

Appendix C
Regulation 14 - Letters/emails



The Radlett Centre
1 Aldenham Avenue
RADLETT
WD7 8HL
www.radlettplan.org

24th July 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

Radlett Neighbourhood Plan

I am writing to you as a statutory consultee on planning applications that affect the Borough of Hertsmere and in particular Radlett.

In 2013 Aldenham Parish Council (APC) decided that it would apply to Hertsmere Borough Council (HBC) to have a Radlett Neighbourhood Plan. APC felt that, whilst at present there is very little danger of Radlett being asked to support a large increase in homes as it is surrounded by Green Belt, it would have added influence by having such a plan. In addition, the plan could influence the design of new developments and landscape, and protect the verdant nature of this village.

Neighbourhood Planning is a fairly new concept introduced by the 2011 Localism Act to allow communities, such as Radlett, to shape development in their areas through the production of Neighbourhood Development Plans, Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders.

This is a community initiative, which although sponsored by Aldenham Parish Council (APC), with the aid of funding made available by government, involves members of the Radlett Community. Over fifty local people have been part of the various working groups that looked at areas such as Housing, Green Belt, Roads, Transport & Parking and Civic Amenities. These were all themes highlighted in the first questionnaire to all residents in Radlett in early 2015.

You can view the Draft Radlett Neighbourhood Plan, at www.radlettplan.org, please read and either comment on on-line or by e-mail at info@radlettplan.org.

The whole plan is also available by visiting the Aldenham Parish Council offices at the address above. This exhibition and the whole consultation will run until the 30th September 2017, after which the Radlett Neighbourhood Plan steering group will analyse the results and comments and make any necessary adjustments before sending it to the independent examiner.

The independent examiner will review the Radlett Plan and if all goes well they will recommend it for referendum, all residents in Radlett aged 18 and older will then be invited to vote on the Radlett Plan.

If more than 50% of those that voted said yes the Radlett Plan becomes Planning Policy everyone has to adhere to it.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via Peter Evans on 07833 251115.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Neil Payne', written over a horizontal line.

Neil Payne (Chairman of Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group)

Correspondence towards Submission Plan Version (Reg 16)

Email from Manager Aldenham Parish Council to Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Team

Date: 13 February 2018

Item: Follow-up, Actions from Meeting on 1/02/2018 between Hertsmere Borough Council, Radlett Plan Steering Group Members and Neighbourhood Planning Advisor ImaginePlaces at HBC Offices

Subject: Draft list of actions

Manager Aldenham Parish Council

To Grace Middleton, Mark Silverman and 3 others

Grace/Mark

I thought it would be useful just to pull together what I thought were the agreed actions from the meeting between the RNP Steering Group and yourselves.

Hope this helps but if you have any thoughts please let me know.

- a. **SEA screening of Radlett Plan** HBC policy team to review Reg 14 version to ascertain whether this is required now/during Reg 16 consultation (with the REG 16version) or at all.
- b. **RNP to send to HBC Policy team an updated Radlett Plan** (as a working draft) for feedback from the HBC Policy Team by end of February, after next meeting of RNP Steering Group.
- c. **Workshop Day with an accredited Neighbourhood Planning Examiner** To provide feedback, guidance and hands-on ideas for the improvement of policy wording and justifications in the then Draft Submission Plan Reg 16. It was agreed that this is best done when drafts of the Basic Condition Statement and Consultation Statement are available and after another round of feedback from HBC Policy team and the RNP Steering Group on the current plan. Guidance is available on (<http://www.rics.org/uk/join/member-accreditations-list/dispute-resolution-service/drs-products/neighbourhood-planning-independent-examiner-referral-service-npiers/>)
- d. **Date for workshop** Aim to have the workshop day in mid-March at the Radlett Centre, with an accredited Examiner. RNP/APC propose to use Tony Burton. He's a leading figure in Neighbourhood Planning, an independent examiner and wrote the Locality publication on 'Writing Planning Policies' (<http://mycommunity.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Writing-planning-policies-v51.pdf>).
- e. **Costs of Examiner/Workshop** An estimate of the costs for the examiner have been requested = £1500 for three days work, one to examine paperwork, one for workshop and one to write a report. It was suggested that this cost is shared between APC & HBC as it benefits both parties. This needs to be agreed in principle and coordinated with Tony Burton and attendees. I suggest the day could have an hour that is open to for asking questions etc.
- f. **Other items to support the RNP going forward especially the Vision & Key Objectives, possibly as part of the HBC Local Plan**
 - RNP ask HBC to redefine the District Centre boundary to include key sites incl. Village Institute Site, the full station precinct and employment site, access to Newberries Car Park key access, key junctions and bridge heads (see Radlett Plan Audit and Action Plan Area Figure 17, attached) . This would support a more effective approach to a comprehensive town centre strategy and development management incl. the ability to investment into the town centre vitality (closely aligned with its key functional parts)
 - HBC to clarify the planning status and what weight is given to Hertsmere Borough Council's Revised Radlett District Centre Planning Brief, SPD, 2016 (Consultation Draft), Key Locations for Change in the centre of Radlett as this has not been adopted.
 - RNP asked that HBC redefine the Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages in the District Centre and consider an Article 4 to manage architectural detail of Oakway Parade through restricting permitted development rights.
 - Please share the scope of the study for the on-going work re town centre health carried out by NEXUS. It would be very helpful if the consultants commissioned would include Battlers Green and /or release the latest floorspace data and mix of uses incl. office use. (See NPPG, Paragraph: 005 Reference ID: 2b-005-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014)

