**Summary Document of Representations:**

This Document provides a summary of representations received during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Development Plan. All comments received during the consultation were sent to the Independent Examiner in their entirety.

| **Organisation** | **Summary of Comments** |
| --- | --- |
| MH-001  C Clayton | We are objecting to the proposal, to include the nominated Bull Inn site X2 for future housing development, for the reasons indicated below:  Bull Inn survival. 92% of the sample of the Much Hadham residents consulted want the Bull Inn protected as a valued community asset. If housing development is allowed in the space beyond the restricted pub garden it will significantly reduce future revenue. Practically speaking; how can the Pub survive if a twin track road is driven through its existing limited car parking space and through its recently more limited garden space? The result would be a small confined area for outside dining and refreshment.  Heritage Setting. The Inn and Garden area has existed for centuries. The surrounding properties are all listed and in the immediate proximity go back to the late medieval period. The garden is a very pleasant place for Much Hadham residents and tourists to visit. This significant heritage setting would be spoilt and lost forever.  Attractive Views. Within the rising pub garden setting there are fine views on all sides of Trees and fields beyond the southerly and western borders of the open grass area. The rear of the roofs of the listed buildings to the south and east and north and east are pleasing to the eye. The view from the road through the parking area to the garden, open grassland and trees and rising fields beyond captures a pleasing and rare view of the westerly aspect from the High Street. The views from within the garden and from the entrance would be lost.  Ecology/Biodiversity. The hatched area X2 has been largely undisturbed by human activity for decades. Its’ soil should be rich in microorganisms because it has been free of pesticides, herbicides, fungicides and artificial fertilizers. The grassland, hedgerow, trees and ancient steep embankment contains significant wildlife, a badger population has been established for decades if not centuries and other animals have been noticed. Our house and garden is joined to the Bull inn and garden and we are visited by newts, toads, hedgehogs and the badgers. Surely these should be given the opportunity to be protected.  The Strategic Environment assessment by AECOM.:  **Biodiversity**: No mention of the significant Badger Community therefore I doubt they walked the site and investigated properly. Their assessment of neutral effects on Biodiversity appears to be based on what? If you cover most of the site in concrete the effect must surely be negative.  **Climate Change:** AECOM claim the site is free of fluvial flood risk – neutral effects anticipated is surely incorrect because there is no mention of recent flooding to Bull Cottage, Campden cottage and I believe Bull Inn Cellar. The existing conserved grass area acts like a sponge mitigating flooding. To take this away is clearly a negative effect.  The anticipated 6 bungalows, 18 parking places and all the associated roads covering the area will obviously increase flood risk to Bull Cottage, Campden Cottage and The Bull Inn.  **Landscape**: AECOM report admits Development has potential for adverse effects.  **Historic Environment**: AECOM mentions potential adverse effects to Much Hadham Hall and its setting and mentions adverse effects to 3 nearby 2 star plus buildings. Also mentions adverse effects to listed buildings nearby, the adjacent Bull Inn and Vine Cottage, but does not Mention Bull Cottage or Campden Cottage anywhere in their report. Both are also grade 2 listed and are joined onto the Bull inn building and garden. Both cottages would be very sensitive to effects from the proposed new building and yet their existence is not known by AECOM.  It is interesting to note that the Authors of this AECOM report and the Authors of an earlier Punch Inn commissioned report clearly don’t recognise the existence of these cottages. Perhaps they both researched the same deficient database.  **Much Hadham conservation Area:** The AECOM report does mention adverse effects to the Much Hadham conservation area; saying the site’s openness plays an important part preserving the significance of Much Hadham’s buildings within the settlement area of the high street. |
| MH-002  L Ghijben | I am a longstanding resident of Much Hadham. I strongly object to “policy MH H5: Land at Hopleys” in the Neighbourhood plan. We and the residents of the other Grade II and one Grade I listed properties which are adjacent to and sit on land 1.5 stories lower than the proposed development site have objected to the building of housing on the elevated land of Hopleys adjacent to our boundaries both to the Neighbourhood Planning team in writing and verbally at their meeting a number of times, and on the East Herts Planning site (please see planning application reference 3/20/2375/FUL and objection documents).  In section “2 .3 Objectives” of the Neighbourhood Plan document, the following aims are stated:  1. Protect the pleasing character of the built environment and rural landscape setting.  3. Ensure that new building minimises damage to rural views and historic building views.  7. Ensure that new building does not add to the flood risk of the locality, nor does it infringe upon the flood plain.  10. Preserve and enhance woodlands, green spaces and green corridors, and the River Ash. Protect and promote biodiversity when considering new development.  All of these objectives will be infringed by the building of properties along the boundary of Hopleys with its neighbouring listed houses on the historic High Street.  The current “pleasing character of the built environment and rural landscape setting” which the listed properties along the High Street currently enjoy will be replaced by buildings and thus be destroyed.  The proposed new buildings along this boundary will completely damage and will indeed remove rural views from this historic Grade I and Grade II listed buildings.  A number of High Street homes have been repeatedly flooded in recent years. Despite repeated requests for detail from the Hopley site developers showing how they will “ Ensure that new building does not add to the flood risk of the locality”, no response has been given.  In contravention of Objective 10.”Preserve and enhance woodlands, green spaces and green corridors”, the historic green parkland would be built on and the view of it from the High Street and neighbouring properties obliterated. The green space and established trees in front of Hopleys and this part of the historic High street will be replaced by a widened road and pavements.  In view of these infringements, I fail to understand how building of houses along the High Street boundary of the Hopleys site can be part of the Neighbourhood plan if it is to remain true to its objectives and sympathetic to this conservations area, the listed properties and heritage within it and the significant number of village residents whose lives and homes will be adversely affected. |
| MH-003  A Ghijben | I am objecting to a specific element of the plan – specifically the row of housing that will be built in parallel to the High Street. These houses will have a direct impact on privacy for the existing high street properties PLUS will also impact on light to the properties. The plans do not show the actual height of the properties however it does look like they will be the same height of the current Hopleys House. The result will be lack of privacy and lack of light for the existing High Street properties. In accordance with the Objectives of the Parish Plan, a number of these objectives will be compromised under the proposed plan – these being (Please see NOTE):  1. Protect the pleasing character of the built environment and rural landscape setting (NOTE – all views from existing properties will be impacted)  2. Help maintain a strong community spirit by supporting sustainable development lose to the centre of the village (NOTE – the proposed houses are not “Social Housing” and therefore will not be affordable)  3. Ensure that new building minimises damage to rural views and historic building views. (NOTE – we are a Grade 2 listed house – our view will be impacted)  4. Ensure that new building meets high sustainability standards.  5. Ensure that new building has generous provision for on-site parking and, as far as possible, encourages walking and cycling to the main village facilities.  6. Meet agreed housing targets and needs, with a new housing mix that is predominantly 1-, 2- and 3- bedroom homes, and encourages affordability through good building design and practices. (NOTE – no comments in the Plan regarding “affordability” – this is a private build and it is believed that the “2” bed houses will not be affordable for people working directly in the community).  7. Ensure that new building does not add to the flood risk of the locality, nor does it infringe upon the flood plain.  8. Encourage and enable existing and prospective leisure facilities and business ventures which are appropriate in the village and its rural context. (NOTE – the plan is looking to create a village business hub – whilst I am not opposed to the idea the reality is that the access road for the hub – between Red House and Collarmakers – will be dangerous to cars/pedestrians/cyclists due to the current amount of vehicles parked on this part of the street).  9. Ensure footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways are protected interconnected and extended where possible.  10. Preserve and enhance woodlands, green spaces and green corridors, and the River Ash. Protect and promote biodiversity when considering new development.  11. Support the creation of a multi-disciplinary/integrated health centre should the opportunity arise.  In conclusion – 5 of the 13 objectives would not be achieved with this plan and the question therefore must be asked how this would be deemed as fair and acceptable if it were to be passed. I would therefore recommend that this plan be reviewed and adjustments made (increase the village boundary) to support the housing being moved further away from the High Street. |
| MH-004  A Savage | 1 Priority Views – Moor Place Drive from B1004  Under v2 Moor Place Drive (page 77) the text states:  “The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of Moor Place Gate (see Chapter 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced.”  As the Moor Place Gate site is no longer in the plan, all reference to it should be removed.  2. Local Green Spaces – L2 Lower Park  Policy L2 Lower Park – East of Moor Place (Pages 18 and 69 ):  The designated area does not include both sides of Moor Place drive from Tower Hill / Behind the War Memorial in the proposed Local Green Space. The former site earmarked for Moor Place Gate has been excluded from “Lower Park”, although the right hand side of the drive is included. This reads as an error, given the wider statements on v2, the fact that public footpath 10 runs directly through it, and that the whole site meets the stated criteria (para 10.1).  Following the removal of the proposed development at Moor Place Gate site should be zoned as part of L2 . This is especially so given the many responses from residents and those of Historic England, East Herts Garden Trust and the War Memorial Trust. At the top of pg.125 of The Consultation Statement a resident’s comment requests the site of Moor Place Gate to be placed within the Local Green Space L2. The response within the feedback to this comment is as follows: “with the site allocation (MPG) having been dropped, it will now be included within L2” which implies this change really should have been made already.  3. Development Boundary Change – Nimney House.  Boundary Change to include Nimney House (Page 22):  This proposal has been added at a very late stage with no prior public consultation on this significant move of the boundary. The boundary change is proposed to potentially accommodate a residential scheme of 4 or so units. Whilst it is not presented as a formal site it would seem it is, yet it has not been subject to any of the consultation or scrutiny that surely it should have been prior to inclusion in the plan.  The site runs alongside Moor Place Lower Park and as such development here would potentially have a detrimental impact on the  Moor Place Lower Park. Development of the Hill House site as well as at Nimney house would together create an additional access bottleneck right at the already congested centre of the village. The current housing requirement of this village could be accommodated by sympathetic development of the Hill House site alone. This is the justification for the ‘windfall allowance’ being an acceptable part of the plan so a development boundary change to facilitate additional development is both inappropriate and unnecessary and should not be accepted.  4. Development Boundary Change – Front Lodge  Boundary Change to include Front Lodge (Page 22):  In contrast to moving the boundary at Nimney House, the extension to the Development Boundary at Front Lodge is explained in order to protect the land beyond from further development. Whilst the principle of this is understood, how does this change offer ‘greater’ protection overall. Instead it would seem, like at Nimney House, it could possibly facilitate further development of the substantial plot of Front Lodge. This would have a hugely detrimental impact at this sensitive central location so I do not support this amendment and believe it should be removed from the plan.  5. Hill House & Land to the Rear – Considerations  Policy MH H10 – (Page 38):  This policy looks to make provision for key desirable features of any future development on the Hill House site. There is one key omission from this list of considerations. The un-designated footpath that runs between Tower Hill and Oudle Lane between St Andrew’s School and the Hill House site should be widened and improved and/or redirected as part of a scheme that incorporates the closure of the footpath that runs across the school site. Development of the Hill House site could facilitate this after many years of unsuccessful attempts at sorting out this important issue for the school.  It should be one of the top requirements for any scheme on this site and should therefore be stated as such in the policy. The 2019 pre-submission version of the NP did indeed include the extension of the school playing field and provision of a school pick up and drop off facility as part of this policy which would facilitate all the requirements of the school. The vision of a redistribution of land in favour of the school should remain a stated point in this policy. |
| MH-005  P Platt | 1 L2 Lower Park should include the land behind the War Memorial.  2 There should be no boundary change around Nimney House. The full implications of this to provide a significant additional housing site have not been assessed and consulted upon. Indeed this proposal has only come forward in December 2020 after over 4 years of discussions on the Plan. Why has this been left so late? |
