

Responses to Draft Neighbourhood Plan

Version 26. 02.2017.

Number	Date	Comments/Questions	Action Taken/Response
1	27/10/2016	It would appear that only 'even' page numbers are contained within the on-line document?	Investigated but error not found. No further action.
2	11/01/2016	1. Always sad to see countryside disappear under development.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. I doubt any of the proposed housing will be genuinely affordable, more like a sop to the public while more expensive housing is built.	Policy SP11 sets out the proposed requirement for affordability. No further action to be taken.
		3. The main practical objection is the infra structure. The junction of high street and Standon hill is dangerous, being very close to the roundabout with the A10. Passage through Puckeridge high street is always awkward and more so at school start and finish times.	Assume this is referring to the Cambs Rd/A120 junction, therefore Policy SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
3	11/07/2016	I have read the full draft of the neighbourhood plan. While I know we do have to have some development I think the proposal is for far too many new houses all condensed in one area.	Policy SP7 refers. No further action to be taken.
4	11/07/2016	1. I have read the above which I found interesting but too long by far.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. It appears comprehensive but there are in my humble opinion far too many "Motherhood statements" for a document of this type.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. I was also a little disappointed to read that the Standon & Puckeridge Community Centre (good as it is) is at the heart of the village of Puckeridge Community life, but no mention at all of Standon Village Hall which surely plays a similarly important role in the community life of Standon.	Addition to be made to para 2.5.
		4. A well thought out but overlong document.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
5	11/09/2016	1. Whilst I agree with the need for additional housing - the impact it will have on highways (especially Cambridge Road to A120 with over 50 new houses, plus 200 or so on Cafe Fields along with the impact of the Hadham Bypass) will be enormous.	SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
		2. With developments going ahead one at a time, I am concerned the true impact wont be realised until after the developments have been fully approved and built, which will then be too late.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. The plan talks about encouraging alternative methods of transport. I cant envisage more people wanting to cycle on the A120 or across it once we have these developments!	Policy SP20 refers to improving cycling links. No further action to be taken.
6	11/09/2016	1. This is a very well presented Report and the Committee deserve our thanks for a job well started.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. I have one comment. In the historical preamble for Puckeridge I think it would be pertinent to spell out that the vast majority of wage earners in the village work elsewhere. There is no industry in the Parish and Puckeridge is a dormitory village, with the special needs that status demands.	Addition to be made to preamble.
		3. Better connections to the road network in all directions, especially to the west.	SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
		4. Improvement to existing connections to accommodate peak flows.	SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
		5. Improved requirements for domestic parking within the curtilage of properties. (Mentioned, but the basis of need is not spelled out)	Comment covered by policy SP19.
		6. Improved requirements for off street parking to service shops and commercial properties without using the existing Public Highway.(An ultimate requirement to deny the use of the Public Highway for parking)	This suggestion to be referred to the Parish Council for their consideration.
		7. Allocation of additional land for shops and light industry.	Covered by SP17. No further action to be taken.

		8. Existing Plans will see an increase in the number of families in Puckeridge. There will be a concomitant increase in the need to provide travel, work, shopping and recreational activities for the increased numbers of non workers who will be spending more time in the village, a number which will continue to include an ageing population.	This is partially dealt with by SP21 and some reference to accommodation for the elderly (para 4.3). No further action to be taken.
		9. It should not be necessary to leave the village to purchase foodstuffs. Who knows, if enough new houses are built we might get our Post Office, our butcher and our baker back?	The main aim is to protect what we have got Policy 16(2) refers. No further action to be taken.
		10. Until that happens, a much more convenient local public transport service is needed to connect to the shops (and to the Health Centre and Pharmacy) in Puckeridge itself, and to the bigger markets in Ware and Buntingford.	Para 3.9 described one of the main issues raised during consultation was improved public transport provision. However para 5.60 explains why this is not included. No further action to be taken.
7	11/12/2016	1. Is 'Co-op' a group of developers? If so, who are they?	No, a land-owner. No further action to be taken.
		2. Define 'hybrid' applications?	EHDC should respond. No further action to be taken.
		3. Is Puckeridge a Category 1 or Category 2?	Category 1. No further action to be taken.
		4. What is 'linear' form - reference Puckeridge Parklands and Standon Village?	EHDC should respond. No further action to be taken.
		5. We must have public transport to Stansted Airport?	Para 3.9 described one of the main issues raised during consultation was improved public transport provision. However para 5.60 explains why this is not included. No further action to be taken.
		6. What prevents development on the 'old' A10 from Colliers End to St. Edmunds?	Category 2 village; see EHDC draft plan
8	11/12/2016	1. Will all new housing be forced to have solar panel and/or other forms of renewable energy as an integral part of new house design?	Policies SP2 and SP15 refer. No further action to be taken.
		2. We need a one-way system through Puckeridge Village.	We have no proposals for a one-way system which could result in more speed and resulting accidents. No further action to be taken.
		3. Hard standing and parking areas in new developments should be of a porous nature to reduce the risk of run-off and help alleviate flooding.	Policies SP15 and SP24 refer. No further action to be taken.
		4. The egress road proposed from Cambridge Road is a brilliant idea.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		5. The Neighbourhood Plan is an excellent document and accurately portrays the wishes of the local people in my opinion. I hope it gets adopted very soon.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
9	13/11/2016	1. I was able to attend the informal surgery at the Community Centre yesterday, which was very helpful.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. If the proposed large housing developments at A10/A120 are approved, I believe they should be developed over the course of perhaps 10 years, rather than a single large scale development, as the number of homes proposed there is vastly more than the number required of our parish for the duration of the plan.	Reference to phasing of developments in para 3.14. No further action to be taken.
		3. ALL developers should contribute fully to providing community services for the expanded number of people who will be living in the village/s. This must include building another community building, doctor surgery, primary school and neighbourhood shop within the development, to prevent further stress on the already oversubscribed services.	Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.
		4. The developers should be responsible for the cost of the highways arrangements shown in the draft plan. I fully support the provision of the new access road on to the A10 southbound carriageway from the development, which will facilitate a far safer arrangement than increasing the right turning traffic from the village onto A120/A10 roundabout.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		5. All improvements to the drainage and sewerage arrangements for the village which will be necessary due to the proposed increase in households should be at the cost of the developers.	Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.

