCO (Special Needs Coordinator) - Some additional building on a green belt site will be needed if the school is to function effectively. Does para 8 preclude this? It appears to me to do so.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School in Green Belt has been difficult to expand; See no proposals from TRDC to expand primary school provision in the area; Some additional building on a green belt site will be needed if school is to function effectively. Does para 8 preclude this? It appears to do so. 	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".	No action
P1_001_66		No	You should not be building on Green belt land at all. The proposed development of 300+ houses near Woodside Road for example would mean the irreversible loss of valuable countryside and green space. The proposed site is a sanctuary for horses, plants/wildflowers, protected trees, hedgerows, wildlife and people. The public paths through the fields are used daily by individuals, cyclists, families, joggers and dog walkers for exercise, recreation and peaceful appreciation of the countryside. The site is used by nurseries, schools and care home residents as a recreational, therapeutic and educational space. Current infrastructure is insufficient to support further house building of this scale. Local services are already stretched for existing residents. The fields hold a memorial site for RAF servicemen. A development of this scale will cause mass road congestion. The area will not cope with the increased traffic. Quality of life for local people will decrease. The recent COVID 19 pandemic has evidenced the need for green spaces such as this to support physical and mental health and well-being, particularly given the massive increase in remote/home-working which is likely to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No development in Green Belt; Proposed 300+ homes near Woodside road would mean irreversible loss of valuable countryside and green space; Current infrastructure is insufficient to support further house building; Quality of life will decrease; Green spaces are needed more as a result of the recent pandemic; Proposed development is directly opposite to climate change emergency that TRDC declared. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			largely remain going forward, and the need for people to use local facilities, services and green spaces on a far greater scale. The local community wish to strongly retain its village identity in a semi-rural setting. Three Rivers District Councils declared a climate emergency in April 2021. This proposed development is in direct opposition to the Three Rivers District Councils Climate Emergency & Sustainability Strategy * stated aims.		account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release”.	
P1_001 67		Not Stated	I find TRDC's policies here totally astonishing. It seems intent on destroying the northern part of the Colne Valley park, which is an important local amenity – not only for TRD residents but for residents of the west side of London.	<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”.	No action
P1_001 68		No	The protections for the Green Belt are much too weak. e.g. "approval will not be given for new buildings other than those specified in national policy" - this surrenders the issue to national policy - wholly inappropriate for this council to do this. "a general presumption against inappropriate development that would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt or which would conflict with the purposes of including land within it" - opaque and self-reflexive wording We have plenty of brownfield sites across the Council's area - why is there no firm statement that these must be developed first?e.g. why are we considering the proposals involving tarmac on fields (CFS18b, etc) whilst the sites on brownfield land (eg CFS16) have not been fully exploited?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear statement that all brownfield options must be exhausted first. Protections for Green Belt are too weak; 	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”.	No action
P1_001 70		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 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recent application Lower Green Street should be resurrect; Is a ploughed field, should not be called an AONB. 	Noted. Planning applications lie outside this consultation.	No action
P1_001 72		Yes	We must protect the Green Belt at all costs.	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 74	No	<p>Has the need for housing been considered against the effects that both the coronavirus pandemic and BREXIT have had on the population (i.e. potentially meaning there are now fewer people residing in the District now)? The Government housing targets are based on out-of-date forecasts from 2014, when there are more timely datasets from 2018 (and even upcoming data from 2020) that could be utilised which would reduce housing targets in the District and preserve our precious Green Belt and the wildlife dependent on it for survival. Allowing unrestricted development on Greenbelt which is detrimental to local biodiversity already in decline, and the fight against the climate crisis fundamentally contradicts the Councils declaration of a climate emergency and talk of an ecological emergency in its Climate Emergency and Sustainability Strategy. It is also inconsistent to act on the latest science and statistics on issues like climate change, but then accept outdated and unreliable data to inform major policies such as the Local Plan. The Council should challenge the Governments Standard Method more robustly, considering the constraints of the District (being mainly Green Belt), and use up-to-date data to calculate the actual housing requirements. Also: If it cannot be avoided, removing land from Green Belt should be accompanied by a mandatory carbon offsetting and biodiversity net-gain requirement (regardless of when the Environment Bill officially becomes law). In 8.8, What is long term referring to does this mean remaining Green Belt will be protected from development until the next Local Plan is created, or for the next 50, 100+ years? The remaining Green Belt needs to be protected in perpetuity to preserve the wildlife habitat, space for recreation and amenity, and the landscape value which makes the District what it is. Regarding Part 4 of PPO 16, Enhancement of biodiversity should be more than encouraged on Green Belt that is released for development. This wording is very weak and it will be ignored by developers unless it is insisted upon. Indeed, developers will be required to demonstrate a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain, with the emerging Environment Bill - this should be recognised more robustly in the Local Plan.</p> <p>80% of the 8,973 additional houses identified as being necessary are allocated to Green Belt sites. A core characteristic of the Green Belt is its permanence, and it should be regarded as a principal constraint to development and a major asset for the District to be protected and enhanced indefinitely. Paragraph 11, footnote 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) supports this; allowing local planning authorities to restrict the scale of development due to planning constraints including protection of Green Belt and AONB. The cumulative impact of the proposed developments when considered alongside other threats to biodiversity (of which there are many), will exacerbate the risks to local wildlife and their habitats, making the development plans unsustainable in the long-term.</p> <p>Our countryside is precious and finite and urgently needs safeguarding in the face of the climate and nature emergencies. Ensuring land is not lost to development unnecessarily is a critical part of this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not consider the effects of Coronavirus and Brexit; Government targets are based on out of date; Allowing unrestricted development whilst fighting climate change is contradictory; Council should challenge methodology more robustly; If Green Belt release unavoidable then needs mandatory carbon off-setting; Enhancement of biodiversity should be more than encouraged on Green Belt that is released for development; Wording is very weak and will be ignored by developers. 	<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>	No action	
P1_001 76	No	<p>We should not be redrawing Green Belt boundaries. Green Belt must be protected. Redrawing lines is unacceptable. It makes the Green belt further away and difficult to reach for residents when outside space and exercise is so important to wellbeing, particularly witnessed during this pandemic.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not redraw Green Belt boundaries, as makes Green belt further away and more difficult to access. 	<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</p>	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			Destroying Green Belt reduces biodiversity and wildlife. Where will it stop? We need to look at other ways of creating housing e.g. better use of brownfield sites, reclaiming unlive in properties etc.		(2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_001 77	No	Protecting Green Belt should be non-negotiable. You shouldn't just be able to redraw the lines. This is unacceptable. It means valuable space that is essential to people's wellbeing will be lost. Wellbeing of residents is one of TRDC's Corporate Framework 2020-23 policies. It means decrease in nature and biodiversity. With the climate change crisis, we should be doing everything we can to prevent this becoming worse. It is an international obligation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting Green Belt is non-negotiable. Will lead to loss of biodiversity and loss of Green Belt not in conformity with Climate Change. 		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".	No action