| MH-006  S Barra | Whilst it is extremely good news that the Moor Place Gate scheme was removed from the draft Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan in 2019, there are still areas of concern and some amendments to the final draft which ought, in my view, to be made:   1. Priority Views – Moor Place Drive from B1004   Under V2 Moor Place Drive (page 77) the text states:  “The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of Moor Place Gate (see Chapter 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced.”  This may just be a simple clerical error, but the reference to development of Moor Place Gate (MPG) should be removed as this residential site has been dropped and is no longer in the NP.  2. Local Green Spaces – L2 Lower Park  Policy L2 Lower Park – East of Moor Place (pages 18 and 69 ):  The designated area does not include both sides of Moor Place Drive from Tower Hill / Behind the War Memorial in the proposed Local Green Space. In effect the former site earmarked for Moor Place Gate has been excluded from “Lower Park”, although the right hand side of the drive is included. This is surprising given the wider statements on V2, the fact that footpath 10 runs directly through it, and that the whole site meets the stated criteria (para 10.1). Following the removal of the proposed development at Moor Place Gate it seems logical to have zoned this site as part of L2. This is especially so given the many responses from residents and those of Historic England, East Herts Garden Trust and the War Memorial Trust. At the top of pg. 125 of The  Consultation Statement a resident’s comment requests the site of MPG to be placed within the Local Green Space L2. The response to this comment is as follows: “with the site allocation having been dropped, it will now be included within L2” which implies this change really should have been made already.  Both sides of the Moor Place drive should be included in the Local Green Space ‘Lower Park’ designation and I would like this amendment made.  3. Development Boundary Change – Nimney House.  Boundary Change to include Nimney House (page 22):  This proposal was never part of the initial public consultation, nor was it a matter on which there was any public responses at all. It was first raised at a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan team only in December 2020 and is proposed to, in effect; accommodate a residential scheme of 4 or so units. Indeed the text states that “extending the boundary opens up the option for windfall housing on this sizeable, sheltered site “. The top of page 18 states that “the village development boundary is extended to include these sites to ensure they come forward without opposition during the lifetime of the NP”, so whilst this change is not presented as a formal development site in the plan, it is a significant addition. This scheme has not been subject to the residential appraisal as part of the plan process nor was it looked as part of the SEA. The site is sensitively located on the northern side of the village adjacent to allotments, the Village Recreation Ground and the proposed L2 Lower Park above. It certainly is not “sheltered”.  It is now highly likely the old Barn School (Hill House) site will provide more than sufficient residential units, over the lifetime of the plan, to satisfy the required village housing quota. This is why the ‘windfall allowance’ forms an acceptable element of the NP. It is unnecessary to extend the development boundary to ‘future proof’ further development opportunities.  For these reasons, the last minute addition of a boundary move to include the Nimney House plot into the development boundary of Much Hadham is both inappropriate and unnecessary and should be removed from the plan. |
| MH-007  Herts Garden Trust | HGT have considered the NP for Much Hadham and applaud the policies proposed to conserve and enhance the character of the village and Conservation Area and especially the landscape heritage of historic parks and gardens. We have the following comments on particular sections of the NP.  Chapter 4  The hamlets of Green Tye, Perry Green and South End are unique, small groups of housing and any windfall housing must not adversely affect their rural nature and character. Extending housing between hamlets or between hamlets and Much Hadham village would also be viewed as undesirable coalescence.  A specific example of where a proposal for new homes in a large garden may come forward is Nimney House on the west side of High Street, which has the potential to accommodate 3 or 4 additional homes. The village boundary has been extended to include this site in the Neighbourhood Plan (see X4 on the Policies Map). Other examples of broad locations where there is potential for large gardens to accommodate additional home are land between Station Road and Windmill Way, land to the rear of larger properties on the West side of the High St and in residential curtilages on the East side of Widford Road.  The rural views on the various approach routes are considered to be important as they are highly visible to all who approach the village, and because first impressions are particularly memorable. A typical example of this are the open fields and trees that line the approach to Much Hadham on the B1004 from the south.(9.1) The above are quotations from the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan.  HGT Comment 1  We consider that the addition of Area X4 to the village boundary could cause coalescence between Much Hadham and Kettle Green Lane as it is bounded on north and south by designated Recreational Areas and to the west by a designated Local Green Space. The quoted paragraph 9.1 recognises the importance of the rural approach from the south.  Windfall housing here would not only alter the southern approach to Much Hadham and extend the perceived built area, and rural setting of the village contrary to point 9.1 (above), it would also intrude an area of buildings into green surroundings.  We propose the deletion of X4 from Policy MH H2  HGT Comment 2  Development of gardens for housing should be discouraged as it harm to the setting of the built environment and causes unacceptable densities in rural areas. There are exampled throughout the country where the cramming of houses or flats into gardens has resulted in the deterioration of the character of an area. In villages such as Much Hadham, which have a strong vernacular character, this is particularly noticeable and regrettable.  4.6 Housing Allocation sites  HGT Comment 3  We note that the area to the south of the drive into Moor Place has been removed from the housing allocations, which we welcome. We therefore suggest amendments to Chapter 11 Priority Views, V2 to remove the sentence as below in Comment 6.  HGT Comment 4  4.6.2. Hopleys. We note that housing is designated for the area adjoining the rear of the High Street properties. Careful planning must ensure that no development on the Hopleys site causes harm to the setting, and therefore significance of any of the High Street listed buildings  Part 2 Environment Strategy  HGT Comment 5  Chapter 8 Heritage Assets Policy MH HA1. We strongly support the condition of a good quality Conservation Management Plan for the whole site if any further development on the Moor Place estate is proposed, to include built heritage, landscape and designed views.  Chapter 11 Priority Views  V2 Moor Place Drive from B1004  HGT Comment 6  We welcome the protection offered for this important view. As development to the south side of the drive, behind the War Memorial, is no longer in the Plan, reference to it should be removed and the words The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of Moor Place Gate (see Chapter 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced be removed and substituted with The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village and must be preserved and enhanced. |
| MH-008  Hertfordshire County Council | **1.0 Introduction**  1.1 This representation is made by Hertfordshire County Council’s (HCC) Growth & Infrastructure Unit, in relation to the Hertford Heath Neighbourhood Plan consultation (henceforth referred to as NP). The comments within this representation reflect the interests of the following services that are provided by HCC, along with other relevant areas within the Environment & Infrastructure  Department (excluding HCC Property):   Highways & Transport   Environment Resource Planning (Ecology & Historic Environment)  1.2 Comments from the above listed HCC services and other relevant areas within the Environment & Infrastructure Department are stated in the following sections throughout this representation.  **2.0 Highways & Transport**  General Comments  2.1 Due to the rural nature of the parish private car ownership is high and there are high levels of vehicle movements travelling into and out of the plan area in order to access surrounding services and facilities. It is recognised that there are significant challenges in providing development that is sustainable in terms of highways and transport in the parish, and in order to support sustainable development in the plan area HCC will need to see significantly more policy details provided that are in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4 as this will encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. HCC would also suggest that the plan focusses more on the outcomes that Much Hadham wants to achieve, rather than addressing immediate issues, to ensure the plan can be flexible going into the future.  2.2 HCC has serious concerns in relation to new development has generous provision for on-site parking as this is contrary to the policies in HCC’s LTP4. And as such this statement should be removed from the plan and replaced with wording that emphasises on the use of sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.  2.3 It should be noted that the majority of the comments provided by HCC in the response to the Pre-Submission version of the plan (September 2019) have not been incorporated into this version of the plan.  Detailed Comments  2.4 Page 13, Section 2.2. Aim E, ‘Footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways will be retained, extended and connected whenever possible’.  The county council welcomes this statement as retaining, extending and connecting footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways whenever possible will encourage walking and cycling within the parish which is in in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.5 Page 13, Section 2.2, Aim F, ‘New housing will be sustainable, delivering social, economic and environmental gains’.  This statement is welcomed by the county council as it is in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4 which promote sustainable travel behaviour in order to support better economic, social and environmental outcomes for the county in the context of growth.  2.6 Page 13, Section 2.3, Objective 5, ‘Ensure that new building has generous provision for on-site parking, and far as possible, encourages walking and cycling to the main village facilities’.  The county council welcomes encouraging walking and cycling from new development to the main village facilities as this it is accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4. However, HCC strongly disagrees that new development has generous provision for on-site parking as it is contrary to the policies in HCC’s LTP4 and would likely further compound the parking and vehicular issues stated elsewhere within the plan. As such this statement should be removed from the plan and replaced with much more emphasis on the use of sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.  2.7 Page 13, Section 2.3, Objective 9, ‘Ensure footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways are protected, interconnected and extended where possible’.  The county council supports this statement as ensuring footpaths, cycle routes and bridleways are protected, interconnected and extended where possible will encourage walking and cycling within the parish which is in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.8 Pages 24 – 35, Section 4.6, Housing Allocation Sites.  It should be noted that any information provided in the plan in relation to site layout and access for the housing allocation sites in the parish, will need to be discussed and agreed with HCC as the Local Highway Authority, as these sites are progressed towards a planning application to ensure that they are compliant with policies in HCC’s LTP4. At the planning application stage, either a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment will be required for a new development of 10 dwellings or more, as outlined in Roads in Hertfordshire where detailed information will need to be provided in relation to the layout and access for each site.  2.9 Page 45, Section 5.4, ‘Neighbourhood Plan sets out a higher allowance for vehicle parking than that recommended in the District Plan’  HCC has serious concerns with this statement as it is contrary to the policies in HCC’s LTP4, and is unlikely to be supported by East Herts District Council given it is contradictory to the District Plan. We would also suggest that generous allowances in parking are likely to compound on-street vehicular parking issues stated elsewhere in the plan. As such, this statement should be removed from the plan and replaced with wording that emphasises the use of sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport. HCC cannot support a plan that provides incentives for residents to use of the private car.  2.10 Page 46, Policy MH D3, Vehicle Parking Provision  The car parking standards for the parish outlined in Policy MH D3 are greater than that for the District, and as outlined above HCC strongly disagrees with this approach, as it is contrary to the policies in HCC’s LTP4 and should be removed from the plan. HCC would also suggest that this is unlikely to be supported by East Herts District Council.  The level of car parking provision for a residential development will need to be considered much more closely with sustainable transport measures (i.e. are there alternatives to the car). For example, if a residential development is located within an acceptable walking distance of a good bus service to key destinations, HCC would strongly support a reduction in the level of car parking provision in line with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.11 Page 50, Policy MH ITC1, Transport, ‘Development proposals should identify the realistic level of highways traffic the development is likely to generate by including a traffic assessment proportionate to the scale of the development proposed. It must assess the potential impact of traffic on pedestrians, cyclists, road safety, parking and congestion within the parish and include measures to mitigate any adverse impacts’.  The county council require a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment to be submitted as part of any planning application for a new development of 10 dwellings or more as outlined in Roads in Hertfordshire. These documents will be assessed by HCC to ensure that any impact is adequately mitigated with appropriate improvement measures.  2.12 Page 50, Policy MH ITC1, Transport, ‘Where new development is planned, consideration should be given to the opportunity to create new permanent rights of way and green space that enable active travel modes’.  The county council supports this statement that consideration will be given to the opportunity to create new permanent rights of way and green space that enable active travel modes as this in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.13 Page 92, Policy MH CFLR1, Unclassified Road, ‘Proposals for development must respect the tranquil nature of unclassified roads and not adversely affect their ability to continue to function safely as routes for walking, cycling and horse-riding’.  This policy is welcomed by the County Council as proposals for development that respect the tranquil nature of unclassified roads and not adversely affect their ability to continue to function safety as routes for walking, cycling and horse riding is in accordance with the policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.14 Page 95, Section 13.3, Priority 3, ‘Improvement and maintenance of public rights of way e.g. footpaths and bridleways throughout the parish’.  The county council welcomes this statement as improving and maintaining footpaths and bridleways throughout the parish is in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.15 Page 95, Section 13.3, Priority 4, ‘Introduction of no-parking areas in sections of the village where road visibility is poor or where parking detracts from the beauty of the surroundings’.  This statement will only be supported by the county council if any measure identified does not result in an increase in vehicle speeds through the village or impact on the rural nature of lanes as this will be contrary to the policies in HCC’s LTP4.  2.16 Page 95, Policy MH SP1, Funding  The county council welcomes this policy particularly in relation to improving sustainable transport infrastructure as this will be in accordance with policies in HCC’s LTP4.  **3.0 Environment Resource Planning (Historic Environment)**  3.1 As noted in the comments on the Pre-Submission Draft Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan consultation (2019), HCC welcome that Chapter 8 (Heritage Assets) contains sections on archaeology, the conservation area, listed buildings and structures, historic parks and gardens, non-designated heritage assets, and assets of community value.  3.2 The NP contains two policies relating to the historic environment and heritage assets - Policy MH HA1: Moor Place, and Policy MH HA2: Non-Designated Heritage Assets.  3.3 HCC are pleased to note that Policy MH HA2 now includes an additional Criterion that seeks to take account of our previous comments concerning other (unidentified) above ground non-designated heritage assets, known nondesignated archaeological remains (heritage assets), and the potential presence of unknown buried heritage assets of archaeological interest within the village or the wider parish.  3.4 Criterion II. Other above ground non-designated heritage assets not identified in Criterion I. and as yet unknown buried heritage assets of archaeological interest may also be given due regard for the purposes of District Policy HA2 Non-Designated Heritage Assets.  HCC recommend in this context that the NP should also make reference to District Policy HA3 Archaeology.  3.5 HCC also recommends in the context of the potential residential development sites mentioned in the NP that the text is augmented to reflect NPPF para 189: ‘… Where a site on which development is proposed includes or has the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.’  **4.0 Conclusion**  4.1 HCC would like to stress the importance of the Local Transport Plan (LPT4) and its sustainable travel policies in the preparation of the NP.  4.2 In addition, HCC would like to stress the importance of the historical environment and any as yet unknown archaeological remains within the parish, these should also be acknowledged in the NP.  4.3 Finally, HCC look forward to working with Much Hadham Parish Council in the evolution of the NP. |
