

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

Site CFS6 Land at Mansion House Equestrian Centre	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Support redevelopment of a derelict site. • Herts & Middx Badger Group / Herts Wildlife Monitors – no issues
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to loss of Green Belt and the progressive eroding of the boundaries. • Questions justification for inclusion when other far less rural and key sites elsewhere in the district are available, especially as this site represents a high quality rural Green Belt buffer between north Watford and St Albans. • Objections to loss of wildlife, Skylarks (on the RSBP red list), swallows, house martins, swifts, yellow hammers, meadow pipits, kites, buzzards, sparrowhawks, kestrels, owls, partridges, badgers, foxes, roe deer and muntjac deer, stoats, and it also contains some well - established ancient hedgerows which provide habitat for many of the above. • Objections to loss of agricultural land, public rights of way and Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which is an area of substantive nature conservation value which makes an important contribution to local ecology. • Objections the need for more homes, given that the local population has decreased as EU workers have returned home due to Brexit and Covid.
Site CFS26c West of the Kings Langley Estate	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Minimal impact on existing residents, plenty of land
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to the site's location adjacent to the M25, impact of noise, light and air pollution and increased traffic. • Objections to a primary school close to the M25 and its impact on children's health. • Objections to loss of agricultural use, public rights of way throughout the site and nature conservation due to the Local Wildlife Site (LWS), which makes an important contribution to local ecology. • Herts Wildlife Monitors – there are issues regarding protected species on the eastern side of this proposed site; we would therefore object in part to this site. • Herts & Middx Badger Group – issues regarding protected species, we would be objecting in part to this site. • Objects to loss of Green Belt – development spoiling the rural appearance of the area and would take a large step towards making Kings Langley, Abbots Langley and Watford an uninterrupted conurbation. Urban sprawl would be unavoidable and the villages of Kings Langley, Abbots Langley, Bedmond and Nash Mills would coalesce into a town. • Have all Brownfield sites been explored? • KL&DRA – The Association does not dispute that there is a need to provide for future housing requirements, but these should be proportionate to the characteristics of the local community. Objects and expressed concerns about the potential effects of development to the east of the village on the settlement as a whole. Although the overall amount of housing has been reduced in the New Local Plan (Part 1 Preferred Policy Options), the scale and size of the proposed development on site CFS26c would see an increase of more than 40% in numbers of dwellings counted in the 2011 Census. Clearly, this is disproportionate to the size and function of Kings Langley, most of which lies to the west of the Grand Union Canal.

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the cumulative impact of development. The TRDC assessment takes no account of the significant level of development that has recently taken place, and is still taking place, along the canal corridor between Hyde Lane and Abbots Road, already placing unreasonable burdens on local infrastructure and services. • Objections to the impact on the open environment of the Gade valley • Objections to out-of-date studies, all pre COVID era stuff from 2014.
Site CFS8d Notley Farm (combined)	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports development of site
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to building on Green Belt land • Concerns about infrastructure provision, especially schools, nursery schools and medical facilities • Concerns about damage and loss to the natural environment, trees, old native hedgerows, agricultural land, biodiversity and wildlife. • Concerns over loss of access to green space e.g., Leavesden Country Park for the public. • Concerns about increased traffic • Focus should be on redeveloping disused sites, e.g. shops / offices • Suggests empty “second homes” should be used for local people
Site PCS21 Land at Love Lane	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports suitable site subject to access
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herts & Middx Badger Group – objection there is an issue regarding protected species on this site. • Herts Wildlife Monitors – issue regarding protected species, objection. • Objections to loss of Green Belt, progressive nibbling away of Green Belt and coalescence of Green Belt especially as this site represents a high quality rural Green Belt buffer between north Watford and St Albans. • Development should be limited to Brownfield sites only. Questions justification for inclusion when other far less rural and key sites elsewhere in the district are available. • Objections to overdevelopment at Kings Langley. There is no infrastructure to support this potential growth, loss of wildlife, lack of good public transport, traffic congestion and pollution, low bridges e.g. Toms Lane. There is no capacity for any more cars in this area, cars park on the pavements obstructing pedestrians