?		<p>Whilst the Preferred Policy Option essentially repeats national Green Belt policy, it fails to recognise the large areas that are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt to allow for housing and infrastructure development. The Green Belt section needs to recognise this and clarify the process that has been undertaken to identify allocated sites. The sites should be listed in the policy for clarity and an explanation given as to why the Council considers that exceptional circumstances exist for taking these sites out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Given the uncertainty as to how Green Belt will be considered in the national housing numbers calculations, it seems premature to accept such a high level of housing in the Green Belt at the current time. Areas in and around the Chilterns are under such high pressure for development. The Government's housing numbers algorithm has increased this pressure at the expense of reducing housing development in the north. We are pleased that the Council has removed the sites at Abbots Langley and Croxley Green from the version of the Plan that was considered by the Council. Our view is that the Council should consider further reductions in housing numbers in the Green Belt, and particularly some of the larger sites proposed for development. Our detailed comments on these sites are below.</p> <p>Where land is to be taken out of the Green Belt, the Council should consider whether there is scope to create new areas of Green Belt as compensation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy fails to recognise large areas that are proposed to be removed. Allocated Green Belt sites should be listed in this policy; Premature to release land from Green Belt due to potential change in housing numbers; Pleased sites at Abbots Langley and Croxley Green have been removed from the Plan. 		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".	No action
P1_001 83	Yes	SAVE OUR GREENBELT	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					(2020). The draft Housing Density policy also promotes a significant uplift in the density of development in the District, and in all cases, proposals will need to make efficient and effective use of land. However, even with these actions, there is insufficient capacity to meet the growth levels required by the Standard Method within the District's existing urban area. The Council therefore has no alternative but to release a small portion of the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs. Should all the sites in the Regulation 18 consultation be allocated, the Green Belt release that would be required would represent approximately only 4% of the total Green Belt in Three Rivers. Furthermore, the Stage 1 and 2 Green Belt Reviews, alongside other environmental and sustainability considerations, have been taken into account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release".	
P1_001 84	No	The Green Belt within Croxley Green and in the surrounding areas is one of the key features of the settlement and highly valued by most residents. The whole point of the Green Belt is that it is intended to be an enduring feature. Otherwise, the whole character of a place like Croxley Green will be totally changed. The NPPF polices on Green belt are clear and substantial so there is no need to change these. TRDC should stick to the clear policies in the NPPF and not change the designation of any land within the Green Belt, except in extreme cases or where slight amendment of the boundaries is locally acceptable and does not damage the integrity of the Green Belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not release Green Belt Land unless under extreme cases; Only amend boundaries where slight amendment of the boundary are allowed. 	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".	No action	
P1_001 85	No	TRDC claims to recognise the great importance of the Green Belt to communities and yet among the in14 areas listed in the Local Plan, Carpenders Park would be the second area after Abbots Langley & Leavesden to have the largest number of new dwellings (1,499), of which 1,431 would be built on the Green Belt. This would destroy the present desirable buffers with Harrow London Borough Council, Hertsmere Borough Council and Watford Borough Council land. In addition, unless stopped, by 2038 Carpenders Park residents would have lost forever the great benefits of having access to the Green Belt around them. Carpenders Park is one of the five wards within Watford Rural Parish and Rural is within that name for a sound reason. Please do not destroy that concept and recognise that TRDC has a responsibility to stand as custodian of the Green Belt for the benefit of present and future generations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carpenders Park would be second area to have largest number of new homes (1,431) built on the Green Belt. Would destroy present desirable buffers with other authorities. 	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".	No action	
P1_001 86	No	Green belt is vital to retain for future generations	<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	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 87		No	The Green Belt within Croxley Green and in the surrounding areas is one of the key features of the settlement and highly valued by most residents. The whole point of the Green Belt is that it is intended to be an enduring feature. Otherwise, the whole character of a place like Croxley Green will be totally changed. The NPPF policies on Green belt are clear and substantial so there is no need to change these. TRDC should stick to the clear policies in the NPPF and not change the designation of any land within the Green Belt, except in extreme cases or where slight amendment of the boundaries is locally acceptable and does not damage the integrity of the Green Belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not release Green Belt Land unless under extreme cases; Only amend boundaries where slight amendment of the boundary are allowed. 	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".	No action
P1_001 88		No	The proposed Policies in the Local Plan. I fully share her concerns that TRDC is failing to protect Green Belt by planning for more houses than are needed.	<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".	No action
P1_001 90		No	Green Belt must be fully respected	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 91		No	I want to see TRDC uphold the full principles of the green belt policy in the London Metropolitan area. This means NO development on the green belt. TRDC should resist the housing numbers suggested by the Standard method – see response to Q1	<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".	No action
P1_001 96		No	We want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers (as per Q.1 response) especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, which is London. We want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to uphold Green Belt Policy and resist inflated housing number on the Green Belt. 	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".	No action
P1_001 97		No	In relation to Point 3: we note TRDC has decided not to comply with the Governments Standard Method for calculating housing need (by initially planning for a figure that is 1,700 dwellings below the Government target). Whilst we support this approach we believe TRDC has not gone far enough and that the housing requirement should be reduced considerably a) in accordance with more up to date Office of National Statistics data and b) because, as recently as May 2021, the Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government stated that: "Local Housing Need is simply a measure of need and we recognise not everywhere will be able to meet their housing need in full - for example, where available land is constrained due to Green Belt and an area therefore has to plan for fewer homes. Three Rivers is a district of which 76% is Green Belt. This considerable constraint has to be factored into any algorithm calculating Local Housing need before reference is made to any review of the quality of Three Rivers Green Belt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC have not gone far enough to challenge the housing numbers; Green Belt has to be factored into any algorithm calculating Local Housing need before reference is made to any review of the quality of Three Rivers Green Belt. 	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".	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_001 98		Not Specified	We consider it essential to protect the Green Belt. A necessity for everyone's health and recreation. Also the protection of wild life and flora.	<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".	No action