| MH-009  Natural England | In response to consultation on the MHNP Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report, Natural England highlighted that the Report’s biodiversity baseline did not include the Hatfield Forest SSSI Impact Risk Zone and consequently failed to consider the risks posed by development in Much Hadham upon this nationally designated site. Natural England’s letter (dated 15th May 2020, our ref 313379) stated:  “Our key concern is that Much Hadham is within the Impact Risk Zone of Hatfield Forest SSSI and NNR, and development within this buffer has the potential to harm Hatfield Forest via recreational pressure.”  Natural England’s advice was referenced in the subsequent SEA for the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan prepared by AECOM and dated August 2020. At paragraph 9.8 the SEA states:  “Natural England has identified that the Neighbourhood Plan area falls within the 14.6km Zone of Influence (ZoI) of the Hatfield Forest SSSI/NNR. Based on visitor survey evidence, the ZoI is considered to be the area within which new residential development could lead to additional visitor pressure on the SSSI/NNR and which may therefore have to contribute towards mitigation. This contribution could either be through the provision of on-site Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) or through financial contributions towards off-site mitigation elsewhere. Currently, there is no recognition in the Neighbourhood Plan of Much Hadham’s location within the 14.6km ZoI nor recognition of the potential implications of this for development proposed through the Neighbourhood Plan. It is recommended that an amendment is made to include acknowledgement of this.”  Unfortunately, the recommendation does not feature in the “Conclusions and Recommendations” section of the SEA, nor has it been picked up in the consultation version of the Neighbourhood Plan. As far as we can see therefore this matter remains outstanding.  As you may be aware, Hatfield Forest has experienced rapid and unsustainable growth in visitor numbers over the last 10-15 years which is putting it under considerable pressure and there is clear evidence that the SSSI/NNR and other designated/protected features are being damaged. It is currently in ‘unfavourable, recovering’ condition but with this current status having been put at formal threat of declining by Natural England in its 2018 SSSI assessment, entirely due to footfall impacts.  In order to advance understanding of the issues as well as an understanding of visitor numbers, origin and behaviour when visiting the Forest, the National Trust, with support from Natural England, commissioned consultants Footprint Ecology to undertake visitor surveys and prepare an impact management report to help build a practical strategy for the Forest going forward. The Footprint Ecology report describes the issues arising from recreational pressure in more detail, identifies a Zone of Influence of 14.6km and recommends the development of a strategy to mitigate these impacts in order that new development can meet planning policy requirements (including NPPF para.170-175). A copy of this report (the Hatfield Forest 'Visitor Survey and Impact Management Report 2018') has previously been sent to East Herts District Council and the other three District Councils which fall within the Hatfield Forest ZOI. It is hoped that the report will help to inform the preparation of Local Plans, including Neighbourhood Plans.  Based on recommendations set out in the 'Visitor Survey and Impact Management Report', the National Trust has prepared a costed Mitigation Strategy for Hatfield Forest to enable developers to agree packages of funded measures proportionate to the size and location of their projects. This takes the form of a package of on-site (i.e. within the SSSI / NNR) Strategic Access Management Measures (SAMM) to which new housing development projects can contribute. The overall scale of such contributions is based on the proportion of the increased mitigation costs that can be attributed to predicted growth in housing numbers within the ZOI through to 2033. The final version of this Mitigation Strategy will soon be forwarded to the 4 Local Authorities within the ZOI.  In conclusion, new housing development within the ZOI will contribute further (both individually and cumulatively) towards recreational pressure on the Forest. The Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan proposes new housing sites (with a minimum increase of 54 dwellings to 2033) and, whilst small in scale, they present a cumulative risk of harm to a designated site and this needs to be acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Plan. Accordingly, in line with the recommendation of the SEA, Natural England recommends that suitable amendments are made to the Neighbourhood Plan to reflect the potential risk and referencing the evidence base outlined earlier in this letter. |
| MH-010  M Savage | Increased traffic in our cul de sac, construction traffic, already parking issues at this time, enhanced Health Centre causing massive parking issues at the top of Ash Meadow, Fire and Ambulance access issues, refuse collections. If this goes ahead it beggars belief. No common sense, nor thoughts or respect for those of us that have lived here since 1985. |
| MH-011  M Carver | May I start by congratulating the Neighbourhood plan Steering Group in  Much Hadham who have put a huge effort into producing an excellent Neighbourhood Plan.  As the former District Councillor for Much Hadham for several years and responsible with planning team at East  Herts for the development of the District Plan, I am very aware of the huge amount of strategic policy work which is needed as well as massive level of detail and evidence required.  I have only a few comments to make concerning the plan.  1.A reference to changes in the East District Plan perhaps could be reflected in the Chapter on Strategy, it is correct that the NPS is “ certain” but only in the context of the EHDC Plan, which itself could well change in the time frame 2017 -2033.  2.I personally believe there is an opportunity to have a broader look at the village boundary which is demonstrated by the need to extend in certain respects the East Herts Plan boundary. The current approach may lead to a long term difficulty with future housing requirements.  3. In the Housing Chapter there is already a demonstration of housing provision(19) of which few of these are in tune with the overriding strategic aims of providing housing for local young and those wishing to downsize.  Equally, the sites identified again do not provide sufficient opportunity to address the major issues within the village of the young and those wishing to downsize.  4. The housing sites suggested I believe add to the already congested centre of the village further exacerbating the issues surrounding traffic/ parking/ environmental impact.  5. Page 20, final paragraph is slightly incorrect as I believe that The Crown Public House was also a commercial to residential conversion within the past 10 years?  6. Page 21 and 22 With regard to the final paragraph concerning the South Plot Culver I would disagree with presumption of increasing permissions to 4 as this would not be in keeping with the linear approach of larger houses in that location and the impact on the visual aspects of the Ash Valley which are again special from the Widford Road at this point.  7. Village Development Boundary, I reiterate my point 2 but would be totally opposed to looking at the east of the village which is dominated by the hugely important Ash Valley which is a not only important to Much Hadham, it is a very special site within Hertfordshire.  8. Page 23, I am totally supportive of this policy MH H3 but trust that this will be acceptable to EHDC and applied appropriately.  9. The development of the site of Hopley’s will require some significant controls in order to maintain the designated Historic Garden status.  From the description it is not apparent what is happening with the existing large residence. There is also no mention of TPO’s on the site which should be clearly be protected. As a point under MH H3, I am unclear why paragraph IV is included with a totally different approach to development which could result in an impact which may affect the proposed housing development.  10. Page 58, 8.6.1, I believe an essential community asset for the village is the retained fire station, this is particularly important relative to the site of St Elizabeth’s and Henry Moore let alone the remainder users in the village.  I am fully supportive of all other MH policy statements. |
| MH-012  Chaldean Estate | On behalf of Fisher German’s client, Chaldean Estate Limited, I write in response to the Regulation 16 consultation being held for the emerging Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan (MHNP). Chaldean Estate Limited has a general interest in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan given their land holding in the local area.  **Legislative Requirements – The Basic Conditions**  Paragraph: 065, Reference ID: 41-065-20140306 of the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out the basic conditions that a draft neighbourhood plan or Order must meet if it is to proceed to referendum.  Before a Neighbourhood Development Plan can be put to referendum and be made, each of the basic conditions set out within Paragraph 065 Reference ID 41-065-20140306 must be met. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.  The basic conditions are as follows:  “(2) A draft order meets the basic conditions if –  (a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order,  (b) having special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed buildings or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses, it is appropriate to make the order.  (c) having special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of any conservation area, it is appropriate to make the order,  (d) the making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development,  (e) the making or the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area),  (f) the making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations [as incorporated into UK law], and  (g) prescribed conditions are met in relation to the order and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the order.  This representation seeks to make general comments in the context of the basic conditions where relevant.  **Policy MH LGS1: Local Green Spaces**  The emerging proposals map at Figure 4 of the NDP identifies 6no. Local Green Spaces (one of which is in Green Tye) as follows:  ▪ L1 – Great Leys – North of Kettle Green Lane.  ▪ L2 – Lower Park – East of Moor Place.  ▪ L3 – Northern Fields – Culver Estate.  ▪ L4 – River Ash Meads – from Two Bridges to Watery Lane.  ▪ L5 – Court Orchard – field between North Leys and the Palace / St Andrew’s Church; and,  ▪ L6 – Field next to the Mission Hall at Tye Green.  Paragraphs 99 and 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF) set out the tests to be met in designating LGS. Paragraph 99 states that designating land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, as well as being capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. Paragraph 100 states that LGS designations should only be used where the green space is:  ▪ In reasonably close proximity to the community it serves.  ▪ Demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, or recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and,  ▪ Local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.  The Basic Conditions statement which supports the submission draft of the NDP states that policy MH LGS1 meets the environmental strand of sustainability within the NPPF as it supports sustainable development by seeking to preserve and enhance woodlands, greenspaces and green corridors.  Policy MH LGS1 expects a biodiversity net gain to be delivered for developments on Local Green Spaces. The policy does not prescribe a % minimum net gain and is therefore not overly prescriptive. This is supported given that the Environment Bill, which is expected to require a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity, has not yet gained Royal Assent and therefore a minimum requirement should not be set in policy at this time.  We have concerns about the methodology used to assess Local Green Spaces on a site-by-site basis. It is noted that the methodology used to select Local Green Space designations is that produced by Bedford Borough Council in 2015 to support their then emerging Local Plan1. It is unclear why this methodology has been used over exploring the opportunity to develop a methodology with East Herts District Council. There does not appear to be an endorsed methodology produced by East Herts Council. However, it is noted that within a Part 2 Hearing Note2 supporting the Examination of the now adopted District Plan, the Council stated that the NPPF requirements are subject to interpretation taking account of specific local circumstances.  It is questionable how using a methodology produced by Bedford Borough is sufficient to take into account specific local circumstances in Much Hadham when selecting Local Green Spaces. This methodology in particular is not, to our knowledge, an approved mechanism for assessing whether proposed Local Green Spaces meet the tests of paragraph 100 of the NPPF.  More specifically, Part 2 of Stage 1 within Bedford Borough Council’s methodology (and Section 10.1 of the emerging NDP) states that in order for a site to qualify for a Local Green Space designation, the site must not have a national designation or right of way [emphasis added]. 4 out of 6 proposed Local Green Spaces have public rights of way running across them. These are:  L1 (Footpath 10)  ▪ L2 (Footpath 10)  ▪ L3 (Footpath 25 and 27)  ▪ L4 (Footpath 22 and 23).  