		6. The proposed development of 15 homes on A120 Stortford Road at Town Farm Crescent is completely unnecessary due to the large number of homes proposed at the Puckeridge sites and will open the way to the full scale development of the whole field over time, leading to over development of the parish. The access for this site is also poorly planned.	This proposal is not included in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		7. I do not agree with a bypass, either north or south of the parish and traffic management measures are more appropriate to alleviate the possible traffic problems once the Little Hadham bypass is opened.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
10	13/11/2016	1. First huge congratulations on a great effort.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. Second, I'm disappointed that, as always, it is Puckeridge that gets the developments, never Standon. However, I do understand the reasons behind your decisions.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. So my main concern is about hedges, although it is probably too late for the Co-Op development which I gather has now gone through. The hedges on either side of Cambridge Road should indeed get special attention, and I'm very concerned that the Co-op is planning to take a great lump out of the middle of the one on the east side. I would therefore hope that the western side will be better protected for the future, as you have said in your plan, along with the oaks which are at least 150 years old.	Policy SP6 refers. No further action to be taken.
		4. Could you also protect the northern boundary of field number 45 on your plan. This is an ancient hedge, with a double ditch and bank denoting a boundary with a field that used to belong to Standon Charities. It also has coppiced hornbeams on the bank. Of course most of it is now under the bypass, but it would be nice to hang on to the rest.	Policy SP6 refers. No further action to be taken.
11	14/11/2016	1. My warmest congratulations to all concerned who must have put in a huge effort to produce an excellent draft plan for our neighbourhood. I liked the way, style and clarity as to how you arrived at your recommendation for the pieces of land for future housing development.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. I agree with your suggestions to concentrate future development at the southern end of Puckeridge along Cambridge road, but it is critical that EHDC/ CC place strong conditions on housing density, sort out access/egress, drainage and sewerage, so I think the plan needs to not only stress these conditions but also recommend these conditions as key to <u>granting any future development</u> .	Policy SP13 deals with density, SP18 access/egress, no further mention of infrastructure requirements. No further action to be taken.
		3. Highways must be persuaded too that all developments must be taken as a whole not individually, and I like the idea of a road from Cambridge road to the A10 joining as a slip feed onto it, much like I presume the High Cross feed-in but preferably a little longer.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
12	14/11/2016	1. I was pleased to have the opportunity to discuss part of the draft Neighbourhood Plan with members of the Steering Group Committee at the informal surgery on Saturday and am very grateful for their help and advice. I take this opportunity to thank members of the Steering Group Committee for their hard work and congratulate them on presenting their Draft Neighbourhood Plan.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.

	<p>2. I raised my concern that there is no mention of “infills in the hamlets” although I had understood that such applications would be considered. Both Mike Gill and Dick Rainbird confirmed this principle is accepted by the EHDC and by the Steering Group Committee and suggested I write with my comments to enable this point to be included in the Draft Plan. There are very few references to “infill” in the Draft Plan and none (as far as I can see) to “infills” in the hamlets.</p>	<p>In the hamlets (Barwick, Bromley, Latchford, Wellpond, Broken and Old Hall Green) and within Category 2 village Colliers End, each properties tend to have an individual access to the public highway. Where proposed new properties access off a common drive, this can produce an extreme and unacceptable change with a negative impact on the rural street scene of the hamlet/village. The term 'infill' when applied to the above areas and indeed within Standon and Puckeridge, should add the existing street scene in exactly the same way as existing development which has in the same way created the present ethos of its surroundings. Any proposals not being infill but speculative development and detracting from the general theme of its surroundings will be considered contrary to the District Plan and the Standon Parish Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
	<p>3. Paragraph 5.36 states “In the draft District Plan Colliers End is listed in policy VILL2 as a Group 2 village where limited infill development will be acceptable..... Those villages not listed as Group 1 or Group 2 settlements will be considered as Group 3 villages where limited infill development will be acceptable provided that it’s identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. There are no Group 3 villages in Standon Parish. Accordingly for the purposes of this Plan, policy GBR2 of the District Plan will be applied to all parts of the Parish except for Standon and Puckeridge and Colliers End. Thus there will be a presumption against development in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt with certain exceptions (see policy SP9 below).”</p>	<p>Amendments to be made?</p>
	<p>4. Policy SP8 states: “In the Group 2 settlement of Colliers End, there will be limited infill provision for housing of up to five dwellings, in accordance with Policy VILL2 of the East Herts District Plan.....”</p>	<p>Amendments to be made?</p>
	<p>5. Policy SP9 states “In all other parts of Standon Parish, with the exception of the Group 1 and Group 2 Villages, there will be a presumption against development in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and East Herts District Plan Policy GBR2. Exceptions to this presumption, for specified rural needs, will be determined against policies GRB2 and HOU4 of the District Plan and policy SP12 of this Plan. NB for the purposes of policies SP8 and SP9, the definition of ‘infill’ requires that any new property contributes to the character of the street scene in exactly the same way as existing development.” SP12 sets out “the eligibility criteria for Local Needs Affordable Housing on rural exception sites” and makes no reference to “infill”.</p>	<p>See response the 12.2 above.</p>
	<p>6. I wonder, therefore, if it would it be possible to expand Policy SP8 to include limited infill provision for housing in the hamlets of Barwick, Latchford, Wellpond Green, Broken Green, Bromley and Old Hall Green. Paragraph 5.36 and Policy SP9 would also need to be amended.</p>	<p>See response the 12.2 above.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>1. If any of the planned developments get the go ahead, particularly the larger ones, is it not possible to get the developers to put money into the community. This needs to be for the long term and not like the developers at Buntingford who put money (short-term) into public transport (buses) and then when their properties are all sold (partly due to 'good' public transport in their literature) the extra buses were taken off!</p> <p>2. We need long-term benefits for our schools, surgery, public transport and amenities. They make huge profits on developments and we should not be 'fobbed off' by them all.</p>	<p>Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements? No further action to be taken.</p>

14	21/11/2016	1. Firstly can I thank everybody involved with the plan. The time and effort that they put into something like this is very much appreciated by the rest of the community. I was born in this village and my children will be the fourth generation of my family to live here. We all love this parish and care immensely that any development is sympathetic to its character.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. I agree that the proposed development on the Cafe Field is too large and goes above and beyond the requirement for our parish. I would not object to limited development lower in the valley and parallel to the Cambridge Road and at the rear of the Co-op development. However, the housing should not extend up the hill. This would be detrimental to the feel of the village and dramatically alter key public views, including those from the A120, Cambridge Road, looking back from various footpaths on the other side of the A120, current housing and allotments. If this whole area were to be developed the immediate impact for someone driving past would be of a small town rather than a village.	Policy SP3 refers. No further action to be taken.
		3. In Point 5.41 you talk about smaller dwellings with "1, 2, 3 and 4 bedrooms". I would suggest that 4 bedrooms is not a small dwelling and even 3 is not really small. Surely we should be encouraging the building of 1 and 2 bedroom properties to help first time buyers or people retiring into smaller properties?	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		4. Any development approved should be to include solar panels.	Policies SP2 and SP15 refer. No further action to be taken.
		5. Any develop should include a significant amount of green communal area and include attractive and appropriate trees.	Policy SP14 refers. No further action to be taken.
		6. The local Scout Association have been trying for years to raise the money to fund the buying of land and building of a scout hut. Surely this would be the ideal opportunity to include this as part of the planning permission? The children of the village for many generations have enjoyed the benefits of this wonderful activity. There is not much else for them to do locally and therefore it is essential that if we are to expand the parish, we should support this activity, run by hard working volunteers, and provide them with a dedicated base.	Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.
		7. The plan covers the need to alter the junction with Cambridge Road and the A120. This is imperative and before any further development is undertaken this needs to go ahead.	Policy SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
		8. You don't mention the junction going out of Puckeridge to Buntingford where it is necessary to turn back to reach Pearce's Farm Shop. This might be outside the scope of this plan but I would mention that this is also dangerous given the speed that many people travel along the A10 going north, many not realising that this junction exists and that local people are slowing in this lane to make a turn.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		9. I support the requirement for smaller, affordable housing and the terms that would be applied to someone making an application. This should most definitely be for those who have a long term connection with the parish. There is also a need for sufficient local advertising when the properties are for sale, via such publications such as the PS, noticeboards, etc.	Policy SP12 refers. No further action to be taken.
		10. When you talk about the A120 bypass, I object to this passing to the south of the village over the Water Meadow area. This is a particularly beautiful part of the local countryside, used by many local residents and it would be tragic if the road was built here. In the interim, I like many other residents, dread the time when the Little Hadham bypass is opened. I have no idea how I will be able to drive out of South Road and head towards the A10.	Policy SP3 refers. No further action to be taken.
		11. I am concerned to hear about the drainage problems and it would seem that no new development should drain into the current system, unless the developer pays to make the necessary changes to upgrade.	Policy SP 24 refers. No further action to be taken.
		12. I would not want to see land around the local schools being sold for development. The large playing fields are part of our local community and provide wonderful play areas for the children.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.