P1_002 00		No	<p>In our view, TRDC's Local Plan Consultation fails on the basis of soundness.</p> <p>The evidence base, particularly the Green Belt assessment, the sustainability assessment and the landscape appraisal, do not justify the site allocations. In most cases the evidence base actually recommends not allocating the proposed sites within the Colne Valley Regional Park. As a consequence, the golden thread that ought to run from the evidence base to the site allocations is deeply compromised. The need to maintain the openness of the Green Belt ensuring it provides a natural environment resource for the long term has been given inadequate weight in this emerging Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Metropolitan Green Belt extends many miles beyond London's built-up area, that 'inner' part right on the edge becomes a more critical buffer and plays a vital natural environment role for communities – a rationale that led to the establishment of the Regional Park in the first place.</p> <p>The Plan fails to include a policy to compensate for the loss of Green Belt in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>There is therefore insufficient justification for removing the site allocations within the CVRP from the Green Belt. We regard the amount of land lost from the Green Belt to be excessive and believe it will harm its openness and have an adverse impact on landscape, views and biodiversity. There will also be problems with excessive noise, light pollution and worsened air quality from the motorway. Local roads in Maple Cross will not be able to cope with the additional traffic, and this will inevitably lead to pressure to urbanise these roads, further undermining the rural character of the locality. Many of these are single track, with no lighting or pavements.</p> <p>The proposed sites for 1,500 new homes are not in a sustainable location, being distant from public transport hubs and services. It is likely that due to the lack of public transport most of the new residents will have to use their cars.</p> <p>Lynsters Farm in Maple Cross is proposed for warehouse development. Again, this is a totally unsuitable use for this sensitive site involving loss of agriculture, proximity to a heritage asset – the listed farmhouse, a local nature reserve at Maple Lodge immediately to the north of the site, and the adjacent lake. The site is also prone to flooding. In addition the sites located within the Colne Valley Regional Park (CVRP) namely Batchworth Park and Maple Cross, will involve the removal of undeveloped land from both the Park and the Green Belt, a step that would be seriously detrimental to the rural environment, and negatively</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan fails on soundness; Plan fails to include a policy to compensate for the loss of Green Belt in line with the NPPF. Lynsters Farm in Maple Cross is proposed for warehouse development. Again, this is a totally unsuitable use for this sensitive site involving loss of agriculture, proximity to a heritage asset – the listed farmhouse, a local nature reserve at Maple Lodge immediately to the north of the site, and the adjacent lake. The site is also prone to flooding; Little acknowledgement of Colne Valley Regional Park; Council appears to have failed in its duty to co-operate as the SW Herts Strategic Plan is still in progress; Assessment indicates that the proposed Green Belt sites should not be released as they still perform strongly in terms of the stated NPPF purposes. The sites around Maple Cross make a significant contribution to those purposes; Housing figures are too high and not based on latest information; No reference to use of Brownfield sites; Vision and objectives are too vague; is no mention of loss of agricultural land or viability issues; Duty to co-operate: Documents refer to consultation, but no neighbouring authorities have offered to help. No evidence put forward to justify, yet TRDC a number of local planning authorities in SW Herts that are preparing strategic planning documents in early stages of preparation. 	Noted – See Part 2 Responses for response to specific sites.	Comments based on Sites at Maple Cross (1,500 homes and warehousing) and Batchworth, have the biggest impact in terms of CVRP, landscape and Green Belt purposes.

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

		<p>affecting the six objectives (see above) that are so important to the continued success of the Park. We are both surprised and disappointed to note there is little acknowledgement of the CVRP in the Plan, and the role it is there to play, even though it makes up a significant proportion of the southern part of the District. Other planning authorities have included a dedicated policy which protects the Park from unsuitable development and seeks its improvement as a 'natural' landscape.</p> <p>Although there is a presumption for sustainable development, Maple Cross is not the most sustainable of locations due to its isolation from a town centre, its lack of shopping facilities, poor public transport, and unsuitable rural road network. The SA – see below – confirms this. Although it is recognised that development of the scale proposed is intended to improve the sustainability of the existing settlement, the loss of Green Belt and the detrimental impact on the local environment militates against any such gain.</p> <p>Removing so much land from the Green Belt, which performs strongly against the five purposes set out in the NPPF, do not meet the exceptional circumstances required for removal.</p> <p>The Council is not required to deliver its entire housing need if there are exceptional circumstances, such as the 76% of Green Belt land in the District, and until all avenues including intensifying the use of existing town centres and the change of use of existing commercial developments have been explored.</p> <p><i>Paras 141 of the NPPF states:</i> <i>Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes, the strategic policy making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development.</i></p> <p><i>a) Makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield and underutilised land;</i></p> <p><i>b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and</i></p> <p><i>c) and has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development through the statement of common ground.</i></p> <p>The Council appears to have failed in its duty to co-operate as the SW Herts Strategic Plan is still in progress. This document will be able to look at Green Belt removal, if justified, at a sub-regional scale, as well as delivering housing in the most sustainable locations.</p> <p>Green Belt Assessment</p> <p>The Council must assess the Green Belt to see if it meets the five purposes set out in the NPPF, and only release land that does not meet those objectives.</p> <p>This work has been carried out but has not apparently been used to influence site allocations. This map clearly shows that most of the land proposed for release still meets the NPPF purposes.</p> <p>The maps attached show parcels of land categorised. The sites proposed for release all fall into the moderate, moderate high or high category. This indicates that they should not be released. The land surrounding Maple Cross is considered as providing a significant contribution to Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Maple Cross is an unsustainable location not well served by public transport – see para138 of NPPF.</p> <p>If land is removed from the Green Belt the NPPF states that compensatory measures should be applied. This important point appears to have been omitted from the plan, thus making it unlawful in terms of compliance with Government policy.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

		<p>These paragraphs in the 2021 NPPF are relevant: Para 141 <i>When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Strategic policy-making authorities should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport. They should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.</i> Para 143 <i>f) define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.</i> Para 145 <i>Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.</i> The assessment below indicates that the proposed Green Belt sites should not be released as they still perform strongly in terms of the stated NPPF purposes. The sites around Maple Cross make a significant contribution to those purposes.</p> <p>The housing need calculations are too high and are not based on the latest information. The Government, however, is still in flux as to how to determine housing numbers at a local level. Therefore, TRDC should push back at having to deliver such high numbers based on the large amount of Green Belt in the District, and other sensitive environmental indicators.</p> <p>It is recognised the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing supply. The Local Housing Needs Assessment is for 624 dwellings per year. Most of the need is for small dwellings – either flats or small houses, especially affordable housing. Specialist accommodation for the elderly is also needed as the population ages. This indicates that new housing should be provided in town centres and sustainable locations.</p> <p>Climate change issues have not been sufficiently explored, despite water scarcity being highlighted as an issue. Ground water protection zones are proposed for development threatening the land's ability to absorb rainwater, and that in turn could affect water quality from pollution.</p> <p>We see no evidence that the use of brownfield sites – particularly retail and vacant employment sites – has been adequately explored. In the post pandemic world demand for much commercial space will change significantly. Further study work to identify potential capacity for housing is needed before the Plan is finalised.</p> <p>There is no mention of loss of agricultural land or viability issues if farm holdings are broken up. Agriculture is especially vulnerable in the rural urban fringe, with increased urban threats such as fly-tipping and uncontrolled dogs worrying livestock.</p> <p>The Vision and Objectives in the plan are vague and focus primarily on housing delivery and employment. Strategic release of the Green Belt is mentioned but should also include reference to the GB as a strategically important designation that should be protected.</p> <p>Provision of a network of green infrastructure is proposed, but no details are provided on specifically maintaining and enhancing the natural environment or improving access to</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			<p>the countryside and recreational facilities. No mention is made of the Aquadrome or the network of blue infrastructure. Or the CVRP. These are all fundamental features that shape the character of the area.</p> <p>The Community Strategy makes no mention of the GB as a strategic issue.</p> <p>Specific policies on promoting and enhancing green infrastructure network are vague in terms of delivery: i.e. new development should contribute towards green and blue infrastructure. How, precisely, would this be achieved? Duty to co-operate – the documents refer to consultation, but no neighbouring authorities have offered to help. No evidence is put forward to justify this, yet TRDC is one of a number of local planning authorities in SW Herts that are preparing strategic planning documents in the early stages of preparation. Perhaps it should wait.</p> <p>The documents do not comply with the requirements of the NPPF in terms of releasing Green Belt. There are only vague promises about encouraging compensatory improvements, and most sites are in areas where there is poor public transport provision. In Maple Cross and Mill End, the land proposed is close to the M25 giving rise to air pollution, noise and lighting concerns. Placing housing on valley slopes gives rise to negative impact on views and landscape concerns.</p> <p>Impact on the Colne Valley Regional Park</p> <p>Sites at Maple Cross (1,500 homes and warehousing) and Batchworth, have the biggest impact in terms of CVRP, landscape and Green Belt purposes. Our comments are therefore based on these sites.</p> <p>The Sustainability Assessment is supposed to guide and influence the production of the Plan. The quotes from the document below indicate that this is not the case.</p>		