Therefore, if the intention is for potential Local Green Space designations to be disregarded where they have a right of way. L1, L2, L3 and L4 would appear to fail the test. More clarity is needed on this.  Proposed Local Green Spaces L1 and L2 could arguably be viewed as a single entity of greenspace in terms of its function which in total would be a site area of 13.45ha and would be considered an extensive tract of land.  We ask that the methodology used is checked for reliability and robustness, as without this there is a risk that the Local Green Space designations do not meet the Basic Conditions 2(a), 2(d) and 2(e) by way of their selection process and do not accord with paragraph 100 of the NPPF.  **Policy MH ET2 Visitor Economy**  Chaldean Estate Limited’s previous response to the Regulation 14 consultation raised concern with the ‘blanket’ lack of support approach to any applications for commercial holiday homes / lodges and touring caravan sites under emerging policy MH ET2.  Whilst emerging policy MH ET2 does permit development proposals in principle for development which will attract “low volumes of personal visitors”, MH ET2 should note the importance of visitor accommodation provision which is key in creating a level of footfall in the rural area to support the local rural economy. Without permitting appropriate rural accommodation sites such as holiday lodges, the growth of the visitor economy in Much Hadham will be limited to day visitors.  The District Plan (policies ED5 ‘Tourism’ and ED2 ‘Rural Economy’) and the NPPF (paragraphs 83 and 84) actively support the rural economy and recognise the importance of rural diversification. For example, policy ED2 states:  “In order to support sustainable economic growth in rural areas and to prevent the loss of vital sources of rural employment, proposals that create new employment generating uses or support the sustainable growth and expansion of existing businesses in the rural area will be supported in principle where they are appropriately and sustainably located and do not conflict with other policies within this Plan.”  Policy ED5 states:  “New tourism enterprises and extensions to existing tourism enterprises will be supported in principle where the facility meets identified needs which are not met by existing facilities, are appropriately located and do not conflict with other policies within this Plan.”  It is considered that policy MH ET2 as currently drafted conflicts with these policies as it is too restrictive and will not permit any new visitor accommodation in the Parish. We support the need for tourism facilities and accommodation to be sustainable so as to not harm the environment that draws visitors in the first place, however this does not mean that no new visitor accommodation could be provided.  We draw attention to our client’s previously proposed policy wording change within their response dated 25th September 2019, which is not repeated here in the interests of brevity. Nevertheless, emerging policy MH ET2 should be amended to permit commercial holiday homes / caravan accommodation where a need is demonstrated and where proposals are sustainably located, such as in and near Group 1 Villages. In addition, the definition of rural visitor accommodation should also include boutique hotel style accommodation suitably designed to complement a rural setting.  **Housing Need and Draft Housing Allocations**  We support the removal of the previously proposed allocation of Moor Place Gate (South Side) in light of the potential harm to heritage and conservation.  The emerging neighbourhood plan provides for 54 dwellings as follows:  ▪ Completions since 1st April 2017 – 19  ▪ Other approved sites – 4  ▪ Priest House - 7  ▪ Hopleys - 9  ▪ Bull Inn – 5  ▪ South Plot (Culver) - 2  ▪ Windfall (within village boundary) – 8  Policy DPS1 ‘Housing, Employment and Retail Growth’ of the East Herts District Plan states that in the period 2011 – 2033 the District will provide for a minimum of 18,458 dwellings up to 2033. This is an annual requirement of 839 dwellings.  Policy VILL1 ‘Group 1 Villages’, of which Much Hadham is one, will need to accommodate an at least 10% increase in housing stock based on the 2011 Census between 1st April 2017 and 31st March 2033. Emerging policy MH H1 ‘Village Housing Numbers’ plans for 54 homes (based on a 2011 Census household total of 535) and is therefore in line with this minimum requirement and is consistent with strategic policy.  The Standard Methodology result (2020 measurement) for East Hertfordshire results in an annual requirement of 1,145 dwellings per annum, this is an increase of 306 dwellings per annum on the current adopted requirement for East Hertfordshire. The Housing Delivery Test result (2020 measurement) shows a current result of 104%. We ask that the neighbourhood plan, if successful at referendum, is regularly reviewed in order to ensure that the provision of housing in Much Hadham accurately reflects any increase in housing requirements across the District and reflects any change in the growth strategy for Group 1 Villages.  **Conclusion**  We ask that the methodology used for selecting Local Green Spaces is checked for reliability and  robustness, as without this there is a risk that the Local Green Space designations do not meet the Basic  Conditions 2(a), 2(d) and 2(e) by way of their selection process and do not accord with paragraph 100 of the NPPF.  We ask that a change to the wording of emerging policy MH ET2 is made that enables greater flexibility in the provision of new tourist accommodation facilities where a need is demonstrated, and where the proposals are sustainable.  We broadly support the level of growth planned for the village and are of the view that this accords with national policy, however we ask that the MHNP is regularly reviewed to ensure housing provision is in line with the District’s growth strategy going forward. |
| MH-013  R French | Page 22 of 126  ‘Large gardens to accommodate additional houses on land between Station Rd and Windmill Way’  When considering these areas it should be noted that any increase involving heavier usage of Station Rd should be discouraged as it is an un-adopted road with minimal services such as sewage, with no pavement protection for pedestrians. It also has a dangerous junction onto the B1004  Page 64  Non designated sites and green corridors  9.2.2 Appendix E Map of wildlife sites  This map is hard to follow and to be able to distinguish where these sites are but it is pleasing to note that an effort will be made to preserve and ideally establish wildlife sites and green corridors. |
| MH-014  R Rodwell | I refer to section 4.6.1 Priest House  Whilst I fully support the view that Much Hadham is in desperate need of affordable property for local younger people, first time buyers, young families and older downsizers, I cannot support the plan for an additional 7+ houses to be built on such a small space in such close proximity to existing houses.  Ash Meadow is already a very crowded cul de sac, with traffic and parking needs already at a maximum. There is often not enough space for existing residents to park, with every space on the road and pavements taken up and residents often having to park away from the houses at the top of the road near the high street and doctor’s surgery.  The plan to include one parking space for each new house and a shared parking area covering an undisclosed (given the remaining space a maximum of perhaps 3 or 4 spaces ?) amount of spaces will not be sufficient, particularly as the plan aims at younger people who will inevitably have at least 2 vehicles per household.  This will also create a considerable increase in the volume of traffic using the road, which given the increase in residents commuting, delivery vans, visitors, and particularly heavy construction traffic will cause a significant amount of chaos and disruption.  I am also concerned that the construction of additional houses will negatively impact the outlook for current residents. Many houses particularly at the bottom of Ash Meadow have views across to the Ford, sheep fields and woods beyond. This will now become a view into new houses – a view which will have detrimental impact on current residents.  I support the view that Much Hadham needs housing affordable enough to cater for younger people, we are ourselves a growing family, unable to move within the village as there is a clear lack of mid-priced 4 bed properties. However, I feel this argument would hold more weight if the 19 completions to 2017 and the other pre-approved sites had not been largely circa £1m+ properties.  I object to the proposals put forward for the Priest House. |
| MH-015  H Platt | 1. Priority Views – Moor Place Drive from B1004   Under V2 Moor Place Drive (page 77) the text states :  “The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of  Moor Place Gate (see Chapter 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced.”  The reference to development of Moor Place Gate clearly should have been removed as, following the Regulation 14 consultation, this proposed residential site has now been dropped.  2. Local Green Spaces – L2 Lower Park  Policy L2 Lower Park – East of Moor Place (pages 18 and 69 ):  The designated area does not, as it should, include both sides of Moor Place Drive from Tower Hill / Behind the War Memorial in the proposed Local Green Space. In effect the former site earmarked for Moor Place Gate (MPG) has been excluded from “Lower Park”, although the opposite side of the drive is included. This is surprising given the wider statements on V2, the fact that footpath 10 runs directly through it, and that the whole site meets the stated criteria (para 10.1). Following the removal of the proposed development at MPG it seems logical to have zoned this site as part of L2. This is especially so given the many responses from residents (see pages 144 to 173 of the Consultation Statement) and those of Historic England, East Herts Garden Trust, the War Memorial Trust and Moor Place Heritage Group.  Indeed at the top of page 125 of The Consultation Statement a resident’s comment requests that the site of MPG be placed within the Local Green Space L2. The response to this comment is as follows: “With the site allocation (MPG) having been dropped, it will now be included within L2”. It adds “P16 Amend Policies Map accordingly. Add footnote to heading of p69: 86% consultation support based on the area north of the drive, as south of the drive was presented as a housing site allocation. Subsequently the site was dropped and the area of L2 extended to include it.” This all implies that this change really should have been made already.  3. Boundary Change to include Nimney House  This proposal was never part of the initial Regulation 14 public consultation nor was it a matter on which there was any public responses at all. The proposed boundary change should be removed from the Plan.  This proposal was first raised at a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan team only in December 2020 after nearly 5 years gestation in the development of the Neighbourhood Plan. Declarations of interest in this belated proposal have been made by both a Parish Councillor and a member of the Neighbourhood Planning Team. The aim has clearly been to change the boundary of the village so that a ‘windfall’ housing scheme can occur here on a site which is actually larger than some sites allocated for development in the plan i.e. sites H4 , H5, H6, and H8 ! (See the published minutes of the workshop of the Neighbourhood Planning Team of 16th November, 2020; and minutes of the Steering Group of 16th December 2020 and 19th January 2021).  The site is proposed to accommodate a residential scheme of 4 or so units (page 16). Indeed the text further states that “extending the boundary opens up the option for windfall housing on this sizeable, sheltered site “. The top of page 18 states that “the village development boundary is extended to include these sites to ensure they come forward without opposition during the lifetime of the NP”. Whilst this change is not presented at this stage as a formal development site in the plan, it is a very significant addition. Windfall is by definition unallocated. And the intention of the Plan is effectively to allocate this site for future development.  This scheme has not been subject to the residential appraisal as part of the plan process nor was it even looked at as part of the SEA. This is a serious disregard of transparent process. Further, the site is sensitively located on the western side of the village. It is between allotments and the Village Recreation Ground (both sites designated as Recreational Open Spaces R1 and R3 in the Plan) and adjacent to the proposed L2 Lower Park . It is certainly not a “sheltered” site. It is in fact very sensitive.  As the Heritage Statement of the Moor Place Heritage Group ( www.moorplaceheritagegroup.co.uk ) says on this wider area (page 5, para 2.4 ):  “Whilst the houses of Much Hadham stretch for more than a mile on the main road from Ware to Bishops Stortford … the houses that were at the core of these groups were at High Street North End and Hadham Cross. Indeed until the eighteen century much of the site to the west of the road was simply open ground lying between the village of Much Hadham proper to the north and the hamlet of Hadham Cross to the south. Between these two core areas, residential development has focussed on the lower east side of the road whilst the west side’s evolution has reflected its position at the perimeter of the Moor Place estate. So from Yew Tree farm (built in the 15c) at Hadham Cross to Laylock Cottage (dating from the 17c) there remains a real sense of greenness with limited development.”  Historically the site of Nimney House was actually part of the Moor Place Estate, and then it was part of the village allotments, before the building of the present single dwelling on a large plot with a lot of open land/garden. The site together with the allotments and the park provides a green buffer between Much Hadham to the north and at the southern end, Hadham Cross, round Kettle Green Road. Indeed the Neighbourhood Plan recognises this on page 56 stating that “ Moor Place estate helps to retain the linearity of the village by preserving a green boundary to the west of the High Street “. Intensification of development at Nimney House would also be contrary to the NPPF which tries to prevent the coalition of settlements, such as Hadham Cross and Much Hadham proper.  Finally, too little regard has been paid in this proposal for the possible impact on the future development of the reserve site at Hill House (H10). There is considerable support for the future development of Hill House with an appropriate affordable housing element. Indeed the Plan suggests that 25 units or more could be accommodated here, including about 10 affordable units. Traffic congestion is a major issue at this section of the High Road (page 48). Intensification of development at Nimney House at an earlier stage than Hill House could, on traffic grounds alone, prejudice the future development of Hill House.  In conclusion, the boundary change to include Nimney House should be rejected on two grounds:  1 Proper procedure in determining this proposal has not been followed. The proposal is not just a boundary change but a residential development scheme which has not been through the due process. It should also be noted that should this boundary change be approved , and a scheme come forward for up to 4 units , other proposals in the plan could effectively enable a scheme on this site to avoid “engagement with the local community before detailed design proposals are submitted” (Policy MH D1 page 40). This would be a further erosion of the process for handling this site in comparison to the many others considered in the plan process (both those accepted and those rejected). It is unfortunate those promoting the proposal are directly involved on both the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood Planning Team).  2 In any event the site is inappropriate for intensification with further residential development .The site is sensitive and highly visible on the western side of the High Road adjacent to R1 R3 and L2; its development would contribute to the further coalescence of the two historic parts of the village; and, it could prejudice the future development of the reserve housing site at Hill House.  4 Windfall Housing  Remove the windfall element from the plan, and make more positive comments on supporting appropriate development at Hill House within the Plan period.  In line with the East Herts District Plan the current Neighbourhood Plan proposes 54 new homes including 8 or more as windfall. Yet within the plan period to 2033 it is also most likely that a scheme will come forward at the reserve site at Hill House for 25 or so units. On top of this the plan suggests that the existing building of Hill House could be divided into 3 homes (page 21). Clearly with development at Hill House the village will more than meet the requirements of the District Plan. There should be no need therefore to enforce a windfall requirement with the additional pressure that this will put on the village. Rather the aim should be to commit to positively supporting the development of Hill House in line with the parameters set down in the Plan within the Plan period (by 2033). |