		<p>13. I am finding it increasingly difficult to secure an appointment with the doctor. I hear that I am not alone. Surely, increased population is just going to make this more difficult? Are their plans to expand the service/add doctors?</p>	<p>NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity. As with many other GP Practices, the recruitment of GP's is extremely difficult.</p>
		<p>14. I seem to be against most other people, but on the point of sustainable energy, I have no objection to wind turbines. I think they are rather lovely and if we want to keep using increasing amounts of electricity, we need to accept this as part of our local landscape. Maybe we should begin approving the build of smaller versions to meet the needs of local residents?</p>	<p>Policy SP2 and 3 refers. No further action to be taken.</p>
15	22/11/2016	<p>1. Surface water is our main concern after the flooding down in the village in 2014.</p> <p>2. Doctors: it takes 2 weeks now to get an appointment.</p>	<p>Policy SP24. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>The Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre has over 8,000 patients and space is limited. The NHS 2017 Planned Extension will provide more consulting rooms.</p>
		<p>3. Cars: various papers (Link etc.) saying about people getting out of their cars and biking or walking. Put infrastructure in before you start building.</p>	<p>Policy SP20 refers to improving cycling links but little detail shown. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>4. My view on building more homes in villages is that you are making a huge mistake for the future. Houses should be built near towns where they have trains and buses so people don't have to use their cars.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
16	22/11/2016	<p>1. Before any further development to Puckeridge/Standon goes ahead the infrastructure needs to be addressed - size of Doctor's surgery - schools.</p>	<p>NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity.</p>
		<p>2. Also before any further development of Standon and Puckeridge is to be considered, major priority must be to control the traffic so that people can exit from Station Road onto the A120 safely, also to control traffic on the A10 roundabout, so that people can cross the A120 from the old A10 safely. Standon and Puckeridge can't cope with the traffic now. Streets lined with cars due to households not having parking spaces, over develop and this will just add to this problem.</p>	<p>Policies SP18 and 19 refer. No further action to be taken.</p>
17	22/11/2016	<p>I would like to draw your attention to the sad condition of the bus shelter in Station Road outside my house. For many years I have tried to find someone who is responsible for the cleaning only to be passed from one department to another, local councillors, the bus companies - no one wants to know. Please can you help? The bus shelter on the other side of the road is cleaned regularly.</p>	<p>Referred to parish council clerk for action. No further action to be taken.</p>
18	25/11/2016	<p>1. I live next to the Puckeridge Tributary and my garden is often flooded. I'm extremely worried that more building will mean overload on Puckeridge's drainage, which is already a problem.</p> <p>2. I am also worried about the lack of thought as to access to doctors, increase in traffic and lack of school places.</p>	<p>Policy SP24 refers. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity. This will mean more consulting space for GP's.</p>
19	26/11/2016	<p>1. It seems very sensible to concentrate all the new development in the Cambridge Road area, as long as SAFE and practical vehicular access can be arranged onto the A120 and A10. The permissions granted and pending would seem to take care of all the new housing required.</p> <p>2. Since several people are destined to become millionaires or multi-millionaires as a result of permission being granted for housing to be built on their land, we hope that some pressure can be applied to them BEFORE permission is granted, to contribute to the alleviation of the many problems that such an increase in population, and their remarkable piece of good fortune, will doubtless bring.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Developers may need to join together on this. Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.</p>
20	26/11/2016	<p>1. Whilst I recognise the need for affordable housing (my granddaughter has had to move miles away to afford a property) recent developments haven't taken this into account.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No further action to be taken.</p>

		<p>2. As a person who was flooded in 2014 I am concerned that more houses will increase flood risk. This also affects the sewage problem. I was disturbed to receive a letter from the Environment Agency to say I was responsible to clear any blockages in the Puckeridge Tributary behind my property.</p> <p>3. My other concerns are that the surgery and schools are at capacity, the need for shops and the poor bus service.</p>	<p>Policy SP24 refers. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity. This will mean more consulting space for GP's.</p>
21	26/11/2016	<p>1. First the report is well set out and presented. Easy to read.</p> <p>2. I think we should consider building terrace houses. Small houses look better that way - but they should have <u>very good sound proofing</u> which is possible.</p> <p>3. When new houses are built it should be mandatory to have energy saving features, e.g. solar panels where appropriate and good insulation built in as normal.</p> <p>4. It should be mandatory to separate the drainage of surface/rain water and household waste water. You have highlighted the problem.</p> <p>5. Relieved to see access to A10 from old Cambridge Road has been proposed.</p> <p>6. Health Centre appointments at present are given three weeks hence. It can only get worse with planning proposals leading to an increase in population. It's concerning and worrying.</p> <p>7. Too old to be interested in schools.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Policy SP2 refers. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Covered by SP24 and Water Company legislation. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity. This will mean more consulting space for GP's.</p> <p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
22	26/11/2016	<p>1. The burden on the A120 is already immense trying to turn against the run of traffic proves difficult at best so the introduction of more houses in the villages is sure to impact. Standon would greatly benefit from average speed cameras <u>to try and curb speeding through the village.</u></p> <p>2. The Cambridge Road sites would be reasonable provided the proposed exit onto the A10 is approved together with restricting the exit from the Cambridge Road turning right onto the A120 near the roundabout.</p> <p>3. Provided the housing is of reasonable size with adequate parking and provided stringent checks are made on whether the utilities and infrastructure can cope and adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>4. Refuse, sewers need to be looked at carefully, together with the fact that 150 houses with two cars each (if not more) means certain congestion.</p>	<p>Speeding was an issue raised during consultation (para 3.9) but is a matter for the Police. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>SP24 refers. No further action to be taken.</p>
23	26/11/2016	<p>1. I am very concerned about several proposed developments in and around Standon. The development of Café Field will surely lead to proposals to the south of the A120, which will result in there being no break between Standon/Puckeridge and Colliers End, and so both will lose their identity.</p> <p>2. However, I am even more concerned about the proposal to build 15 properties in the field behind (on the Stortford side of) Town Farm Crescent. The would leave the door wide open to developing the whole field. I personally will end up with a car park behind my house. This will also put further stress of the access to the A120; take away very much needed natural countryside; put even more stress on drainage down towards the river; and be building on GREEN BELT. This should not be allowed to proceed. This proposal makes not sense other than to line someone's pocket. Please let common sense prevail.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p> <p>This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.</p>
24	28/11/2016	<p>1. Any increase in population for the village must be met with proportionate investment in the local schools and GP surgery as a minimum to ensure they are supported in managing the increased demand on these services. Investment in local facilities such as the community centre, grounds and village hall would also be courteous.</p>	<p>Covered by Policies SP20, 21 and 22. Developers may need to join together on this. Builders' support for improvements to infrastructure improvements could come from S106 agreements. No further action to be taken.</p>