P1_002 01	No	Should not be building on green belt land at all as it is a slippery slope towards more development - I live in a village and want it kept that way	<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".	No action
P1_002 02	No	I am strongly opposed to any building on the green belt. The arguments against your plan have been expressed by others and I agree with them	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_002_03		Not Specified	The need for outdoor recreation and green spaces has become increasingly apparent in the last few years. The Green Belt is irreplaceable and awful examples of American style ribbon development, joining up once separate villages, in places such as Aylesbury demonstrate the damaging effect on the environment, infrastructure and ability to access green areas. The need to protect the mental health of the population has never been greater and the wilful destruction of green areas will lead to further deterioration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a need for outdoor recreation and green spaces in the area; Green Belt is irreplaceable; bad examples of American style ribbon development, joining up once separate villages, (such as Aylesbury) show the damaging effect on the environment, infrastructure and ability to access green areas. 	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".	No action
P1_002_04		Yes	The Green Belt areas of land within the Three Rivers Council provide essential leisure and recreation opportunities for local residents in a healthy open-air environment. The recent lockdown restrictions have only emphasised the need for leisure access to open outdoor areas as an essential aspect of healthy living. If these areas are ever lost they will never be reinstated, to the permanent detriment of all residents, both now and in the future	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to retain Green Belt for leisure and recreation purposes, especially in light of pandemic. 	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".	No action
P1_002_05		No	9) the 5metre limit should be altered to within the site - many existing buildings within the green belt are located in sites more than 5metres from the boundary. Condition c) should not be limited to dormer windows but expanded to include other features normally associated with use as a dwelling for example toilets and bathrooms and extensive glass patio doors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5m limit should be altered to within the site, many existing buildings within green belt are located in sites more than 5m from the boundary. 	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".	No action
P1_002_06		No	No changes to our already declining green belt.	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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".	
P1_002 09	No	I cannot understand how the proposal meet 'the fundamental aim of the Green Belt' as listed above. It seems to achieve the antithesis of the fundamental aim. Harrow will start to merge with Bushy/Watford if almost the entire expanse of land is developed as proposed around Carpenders Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not meet fundamental aim of the Green Belt as will lead to coalescence of settlements. 	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".	No action	
P1_002 11	No	There should be a presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legal covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet agricultural and forestry needs, but not allow to be converted to residential. 	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".	No action	
P1_002 12	No	You say no Green Belt development unless very special circumstances. You need to define what you mean by this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to define what the 'special circumstances' are 	Noted. The NPPF defines exceptional circumstances.	No action	
P1_002 13	Yes	No further comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action	
P1_002 15	No	The point of a green belt is correct. However if you keep taking bits of it, its no longer there. It should be an immovable thing otherwise we end up with a green string. Fight for its protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land and fight for its protection. 	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	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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".	
P1_002 18		No	No - as 76% of Three Rivers is Green belt, then the opportunity to change the use of existing buildings to become housing should be welcomed to preserve the open space that the green belt provides, as agricultural, social, ecological and community assets. This sense of, and experience of landscape is a key component of the area. National guidance about green belt land should be followed the phrasing here suggests a more relaxed approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land; Should be given opportunity to change use of existing buildings to become housing. 	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".	No action
P1_002 19		No	There should be no reconsideration of the existing Green Belt area. The Green Belt is there to protect bio-diversity and climate change, to reduce this will be adding to the existing catastrophe that we are experiencing.	<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".	No action
P1_002 20		Not Stated	1. In previous responses to consultations on the Local Plan, the Associations have confirmed their unwavering support for the Green Belt and its protection and enhancement. Successive Government Ministers have pledged their support for it, but at the same time preside over its removal for housing developments. The dilemma has been highlighted in a recent report from the Council to Protect Rural England (CPRE) <i>The Green Belt is under greater threat than ever before</i> (February	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uphold Green Belt policy; Do not duplicate NPPF policies in the Local Plan; In paragraph 8.10 it states that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option. Query whether the guidance in Appendix 2 is strictly necessary. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			<p>2021). In line with the report's findings and recommendations, the Associations call on Three Rivers District Council to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers (see answer to Question 1).</p> <p>2. Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF 2021, and has been a key element of planning legislation since 1955. Accordingly, the Associations do not see the need for duplicating the NPPF policies in the Local Plan. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. In the view of the Associations, this would lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy. Accordingly, the Council is urged to delete paragraphs (5) to (11) of the Policy Option, and to retain paragraphs (1) to (4), with a clear cross-reference to the NPPF. Although the Council states, in paragraph 8.10 of the supporting text, that relying on the NPPF was considered, no clear reasons are given for rejecting that option. The Council should also consider whether the guidance in Appendix 2 is strictly necessary.</p> <p>3. From a study of other Local Plans in Hertfordshire and the Home Counties, it is clear that the above approach is the norm. In a sensitive topic area such as Green Belt, consistency of interpretation and delivery in Local Plans is paramount. It is important to remember that the Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt – its primary purpose is to “check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”, which is London. That is why consistency across the region is essential. In the context of the South West Hertfordshire sub-region, it is essential that Three Rivers should take full account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities, to secure a strategic and consistent approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Important to remember that the Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt – its primary purpose is to “check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas”, which is London. 	<p>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>	
P1_002 21		Not stated	<p>TRDC must uphold Green Belt policies and to resist inflated housing numbers to check on the unrestrained sprawl of large built-up areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uphold Green Belt Policies and resist inflated housing numbers to prevent urban sprawl into the 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>	No action