| MH-016  St Andrew’s CofE Primary School | As the new Head teacher of St Andrew’s CE Primary School, I have read both the 2019 Pre-Submission and the Submission Version 2021 of the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan and I would like to make the following comments, based on the current needs of the school.  The 2019 Pre-Submission Consultation, Policy MH H11 Hill House and Land to the Rear (see pg. 42 & 43), included a masterplan that specified support for an extension to the school playing field. This is welcomed by the school, given the potential ‘once in a lifetime’ opportunity to increase our outside provision. It could also give the school the important opportunity to finally resolve the long standing safeguarding issue of the unwanted public footpath (Much Hadham Footpath No 22 that currently crosses the site) by incorporating a suitable redirection/extinguishment away from the school site.  I was surprised to see that the Submission Version 2021 no longer refers to St Andrew’s school at all in this same policy (Policy MH H10 on pg38).  Whilst I acknowledge that this policy does not form a formal site allocation at this stage, I am aware that progress toward redevelopment has started there, so I believe it is important that the requirements below are stated as desirable considerations for any potential future development on this site.  I request that the wording of this policy is amended before the Neighbourhood Plan is finally ratified, to incorporate:  • Provision of the extension of the school playing field.  • The redirection/extinguishment of Footpath 22 that bisects the school. |
| MH-017  D Collins | 4.2 Some of the changes to the village boundary would not be required if site 4.9 Hill House became the primary development area. Please note that in many cases the changes to the boundary benefit landowners that have links to the Parish Council.  4.6.2 Development in this part of the village will increase congestion and risk to highway users, the landowner has links to the Parish Council.  4.6.3 This development requires changes to the village boundary in an especially historic area with limited highway access.  4.9 This area (Hill House) is the most suitable for development yet has not been allocated.  5.4 I support the observation that parking provision is insufficient and therefore consider the small developments close to the high street inappropriate when compared to a well thought out single development at 4.9 which has not been allocated.  11 I support the priority views but wonder why some proposals have been removed, in particular from Grudds Farm, Green Tye north-west.  X4 The landowner is a serving Parish Councillor. |
| MH-018  Hill Residential Ltd | 1.Introduction  1.1 Hill Residential Limited (Hill) are the owners of Hill House and the land to the rear, identified in the Submission version of the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan (sMHNP) as site MH H10. Hill welcomes the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. it identifies important issues for the village, including the need for enhanced access to green infrastructure and play facilities and the need for affordable homes. Hill is concerned that the sMHNP does not make specific provision to meet affordable housing needs and that it risks being found not to accord with basic conditions tests and therefore being unable to proceed to referendum and be Made. Hill recommends a number of amendments which would overcome the identified issues and enable the sMHNP to be held to meet the basic conditions of  - have appropriate regard to national planning policy and guidance  - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development  - be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area  - not breach, and otherwise be compatible with, European Union (EU) Regulations, including human rights requirements, as incorporated into UK law  - meet the prescribed legal requirements including those of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.  1.2 These representations are accompanied by:  - Interim Archaeological Desk based Assessment, Lanpro, April 2021  - Heritage Appraisal, JB Heritage Consulting, May 2021  - Landscape Statement, TEP, May 2021  - Access Appraisal, Vectos, May 2021  - Walkover Tree Survey, Roberts Arboriculture, April 2021  - Plan MH - 000-FE-002 – Development Parcel Concept  - Plan MH - 000-FE-100-A – Proposed Site Boundary  - Plan MH - 000-FE-101-A – Amendment to Village Development Boundary  2.Key issues  2.1 We agree that there is a pressing need for affordable housing in Much Hadham (2.1).  3.Development in Much Hadham  3.1 We agree that previous policies of restraint have had negative effects such worsening affordability and decline of village services/facilities (3.4). We welcome the sMHNP seeking to identify and tackle these issues.  4.Housing numbers  4.1 The adopted East Hertfordshire District Plan 2018 (EHDP) identifies that Group 1 villages, such as Much Hadham, should deliver at least 10% growth over the period 2017 to 2033. We recognise that the sMHNP has identified 10% growth. However, with affordable housing being identified as such a significant issue, we are concerned that the sMHNP does not demonstrate how identified affordable housing needs will be delivered and as such will not fulfil one of its key objectives, tackling affordability, nor will it comply with the NPPF, including paragraphs 59, 61 and 62, which require that:  - the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed (59);  - the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing…(61);  - where a need for affordable housing is identified, policies should specify the type of affordable housing required ad expect it to be met on-site.  4.2 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF requires that plans should positively seek opportunities to meet development needs of their area.  4.3 Not positively planning to meet the affordable housing need means that the plan risks being held not to:  - have appropriate regard to national planning policy and guidance;  - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;  - be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area.  4.4 We are also concerned that the supply of housing land identified will not achieve the 54 homes identified. Whilst the NPPF does allow for windfalls there must be “compelling evidence” that such sites can and will provide a reliable source of supply. Whilst the sMHNP identifies general areas which *could* be suitable for windfalls there is no compelling evidence that such sites will come forward. There is no evidence to suggest that sites west of the High Street can be suitably accessed. The sMHNP relies on windfalls to deliver 25% of the future homes required to ensure needs are met, without compelling evidence that such sites will come forward.  4.5 More fundamentally, the windfall sites will not deliver any affordable homes as they will fall below the threshold set in paragraph 63 of the NPPF.  4.6 The sMHNP identifies that the East Herts housing register had 15 applicants registered in June 2019. It is unclear how the sMHNP will deliver the 15 affordable homes identified as being required. Appendix B lists that 2 affordable homes were delivered at Walnut Close, although it is our understanding that those homes were built before 2019. The other sites which have been built or have permissions are for 5 or fewer homes and will not deliver any affordable homes.  4.7 Policy MH H1 identifies further allocations. However, these sites all deliver fewer than 10 homes and so affordable housing cannot be sought from them.  4.8 Accordingly, there appears to be current unmet need for at least 15 affordable homes. The sMHNP does not appear to have assessed whether there are any concealed households in need, or the future arising need.  4.9 The identified immediate need for 15 affordable homes, from a total of 54 proposed, represents just 27% of the need. That is considered unlikely to represent the full extent of need given the affordability pressures within the area.  4.10 EHDP Table 14.1 identifies unmet need in 2017 across the whole District of 1,204 homes. It then identifies future arising need of an additional 2,481 homes. In other words, future arising need is projected to be 2.1 times greater than the need in 2017. We can see no logical reason that future need will not arise in Much Hadham as a similar proportion. Applying the district rate of future need to the current need at Much Hadham would suggest that future need would amount to a further 31 affordable homes being required by 2033.  4.11 Group 1 Villages are identified on the basis that can accommodate a minimum of 10% growth on the grounds of their sustainability. The minimum 10% growth set by the EHDP Policy VILL1 must be seen against the overall housing picture in East Hertfordshire. If East Hertfordshire is not achieving its requirements then the amount planned for in sustainable locations, including Much Hadham, must be seen against a policy requirement for at least 10% as being the minimum required. EHDC has not published a five year housing land supply statement since October 2019. It is not currently demonstrated therefore that across East Hertfordshire needs will be met. Whilst the October 2019 statement claimed a five year supply, that statement anticipated completions at a number of strategic sites, which have clearly been delayed.   * WARE2: Land North and East of Ware is assessed in that statement to achieve 200 homes by 2024. It is allocated for 1,000 homes. No application has yet been submitted. We assume such an application is likely to be deemed to be EIA development. The planning applications register shows no request for screening or scoping for EIA. Assuming 9 months from scoping opinion to prepare and submit such an application would suggest it is unlikely that any planning application could be submitted until April 2022. Assuming 9 months to get such an application to committee and then six months to complete a S106 agreement would mean an outline consent might be issued July 2023. There will then be a need to progress strategic infrastructure and prepare the site for house builders. Those house builders will need in turn need to secure Reserved Matters and Discharge conditions. Assuming 12 months, would enable house builders to commence onsite in July 2024 with first completions achieved by July 2025. We consider that it is unlikely that WARE2 could deliver any homes before Monitoring year 2025/26. * EOS1: East of Stevenage was identified to deliver 240 homes by March 2023. No Reserved Matters have yet been submitted. Assuming they are submitted imminently, we consider that the first completions could reasonably be achieved around February 2023. * EWEL1: Land East of Welwyn Garden City is a cross-boundary allocation with the Welwyn & Hatfield Local Plan (WHLP). The WHLP is still at examination and is unlikely to be adopted until mid 2022. We can find no planning application submitted within East Herts, nor any evidence of screening/scoping for EIA. That site was due to deliver 225 homes by 2025 in the supply. Using similar timescales to WARE2 we consider that the site is unlikely to deliver any homes until monitoring year 2025/26 at the earliest.   4.12 Brief analysis of these sites alone means that at least 750 homes have slipped in the housing trajectory. The sMHNP needs to be seen it its strategic context and to ensure that needs across East Hertfordshire are being met. There is likely to be a shortfall at District level over the next five years and sites are required to contribute to that need. That shortfall will need to be addressed at Group 1 villages as all the towns in East Hertfordshire are affected, to some extent at least, by Green Belt.  4.13 We also consider that EHDC has an error in its calculation of 5 year requirement. It apportions under delivery across a 10 year period. Whist the local plan does establish that the shortfall can be delivered over a longer period than the NPPF usual requirement for it to be made up within the next 5 years, the plan states that the shortfall for 2011 to 2017 will be made up in the 10 year period 2017 to 2027. The October 2019 statement averages all under supply across 10 years, when in fact the shortfall for 2011 to 2017 should have been averaged across 8 years (2019 to 2027) and any shortfall since 2017 should be made up within 5 years.  4.14 The housing requirement for Much Hadham must take into account the housing situation across the whole district and plan to meet affordable housing needs in full. At present there does not appear to be evidence that either of those have been assessed is setting a housing target of 54 homes.  5. Village development boundary  5.1 We agree that the village should look to expand west/east rather than further north/south extensions (4.2).  5.2 Policy MH H2 seeks to apply Green Belt policies to non-Green Belt land. That is not in accordance with the NPPF. Reference to development outside the village boundary as being “inappropriate” should be deleted as that has a specific meaning in the NPPF. In II a) reference to GBR1 should also be deleted as it applies Green Belt policies to land which is not designated as Green Belt.  6. Housing mix  6.1 MH H3 – the EHDP identifies how housing needs for East Hertfordshire are to be met, including through at least 10% growth of Group 1 villages. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a wide of district needs, including for 4+ homes. As the sMHNP is in part meeting East Hertfordshire housing needs, it is not appropriate to restrict the type of market properties by seeking the demonstration of evidence of local need.  7. Affordable housing  7.1 We agree with the analysis at para. 4.5 regarding affordable housing. However, the plan does not make provision to meet affordable housing needs a set out in our representations  8. Housing allocations sites  4.6.1/MH H4 Priest House  8.1 It is unclear if this proposal is deliverable as access is required to be taken from Ash Meadow. That road is shown on the Land Registry to be owned by Rialto Builders. It is unclear if access can be gained to the site.  4.6.2/MH H5 Land at Hopleys  8.2 It is unclear whether or not a suitable form of access can be achieved given the width of the access and the presence of a listed house immediately to the south and the wall to the north.  4.6.4/MH H7 South Plot, Culver  8.3 The site lies at the southern end of the village. It is not as well located as MH H10 in relation to access to village service and facilities. The footway along the frontage and northwards is also lacking in width, making it far from ideal for children to walk to school.  4.9/MH H10 – Hill House and land to the rear  8.4 The house and land has been purchased by Hill. Hill House itself is being re-sold with an extensive area of garden. It is the intention of Hill to bring the land to the east forward to deliver a scheme of c30 homes, 40% of which would be affordable. Development would be located in the south-east corner of the site, as shown on the enclosed concept plan. A significant portion of the site would be devoted to green infrastructure and play. The details of such a scheme would be drawn up through a community-based design exercise.  