		<p>2. The locations of development appear rather sporadic around the village and would be best concentrated in a single large area to avoid the level of disruption to current residents. The lower part of Café Hill appears most favourable, where there will be relatively minimal disruption and greater efficiency in terms of incorporating/ upgrading the necessary utilities.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		<p>3. Of course, I'm particularly against the relatively small and unnecessary additional development proposal behind Town Farm Crescent. Myself and all other residents along this road value the outlook for which had been reflected in the price of our property on purchase and therefore we have both a personal and financial interest in maintaining this, or seeking compensation where this is taken from us. A number of other points to note on this development proposal:</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o Additional car access onto the increasingly busy A120 will impose additional risk to the already compromised safety along that road. Should Town Farm Crescent be looked upon as an access point, this would be inconsiderate. There are many cars already parked along this road, an increase of traffic would make the road unfit for purpose. Any development regarding increased access to the A120 at this point highlights the necessity of a bypass.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o The safety of pedestrians, particularly children, would need to be considered due to a housing development of this nature bringing more children to this part of the village and/or potentially an increase in resident traffic in addition to the increase of traffic on the A120 due to other developments in the area. A footpath from the top of Town Farm Crescent across the fields to the school and community grounds would be favourable, to avoid the need to walk along the narrow path next to the busy A120 and to keep children safe.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o The need for a 'drainage lake' must immediately raise a red flag, highlighting the flood risk to developing on this land.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o The geography of this land would mean that housing is built at a higher level to current housing along Town Farm Crescent which has the potential to overshadow current residents which will block light and be intrusive on privacy.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o Proposing the location of affordable housing backing onto current residents is incredibly inconsiderate.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>o The significant amount of inconvenience and lack of consideration of current residents would, if the development was to go ahead, require a legal process to ensure sufficient compensation is granted to current residents.</p>	This development does not feature in the NP. No further action to be taken.
		<p>4. I was surprised to hear that following the A120 consultation, the outcome is suggested to be a delay on the bypass due to, as I understand, a 50/50 split on whether the bypass should be north or south of the village. Instead, a proposal to improve the current road is likely to go ahead. If this is the case, then this would appear to be against public consultation rules since the notion to improve the road was one of the 3 options being consulted upon. Therefore, this option can only be favoured if it received the vast majority of the public vote. However, I understand that there was greater support for the other 2 bypass options - the outcome therefore must be a preferred position of a bypass of some sort. If this is correct then the consultation is open to legal challenge.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
25	12/04/2016	<p>As a long standing resident of Puckeridge, I write to give my wholehearted support to the Draft Local Plan. To the team who have given their time and careful consideration to every detail, I extend my thanks and admiration. The document is beautifully written, the content clear and concise, the proposals make absolute sense and will conserve the nature of the community and built environment. The proposed solution for the A120/Cambridge Road problem is a stroke of genius! BRILLIANT</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
26	12/05/2016	<p>1. First, I should like to say that this seems to me to be a thorough and perspicacious plan and deals well with the constraints of the context in which it has been prepared. Broadly, I support it strongly.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.

<p>2. Given the two bullet points under “Context” in the key objectives (para. 4.3) and some of the subsequent Policies in the Plan, I believe that it would be giving a hostage to fortune to mildly accept that accordance with the NPPF and the EH District Plan is necessarily sufficient to obtain support. I suggest that there should be an addition to SP1:</p> <p>SP1development proposals which accord with, or preferably go beyond, the principles of sustainable development</p>	<p>Changed wording to be considered further</p>
<p>3. Subsequently, the plan supports on site energy generation and/or low energy systems. Again, I believe that this should be reflected clearly in these first two key policies. I suggest:</p> <p>SP2 Insert a new paras. (2) Providing on-site power generation and/or low energy systems. (3) Minimising the use of private cars as far as possible. Re-number existing para (2) as para (4).</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered</p>
<p>4. The Plan seeks to protect the view over the water meadows south of Standon, which is excellent, but these meadows are more important than this. They provide an excellent facility for residents, especially dog-owners, and thus promote healthy walking. The emerging District Plan proposes to designate the west bank as a wildlife site. I suggest designating the whole of the water meadows for protection by adding to SP6:</p> <p>SP6 Add at the end of the third para.: Environmental Records Centre, and the water meadows south of Standon on the east and west banks of the river Rib (including the meadow designated as a wildlife site in the emerging East Herts District Plan).</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered Wildlife Sites 32/044 Standon Lordship Meadows – Northern section, 32/045 Standon Lordship Meadows – Southern section, 32/085 Standon Lordship Area</p>
<p>5. I believe that there may be an understatement of need for affordable housing in the village survey. Specific comments show that some people had personal reasons for wanting affordable homes whilst others may have answered according to the type of neighbour that they want, without having any knowledge of what the real local need is.</p> <p>Also, many do not see the point of “affordable” housing when, as currently defined, it is not affordable for those that really need it. However, there is a strong desire for smaller houses and houses to rent, which suggests that respondents want houses for local people who cannot at the moment get them.</p> <p>To minimise travel, those likely to commute by car either to stations or to workplaces should be discouraged. So, larger houses attracting commuters should be discouraged and affordable homes for local people encouraged, particularly in village developments.</p> <p>Therefore, I suggest: SP11 Amend to read after “dwellings”:which are affordable at the maximum levels indicated in District Plan policy HOU3, subject to other policies in this Plan.</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered</p>