- Section 8.13 of the Core strategy refers to Radlett District Centre as having 11638 m2 Town Centre floorspace, in 2010. Table 15 on page 82 of the core strategy document states it as 11907 m2. HBC to clarify. The RNP/APC would like a meeting to discuss the merits of defining Radlett District Centre as a 'Town Centre' this in light of its current size in comparison to Potters Bar (available planning policy tools supporting and managing changes that come with Town Centre status, investment /CIL and the expected growth in the catchment area e.g.)

g. **Article 4 use by HBC**

RNP have asked whether HBC are considering using Article 4 directions to say support policy H3 of the Radlett Plan for protection of bungalows, protection of trees outside the conservation areas, the District Centre

Peter Evans PSLCC
Parish Council Manager
Aldenham Parish Council
e-mail manager@aldenham-pc.gov.uk
Tel: 01923 856433 M: 07833251115

From: CHIPARO, Ann (THE RED HOUSE GROUP) [mailto:ann.chiparo@nhs.net]
Sent: 15 February 2018 09:25
To: Manager Aldenham Parish Council <manager@aldenham-pc.gov.uk>
Cc: DELANEY, Lynn (THE RED HOUSE GROUP) <lynn.delaney@nhs.net>
Subject: RNP Comments

Dear Mr Evans

Lynn has asked me to respond in her absence.

I can confirm that the policy wording below has been agreed.

RV3 Medical Hub

The Radlett Plan strongly supports the retention of the main local doctors' surgery in the highly accessible village centre. Should the Red House Surgery seek to develop and expand premises in the future, an application for a medical hub located within the highly accessible village centre is strongly supported.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any further queries.

Kind regards

Ann Chiparo

Assistant Practice Manager

Appendix C
Other Material

hertsmere.gov.uk

Radlett Neighbourhood Plan - Hertsmere Borough Council

Find leisure facilities Find your local councillor Apply for business licences Pay a parking fine Find a recycling centre

Choose another section

- Home
- Planning & Building Control
- Planning Policy
 - CIL submission documents
 - Community Infrastructure Levy - Submission and Examination
 - Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
 - Community Right To Bid
 - Consultation on planning policy documents
 - Developer Contributions Framework
 - Elstree Aerodrome Safeguarding Zone
 - Greenways
 - Gypsy & Traveller information
 - Local Plan
 - Neighbourhood Planning
 - Planning News
 - Planning publications
 - Radlett Neighbourhood Plan**
 - Rights of Way
 - Self-build and Custom Housebuilding
 - Brownfield land register

Home > Planning & Building Control > Planning Policy

Radlett Neighbourhood Plan

Last Modified July 25, 2017 [Share this page](#)

Preparation of a neighbourhood plan for Radlett

Aldenham Parish Council is currently consulting the community on a draft neighbourhood plan for Radlett. You can send comments to the Parish Council between 17 July 2017 and 30 September 2017. Please see the [Radlett Neighbourhood Plan website](#) for more information.

What happens next?

Following this consultation period Aldenham Parish Council will consider the responses and where appropriate incorporate these into a final draft.

We will check that the submitted plan complies with all relevant legislation, and if we find that it does we will then:

- publicise the proposal for a minimum of six weeks and invite representations;
- notify consultation bodies referred to in the consultation statement; and
- appoint an independent examiner (with the agreement of the Parish Council).