P1_002 22		No	<p>Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. This would lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy. The PPOs need to take appropriate account of the significance of designated protected countryside such as the Green Belt and AONB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much of the wording is changed from what is in the NPPF; Need to take account of significance of designated protected countryside such as Green Belt and AONB; Should be a presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet agricultural or forestry needs. 	<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</p>	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			There should be a presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legal covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission.		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_002 23	No	Too much of the greenbelt has been proposed for housing. Challenging the Government's housing figures. All Local Authorities should get together and question the amount of development it is being told to provide. The figures given do not take into account the areas ability to build without using up valuable greenbelt.	Challenge the Government's housing figures.		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".	No action
P1_002 24	No	Government targets are too aggressive. We need green belt to breathe! I believe we are going too far in destroying the green belt. Once gone it is gone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government targets are too aggressive. Need Green Belt. 		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".	No action
P1_002 26	Yes	I agree with this statement. I just don't understand why you have identified sites in the Green belt for development that include areas where there is flood risk, where it threatens local wildlife sites, where it will contribute to urban sprawl and where it will contribute to pollution and poor air quality.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with statement but query why sites at risk of flooding have been identified in the Green Belt 		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,	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_002 27		No	The whole point of the Green Belt is that it is intended to be an enduring feature. Otherwise, the whole character of a district like Three Rivers will be totally changed. There should be a presumption in favour of only using temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to demolish and remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legally enforceable covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Character will change if Green Belt developed; Should be a presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet agricultural or forestry needs 	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".	No action
P1_002 29		No	The vision for our District including Croxley Green. The head of the TRDC planning dept has been quoted as saying that she has "no vision for the future of our district". And now we are being consulted on a plan that, in its present state, will see over 80% of any new development will have to be on our Green Belt. She wasn't lying when she said she had no vision. We deserve better! I DO have a vision if 80% plus of our Green Belt is destroyed and it's not pretty. I believe all Green Belt is sacrosanct. Existing Government policy protects Green Belt from development except in very special circumstances. But guidance from Government to build build build is contrary to protecting Green Belt and councillors and officers are at best confused, or at worse too lazy or scared to fight against housing targets which will destroy our green district. With respect to consultation on development, if it is on green belt I am against it.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of TRDC Planning said there was no vision for the future, with 80% of development on Green Belt this statement is true; Guidance from government is confusing, protect Green Belt but also build many homes. 	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".	No action
P1_002 30		Not Stated	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Council needs to strongly support our Green Belt and reject the outdated housing numbers which threaten the destruction of our Green Belt sites. The protection of the Green Belt should be a strategic objective of the Local Plan. It is a permanent characteristic of the District and a planning constraint. Our Green Belt should not be destroyed by development. The Green Belt is a major asset for the District which needs to be acknowledged and valued. It contains valued and valuable landscapes for people and wildlife which need to be conserved now and for future generations. The Green Belt needs to be promoted for the health and wellbeing benefits of residents and visitors which was so critical and evident during the Pandemic. Given the importance of the Green Belt in our District in preventing urban sprawl between London and Three Rivers, the very high value which residents place on it as well as its critical importance for wildlife, the protection of the Green Belt should be added to the Vision and be a strategic objective of the Local Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject the housing numbers which threaten destruction of Green Belt sites; Protection of Green Belt should be a strategic objective; Green Belt prevents urban sprawl around London; Council should not remove Bedmond for the Green Belt; Will attract development between Abbots Langley and Hemel Hempstead; Council needs to take full account of Green Belt reviews in neighbouring local authorities to ensure a consistent approach across an area. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			<p>4. The place of the countryside and rural life is a critical part of the distinct character of Bedmond and needs to be protected. Green Belt is permanent. The Council has proposed to inset Bedmond from the Green Belt in Question 77 of the Part 2 Sites Allocation document which will only attract more development which is harmful to the unique character of our Village which also protects the open space between Abbots Langley and Hemel Hempstead.</p> <p>5. The Council needs to take full account of Green Belt reviews in neighbouring local authorities to ensure a consistent approach across an area. Bedmond is divided between Three Rivers and St Albans District Councils. It is also close to Dacorum Borough Council.</p>		account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release”.	
P1_002 32	No	<p>Current Government policy on the Green Belt is set out clearly and comprehensively in the NPPF. Much of the detailed wording in Preferred Policy Option 16 is changed from that which is set out in the NPPF. This would lead to confusion and provide opportunities for unscrupulous developers to circumvent Green Belt policy. The PPOs need to take appropriate account of the significance of designated protected countryside such as the Green Belt and AONB. There should be a presumption in favour of temporary buildings to meet any agricultural or forestry needs and a requirement to remove any such buildings or structures when the original purpose expires. There should be a prohibition on converting such buildings to residential use with a legal covenant as well as conditions attached to any planning permission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of the wording is changed from what is in the NPPF; • Need to take account of significance of designated protected countryside such as Green Belt and AONB; 	<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>	No action	
P1_002 33	No	<p>I don’t agree with the Preferred Policy Option for Green Belt is the right approach. Green belt boundaries should not be arbitrarily altered to conform to government imposed local housing targets. The local plan should be utilised as a means of preserving and enhancing our existing greenbelt. The council should not use a local plan as an opportunity to amend any boundaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should not be released just to meet Green Belt targets. Local plan should conserve Green Belt not use as opportunity to amend boundaries. 	<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>	No action	
P1_002 34	No	<p>I don’t agree with the Preferred Policy Option for Green Belt is the right approach. Green belt boundaries should not be arbitrarily altered to conform to government imposed local housing targets. The local plan should be utilised as a means of preserving and enhancing our existing greenbelt. The council should not use a local plan as an opportunity to amend any boundaries.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Belt should not be released just to meet Green Belt targets. Local plan should conserve Green Belt not use as opportunity to amend boundaries. 	<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,</p>	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_002 35		Yes	protect the green belt at all costs	<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".	No action
P1_002 36		No	Once you accept that Green Belt can be used ' in exceptional circumstances' the flood gates will open and we will lose one of the feature of life that keeps us all mentally and physically healthy and preserves our environment. Surely it is necessary to resist the target that cannot be met without doing this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once Green Belt can be used for 'exceptional circumstances' the flood gates will open. 	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".	No action
P1_002 40		No	Green belt land should not be developed.	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release”.	