<p>6. Climate change is the biggest threat that we face and SP15 seems rather mealy-mouthed by only “encouraging ... high standards” rather than demanding them. Even the draft District Plan talks of getting developers to go beyond what the current regulations require.</p> <p>Ground source heat pumps are much more easily installed on new-build sites. I am not in a position to compare costs, but I doubt if at that stage their installation is much more expensive than, say, gas fired boilers.</p> <p>I should like to see SP15 being more outspoken on these lines:</p> <p>SP15 New dwellings must be constructed to high standards of sustainability. All new buildings must be constructed to the highest standards of energy efficiency. New buildings should incorporate the use of renewable energy technologies and other low energy systems, such as ground source heat pumps, with the aim of achieving zero net carbon emissions. All car parking and driveways will have surfaces that are pervious to rainwater.</p> <p>Support will be givenetc. as original.</p>	<p>Changed wording to be considered further</p>
<p>7. Para. 5.55. I do not believe that it is true that “Standon and Puckeridge are further from a railway station than any other substantive settlement in Hertfordshire”. Nearby, Buntingford is further from Royston Station than Puckeridge is from Ware. It would be a pity if the sound point being made was overlooked because this statement was disputed. Instead of this sentence, I suggest: Local railway stations are upwards of five miles from Standon and Puckeridge.</p>	<p>Changed wording to be considered further</p>
<p>8. Para. 5.62. I should like to see added at the end: In particular, the housing proposed in this Plan should be provided with a cycle path to the shops in Standon, avoiding the use of the A120, and a convenient means of accessing the cycle path under the A10 leading to Colliers End, to encourage cycling along the old A10 to Ware.</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered</p>
<p>9. The A120 bypass was originally planned as part of a strategic east-west trunk route from the Haven Ports to the West Midlands and the North. The history of the planning process is described in the Transport Topic Paper, explaining how the status of the A120 has declined in the past 30 years. Nevertheless, the County Council is responsible for the maintenance of the A120 and its future improvement. In early 2016 the County Council published a consultation leaflet. The leaflet explained the potential need for the bypass and sought views on three options: two alternative route corridors for a by-pass – one to the north, and one to the south, of Standon and Puckeridge – and improvements to the existing road. Since there was opposition to both bypass routes, the County Council decided to concentrate for the medium term on improving the existing road, which effectively means that consideration of a bypass is deferred until 2030 at the earliest.</p>	<p>Comments noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
<p>10. From this consultation, the Parish Survey results and other consultation events, it was clear that there was considerable support in principle for a bypass. At this stage, however, all the Neighbourhood Plan can do is to show its support for the eventual construction of a bypass and to protect areas from development which may affect the planning and construction of a bypass route. In the meantime, the County Council is exploring whether a series of on-line improvements could be made to the A120 through Standon and Puckeridge. These interim measures would need to off-set the effects of the Little Hadham bypass which will change the volume and patterns of traffic flow through Standon Parish, both on the A120 and connecting roads. The Parish Survey also showed high levels of concern about entering the A120 safely, speeding and crossing safely. The Parish Council will work closely with the County Council in the development of the interim measures and will seek to ensure that all the issues are addressed and that there is full public consultation and involvement.</p> <p>5.64a. Also, since the consultation took place, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) has expressed considerable concerns about air pollution, particularly arising from road traffic. Therefore, this is also a concern whilst the A120 continues to bisect the community of Standon and Puckeridge. Currently, air quality in the village is not monitored by the District Council.</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered</p>

		<p>11. Para. 5.80 recognises the importance of Ridge House Pharmacy, but does not refer to the fact that there is a current threat to pharmacies serving smaller communities. I suggest adding at the end of the para. on the pharmacy: Recently, national plans to drastically reduce the number of pharmacies have been mooted. This is an important service for the community and also helps to maintain the viability of other shops in Puckeridge. The Parish Council will seek to ensure that this service is not lost.</p>	Policy SP16 refers to shops. No further action to be taken.
		<p>12. Comments on Transport Report (Second Draft)</p> <p>Page 3: There is paragraph in which I am quoted at the top of page 3 which is not quite accurate. Jan Cunningham may already have amended the quote in inverted commas which was not, in fact, a direct quote. It should read something like this:</p> <p>Over the period from 2007 to 2013, the STANDonA120 campaign, chaired at the time by David Bell, campaigned for the installation of average speed cameras. The campaign was endorsed by public meetings in the village in 2007 and 2010. In spite of support from Sir Oliver Heald MP and the leader of the County Council at the time, David Beatty, it did not succeed. After another public meeting in 2013, the focus was altered to pressing for a bypass.</p> <p>“Data on speeds (were) collected in 2007 after the vehicle activated signs had been put in place. 85th percentile speeds were above 40 mph at all points except by the pelican crossing. Our estimate is that something like three-quarters of vehicles exceed the speed limit at some point through the village.” (excerpt 19/11/09)</p> <p>At the end of the section on “Setting Local Speed Limits”, I suggest that you add: The County Council has a policy that there should be a 30 mph speed limit through all villages and the speed limit was reduced from 40 mph when this policy was adopted.</p>	Changed wording to be considered further
27	12/05/2016	<p>1. I notice that on the page with the Standon plan, you have copied over from the district plan an error which shows only one side of the Laundry meadows(water meadow) as a wild life site.</p>	This needs checking
		<p>2. Further, the district plan doesn't seem to show any of the plans that are available with the paper document so are unavailable for general email comment.</p> <p>I have made comment to Linda Halsey them but to date have had no reply.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
28	12/05/2016	<p>1. Firstly, well done in producing such well thought out documents. Thankyou for the opportunity to comment. I had hoped to attend more of the planning meetings in person and get involved but the Tuesday meetings don't fit well into my schedule.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		<p>2. I had hoped the climate change plan document might include some more details to reduce car usage and support alternatives like public transport and bicycles. Having just moved to the area from a larger town I have been struck by how dependent villagers are on their cars and I now own a car for the first time in my 43 years :0) The main plan seems to have entirely given up on the possibility of good bus services that would be needed to reduce car usage.</p>	Policy SP20 refers to improving cycling links but little detail shown. No further action to be taken.