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

Site EOS4.0 Land adjacent to Bedmond Road & South of M25	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support sensible site for development with suitable access.
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to the Loss of wildlife and habitats, loss of land in agricultural use, rights of way, fragmentation of the ecology network. • Herts Wildlife Monitors – we do not have an issue with the site per se but there we do have serious concerns regarding protected species on the perimeter/boundary of the site which would result in an objection in part to this site as things currently stand. • Herts & Middx Badger Group – issue regarding protected species on perimeter/boundary, we would be objecting in part to this site. • Objections to loss of Green Belt, development spoiling the rural appearance of the area and coalescence of Kings Langley, Abbots Langley and Watford. The current boundaries of housing in Abbots Road and Gallows Hill mark a clear line between the urban area and the rural Green Belt and should be maintained. • Objections to noise and pollution generated from the M25, lack of public transport, size of development and lack of infrastructure to support development, proximity to M25 would be at risk of exceeded air quality objectives, e.g. the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Chorleywood which has historically exceeded levels of NO2 and PM10. • Questions why Impact of Brexit and the pandemic has not been undertaken. • Objections to the lack of road transport links. • Questions justification for inclusion when other far less rural and key sites elsewhere in the district are available, especially as this site represents a high-quality rural Green Belt buffer between north Watford and St Albans.
Site OSPF22 Batchworth Golf Course	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports site for much needed housing and is close to all the necessary amenities. • Supports this development on the basis that there are enough golf courses in the area! • Supports site if developed sensitively
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the encroachment of Green Belt land. The potential development of Batchworth Golf Club is a particularly good example of the urbanisation of the Green Belt. The proposed development on a large swathe of Green Belt will join Rickmansworth to Northwood, thus extending Greater London into Hertfordshire. The whole purpose of the Green Belt, to protect the expansion of urban areas will be undermined. Refers to Government policy on levelling up and need to build on brownfield sites • Batchworth Golf Course is not an appropriate site for a massive expansion of Rickmansworth/Batchworth into the Green Belt. • Objections to the site as assessed, through the Green Belt Reviews, have been identified as making a significant contribution to the Green Belt and identified as resulting in ‘very high’ harm through its release. • Objections to negative impact on biodiversity, wildlife loss and protected trees. • Objections to the consultation documents as misleading and the Batchworth Park Site (OSPF22) is labelled as the ‘Nine of Herts Golf Course’.

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Herts Wildlife Monitors – We have concerns with this site due to the development area and the main access road south of the site; this is due to protected species; we would therefore be objecting to this site as it currently stands and would suggest that this part of the development be removed and the main site road be moved further north. • Herts & Middx Badger Group – no issue with northern part of site but issue with main site access and Lower part of development site due to protected species; we would be objecting in part to this site. • 02144-02386_Keep Watford Rural petition – object to loss of community facilities/amenity for existing residents, to availability of alternative brownfield sites for this type of development, environmental impact (e.g. on wildlife, biodiversity, noise, pollution, flooding, water supply/sewage, traffic), and does not meet National Policy criteria for loss of Green Belt. • Objects due to increased level of traffic and associated air and noise pollution and parking. • Objections to lack of secondary schools. In the past the area has witnessed the closing of Durrants and William Penn Secondary Schools which has necessitated the building of a local school on Green Belt land to accommodate a misjudged need or local places. • Development not practical in Rickmansworth and should be spread across District. • Concern about loss of visual amenity for golfers and those using public rights of way • States that the Batchworth Park Golf Club have a long lease on the property to 2096 and are opposed the development – development can't go ahead unless members agree. • Quotes recommendations from the Playing Pitch Strategy and Action Plan, Report to the Local Plan Sub Committee in July 2019. Objections to the loss of this leisure facility that is very much needed to ensure there are appropriate facilities to maintain mental health and physical activity.
<p>Site CFS59 Land on London Road, Rickmansworth</p>	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports redevelopment of this site for much needed housing and is close to all the necessary amenities, good use of land.
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to encroaching on Green Belt, does not meet national policy on Green Belt. • Objects to lack of infrastructure to support new development e.g., access. • Concern about increase in traffic and pollution • Objects and considers Bridge Motors would be far more suitable given access to town and facilities
<p>Site EOS7.0 Land to the south of Shepherds Lane and west of the M25</p>	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support site redevelopment, minimal impact on the Green Belt and being surrounded on 2 sides by fairly dense development, with the M25 on the 3rd side. • Supports good access and low impact on existing residents.
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to encroaching on the Green Belt/ agricultural land. This potential development comes on the back of previous encroachment on the Green Belt in this area and sits alongside other development plans for Green Belt land adjoining the M25 (East and West) between Shepherds Lane and Long Lane. As such, there is a concern that the 'domino effect' will come into play here.

