

Rep 163

Dear Mr Wilson,

My objections to the proposals for the Elstree Way corridor, along with suggestions for changes and alternative strategies are below. My view is coloured by having chaired the Transport and Road Safety forum for some while now, which has given me a much fuller understanding of what many of the issues are and how they might be addressed, and having had the opportunity to hear the views of many residents.

Some of these comments are the same as those provided in the response on behalf of the Woodcock Hill Village Green committee, with which I am in wholehearted agreement, but I have made a number of additions.

Para 2 – Strategic Vision

It is stated that the redevelopment of the EWC will provide a range of Community and cultural facilities for Borehamwood, but the range and scope of facilities proposed do not get anywhere near that which I perceive as being necessary for an ever-growing population. Existing facilities alternatives are heavily used and in many cases are not suitable for many of the activities.

Para 3.3b Policy EWC 1

The “significant highway improvements” and strategy to “facilitate the required highways” mentioned in the document do not appear to include *any* that relate to improvements from which car drivers will benefit. Congestion in the Town Centre is already at the level of unacceptability at various times of day and this then also has a knock-on effect on bus services. Re-routing around Shenley Road is not currently an option as other roads would become more of a rat-run than they are at present. Getting out of the EWC in the morning is a nightmare with the option of going North on the A1 being the only route free of massive congestion.

However, no matter what work is carried out on existing road networks there will continue to be traffic congestion for most parts of the day. Our roads were built in the 1930s and 1950s when the current level of car ownership was not envisaged. They will remain narrow and unfit for the 21st century: unfortunately in another 30 or 40 years' time I believe that if anything car ownership will have increased further. **I strongly believe that action needs to be taken now to plan for that future.**

Although near to public transport routes;

- persuading residents to give up their cars is aspirational not a reality;
- the routes do not necessarily correspond with where people need to go or want to travel.

Rail transport to and from the town leaves much to be desired and travel to and from the station adds considerably to the congestion, particularly in the morning and evening. In a recent survey First Capital Connect who run the rail service, in a recent Which Report, were rated 17th out of 19 companies for customer satisfaction. This clearly adds to the frustration of commuters living in the EWC. The lack of parking at the station is another problem that needs to be addressed as the train service does attract commuters from far and wide who park in local residential roads adding to congestion and lack of parking.

Stakeholders in transport matters are outside the planning authority control and must be actively involved in the planning process at an early stage.

Solution: Before any development takes place, it is critical that the transport requirements need to be identified and plans set in place, with timescales to ensure that they proceed in parallel.

EWC 2

"Building development will be permitted if it...provides for the *reasonable* sharing of facilities, such as off street parking...". What is reasonable? If sufficient parking is not provided then in my experience there will be nowhere for residents and their visitors to park as the street parking is already 'chock-a-block' where not controlled and I do not believe that additional controlled parking is in general desirable.

Para 4.10, 4.11 & 4.12 Policy EWC 4

4.10: Why would only a further education facility be welcome and not a primary (or secondary)?

The site is not suitable for a primary school. It is too small, has poor access and has a busy main road separating the catchment area. The school grounds would encroach onto a valued green space against the SADM policy.

The activities that take place at present at Maxwell Community Centre & Guide HQ could not be accommodated within a school. To comply with safeguarding of children, people would not be allowed on school premises in term time, during school sessions or after school activities. Regular classes could not be run as there would be no guarantee of continuity. Parking, too, would be a problem. Shared use would not work for either the community or the school.

Possible solutions include:

- To build the new school on the Hertswood Academy site at Cowley Hill;
- To change 1FE schools into 2 FE schools and absorb the extra pupils that way. St Teresa's, Saffron Green, Kenilworth, Monksmead and St Nicholas are all 1FE.
- To allocate and purchase a section of the Hertswood academy site scheduled to be redeveloped, utilizing the money that could be generated by the sale of Maxwell Community Centre to the Elstree and Borehamwood District Residents' Association.

It is noted that Herts County Council have not set aside any money to purchase sites for new schools.

Para 4.16 & 4.17 Policy EWC 4

96 Shenley Road does not and could not replace 7 current buildings. The Library, the Museum, Youth Connexions Shop, Village Hall, Church Sunday School and Guide HQ activities were all expected to move to 96 and help to pay the running costs. All these buildings provided important recreational and leisure activities for the Town.

The Library and the Museum have moved into smaller accommodation at 96. Storage is a big problem for the Museum. It is hard to get to and cannot open when the Library is closed.

The main Hall at 96 is too small for some activities e.g. indoor bowls and table tennis, neither could their equipment be stored at 96. The main hall at 96 can be divided with a partition but it would require 2 quiet or silent activities to take place.

The activities at Maxwell cannot be accommodated at other community centres for many reasons, lack of parking, cost, availability and storage are all factors.

Loss of green space at Maxwell Park would be a travesty and against Council policies to keep green spaces.

Solution; Build the school elsewhere and allow Maxwell and the Guide hut to remain.

Land to the North East of the Civic Offices is currently a valuable green space and as such should be retained as per general council policies, and not built upon.

Para 5.1, 5.2, 5.7, 5.8 policy EWC 5

If "improving movement through the corridor" and "strengthening road links" are key objectives why have I seen no plans within this document or elsewhere that in my opinion will make more than the slightest contribution to this aspiration? No plans I have seen for the centre of Borehamwood would improve traffic flows through the town, indeed almost all proposals seemed designed to have a significantly detrimental effect on traffic congestion.

I cannot conceive how the Movement Framework, as presently designed, will maximise the area's development potential.

The aspiration to ensure that suitable public transport will be forthcoming must be tempered by the realisation that the funding regime for, in particular, buses is dependent on County Council subsidies, which are generally becoming more restricted, or on commercial viability of any given route. How will these factors be reconciled with the policy of providing appropriate public transport facilities for developments?

Public realm improvements should indeed ensure the provision of additional open spaces. Developments should not, therefore, remove any existing green spaces by building thereon.

EWC 5: What is a "legible environment"? Error in para c) – 'finding' should surely read 'funding'.

Para 6.23 policy EWC 8

There is not enough parking allowed for residents, visitors, friends, family, GPs, health visitors, district nurses, care workers social workers or deliverymen. Although we would want to encourage less cars and make more use of public transport that is a worthy aspiration but naïve and totally unrealistic. We already suffer badly from the lack of foresight resulting in a past deficit of parking provision. Please let us not make the same mistake once again. Creating a deck or platform over the existing Council owned car park would be a sensible move, although by no means a complete solution.

Solution: Make the car parking allocations realistic.

Para 7 Policy EWC 9

How would Section 106 agreements ensure that infrastructure would be delivered in a timely fashion? Surely if the provision of infrastructure waits for Section 106 funding it will lag significantly the developments for which it is required?

Isopad House and Hertsmere House were not in the original plan but were added after a planning application slipped through for a 12 storey building of 150 dwellings with 150 car park spaces. It breached the design conditions for the EWC of 5/6 storeys.

A 12-storey building is not a gateway to the Town but an affront to residents. Residents were not properly consulted about this.

Para 7.9, line 4 should read "essential infrastructure that *is* required".

Solution; Encourage the developers to go for their second back up option of change of use to an accommodation of 40 dwellings.

7. Primary School: Should already have been ruled out as site is unsuitable, alternative provision for community activities cannot be found elsewhere and local opposition is most emphatic and widespread.

Kind regards,

Cllr Clive Butchins - *Brookmeadow Ward*
cllr.clive.butchins@elstreeborehamwood-tc.gov.uk
Mayor, Elstree & Borehamwood Town Council
Chairman, Transport & Road Safety Forum