8.5 It is also the intention of Hill to provide land an area of land to St. Andrews School for use an outdoor/forest classroom. That area of land lies between Hill House and the current school boundary as indicated on the concept plan.  8.6 The scheme offers the potential to provide a range of new pedestrian routes across the site from and along Oudle Lane.  8.7 Footpath 22 currently runs along part of the western edge of the site and across the school grounds. It represents a significant safeguarding issue for the school as walkers can demand access across the school grounds at any time. Policing that Public Right of Way is an additional cost to the school as well as a considerable worry. It is the intention of Hill to provide a route from the north-east corner of MH H10, running through the open space and then between the outdoor/forest classroom land and Hill House itself and connecting to Footpath 22 on the western side of MH H10. That would enable an order to be made to extinguish Footpath 22 where it runs through the school grounds.  8.8 A second route would run across the new open space, joining the new access route into the site and providing a connection further south on Tower Hill.  8.9 A new route along the eastern boundary, inside the site, would remove pedestrians from Oudle Lane. A new cycle/pedestrian access from the site would be created onto Oudle Lane in the south east corner enhancing connections to the countryside for recreation.  8.10 Vehicle access would be taken from Tower Hill, south of Hill House. Sufficient visibility and width can be achieved as demonstrated in the submitted access appraisal.  8.11 The submitted tree, heritage, landscape and archaeological assessments all demonstrate that a modest development of c30 homes could be accommodate without any harm. A development of 30 homes would provide 12 affordable homes, meeting almost all of the identified existing need.  8.12 Throughout the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan the site has been considered to be the most suitable site for development. It appears not to have been included in the plan because of uncertainty over deliverability. The site is now in the hands of a house builder and is suitable, available and deliverable. Development would facilitate significant local community benefits and would deliver much needed affordable homes which the plan does not currently demonstrate can be provided for. The development could provide affordable housing to meet a significant proportion of the current need and is available now. It can also facilitate stopping-up of Footpath 22 where it runs through the school grounds and which represents a significant safeguarding issue for the school. Alternative new routes would be provided across the site to facilitate pedestrian connections to the village and countryside.  8.13 There is an area of trees and wood along part of the western boundary of MH H10. The quality of trees within it is mixed. It is intended to retain the area, although the precise area of retained wood is subject to further detailed surveys.  8.14 The plan (Policy MH PV1) seeks to preserve Priority View 6 from Steep Jack Hill. As identified in the submitted Landscape Statement, it is unclear whether this is a private or public view. Either way, it is considered that a scheme can be sensitively designed with careful use of materials not to have a significant adverse impact on V6.  8.15 Hill seek the allocation of the site for a residential development of c30 dwellings, along with community facilities. Hill propose that policy MH H10 be amended as follows:  Policy MH H10: Hill House and Land to the Rear (formerly known as Barn School)   1. To help meet ~~any future additional~~ housing need including the need for affordable homes for Much Hadham, the land to the rear of Hill House, ~~outside the village boundary could be brought forward for development through a Neighbourhood Development Order. The need must either be required or proven and supported by a parish-wide housing needs survey~~ is allocated for development of approximately 30 dwellings 2. Any proposal must preserve the Priority View~~s V6 and~~ V12, preserve the tranquillity of Oudle Lane, and ensure that there would be minimum adverse effects on the landscape, the conservation area and the historic environment. 3. Any proposal must include the retention and maintenance of important trees and features within the wooded area on the western boundary, situated between the rear boundary of Elm House and footpath 25. 4. Proposals should consider making provision for some or all of the following features:  * permissive path or public right of way (PROW) along the boundary with Oudle Lane to connect the footpath network at the ford on Malting Lane with the undesignated footpath along the southern boundary of St. Andrew’s school * the creation of accessible green space, which could include planting, nature trail and/or allotments * a children’s structured activity area * improvements to the biodiversity of the site e.g. through a wet nature reserve or a wild meadow area * the improvement of the green boundaries to the site.  1. Mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures will be required to achieve an overall net gain for biodiversity.   8.16 As a consequence, the village boundary should also be amended as shown on plan MH - 000-FE-101-A Amendment-To-Development-Boundary.  8.17 With Hill House being sold it is proposed that the site boundary MH H10 be amended as shown on plan MH - 000-FE-100-A - Proposed-Site-Boundary.  8.18 In addition, at 4.2 the following should be added:  “Hill House (X6) – the boundary is extended to encompass a larger garden at Hill House and development in the south east corner of the field, following the broad alignment of the proposed new access road to MH H10.”  8.19 In the event the site is not allocated, the policy should be amended to state that  “In the event that East Hertfordshire cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of land for housing, or that the “titled balance” is engaged though the Housing Delivery Test, the site can come forward for development.”  9. Comments on and assessment against Appendix A of Basic Conditions Statement: Neighbourhood Plan Policy Map to the Strategic Objectives in East Herts District Plan 2011—2033  Mitigate the effects of climate change – H10 should score ✓. The site is well located close to services and facilities in the village and will reduce the need for car journeys. Hill is committed as business to achieve net zero carbon by 2030 and that the home sit builds should also be net zero carbon.  Encourage safe and vibrant mixed communities – H10 would deliver affordable homes and consequently performs better than the proposed allocations against the objective.  Balance the housing market - H10 would deliver affordable homes and consequently performs better than the proposed allocations against the objective.  Protect the countryside & historic environment and promote good design – we agree that development of H10 can achieve this objective. It is disappointing that the other housing allocations do not.  Improve access and sustainable transport - H10 would a number of improvements for walking and cycling and should score ✓.  Maintain and improve existing facilities and provide new facilities - H10 would provide a number of improvements for walking and cycling and should score ✓.  Protect and enhance environmental assets including biodiversity - H10 would provide a number of improvements for environmental assets, including new open space, better management of the woodland, areas for biodiversity and a forest classroom. It should score ✓.  10. Comments on and assessment against Appendix B of Basic Conditions Statement: Neighbourhood Plan Policy Map to the Strategic Policies in East Herts District Plan 2011—2033  DPS2 Development Strategy – MH H10 should score ✓  HOU3 Affordable Housing – it is correct that MH H10 should score ✓, however, other sites will not deliver affordable housing and hence should not score positively.  TRA1 Sustainable Transport – MH H10 should score ✓ as it facilitates access to countryside for recreation and is well placed in relation to services and facilities  CFLR1 Open space, sport and recreation – MH H10 should score ✓ as it will deliver new open spaces  CFLR3 Public Rights of Way – MH H10 should score ✓ as it will deliver new and improved rights of way  CFLR7 Community Facilities – MH H10 should score ✓ as it will help deliver an outdoor/forest classroom for St Andrews School.  CFLR9 Health and Wellbeing – MH H10 should score ✓ as it will deliver new open spaces and connections to rights of way network for recreation  HA1 Designated Heritage Assets - MH H10 should score ✓ as it will preserve and enhance heritage assets  EQ4 Air Quality - MH H10 should score ✓  11. Conclusions  11.1 Hill welcomes the preparation of the sMHNP. It represents an opportunity to positively address the issues facing the village. Those issues include a need for affordable homes, a need for new green infrastructure and areas of children’s play, and a need to contribute towards the needs of East Hertfordshire. There is also a local aspiration to see PRoW 22 removed from the school grounds  11.2 We are concerned that the plan as drafted will not pass the basic conditions tests as it has not demonstrated how the affordable homes, which the sMHNP identifies as a priority, will be delivered. It is also at risk of not delivering the homes needed given that a number of sites appeared to issues with access and the windfalls relied upon are not certain.  11.3 A modest development of c30 homes on land east of Hill House can deliver significant local benefits and ensure that the plan is robust and can pass the basic conditions tests. |
| MH-019  CPRE | CPRE Hertfordshire support the production of Neighbourhood Plans; after six years of local effort, we would above all wish to congratulate the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group, Much Hadham Parish Council and its residents on producing such a comprehensive plan with detailed policy, information on locally designated sites, and details such as local architectural references and priorities for S106 funding.  The plan identifies new housing sites in village centre locations without significant encroachment of the countryside and to meet the needs identified by the East Herts District Plan 2018. CPRE Hertfordshire note and welcome the wider public involvement including that of some Year 6 pupils in earlier consultation.  Our comments are intended to be supportive and relate to additional matters going forward, not least to issues of climate change, place making and affordable housing.  **Climate Change**: Perhaps due to its timing, climate action and the climate emergency do not feature prominently in the plan. The planning groups looking at Much Hadham may well be minded to continue with a new focus on actions and ways to reduce carbon footprints and transition to zerocarbon living. This is often related to planning, but involves actions that go beyond development control policy. For instance  -supporting business ideas to promote home working, co-working hubs and local services that reduce the need to travel,  - giving advantage to walking and cycling in local street design, supporting low-emission transport initiatives and the use of ebikes as well as electric vehicles,  - promoting more local food growing and food related businesses,  - community-led renewable energy schemes, pro-active working with local landowners and wildlife trusts on wildlife corridors and habitat creation and sustainable drainage initiatives that enhance water levels and quality in the River Ash.  - local community and street events that support local business and social activity. The challenges of climate change may well require villages and towns to recover many of the services and resilience lost over recent decades.  **Place making**: Some local parishes have established ‘place making groups’ to follow up on local neighbourhood plan work. These can focus on the public spaces and routes that villagers travel and meet in with ideas on how to enhance them, supporting both business and quality of life.  A major issue for Much Hadham for instance is vehicular domination of the B1004 High Street and what this means for the amenity and character of the village as well as peoples’ travel choices. The Parish Council has formed a Traffic Working Party (2018) and the NP advocates traffic calming for the B1004. Guidance in Manual for Streets 2007 is relevant for matters of street design, with priority to put people ahead of vehicles in street design. This is further illustrated within Traffic in Villages; although produced for the County of Dorset, the principles apply widely and it is a useful reference for rural highways design and village centres.  **Sustainable / Active Travel**: Enhanced provisions for walking and cycling overlap with both climate change and place-making objectives. Much Hadham has always been deficient in public transport since the closure of the Buntingford branch line to Ware in the 1960s and the Traffic Working Group could expand its terms of reference to include sustainable and active travel planning, given the priorities of climate change to reduce traffic levels and decarbonise transport.  Baseline evidence is needed on patterns of use and the existing journeys that are made, to see which are potentially avoided and are least desirable due to lack of local alternatives. Is the old railway line a project for a new greenway for cycling and walking? Are there roads that could be made available as traffic free routes for cycling? Could a more effective Green Travel Plan for St Elizabeth’s be encouraged for instance with more on site accommodation for staff?  The Neighbourhood Plan already includes a number of positive recommendations on footpaths and bridleways. More opportunities for local action might then be identified, the objective being to deliver a full network of attractive alternative routes which link the wider area.  **Affordable housing**: The NP includes land at Hill House (Policy MH H10) which is not allocated for housing, but earmarked as a possible reserve and a rural exception site to meet local needs with the role of a Community Land Trust. We would hope that identifying the site does not frustrate this process or embolden an application for general needs housing.  Past policies for rural exceptions schemes for affordable housing have not always secured significant local landowner interest. A local group, actively working with known local landowners, may be better placed to scrutinise schemes and give confidence and backing to those that meet the relevant planning policy criteria.  Ideally this brings forward affordably priced land for housing which is the key to securing genuinely affordable housing to meet local needs, be it for sale or rent. While these sites would not be allocated, the exceptions mechanism is there within the East Herts District Plan (Policy HOU4) and an established local working group to facilitate it may be able to deliver some positive outcomes. |