		<p>3. Regarding renewable sources of energy, your documents promote that and I completely support that. Does the preservation of rural views from public rights if way prevent all generation of wind power? It hints at this. Personally I rate generation of renewable power as much more important than maintaining all our rural vistas, and would certainly consider some change to rural views, particularly if the turbines were owned by and for the benefit of the local people. At minimum I think you should spell out openly and transparently whether wind turbines or rural views are more important according to the majority view.</p>	<p>Additional wording to be considered - The location of sensitive habitats or species can have a strong influence over the design of a wind farm. The landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) forms a significant part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for any wind farm development. Grid connection is becoming an increasingly significant barrier to the development of many wind farm projects. Connection to the local electricity network that can carry away all the generated electricity from the site at an affordable price is essential for a successful project.</p>
29	12/05/2016	<p>1. Firstly I would like to thank you for all the hard work you have put into the plan. I'm impressed with what you have achieved and overall I like and agree with what you have put together.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>2. I would like you to stress the importance of improving the A10/A120 junction. Even with out the proposed developments it is a dangerous junction, where cars hardly slow down. We live in Colliers End and use the road to Puckeridge shops quite often.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>3. By car I am often shocked at how fast cars drive up to the roundabout barely slowing to check for traffic. On a few occasions cars have started to pull out because they have not slowed enough to see that I have been indicating to come off the roundabout to drive to Colliers End. This is the same when trying to cross over the A120 from The Cambridge Road through Puckeridge. If houses are built on the land right next to the roundabout any road improvements to that junction will be restricted. I do believe some land should be reserved until a safer junction can be designed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>4. When the A120 road improvements are looked at, perhaps some of the money raised from the new developments in Puckeridge should go toward traffic lights at that junction and also other junctions in the village that are affected by traffic on A120. Traffic lights will also help to slow traffic between the two villages and help those people trying to pull out.</p>	<p>Policy SP18 refers to egress road but traffic lights unlikely to be granted by Highways on A120 after removal of those at Little Hadham. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>5. Where you have rightly said that Rural and farm businesses must be helped this should also allow sustainable energy to be produced to help support the business but also to provide sustainable energy for the villages.</p>	<p>Policy SP15 relates to energy efficiency. No further action to be taken.</p>
30	12/02/2016	<p>1. Firstly we would like to thank all involved in the draft neighbourhood plan and supporting documents and we acknowledge the amount of work which has gone into their preparation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>2. We recognise the need for a plan which as far as possible is agreed by all the residents of the parish however we have serious reservations about some aspect of the proposed developments and as it stands would not vote for it.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>3. It seems that any additional housing is going to increase the risk of tributary flooding and sewerage overflow; we trust that expert advice will be taken and if drainage capacity needs to be increased that will be done before any building works starts but as that is outside of our area of expertise, we must leave it to those who do understand such things.</p>	<p>Comment noted. No further action to be taken.</p>
		<p>4. The main concerns about which we do have personal knowledge are the numbers and location of the proposed houses. The draft neighbourhood plan provides for 185 houses to 2033, but EHDC draft plan states a minimum of 146, if that is the number considered proportional to the existing villages that is the number we should plan for.</p>	<p>Response to be considered in Lands Group report?</p>

		<p>5. We strongly disagree with the decision to concentrate the whole development strategy around Cambridge Road Puckeridge. We note that you looked at 35/037 (Livings Land) 'in an effort to keep development away from the Cambridge Rd..... To balance out the development a bit more evenly' which we think is the correct strategy. The Land Group report states that the North of Standon developments could not be taken into account because of Highways requirements of no new additional access onto an existing highway. However a planning application has been made for 15 houses on this land so presumably developers don't see access as a problem. There is also an application for 11 houses at the north end of Puckeridge and we request both these sites be included in the plan. We hope that attempt by developers to add to our requirement for 146 houses will be strongly resisted especially the proposed massive development of Cafe Field.</p>	Response to be considered in Lands Group report?
		<p>6. By providing for our minimum requirement of 146 houses and including the current applications, the Cambridge Road sites are reduced to 120 which should still mean a significant increase in vehicles which should be recognised as a major concern.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		<p>7. We were please that the Group recognises the Cambridge Road/A120 junction is dangerous and that so far serious accidents have been prevented by local people being very cautious or using the already congested High Street.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		<p>8. The report agrees that the junction could not cope with hundreds more vehicles and suggests this problem could be resolved by substituting a new road connection to the A10. The map seems to show this joining the dual carriageway which we think would be dangerous and cause delays due to the volume of traffic on the A10 at busy times, and the potential for hundreds of vehicles attempting to join it. It would be safer if the access road joined the roundabout, possibly with traffic light control, but there would still be delays causing drivers to use the High Street instead. However as Highways do not class the junction with the A120 as unsatisfactory this seems somewhat hypothetical and the probability of additional vehicles will join those risking the Cambridge Road exit, or adding to the congestion in the High Street in which case 120 new houses are still too many. We would like other sites to be identified, to further reduce the pressure on Cambridge Road (with knock on effect on Puckeridge High Street) and to achieve your stated wish to 'balance out the development a bit more evenly'.</p>	This is covered by Policy SP18. No further action to be taken.
		<p>9. We are also glad you have recognised that 1.5 parking spaces per household is insufficient, for example the residents of the Buffalo's Head land have parking spaces but leave their vehicles on the road adding to the difficulties of getting to and from our home. The definition of 'parking space' also needs to be considered, as is happening with public car parks, many people have oversized cars and large vans which do not fit into an average parking space so are parked on the road.</p>	This is covered by Policy SP19 but suggests a minimum width needs to be added. Needs consideration.
		<p>10. We do hope you take our concerns into consideration, we accept the need for additional housing, some of which will directly affect Puckeridge, but we do think we have been allocated more than our fair share.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
31	12/06/2016	<p>1. Confused Council. Firstly I would like to say I read an article in the autumn edition of the Link Magazine' regarding green travel (page 14/15). It these houses are built the theory of green travel does not happen, because there is no work in these villages. Meaning a majority of people will have to use their cars to get to work.</p>	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		<p>2. Regarding cycle lanes. 10 years ago at a community meeting with councillors I asked about a cycle way between Puckeridge and Buntingford as the road is very dangerous and was greeted with what a fantastic idea. 10 years on still no cycle way.</p>	Policy SP20 refers to improving cycling links but little detail shown. No further action to be taken.
		<p>3. The doctor's surgery is already overloaded and it takes several weeks for an appointment.</p>	NHS England has the following planned works 2017 to Puckeridge and Standon Health Centre - Extension and works to increase clinical activity. This will mean more consulting space for GP's.
		<p>4. Finally the surface water. I live in the centre of the village and every time we have a heavy fall of rain the drains fill up. Meaning one thing the pipes between the drains are full up with sludge. Putting houses at the top of the village can mean only one thing - more water coming to the centre of Puckeridge and perhaps flooding houses opposite where I live again (approx. five foot of water three years ago). A quote from Thames Water says (letter 22/09/2016) states inability of the waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application.</p>	Policy SP24 refers. No further action to be taken.