The Inspector will hold a hearing on the plan's content and issue a report, which is published by Hertsmere Borough Council. The Council then considers this report and determines whether it should proceed to a referendum.

Anybody registered to vote in the area covered by your Neighbourhood Plan will be entitled to vote. A simple majority of votes (over 50% of those voting) in favour of your Neighbourhood Plan is sufficient for it to succeed.

Over 50% of eligible voters must vote in favour in order for the local planning authority to 'make' the neighbourhood plan (bring it into force). At this point it becomes part of the development plan for the area and has to be taken into account in decisions on planning applications.

For information or help relating to this web page please contact the Policy and Transport Team on local.plan@hertsmere.gov.uk.

For information about the content or timescales of the neighbourhood plan itself please contact Aldenham Parish Council at info@radlettplan.org or see the [Radlett Neighbourhood Plan website](#).

News for You
Sign up to our e-alerts

Appendix E
Regulation 14 - Responses Database

Last update: Monday, September 24, 2018

Radlett Plan Regulation 14 – Summary and Response to Representations (Online survey, household survey, letters/emails from residents and other stakeholders)

Ref No	Means of submission	Date	Draft Plan Section	Name /Organisations / Contact	Summary of representation/ Comments/ link	Response	Actions
<h1>VISION AND OBJECTIVES</h1>							
1a	Short Survey send out via 'All household drop' and link to longer detailed online survey		Vision	Responses: 230	Out of the 230 survey responses received 82% (189) stated that they can support the draft vision (indicated by voting 8,9,10) https://www.dropbox.com/s/1x1ixy8lm7eukoi/Short%20survey_Vision%20and%20Objectives%20Questionnaire%20Summary%20.doc?dl=0	This is very much welcomed and encouraging.	-Highlight section in document.
1b	Short Survey send out via 'All household drop' and link to longer detailed online survey		Vision/ Comments on Questions 1 in Short survey	Summarised and discussed by APC in October 2017	<p>More General</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have lived in Radlett for 26 years and have seen the development of the village. We believe that Radlett needs more to move into the 21st Century without losing its verdant character and countryside. We are happy to support a plan that has those points. 2. well done for doing this (3) 3. Get younger people onto the guiding committee. 4. please keep Radlett same 5. Bring Radlett into the 21st century 6. very admirable (2) 7. Very good housing plan. I fully support this and am keen to learn more about it and will look online. Thank you. 8. Good broad spectrum, lets hope it can all be achieved 9. Good idea. Lived here 30 years. Seen many changes-not always good ones. Lets try and preserve Radlett's village aura 10. I have only recently moved into Radlett, so I know very little about the Neighbourhood Plan, but having read this document, I am in favour of all the objectives at present 11. Your existence is essential for Radlett to retain its current attraction for its community 12. We would like to thank everyone for all the hard work that has gone into the plan it is an excellent piece of work 13. well done 14. Loads of waffle & generic (2) 15. I am virtually unable to give practical support, for medical reasons. I am in agreement with the proposals, but would like to give a final opinion when the detailed and finer points will be verified. 16. It seems to me that this is all just words. The real power is with the Hertsmere planning department and they have allowed extensions that have already totalled spoiled the appearance of Radlett. The streets are ruined by overextended and unattractive extensions. Many bungalows have gone. The roads are full of skips, and builders' vans. Front gardens are building sites full of waste and rubble. The high street is struggling with a book shop and butchers the latest to go. I am afraid it is too late, Radlett has already been spoiled. 17. We support this statement of aims. In doing so, we hope that Aldenham Parish Council will 	Thank you very much for the many helpful comments, ideas and concerns.	A Key Proposal Map to provide a quicker way for readers to review the key aspects of the Radlett Plan