| MH-020  Hopleys Nursery  (Sworders) | These comments are submitted on behalf of my clients, the owners of Hopleys Nursery.  My clients remain supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan in general, and the proposed allocation of  Hopleys Nursery for up to 9 residential dwellings and the re-provision of the café/retail unit. As you  know, a current planning application is with East Herts Council for a scheme broadly in line with draft  Policy MH H5 (reference 3/20/2375/FUL). We only have a few comments regarding the wording of the proposed policy and supporting text for Hopleys, and these are set out below.  Policy MH H5 Supporting Text – Location in Village and Settlement Boundaries  The final paragraph of this section continues to refer to the new commercial building as being the same size as the existing building; however as set out in our Regulation 14 representations, the new building will be slightly larger to accommodate improved toilet and staff welfare facilities. We are grateful that this has already been amended within the final paragraph of the Background section but should be amended here for consistency.  Policy MH H5 Supporting Text – Access  The change to the wording in accordance with our Regulation 14 response, to include ‘if required’ is gratefully acknowledged. This now ensures that the supporting text better reflects the wording of policy MH H5 V(f).  Policy MH H5 Supporting Text – Design and Layout  The second paragraph of this section is new, and relates to surface water drainage and overlooking. My clients have no objection to the wording, other than to suggest the addition of the word ‘harmful’ before overlooking. An element of overlooking is unavoidable with residential schemes, and in most cases results in no harm to neighbour amenity. For context, East Herts Policy DES4I refers to ‘significant detrimental impacts on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties’. It is therefore considered that the proposed wording is unduly restrictive, and the word ‘harmful’ should be added.  The supporting text continues to state that “The former café/retail barn would be retained as a store/garage/workshop within the curtilage of the landowners’ new home.” As set out in our previous representations, whilst this is indeed the current proposal, the Conservation Officer has not yet provided a formal response, and given that the building is of no architectural merit there should be no requirement to preserve it.  Policy MH H5 Part III  My clients support this new policy wording as it is consistent with their planning application and a holistic approach to development of the site.  Policy MH H5 Part IV  This new wording is welcomed as it offers a degree of flexibility, in accordance with the Supporting Text to Policy MH H5 for alternative commercial uses within the A, B1 or D use classes.  Policy MH H5 Part V(b)  This amended wording, in response to our Regulation 14 representations, is welcomed. |
| MH-021  Historic England | We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, covering a parish that contains such a large number of particularly sensitive aspects of the historic environment. We are pleased to note the strong emphasis that the final plan contains regarding this aspect, and welcome the detailed information regarding listed buildings, parks and gardens, conservation areas and wider archaeological significance that is contained in the introductory section and in Chapter 8.  We are pleased to note that our comments and engagement undertaken during the Regulation 14 stage of consultation have been taken into account, in particular the removal of the harmful site allocation proposed at Moor Place Park drive from consideration.  We do not object to the remaining site allocations that are proposed in this final version of the plan, but have the following comments to make:  P22 – we note that area X4 (Nimney House) is now proposed to be included within the development boundary of the village. One of the reasons stated is that “Extending the boundary also opens up the option for windfall housing on this sizeable, sheltered site”. This proposal was not included in the Regulation 14 draft of the plan, and the wording above could be described as providing an ‘allocation by stealth’, by accepting the principle of development on this site. Whilst we note the fact a building is currently located on the site, we note that this modification has not been subject to consultation at Regulation 14 stage, nor was the site considered as part of the SEA process that considers reasonable alternatives for site allocations.  P29 – we would recommend the removal of reference to widened visibility splays. Given that the road is not a trunk route or major highway, DMRB requirements do not apply, and widened visibility splays should not be required. The over-engineering of any entrance may unnecessarily harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.  P77 – we note that there remains a reference to the deleted site allocation at Moor Park Place drive. This should be removed.  We welcome the detailed and comprehensive information setting out local character and distinctiveness in Chapter 5.  We strongly welcome the inclusion of Chapter 8, and in particular are pleased to note the emphasis on protecting local heritage that is not designated at national or district level. However, because these remain non-designated heritage assets, part III of Policy MH MA2 should be reworded to the following to ensure that it is in line with the wording of paragraph 197 the NPPF:  III. Development proposals that would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, directly or by causing harm to its setting, will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that the harm or loss is justified. Development proposals affecting any of the assets above, or those discovered under the provisions of Part II, must submit a heritage statement setting out the scale of any harm or loss, and demonstrating why it is justified.  Subject to the minor modifications above, we consider that this plan has evidently been prepared positively and contains a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment of Much Hadham, and should meet the Basic Conditions from the perspective. |
| MH-022  National Grid  (Avison Young) | An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid’s electricity and gas transmission assets which include high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines.  National Grid has identified that it has no record of such assets within the Neighbourhood Plan area. |
| MH-023  A Hughes | I wish to strongly object to the building of 7 new homes on the Priest site pages 25-27 of the Much Hadham neighbourhood plan. This part of the village already suffers a higher level of housing density. I did wonder if you expected to meet the least objection in an area where the home owners have lower value properties. I note that other areas of building proposals in the MHNP are where there no existing dwelling in close proximity. Please consider the current traffic using the main road in Ash Meadow ...I suggest you carry out a survey looking at GP surgery and the eastern end of the road. If you were to approve yellow lines would need to be painted. Perhaps a more modest 2 or 3 bungalows could be possible. But 7 homes equates to possibly 10 more vehicles  Also and perhaps most importantly the effect on the view from the Meadow/ ford looking west would be spoilt forever. I know you will disallow 7 homes. |
| MH-024  Dr Clarke | The MH Neighbourhood Plan (MHNP) is generally supported.  General Support. The overall intention to develop Plot X5 is supported and plans for 2 houses have already been approved. Due a change in ownership, submitted plans (3/21/0848/FUL) for 3 houses of a more traditional design are supported. These plans are considered to be an improvement on the already approved plans for 2 houses on this site. We have commented as such in our response to East Herts Development Management.  Specific Objection re: Plot X5. We object to the significant increase (a terrace of up to 8 dwellings) in the density envisaged for this site, in the submitted version of the MHNP, This is in contrast to pre-submission (dated 07/06/2019), in which up to 4 dwellings are envisaged, which we supported and wish to be re-instated. This suggested increase seems to have been added at the last minute, with no hint of it in previous communications with MH Parish Council as far as we are aware.  Rationale for the above objection   1. The neighbouring properties, particularly the adjacent listed property Culver Lodge, are large detached dwellings. A terrace of 8 dwellings is considered inappropriate for this section of Widford Rd. 2. Policy MH H7 Iib access only to be permitted off Widford Rd. is supported, provided the density on the site is limited to up to 4 dwellings, assuming car ownership is to be permitted for each household (Policy MH D3). More than 4 individual vehicle entrances would make Widford Rd. a nightmare, be a safety hazard and severely detract from the ambiance of the road. If MH D3 were to be ignored, residents would have their life choices diminished due to poor public transport and a lack of many services and employment in Much Hadham. 3. Policy MH H7 Iic an increase in density of more than 4 would significantly reduce the open aspect of the site as viewed from Widford Rd.. It would not enhance the conservation area, nor offer an improved rural view and would be incompatible with this policy.   Location Comment  The plot should be classed as entirely Greenfield, as it has been a pasture/meadow for hundreds of years.  Conclusions  Support should be given to the plans 3/21/0848/FUL for 3 detached dwellings.  Should plans 3/21/0848/FUL not be approved, the density in the submitted MHNP should be restricted to up to 4 houses (as in the 2019 version) and the wording amended appropriately. |
| MH-025  B Martin | 1. The general ambivalence of the ford and immediate area will be marred. 2. Traffic. 7 houses equal 14 cars at least. Parking down here is a problem already leading to bad feeling and almost fisticuffs. Because of so many cars, delivery trucks have churned up grass verges and emergency vehicles would struggle to get down. 3. On surgery days it gets even more exciting. Blocking the main road with cars waiting to exit and enter Ash Meadow. |
| MH-026  S Savage | I applaud the enormous amount of work that has gone into producing both the NP itself and the voluminous supporting documentation. Having read it in some detail I would like to make the following observations:  Priority Views – Moor Place Drive from B1004  Under V2 Moor Place Drive (page 77) the text states:  “The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of Moor Place Gate (see Chapter CHAPTER 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced.”  As the MPG site is no longer in the plan, all reference to it should be removed.  Local Green Spaces – L2 Lower Park  Policy L2 Lower Park – East of Moor Place (Pages 18 and 69):  The designated area does not include both sides of Moor Place drive from Tower Hill / Behind the War Memorial in the proposed Local Green Space. In effect the former site earmarked for Moor Place Gate has been excluded from “Lower Park”, although the right hand side of the drive is included. This is surprising given the wider statements on V2, the fact that footpath 10 runs directly through it , and that the whole site meets the stated criteria (para 10.1). Following the removal of the proposed development at Moor Place Gate it seems logical to have zoned this site as part of L2. This is especially so given the many responses from residents and those of Historic England, East Herts Garden Trust and the War Memorial Trust. At the top of pg.125 of The Consultation  Statement a resident’s comment requests the site of MPG to be placed within the Local Green Space L2. The response to this comment is as follows: “with the site allocation (MPG) having been dropped, it will now be included within L2” which implies this change really should have been made already.  Development Boundary Change – Nimney House  Boundary Change to include Nimney House (Page 22):  This proposal appears to have been added at a very late stage with no prior public consultation on this significant move of the residential boundary. The boundary change is proposed to potentially accommodate a residential scheme of 4 or so units. Whilst it is not presented as a formal site it would seem that to all intense and purposes it is, yet it has not been subject to any of the consultation or scrutiny that surely it should have been prior to inclusion in the plan. The site runs alongside Moor Place Lower Park and as such development here would potentially have a detrimental impact on the Moor Place Lower Park. Development of the Hill House site as well as at Nimney house would together create an additional access bottleneck right at the already congested centre of the village. I have always believed that the current housing requirement of this village could easily be accommodated by sympathetic development of the Hill House site alone. This is the justification for the ‘windfall allowance’ being an acceptable part of the plan so a development boundary change to facilitate additional development is both inappropriate and unnecessary and should not be accepted.  Development Boundary Change – Front Lodge  Boundary Change to include Front Lodge (Page 22):  In contrast to moving the boundary at Nimney House, the extension to the Development Boundary at Front Lodge is explained in order to protect the land beyond from further development. Whilst I support the principle of this, I do not understand how this change offers greater protection overall. Instead it would seem, like at Nimney House, it could possibly facilitate further development of the substantial plot of Front Lodge. This would have a hugely detrimental impact at this sensitive central location so I do not support this amendment and believe it should be removed from the plan.  Hill House & Land to the Rear – Considerations  Policy MH H10 – (Page 38):  This policy attempts to make provision for key desirable features of any future development on the Hill House site. It appears there is one key omission from this list of considerations. The undesignated footpath that runs between Tower Hill and Oudle Lane between St Andrew’s School and the Hill House site should be widened and improved and/or redirected as part of a scheme that incorporates the closure of the footpath that runs across the school site. Development of the Hill House site could facilitate this after many years of unsuccessful attempts at sorting out this important issue for the school. It should be one of the top requirements for any scheme on this site and should therefore be stated as such in the policy. The 2019 pre-submission version of the NP did indeed include the extension of the school playing field and provision of a school pick up and drop off facility as part of this policy which would facilitate all the requirements of the school. I do not understand why this has since been removed and believe the vision of a redistribution of land in favour of the school should remain a stated point in this policy. |
| MH-027  Environment Agency | We have no comments to make on the Regulation 16 consultation for the Much Hadham Neighbourhood Plan. |
| MH-028  A Robinson | If you try and create a continuation of the Ash Meadow type houses with your 5 properties +/- The Priests’ house conversion, it will be a disaster. No good saying that each property will come with one parking space – as certainly 4 or 5 properties at least will have 2 cars. Allowing for their visitors we are talking about parking for at least 14 vehicles. Already ‘the main’ road through Ash Meadow is choked with cars many of which like their owners are back on a 8:30 to 5:30 regime. Weekends are worse ad delivery vans all use the area between 51,52,53, and 54 and the opposite house + no. 23 for parking etc. or parking if needs be and there is a space.  I realise you cannot be held responsible for the way Ah Meadow development was delivered back in the early 70s. The road through the estate is far too narrow.  The ash trees hopefully have a TPO, especially in view of the current problem of ash dieback, so it would seem the Priests house would be demolished. Car parking likely to be in the area of No. 51,52, 53, and 54.  So yet again another ‘cram them all in whatever’ whilst we also wait to see what is built on the ‘quote: 2 exceptional plots for sale’ at the south end of the village. |
| MH-029  Punch Partnerships (PML) Limited | Policies MH H2 & MH H6  CPC Planning Consultants represents Punch Taverns, which owns the Bull Inn in Much Hadham.  Punch Taverns has liaised with the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group throughout the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, and supports the proposed residential allocation of the vacant land to the rear of the Bull Inn (Policy MH H6) and the associated alteration of the village development boundary (Policy MH H2). The land in question is not used by the public house, so it’s redevelopment for housing will not affect the future operation of the public house.  The site is capable of accommodating 6 single storey dwellings, as illustrated in the sketch layout plan, so there would be merit in adjusting the wording of Policy MH H6 to reflect this. In other respects, the criteria contained in the policy are considered appropriate. |