P1_002 41		Yes	The introduction to this policy confuses what is potentially acceptable development in the Green Belt, on previously developed land, as defined in the NPPF. Development of underutilised land (referred to in your paragraph 8.5) has no place in Green Belt policy. 1.11. Development of previously developed land in the Green Belt relates to the permanent structure and its curtilage as detailed in the NPPF, but it should not be assumed that the whole curtilage should be developed. Where surface structures have blended into the landscape they should not be developed for housing, other than accommodating garden areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of underutilised land has no place in Green Belt Policy; Development of brownfield in Green Belt relates to permanent structure and curtilage as detailed in the NPPF, but it should not be assumed that the whole curtilage should be developed. 	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”.	No action
P1_002 44		Yes	The Green Belt must not be allowed to shrink further.	<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”.	No action
P1_002 50		Yes	Local Plan Regulation 18 (Part 1) Preferred Policy Options Consultation June 2021 These representations are submitted by Iwan Jones, Managing Director of JIG Planning & Development Ltd, on behalf of the landowner of the land to the north of Chalfont Lane, Maple Cross identified as site EOS12.3 within Part 2 of the Local Plan Regulation 18 Sites for Potential Allocation. Three Rivers is a hugely constrained District. 76% of it is designated as Green Belt. The need for housing and employment development together with supporting infrastructure to provide for the growth which is essential to deliver sustainable development and the Governments growth agenda means that the Council has no choice but to release some land within the Green Belt to meet these needs. The Councils hands are tied. It has made every effort to find as much suitable brownfield sites as possible and considered 341 land parcels as part of its Urban Capacity Study August 2020. However, only 20 of these land parcels were considered to be deliverable and developable resulting in a supply of only 200 homes. The Council has also been in discussion with neighbouring authorities to establish whether some of the identified need for development could be accommodated in these areas, however, they are unable to do so. As a consequence of the above, if the Council is to attempt to meet the governments housing targets it will have no choice but to adopt the Preferred Policy Option and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach 	Noted	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			revise Green Belt boundaries to be shown on the Policies Map.			
P1_002 51	No		Too vague, for example, what does "special circumstances" mean.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too vague, unclear what 'special circumstances' mean. 	Noted. The NPPF defines exceptional circumstances.	No action
P1_002 53	Not Stated		Whilst it is noted that the PPO16 follows the required approach set out in national policy within the Framework, additionally we welcome the policy text at part (4) which states that measures to improve public access, and to enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity will be encouraged. 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"> Agree with approach, but policy should go further to acknowledge that weight will be given to these benefits in the decision making exercise. 	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".	No action
P1_002 56	Yes		TRDC should uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, which is London. We want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach. Remove the weasel clause "unless very special circumstances exist" - as this can be distorted to mean meeting the housing target.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. TRDC should resist inflated housing numbers as Green Belt checks unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. Remove the clause "unless very special circumstances exist" 	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".	No action
P1_002 58	Yes		The Green Belt must be protected to prevent urban sprawl and to protect the character of and separation between, nearby settlements.	<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".	No action
P1_002 60	Not Stated		TRDC must uphold Green Belt policy and resist the outdated and inflated housing numbers which are Not mandatory.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uphold Green Belt policy and resist outdated/ inflated housing 	The priority for development is making as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

				numbers which are not mandatory.	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".	
P1_002 62		Yes	Green belt must be protected. Public footpaths must be recorded right of way maintained	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land Public footpaths must be recorded right of way maintained 	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".	No action
P1_002 65		Yes	The proposals for protecting and enhancing existing green and blue infrastructure networks. It is critically important, as indicated in the supporting justification, to create new infrastructure wherever possible, and to improve the potential for public access and recreational provision and policies seem to be compliant with the regional plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with approach. Critically important to create blue and green infrastructure. 	Noted	No action
P1_002 67		No	I strongly disagree with this policy. It is based upon moving the boundaries of the green belt. This in itself is a reprehensible backwards step regarding environmental, ecological, climate-related issues. This is not remotely compatible with your climate change and sustainability policies. Also important is the well-being of residents being able to access green space and natural environment that they have grown up with. Gradually decimating the green belt is not a solution to population increase. It is a terrible example of short-term thinking. More realistic solutions are to fundamentally rebuild existing estates or perhaps to build on the numerous golf courses, which are not accessible to the vast majority of us, but take up as much space as the land you intend to build on. Redefining your definition of the green belt every time you want more land to build on is outrageous.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with approach; Gradually decimating the green belt is not a solution to population increase. A terrible example of short-term thinking; Redefining your definition of the green belt every time you want more land to build on is outrageous. 	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".	No action
P1_002 71		No	Should not change green belt border, need to preserve environment for all	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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".	
P1_002 76l		No	<p>The Three Rivers District is fortunate to have 76% of its land area dedicated to GB. This is an important asset to the District but it also has an obligation to neighbouring Districts and to London as a whole to protect these open spaces for those living now and future generations. Paragraph 11 b) i. of the NPPF (July 2021) states that the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type and distribution in the plan area. This then refers to footnote 7 to the areas to which this policy refers including GB. This then goes on to state in ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.</p> <p>In a Westminster Hall debate on the 15th July 2020 the Rt Hon Christopher Pincher, the Housing Minister, stated: "But the —local housing need—number is not binding and is not an end to the process; it is a beginning point from which local authorities can then identify constraints, if they have them, or opportunities, if they want them, to build fewer or more homes than their target local housing need. The green belt is one example that local authorities can use as a constraint on building".</p> <p>It appears that this LP is ignoring government policy both in the NPPF and ministerial statements to the cost not only of its own inhabitants but to those living in urban areas who need and want to take advantage of nearby countryside. The LP is disappointing in that it has not properly considered the importance of brownfield land. There has been a detailed analysis of the Green Belt land but no similar in-depth analysis of brownfield land. Hence opportunities for regeneration and recycling of land appear to have been ignored. Other Local Authorities with GB have begun to take seriously the recycling of land and are reaping the benefits not only to their urban centres but in saving GB land for residents. There should be a comprehensive brownfield analysis before this LP is accepted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land; Does not consider the importance of the Green Belt Land; Should be a comprehensive brownfield analysis before publishing the Local Plan. 	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".	No action
P1_002 78		No	<p>Green Belt should be untouched. All countries are experiencing severe weather changes and serious flooding, and in line with the Climate emergency upon us many are saying we need to act now. All green belt should be protected before it is too late.</p>	<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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_002 79		No	I want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers (as per Q.1 response) especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to "check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas", which is London. I want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and resist inflated housing numbers. 	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".	No action
P1_002 81		No	You need to preserve all green belt with no excuse or exceptions. The health and climate benefits of green land cannot be underestimated and by looking at getting rid of it you make an absolute mockery of your climate change stance. Why not consider that this area is over populated already with no room or infrastructure for any other dwellings	<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".	No action
P1_002 84		No	I want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers (as per Q.1 response) especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to "check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas", which is London. I want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and resist inflated housing numbers. 	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	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					account when identifying which potential areas of Green Belt Land to release”.	