32	12/06/2016	1. It feels like our Parish is being overwhelmed by housing developments and nobody within the council or builders seems to care what existing villagers feel or even asked about their thoughts. More housing but no more schools or doctors surgery for many, many more people.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
33	12/06/2016	1. Congratulations on a full and comprehensive information report.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. With the speed at which developers are descending on Standon and Puckeridge the rural feel to the villages is under threat. How much of this plan will they take into consideration?	It will be given material consideration once adopted. No further action to be taken.
		3. It is a great solution to have a new entrance onto the A10 as this would alleviate the problems with the junction of Cambridge Road and the A10.	Policy SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
		4. Improvements have to be made to the A120 for the safety of all road users.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		5. The provision of parking spaces on these new developments is never enough, so let's hope the developers and planners make sure the surrounding roads do not become congested with parked cars and take the necessary steps to prevent this.	Policy SP19 refers. No further action to be taken.
34	12/09/2016	Comments from Beverley Homes.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
35	12/09/2016	1. This representation is submitted on behalf of Mr John Greenaway of Kasteel, Wellpond Green, being a resident of the Parish. It relates to the statement at paragraph 5.36 in The Neighbourhood Plan that "Those villages not listed as Group 1 or Group 2 settlements will be considered as Group 3 villages, where limited infill development will be acceptable, provided that it's identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. There are no Group 3 villages in Standon Parish. Accordingly, for the purposes of this Plan, policy GBR2 of the District Plan will be applied to all parts of the Parish, except for Standon and Puckeridge and Colliers End. Thus there will be a presumption against development in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt, with certain exceptions (see policy SP9 below)". This is considered to be an incorrect interpretation of policy VILL3 Group 3 Villages of the Pre-Submission District Plan in that it is considered that the settlement of Wellpond Green, not being classed as either a Group 1 or 2 village, is by default a Group 3 settlement.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
		2. Moreover, it is also in conflict with Planning Practice Guidance which states that:- "It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements. This is clearly set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in the core planning principles, the section on supporting a prosperous rural economy and the section on housing. A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities..... All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence. The NPPF also recognises that different sustainable transport policies and measures will be required in different communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas". (Bold text is my emphasis).	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
		3. Thus, there is no justification for the presumption against infill development in Wellpond Green as embodied in policy SP9.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
36	12/11/2016	1. Well our main comment is WELL DONE. We are impressed by the amount of work that has been done and the way it is presented. Having lived in the village for nearly 30 years we have seen great changes. We welcome your assessment and guidelines. We believe that you have considered all aspects of village life. Of course development has to come to Standon and Puckeridge, but with your input we hope for this to be as mutually beneficial as possible.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.

		2. Safety at A120 / A10 junction is a priority and needs to be addressed BEFORE houses are built. Speed along the A120 and access onto / off it into the High Street, Station Road and Town Farm Crescent is another priority in our opinion. This again should be addressed before MORE houses are built. i.e. behind Town Farm Crescent.	Policy SP18 refers. No further action to be taken.
37	12/11/2016	1. A comprehensive plan covering all issues pertaining to the well being of the growing community. It recognizes that development will take place and seeks to ensure quality control and to mitigate possible negative consequences. Re. public transport, greater use might be made of public transport with an enhanced bus service, but I recognize that this is a chicken and egg situation.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. Although outside the scope of the document, development will affect traffic flow and congestion. Speeding both along A120 and along Puckeridge High street are major concerns.	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
38	12/11/2016	1. If the proposed housing applications are approved for the Cafe Field and Chestnut & Glantons sites, there will be an increase in traffic movements affecting the A10, the A120 and South Road. It is already very difficult at times to access South Road and the A120. Furthermore it is difficult and dangerous for people to cross the A120 to Barwick Road and the bus stop. As far as South Road is concerned, this is a very busy road with buses, school coaches, taxis, delivery vehicles, children going to school, people going to the doctors surgery, etc. There is already a dangerous situation with traffic turning into South Road from the A120. The double yellow lines need extending to Gauldie Way thus improving the sight line and access/egress from Saffron Meadow. If the Cambridge Road/A120 junction is closed then it is likely that traffic from the A120 East will turn into South Road rather than use the A10 which is already going to see an increase in traffic from the new developments at Buntingford and Bishop's Stortford North together with expansion at Stansted Airport.	Partially covered by narrative contained in 5.56. The access to the bus stop is mentioned elsewhere and needs consideration. The South Road issues need some consideration. As do the ramifications for South Road in the creation of a new egress road.
		2. Regarding the proposed housing, there are concerns about sewerage, drainage and water. Only this week we have had a letter from Affinity Water informing us that they will be fitting water meters because they are concerned about water usage and increased demand in the area. Another issue over the years has been power cuts which still happen from time to time.	Should this be covered by 6.6? See comments by Thames Water (Affinity Water??) under comments 39,
		3. Finally, all of this will increase pollution which will affect our health. Added to this there is already expansion taking place at Stansted Airport which will increase air pollution over the Parish as aircraft come into land.	EHDC Policy EQ4. Chapter 24, states that ' Development and land uses should minimise potential impacts on local air quality both during construction and operation including the operation of heating, cooling and extraction units'
39	12/12/2016	Response from Thames Water.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
40	12/12/2016	Letter from Gladman Developers.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
41	12/12/2016	1. General comment: the document is very well presented and argued. As a Puckeridge resident for over 30 years, I can find very little fault with the analysis and conclusions. Save for the comment below, I am fully supportive of the draft plan, particularly Policies SP11 and SP12 (Affordable Housing).	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. Specific comment: Policy SP7. Given the significance of the site in the wider landscape, I cannot support the development of any part of the Cafe Field site. I recognise, of course, the housing requirement for the village set out in the emerging Local Plan but would prefer the development of alternative sites such as the Enfield Supplies site in Station Road and the post-2031 site in Cambridge Road.	Comments noted. Sites assessed by Lands Group. No further action to be taken.

		3. Notwithstanding the above, I fear that the District Council is about to approve the 160-dwelling planning application for the Cafe Field site given that the highway authority has now agreed the scheme and the District Council's own landscape officer seems satisfied with the amended scheme. In my view, the District Council has let its residents down by failing to produce a Local Plan since the last one expired in 2011, leaving the district vulnerable to speculative applications in places such as Buntingford and Puckeridge that have no Green Belt protection. If the amended Cafe Field application is indeed to be approved, the developer should not be allowed to renege on its affordable housing and other community infrastructure obligations.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
42	12/12/2016	1. Thank you for the huge effort placed on the SPNDP. We both appreciate the work with have done to try and protect the integrity of our village. We agree to your plan and have no further comments to add.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
43	12/12/2016	1. The crossing to the bus stop on the south side of the A120 opposite the entrance to Cambridge Road is dangerous.	The access to the bus stop is an issue for sustainability and needs including (6.6?)
44	12/12/2016	1. Page 13, Policy SP4. All very well, but can it be overruled later on?	Jed to comment
		2. Page 13, Policy SP5 (6). Why has there been digging/surveying work going on in this "protected" area? The excuse of archaeological work seems unlikely – if this is a protected area why would anybody waste time and money investigating what is beneath the surface?	This was purely site investigation work. No further action to be taken.
		3. Page 14, Policy SP7. This mentions 23 dwellings for the Chestnuts/Glanton site. The planning application was for 29 dwellings. If the developers can ride roughshod over the recommendations of the development plan is here any point in producing such plans?	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		4. Page 15, Policy SP11. The so-called "affordable" dwellings might well be cheaper to the initial buyers (most of whom want to move out as soon as possible if the ones in Buntingford are any guide) but subsequently their value is determined by the market, and we all know how that operates.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		5. Page 16, Policy SP13. We have seen before how once permission for a specific number of houses has been given, that number is subsequently increased on appeal. See comment on SP7 (above).	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		6. Page 17, Policy SP15. Regarding renewable energy, is consideration ever given to siting houses such that they have a south-facing roof suitable for solar panels? If not, why not?	Policy SP2 covers climate change. No further action to be taken.
		7. Page 18, Policy SP18. The proposed egress road on to the A10 gives a very limited "run-in" distance. Traffic using it and wanting to use the former main road towards Colliers End would have little chance of entering the roundabout in the appropriate lane. A better solution would be a new roundabout on the A120 approx. 500 metres east of the A10 roundabout. That would eliminate the dangerous junction between Cambridge Road and the A120 and would also better serve any development in the Cafe Field.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		8. Page 18, Policy SP19. There is no evidence that these policies have ever been followed, even in proposals still under consideration. understand Buntingford has an average of 2.3 cars per household, Puckeridge is not likely to be very different, both are dormitories rather than communities.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		9. Page 19, Policy SP20. What facilities and services?	Support and enhance existing amenities and facilities (including clubs of worship, clubs, sports, community buildings)
		10. Page 19, Policy SP21. Who will maintain these areas of public space?	This needs checking
		11. Page 20, Policy SP23 Good, but is there a demand for allotments and are newcomers as likely as older inhabitants to want one?	Comment noted. No further action to be taken.
		12. Page 21, Policy SP24. All very well, but the drains must be kept clear. Regarding surface water run-off, surely any development will involve roads, pavements, etc, increasing the amount of run-off.	Not if it is properly attenuated. No further action to be taken.