| MH-030  S Roh | On page 18 of the NHP, a large piece of my land on Moor Place was designated as Local Green Space and I wish to comment as below.  The land is common grass land without any special features, without extraordinary natural beauty, no extraordinary wildlife.  It is not close to a community, it is not owned by the community, not used by the community, the community has no other right – other than one public footpath (note: the footpath and the free roaming dogs are detrimental to any extraordinary wildlife)  The land is too large – the size suggested is excessive and abusive (L2&L3): there is no explanation for any need of that size.  L2, in particular, has no attractive or extraordinary features, facing the industrial-like tennis courts – with no open but very short limited view (as it is on a hill looking upwards)  It represents 1/3 of land owned by a single owner and is an extraordinary measure of expropriation. It’s the largest area of any owner to be supported as LGS. L2&3 the largest plot designated compared to all others.  There cannot be any argument supporting LGS that “views on Moor Place House should be protected”, as such viewing is an infringement on the privacy of the residents. |
| MH-031  M Leuchten | In reference to section 5.2 (housing design) the recent developments in Walnut Close and Malting Lane fall short of the aim and do not reflect existing village style and design. It seems hard to reconcile yellow brick and faux castle style with the rest of the village.  More care should be taken in managing future additions to the village.  With regards to section 10.1: If L2 is important for V2 surely so is the strip of land to the south of L2 (south of the drive-way) and north of R1 (wedged between the two). I presume this is not included to allow for potential future development of the land to the south of the drive-way but development here would restrict V2 significantly.  The neighbourhood plan does not address flooding and drainage appropriately. The village remains liable to flash flooding with many pipes and drains blocked (not cleared for years maybe decades). For example not long ago the new build area at Yewtree House flooded as a result of poor pipe maintenance. As the village grows this needs to be addressed. The flooding also puts listed buildings and a grade I listed wall at risk.  The neighbourhood plan refers to Gigaclear – it is my impression that Gigaclear is no longer operational. Section 6.3 deserves a revisit as the quality and reliability of broadband in the village is not optimal. |
| MH-032  J Conway | Page 22 proposed boundary change – Nimney House  I object to the sudden and unexpected inclusion of this proposal which has been included at the last minute without being subject to opportunities for neighbourhood scrutiny or comment. This part of the village is characterised by an open landscape and rural views, adjacent to Moor Place and the recreation ground. There was public support for retaining this part of the village as it is. The Heritage Statement produced by the Moor Place heritage Group makes clear why it is important.  Alongside not implementing the development boundary change around Nimney House, I would also request that the plan should make absolutely clear that both sides of Moor Place Drive are identified as ‘local green spaces’ [Policy L2 Lower Park]. |
| MH-033  Moor Place Heritage Group | Priority Views - Moor Place Drive from B1004  Under V2 Moor Place Drive (page 77) the text states :  “The listed entrance to Moor Park, with the adjacent War Memorial, is a focal point at the heart of the village so the development of Moor Place Gate (see Chapter CHAPTER 4) must ensure it is preserved and enhanced.”  This is likely just a simple clerical error, but the reference to development of Moor Place Gate (MPG) should be removed as this residential site has been dropped and is no longer in the NP.  Local Green Spaces - L2 Lower Park  Policy L2 Lower Park - East of Moor Place (pages 18 and 69):  The designated area does not include both sides of Moor Place Drive from Tower Hill / Behind the War Memorial in the proposed Local Green Space. In effect the former site earmarked for Moor Place Gate has been excluded from “Lower Park”, although the right hand side of the drive is included. This is surprising given the wider statements on V2, the fact that footpath 10 runs directly through it , and that the whole site meets the stated criteria (para 10.1). Following the removal of the proposed development at Moor Place Gate it seems logical to have zoned this site as part of L2 . This is especially so given the many responses from residents and those of Historic England, East Herts Garden Trust and the War Memorial Trust. At the top of pg 125 of The Consultation Statement a resident's comment requests the site of MPG to be placed within the Local Green Space L2. The response to this comment is as follows: "with the site allocation having been dropped, it will now be included within L2" which implies this change really should have been made already.  We strongly believe that both sides of the Moor Place drive are included in the Local Green Space 'Lower Park' designation and would like this amendment made.  Development Boundary Change - Nimney House.  Boundary Change to include Nimney House (page 22):  This proposal was never part of the initial public consultation, nor was it a matter on which there were any public responses at all. It was first raised at a meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan team only in December 2020 and is proposed to, in effect, accommodate a residential scheme of 4 or so units. Indeed the text states that “extending the boundary opens up the option for windfall housing on this sizeable, sheltered site“. The top of page 18 states that "the village development boundary is extended to include these sites to ensure they come forward without opposition during the lifetime of the NP", so whilst this change is not presented as a formal development site in the plan, it is a significant addition. This scheme has not been subject to the residential appraisal as part of the plan process nor was it looked as part of the SEA. The site is sensitively located on the northern side of the  village adjacent to allotments, the Village Recreation Ground and the proposed L2 Lower Park above. It certainly is not “sheltered”.  We attach a copy of the Moor Place Landscape Heritage Statement which says on this wider area (page 5, para 2.4 ):  “Whilst the houses of Much Hadham stretch for more than a mile on the main road from Ware to Bishops Stortford … the houses that were at the core of these groups were at High Street North End and Hadham Cross. Indeed until the eighteen century much of the site to the west of the road was simply open ground lying between the village of Much Hadham proper to the north and the hamlet of Hadham Cross to the south. Between these two core areas, residential development has focussed on the lower east side of the road whilst the west side’s evolution has reflected its position at the perimeter of the Moor Place estate. So from Yew Tree farm (built in the 15c) at Hadham Cross to Laylock Cottage (dating from the 17c) there remains a real sense of greenness with limited development.”  It is now highly likely the old Barn School (Hill House) site will provide more than sufficuent residential units, over the lifetime of the plan, to satisfy the required village housing quota. This is why the 'windfall allowance' forms an acceptable element of the NP. It is unnecessary to extend the development boundary to 'future proof' further development opportunities.  For these reasons, we believe that the last minute addition of a boundary move to include the Nimney House plot into the development boundary of Much Hadham is both inappropriate and unnecessary and should be removed from the plan. |
| MH-034  C Mills | 4.6.1 Priest house.  Having recently moved into ash meadow our house overlooks the priest house. Having heard that there was a proposal to develop the house into 8+ properties I am worried that it will disturb the peaceful nature of the area. The lane is already busy and is too narrow to support the added traffic of 8 more dwellings. The proposed 1 allocated space per dwelling is not adequate for modern times which will lead to the overflow being filled and excess traffic parking on what is already a busy road. Currently from our front garden we can look out over the garden of the priest house and see the farmers’ field behind and the sheep grazing, building houses here will obscure this view and spoil one of the aspects of the neighbourhood both us and our neighbours enjoy. I am also worried about the impact the construction would have on the road as it is not built to handle the influx of traffic on the road and there will not be adequate parking for the tradesmen undertaking the work.  Thank you for considering my opinion on this matter. |
| MH-035  H Newton | Support |
| MH-036  D Poullais | I agree and support the need for a wider range of homes that allow people to downsize and also get onto the property market with more emphasis on 3 bedroom properties. |
| MH-037  A Cockburn | The overall plan is well considered, professional and broadly encompassing in scope and proposal.  We have no further comments. |
| MH-038  I Taylor | Regards plan 4.6.2 Hopleys   1. Overlooking the houses on the west side of the high street is an issue. Why not move the boundary back enough to enable houses to be built further back. 2. Pedestrian or vehicular access into Bull development and Hopleys will not be granted by the owner.   Regards Plan 4.6.3 Bull  Any properties built must not overlook the Red House or its gardens to protect the grade II listing.  All efforts must be undertaken to ensure the badger setts do not migrate into the Red House garden. |
| MH-039  J Morris  MH-040  E Morris | Before making our comments, we wish to acknowledge the considerable work that has been undertaken by the Parish Council in producing the Neighbourhood Plan for Much Hadham. I generally support the plan and, indeed, have endorsed the creation of a Green Open Space, L3, on part of our land. My concerns, however, are two-fold and both refer to issues close to Culver, our home.  1. Culver South Plot  Our plan to build Culver Meadow and our son’s plan to build Fox Field have been adversely affected by the pandemic. We are now in the process of selling our plots.  When designing our new homes, we took great care to ensure that our current home, Culver (listed Grade 2), was not unduly affected by the new houses. We ensured that the roof lines of the new houses were lower and asked a heritage expert, Beam Consultancy, who is well known to East Herts, to submit an independent report.  Culver's main facade is unusual in that it faces away from the road and so the protected view from Sidehill Wood, VII, is linked directly to seeing the Culver facade and its terrace, together with its neighbouring properties, across the green fields of the Culver Estate. This is the protected view.  Beam gave clear guidance that, to fit in with the buildings on the east side of Hadham Cross, low density housing would be appropriate. The option mentioned in the Plan on page 34 that a terrace of eight cottages is equivalent to four modest homes has been made without regard to the position of Culver and its orientation.  The suggestion of a terrace of houses would lead to a change in the view as the façade of Culver would be adjacent to a string of back gardens. This would adversely affect the protected view VII and is in direct contrast to Neighbourhood Plan Objective 2.3 (ensure that new building minimises damage to rural views and historic building views). Culver is one of the few large houses in Hadham Cross. It needs to be treasured.  2.Priest House  On page 25/26 of the Plan there is an acknowledgement that the entrance to the Priest House acts as a turning opportunity when the Ford is in full flood. This entrance not only acts as a turning point but also it is one of the few points along Malting Lane where cars can actually pass.  Passing along Malting Lane is difficult at the best of times. The Priest House entrance is necessary to prevent grid lock and unnecessary damage to the wall of our fields, which border the lane to the east. I note that on the accompanying map for the Priest House there is no indentation on the eastern boundary to shown the turning/ passing point. I hope this will be remedied. Without such a provision, Malting Lane will often be blocked. |
| MH-041  D Bottrill | On 2 August 2019 I received a letter 'telling' me that my land would be designated in the Neighbourhood plan as a local green space. No prior consultation or conversation had been had. I responded on 8 August very clearly asking the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group to remove my land from the plan as I did not want it designated as local green space. I had an acknowledgment of my email from the Parish Council clerk on 9 August that my email would be passed to the Steering Group. I subsequently heard nothing from the Steering group and my land has remained in the plan as a designated local green space.  The land in question I believe is referred to as L2: Lower Park - east of Moor Place at page 71 of the plan.  Upon inspection of the documents on this website I can see that a comment on page 124 of the Consultation Statement that an item allocated to Res Id 23 would appear to be in relation to my email however the corresponding comment from the Steering Group is unacceptable. I am not a landowner looking to protect my land from development and as such do not see their comment stating 'It is hoped that landowners who wish to see their land protected from development will support the designation" is relevant in any way? And whether the case or not I do not see that it is in anyway acceptable that land can simply be designated in this way, and as such fundamentally impact on the investment value of the land, without the landowners permission, particularly when the landowner objects.  I see no benefit to the village in designating my land in this way. In fact by designating it this way, against my wishes, will only disadvantage the village. The land in question has in past years been used to enable heavy traffic to cross it in order to park cars on the adjacent land owned by my neighbour, Dr Stephan Roh of Moor Place, during the annual village fete. With the ability to cross this land the annual fete (referred to at page 55 of the plan) raises c£20k each year for the village. I am advised that there are no alternative parking solutions for the fete and without the ability to cross my land the fete cannot go ahead. If my land is to be designated as local green space then it would no longer be suitable for many 1000's of cars to cross it on an annual basis, damaging the land which subsequently takes up to 6 months to recover. The loss of this level of income I'm sure would be a great shame for the village.  Finally, whilst it is noted in the plan that a designation of this nature does not allow people to access the land other than via the established public footpath, we already experience people from the village wandering across the land as they choose with no regard for the fact that it privately owned and I am fearful that such a designation would encourage this further.  I appreciate your consideration of my objection and very much hope to receive confirmation that my land has been removed from the plan as a designated local green space. |
| MH-042  I Devonshire | I am fully in support of this Neighbourhood Plan. This Plan has been produced with great effort, diligence, and I believe it is of a very high quality. |
| MH-043  Sport England | Sport England gave general advice on what it liked to see included in neighbourhood plans. |