P1_002 87		No	TRDC should uphold Green Belt policy and to resist the inflated housing numbers, especially as our Green Belt is the London Metropolitan Green Belt and its primary purpose is to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, which is London. We want to see TRDC taking account of Green Belt reviews in adjoining local authorities to secure a strategic and consistent approach.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Want TRDC to uphold Green Belt policy and resist inflated housing numbers. 	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”.	No action
P1_002 91		No	I wish to notify you of my strong objections to the plans to build new homes on green belt land.	<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”.	No action
P1_002 93		No	We object to this policy on the basis of the manner in which sites have been assessed and exceptional circumstances have been identified. We note our site is assessed as part of a larger parcel (reference SW3) in the Part 1 Green Belt Review (August 2017). A finer grain analysis is warranted given the nature of the land here and the existing defensible boundaries and urbanising influences. This has been undertaken as part of the Stage 2 (October 2019) Green Belt Assessment, which considers the site as Maple Cross Parcels MC1 and MC5/RW7 (extract shown at Appendix 5). In terms of impact on contribution to the Green Belt, we make the following comments. Development of the site is described as constituting urban sprawl. However, the site is contained by roads to the north and west, Springwell Lake to the east and woodland to the south; all of which offer barriers to future expansion and therefore permanent defensible Green Belt boundaries. As a result, we do not consider development of the site would result in unrestricted sprawl. Purpose 2 sets out that development of the site would have a moderate effect on neighbouring towns merging. The assessment states that “the perception of development in this area as narrowing the gap between Rickmansworth and Chalfont St Peter / Gerrards Cross would be more limited”. We therefore consider this should be a minor impact. The A412 will prevent Maple Cross from coalescing with the south of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object on basis of methodology of site assessments; Object to inclusion of Maple Cross Parcels MC1 and MC5/RW7; Development described as urban sprawl, yet site is contained and would be no further development of the site; Will not lead to coalescence due to A412; Entire site should be classed as ‘moderate’; Are exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land; Consider proposal to remove site from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. 	Noted – See Part 2 responses in regards to this site.	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			<p>Rickmansworth. In terms of potential merging to the north, we note that that the Officers Report for the proposed secondary school (16/1523/FUL) did not consider encroachment or merging to be one of the main planning issues. The existing highway network was considered to prevent encroachment into the neighbouring Green Belt and countryside in addition to merging towns. A consistent approach should be taken. This secondary school has now been built of course. The principal part of the site is identified as moderate high. The remainder of the site is assessed as "moderate". For the reasons above we consider the entire site should be assessed as "moderate".</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, we note that Parcel MC7 is also "moderate high" and is identified as a draft allocation, so this does not preclude development as the Council consider there are exceptional circumstances to release it from the Green Belt for residential development. The same is also said for the site to the south (Parcel MC4), this time for employment. It is clear there are exceptional circumstances to release more land for residential and/or employment given the significant need and considerations we have raised above regarding the housing and employment targets. The Council have exhausted all other non-Green Belt options, and as per NPPF paragraph 140, permanent defensible boundaries are present on the site that would help to facilitate a change to the Green Belt without opening up sprawl in the future. Following paragraph 141, the site would make use of brownfield and underutilised land and would optimise density in an area well served by public transport (source, reference?). The remaining undeveloped land within the site can remain in the Green Belt and compensatory improvements to its environmental quality will be proposed (paragraph 142). We therefore consider our proposal to remove the land from the Green Belt would be in accordance with the NPPF and the aims of sustainable development. It would be consistent with the exceptional circumstances identified by the Council for its other draft allocations. Please refer to the cover letter</p>			
P1_002 98	Not Stated	<p>The need for outdoor recreation and green spaces has become increasingly apparent in the last few years. We should be protecting our environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for outdoor recreation and green spaces has become apparent in last few years. Protect the environment. 	<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>	No action	
P1_002 99	No	<p>The Green belt policy is completely at odds with the local housing plan and constant attempts to shoehorn inappropriate developments into Green belt areas that destroy the openness of the Green Belt that the policy refers to.</p> <p>Lower density housing in smaller pockets that are supported by local infrastructure and amenities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt policy is at odds with local housing plan and attempts to shoehorn inappropriate developments into Green belt areas that destroy the openness of the Green Belt Lower density housing in smaller pockets are supported by local infrastructure and amenities. 	<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</p>	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_003_02		No	The use of Green Belt land is unacceptable why not Brownfield Sites.	<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".	No action
P1_003_04		No	The Green belt was established for a good reason and I don't believe there is a strong argument to remove certain areas of it. Once it is gone it is gone; it will never be re-established and this is at a time when both the wildlife and humans need natural environments, it's totally unacceptable to reduce them. Particularly at a time when mental health is on the increase and fresh air and nature is so paramount to this issue.	<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".	No action
P1_003_05		No	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"> Concerned about proposals in Solesbridge Lane, Chorleywood. 	Noted – See Part 2 Responses for response to specific sites.	No action
P1_003_06		No	The Local Plan, if implemented, will result in significant loss of Green Belt in and around Abbots Langley. This has clear environmental impacts, resulting in loss of habitat and impacting wildlife, but it will also completely destroy the character of the village, which is being eroded over time through high-levels of development. It will result in no green space separating Abbots Langley from neighbouring areas such as Leavesden and Watford, resulting in urban sprawl. Green space is vital to support the health and wellbeing of the local population. Overdevelopment will also make the village less desirable, which may impact upon house prices. There will also be severe visual impacts and loss of valuable amenity provided by the Green Belt. Once lost this cannot readily be restored.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will result in significant Green Belt loss; Will result in no green space separating Abbots Langley and Leavesden and Watford; Amend the Local Plan to stop the loss of any further Green Belt. 	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,	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

			<p>Where development is required this should be focused in brownfield areas, utilising vacant office, shop, warehouse and other such sites, where appropriate by modifying existing buildings in line with Building Regs, and where not appropriate/suitable or where no physical structure exists, by new builds on brownfield sites. The Local Plan does not give sufficient consideration to brownfield sites and also needs to reflect the changes brought about by Brexit and the pandemic.</p> <p>The Local Plan must be modified wholesale to reflect achievable targets, which <u>do not result in the loss of any Green Belt</u>. The Prime Minister has also stated the Green Belt will not be developed and this needs to be followed through in local decision making, i.e. the Local Plan. Where this results in insufficient space to meet the Government target, this needs to be fed back to the Government in the appropriate way so the targets are revised accordingly and reflect the available capacity within brownfield sites within Abbots Langley and surrounding areas, indeed across all of Three Rivers.</p> <p>I trust the above is clear and I hope the Council will amend its Local Plan to reflect my feedback and that of the wider community, which I believe generally shares the same concerns I have raised and who hopefully will also be providing feedback into this process. <u>Green Belt must be protected.</u></p>		<p>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>	
P1_003 08	No	<p>The Green belt has been a panacea for many people during the pandemic and is needed more than ever as we move forward. No one wishes to live in a concrete world that loss of more Green Belt brings ever closer and its fragmentation threatens the viability of local wildlife populations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not Develop Green Belt Land 	<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>	No action	