45	13/12/2016	1. We are opposed to the plan to build 160 homes on Café Field, Standon Hill, on the grounds that it is contrary to the sustainable maximum of 146 additional dwellings in Puckeridge and Standon as set out in EHDC's Draft Plan. It does not contribute to the character of the village. It will detract from the openness of the countryside and will have an urbanising effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and wider landscape.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. The village schools are almost at capacity at the moment, the extra children will have to travel further afield, which means they will have to go by car as there are very few buses serving the village. This will put more pressure on our already busy roads.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. We have already had trouble with the sewage system in the village, a further 160 dwellings will only add to the problem.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
46	13/12/2016	1. The area known as 'Laundry Meadows' or 'the watermeadows' is bisected by the River Rib. Why is the whole field not a wildlife site instead of just half?	32/044 Standon Lordship Meadows – Northern section. 32/045 St
		2. The area north of the White Hart pub has a very large area of 'Common Land', it is meant to be the verge at the junction. SLAA land should still be available for building in the future not turned into protected green space.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. Please keep housing density to a maximum of 25 per hectare.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		4. Overall plan good, especially A120/Cambridge Road revised plan.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
47	13/12/2016	1. Once the A120 Little Hadham bypass is complete, improvements for any traffic trying to turn right onto the A120 from any junction in Standon will be almost impossible. Please make improvements to rectify.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. South of Standon why is only half of the Watermeadow field a wildlife area; are they only allowed to live on one side of the field?	Can only find the above listings
		3. Please keep Burrs Meadow as an open space; it is part of the village heritage.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
48	13/12/2016	1. Interesting read, particularly proposed development plans in Puckeridge which seem very reasonable to me.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. Especially noted your views on type of houses to be constructed and associated parking which these days on residential developments leaves a lot to be desired. Roads too narrow and not enough parking provision.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. I've noticed lately around this area at least developers seem to go for the larger 4/5 bed homes or much smaller 2/3 all on top of one another. They don't seem to cater for the lies of people like US who want to downsize - but not to a tiny little terrace!	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		4. I fear though that the government calling the shots local planners will just give the go ahead to as many houses as developers want regardless of where these might be - ALL of Café Field for instance.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		5. We all know that schools and Health services are under pressure now - can Standon and Puckeridge cope with such an increase in population?	Include something about the capacity of the Health Centre.
49	13/12/2016	Letter from Strutt and Parkers.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
50	13/12/2016	1. Having lived in the village for 39 years I'm very concerned That these plans are being submitted . Having to wait 3 weeks for a doctors appointment that's without the new houses . Traffic coming out onto the A120 difficult already and you want to allow further cars how dangerous that is . Schools over subscribed so where are the new children meant to be educated . Puckeridge high street is often gridlocked and at times emergency services have struggled to get through putting life's at risk .	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. The village can not cope with extra people .	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. The drainage system can not cope with that amount of new properties.	Policy SP24 refers. No further action to be taken.
		4. I oppose these plans.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.

51	13/12/2016	Please accept my endorsement of your very detailed and well presented draft plan. I believe you have approached the issue of future housing expansion of our parish in a very structured and well reasoned manner. In particular I support the following: the need to preserve the high visibility open areas around the villages and their rural character; the need to ensure that new housing has a good mix of design types and construction materials, in keeping with those of local properties; the need to ensure that new housing contains a significant proportion of "affordable" housing with priority to local people; the need to minimise the impact of new housing development on parking, local roads/traffic and water drainage/sewerage management; the intention to resist any change of use applications to our shops, public houses and areas of employment.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		I would like to see that developers are asked to contribute to the parish as part of the approval of their developments. By this I would mean the funding of, or financial contribution towards, one or more of the following: additional teaching or medical/care positions and/or facilities; road/pavement improvements and maintenance; upkeep of local parks and open spaces; a community project.	This would come under S106 agreements and the list of infrastructure (6.6). No further action to be taken.
52	13/12/2016	1. As residents of Standon, we are proud of the village's charm and unique character and the natural beauty of the surrounding countryside.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. On the other hand, the UK has an acute housing shortage, home ownership is at a 30 year low and studies (as quoted in The Times or Channel 4 Dispatches) estimate that unless more houses are built, most people in Generation Y (those born after 1980) will never own their own homes.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		3. Hertfordshire's location, close to London, to Silicon Fen in Cambridge and to the M25, means it is inevitable that more housing will be built here. We are concerned by proposals in North Hertfordshire for a 5000 home development that would sprawl across several existing villages.	Comments noted but not relevant to the NP. No further action to be taken.
		4. In view of this, we feel that allowing small-scale, high-quality builds in the Standon area would both provide more housing for the parish, (thus bringing in more revenue for local businesses and for East Herts council) and by using up the available space in a way that is sympathetic to the character of the local area, endeavour to preserve the many features that make our parish such an attractive place to live.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
53	13/12/2016	Letter from EHDC.	Identified in separate file and assessed by Jed Griffiths.
54	13/12/2016	1. We do NOT need any more 3/4/5 bed executive homes in the villages. Listen to the people. We need maisonettes, flats or 2 bed starter homes so that youngsters can <u>afford</u> and <u>stay here</u> and continue to enjoy the surroundings and village life they grew up with.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.
		2. We need bungalows so that the older generation can still stay here and live nearby their families. We have enough 3/4/5 bed properties to upsize and downsize already. To keep the villages as villages we need only smaller properties for the young and older generations. Keep this community as it is for local people that work here and contribute to village life, clubs, entertainment and sport etc. NO MORE BIG EXECUTIVE HOMES!!! WE ONLY NEED SMALL AFFORDABLE HOMES.	Comments noted. No further action to be taken.