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objections to overdevelopment, the cumulative impact of developments in this area would, radically alter the nature of the area while placing intolerable pressure on local amenities. • 02144-02386_Keep Watford Rural petition- object to loss of community facilities/amenity for existing residents, to availability of alternative brownfield sites for this type of development, environmental impact (e.g. on wildlife, biodiversity, noise, pollution, flooding, water supply/sewage, traffic), and does not meet National Policy criteria for loss of Green Belt. • Objections to the loss of wildlife and biodiversity, loss of open space and countryside (Colne Valley Regional Park). • Objections to sites proximity to the school and effect on children’s health. • Objections to the impact of increased traffic in residential areas in Mill End, where roads are very narrow. Increased risk of air pollution levels being exceeded e.g., the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) in Chorleywood, has historically exceeded levels of NO2 and PM10. • Objections to insufficient infrastructure to support this development in terms of access roads and public services. • Objections to significant flood risk to the properties backing onto the site in Mill Way, Whitfield Way, Home Way and Long Lane. • Objections to new school. There is also absolutely no requirement for a further primary school in the area. • Herts Wildlife Monitors / Herts & Middx Badger Group – Objections to protected species on this site.
<p>Site CFS18b Hill Farm, Stag Lane</p>	
<p>For</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support only the farmyard area as being appropriate for development. • Support housing allocation esp. first homes. • Supports site for a mixture of flats and houses, as it is near all the required amenities. • Herts Wildlife Monitors – no issues
<p>Against</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to loss of Green Belt as does not meet national policy for loss of Green Belt. Quotes paragraph 137 of NPPF (reasonable options to be considered before exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to the Green Belt) that Green Belt release should be considered as a last resort. • Brownfield sites should be used instead. • Objections to the failure to consider the effect on the Heronsgate Conservation Area. • Herts & Middx Badger Group – Objections to protected species on part of site, we would be objecting in part to this site • Objections to lack of other Infrastructure. e.g., schools to meet additional demands of the future population. • Concerns about road safety, capacity, and resident’s parking- the cumulative impact of sites CW9, CW24, and CW25. • Chorleywood Neighbourhood Plan contains provisions to prevent any adverse impact to views in and out of Conservation Areas and limits on the number of storeys that development can include. It is also a requirement that developments of this size be able to demonstrate that safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists in order for planning permission to be granted. • Questions density of proposed allocation.

Appendix 6 – Summary of Strategic Sites / Main Issues Raised – General Public

Site EOS12.2 Land to the west and south of Maple Cross	
For	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support despite Green Belt the area is essentially already contaminated by the huge HS2 works. The site has good access onto an existing main road with good visibility. The plan makes provision for increasing local services required by a development of this size. • Supports the need for housing.
Against	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to loss of Green Belt as does not meet national policy. • Objects to no assessment being made of the Green Belt function of this site. • Residents use the area for open space (especially since Covid) • Bucks Councillors – EOS.12.2 West and South Maple Cross and EOS.12.3 North Chalfont Lane. Your plan shows large scale housing on these two sites amounting to 1676 dwellings and a 90-bed care home. Both of these sites are in the Green Belt and we do not believe that special circumstances exist to build on these sites. They satisfy purposes outlined in the NPPF and act as a buffer to retain the separation of Chalfont St Peter and indeed Buckinghamshire from its boundary with Three Rivers and Hertfordshire. • Objections to the Local Plans disproportionate bias towards building houses in Maple Cross. The 1500+ houses proposed for this site would mean the population of Maple Cross is likely to increase by over 100%. • Objects to lack of infrastructure, water/ sewerage, local infrastructure cannot cope with this increase in dwellings, the increase in traffic will add to the already high pollution in Maple Cross. • Concerned about the impact on wildlife/ biodiversity • Chilterns Conservation Board. EOS12.2 and 12.3 – Maple Cross. Both these sites are significant greenfield sites that have the potential to be highly visible from the AONB at Newland Park outside of the district boundaries. A visual impact assessment should be sought as part of the justification for including these sites in the plan • Herts Wildlife Monitors – EOS12.2 – we have no concerns regarding the large part of the site which lies to the west of Maple Cross (which runs alongside the M25) but we do have concerns regarding the site south of Maple Cross (this includes the area shown as an indent within the LP) due to protected species so we would be objecting to this part of the development/site. • Herts & Middx Badger Group – EOS12.2 no issues regarding the large part of the site west of Maple Cross (running alongside the motorway) but issues regarding the site south of Maple Cross (including the indented section) due to protected species so we would be objecting to this part of the development/site.