P1_003 12	No	<p>Our main area of concern is the dissipation of the green belt areas, which we strongly feel should be protected. Under UK planning law green belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully justified.</p> <p>Our green belt land prevents towns merging and safeguards wildlife and countryside near to where people live. This is ever more important as we adapt in regards to the Covid pandemic, with increasing numbers working from home and open space providing a therapy for mental health difficulties. Green belt land once built on, can never be brought back.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect the Green Belt as prevents coalescence 	<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>	No action	

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_003 13		No	<p>The proposed Plan proposes that over 90% of new development is on green belt land and the fundamental aim of Green Belt Policy is to safeguard the countryside and prevent inappropriate development and keep the land permanently open for the foreseeable future, maintaining these areas for agriculture, forestry and related interests and protecting our farms, parks, woodlands, fields, ponds, rivers and lakes for all to access for health and recreation.</p> <p>Now more than ever with global warming we should be preserving green belt land. The pandemic has highlighted the value of the green spaces around us and we need to ensure opportunities for enjoying our countryside are not lost</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land as crucial to protecting wildlife and climate change. 	<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>	No action
P1_000 20		Yes	Use brownfield and industrial sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Brownfield and industrial sites. 	<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>	No action
P1_000 34		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested. 	Noted	No action
P1_000 41		Yes	I would be interested to understand what other approach could have been considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to know what other approaches have been undertaken. 	Noted	No action
P1_000 46		Yes	We should have considered a garden village settlement in Sarratt, which could have been very attractive (like Letchworth) and housed thousands of people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should consider a garden village in Sarratt. 	Noted	No action
P1_001 13		Yes	No idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_001 27		Yes	Brownfield sites first and a last resort of green belt development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt should be last resort. 	<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</p>	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

					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_001 31		Yes	Quote from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government website 'we recognise that not everywhere will be able to meet their housing need in full - for example, where available land is constrained due to the Green Belt and an area therefore has to plan for fewer new homes' (thanks to Dean Russell MP for pointing that out). You appear to be redrawing the Green Belt map to get around the constraint rather than just sticking to brown field and other re-use? There's likely to be a lot of retail and office sites 'going spare' following shopping and working from home changes post Covid?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government recognise that not everywhere will not be able to meet housing needs in full; TRDC are redrawing Green Belt map to get around constraint rather than just sticking to brown field and other re-use 	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".	No action
P1_001 90		Yes	No erosion of Green Belt and no large developments on it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not erode 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".	No action
P1_001 91		No	I want to see TRDC uphold the full principles of the green belt policy in the London Metropolitan area. This means NO development on the green belt. TRDC should resist the housing numbers suggested by the Standard method – see response to Q1	<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".	No action
P1_001 97		Yes	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRDC have not gone far enough to challenge the housing numbers; 	Noted.	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Belt has to be factored into any algorithm calculating Local Housing need before reference is made to any review of the quality of Three Rivers Green Belt. 		
P1_002 01		Yes	Avoiding all building on Green belt land and focusing on brownfield sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not develop Green Belt Land, Brownfield only. 	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".	No action
P1_002 05		Yes	See comments above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5m limit should be altered to within the site, many existing buildings within green belt are located in sites more than 5m from the boundary. 	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".	No action
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"> For councillors to consider alternative options. 	Noted	No action
P1_002 65		Yes	An increase in buffer zones around green belt areas should be considered. There is already a risk that Greater London (Northwood) is already connecting to Herts/TRC which in essence is simply making TRC part of Greater London. Consideration needs to also be given to corridors connecting adjacent green belt areas "bridges" which cut across green areas connecting development areas should be avoided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase around buffer zones should be considered. 	Noted	No action
P1_002 67		Yes	See above. In particular, you should have considered fundamentally rebuilding existing estates, which would have the added benefit of redesigning homes and infrastructure to look to future needs of energy efficiency and carbon neutrality. Or perhaps to build on the numerous golf courses - which are not accessible to the vast majority of us, but take up as much space as the land you intend to build on.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should consider fundamentally rebuilding existing estates, would have added benefit of redesigning homes to meet carbon neutral needs; Build on Golf Courses. 	Noted	No action
P1_002 71		Yes	As above. Need to find other sites to develop on or reduce numbers intended to be built on green belt in order to minimise amount of green belt built on if unavoidable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find other sites to develop. 	Noted	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

P1_002 78		Yes	There are many brownfield sites and business sites that are unused or can be re-used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many brownfield sites and industrial sites to use before Green Belt 	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".	No action
P1_002 81		No	Why not consider that this area is over populated already with no room or infrastructure for any other dwellings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area is already overpopulated with no room or infrastructure. 	Noted. DPH is indicative only and will be determined at the planning application stage. Policy on internal and external amenity space standards included in the Local Plan.	No action
P1_002 82		Yes	See above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Comment 	Noted	No action
P1_002 87		Yes	The Green Belt should not be given away	<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".	No action
P1_002 93		Yes	Please see above and refer to the cover letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object on basis of methodology of site assessments; Object to inclusion of Maple Cross Parcels MC1 and MC5/RW7; Development described as urban sprawl, yet site is contained and would be no further development of the site; Will not lead to coalescence due to A412; Entire site should be classed as 'moderate'; Are exceptional circumstances to release Green Belt land; Consider proposal to remove site from the Green Belt under exceptional circumstances. 	Noted – See Part 2 Responses for response to specific sites.	No action
P1_002 99		Yes	Lower density housing in smaller pockets that are supported by local infrastructure and amenities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower density housing in smaller pockets supported by infrastructure. 	Noted	No action

Appendix 6 - Representations – Green Belt Policy

Q17.Should we have considered alternative options?						
P1_00 020		Yes	Use brownfield and industrial sites.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Brownfield and industrial sites. 	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".	No action
P1_00 034		Yes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested. 	Noted	No action
P1_00 041		Yes	I would be interested to understand what other approach could have been considered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to know what other approaches have been undertaken. 	Noted	No action
P1_00 046		Yes	We should have considered a garden village settlement in Sarratt, which could have been very attractive (like Letchworth) and housed thousands of people.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should consider a garden village in Sarratt. 	Noted	No action
P1_00 113		Yes	No idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No alternatives suggested 	Noted	No action
P1_00 209		Yes	It is for councillors to consider sensible, alternative options and proposal a range of those options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For councillors to consider alternative options. 	Noted	No action
P1_00 265		Yes	An increase in buffer zones around green belt areas should be considered. There is already a risk that Greater London (Northwood) is already connecting to Herts/TRC which in essence is simply making TRC part of Greater London. Consideration needs to also be given to corridors connecting adjacent green belt areas "bridges" which cut across green areas connecting development areas should be avoided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase around buffer zones should be considered. 	Noted	No action