					<p>adopt progressive policies, whilst protecting all that we value about Radlett, do not impede the sympathetic modernisation of our buildings and our amenities</p> <p>18. Happy to see Radlett maintained as it is -- a village not a town (3)</p> <p>19. Planning policies are sufficient, HertsmereBC have qualified planners to decide applications. An unqualified, presumably public funded, representative should not be given any authority.</p> <p>20. This document is a load of mosh What is needed is more housing and jobs, The hotel project over the car park was an ideal opportunity, stop living in the past.</p> <p>21. I think this vision/goal is good. I would just suggest we consider in the first bullet adding after "durable homes" ", maintaining the harmony and (reflecting...)". I am concerned that the demolition of existing homes and replacing them with over-developed mansions disrupts the harmony of the village.</p> <p>22. I am not confident you will implement your aims in this plan. Some new houses are not in keeping with the character of the area. Developers wreck the pathways which are not reinstated. There is little evidence that you have done anything to create affordable housing for the young and elderly downsizers. You are focussed on commercial development.</p> <p>23. Planning permission is too easily granted. Notice should be given to neighbours overlooking the property not just adjoining</p> <p>24. I feel it is important to preserve the characteristics of the area</p> <p>25. To keep Radlett as a nice little village</p> <p>26. This seems to be what every village/town would like and the character of Radlett should remain intact. That's why we love it</p> <p>27. Radlett is no longer a village anymore – all the building going on is terrible. We don't have half the shops we used to have. I remember Radlett when it was a pretty little village. But no more.</p> <p>28. Most of these aims are unexceptional although do not see why Radlett is improved, or otherwise, by having a diverse mix of local residents. Surely the Plan is not suggesting that the RPC or the HBC should take action to promote diversity. If no action is required on this why should it feature in the plan?</p> <p>29. Please do not change the face of the village</p> <p>30. The development vision is, in general, a positive step and it is great that local residents are being asked to contribute. An early demonstration of the vision, will be the proposed replacement of the petrol station with an office block, the former provides a service to the village and whilst an argument could be made for the benefits of the office block, the loss of a local amenity, combined with increased traffic and parking (already an issue), should result in the proposal being refused.</p> <p>31. I cannot support building in Radlett anymore. A nice village has almost already been ruined</p> <p>32. Whilst you mentioned town planning, I do not trust the planning office and/or officers to act in the best interests of our residents</p> <p>Housing & Design</p> <p>33. Fewer homes with brick walls + gates, bring back hedging to front gardens. More parking when new homes are built on the development site, most homes have 2 cars so developments should be made to provide adequate onsite parking. Our roads are getting blocked with parked cars</p> <p>34. support smaller houses for retirees</p> <p>35. Many houses being built now do not reflect the character of the area, hopefully this will improve.</p> <p>36. Have you considered housing for the elderly who wish to remain in the village.</p> <p>37. Maintain green space and more affordable homes for young people (8) one comment -- not flats</p> <p>38. Radlett cannot sustain more housing -- overcrowded now</p> <p>39. Retain bungalows</p> <p>40. Although it is politically incorrect we would not like to see social housing in Radlett.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>41. I do not support the significant housing development plans/proposals to the high street-it will go against the principles of maintaining Radlett as a 'village'</p> <p>42. The roads in Radlett that have the oldest property in should be protected far more than they have been. There seems that Aldenham Parish Council has little or no influence on which buildings can be demolished and very large ugly homes replacing them, even in the slightly newer properties that are still very attractive are still being destroyed and when a house is demolished every living plant and tree are usually destroyed as well. Also my own feeling about the loss of our fire station is, did anyone check out how many more homes have been in this area and also of course St Albans because there have been huge amounts of new building than before (our Fire station was demolished). I bet and I suspect in years to come part of Newberries Car Park will be our fire station to cope with our area, not a hotel, there are 3 hotels within a few miles of Radlett</p> <p>43. I am doubtful about what 'variety' entails. I would like to see developers restrained because the number of new builds is eroding the village feel of Radlett. I would hope that the council, rather than private companies, are responsible for the protection of Radlett's leafy and biodiverse nature.</p> <p>44. No houses to down size for people who would like to.</p> <p>45. We need small family homes and flats in Radlett that are affordable for low paid workers. Stop developers knocking down medium sized houses and building huge houses on land</p> <p>46. Priority should be given to building more small houses and fewer huge houses which alter the 'Village' character of Radlett.</p> <p>47. The plan overall is very satisfactory. But none of the new buildings inserted into good quality residential streets or roads, such as Newlands Avenue, seem to clash with existing buildings in terms of character and size. But overall, I view the protection of the existing countryside as absolutely essential, as well as provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>48. Houses should be safe to live in as robberies and burglaries have increased</p> <p>49. Of course there aims are desirable. However, they will not be achieved by demolishing normal-sized houses + rebuilding on the site of mega-expensive non-contextual houses. The proposal hotel/Waitrose in Radlett car park was hideous + would have destroyed Radlett high street already struggling with high rates and road works and removed parking for local residents</p> <p>50. I would like to see less instances where new houses build right to the edge of their space so that hige houses squash together with no green space/garden in between. I think there should be a good supply of affordable social housing</p> <p>51. So many relatively small houses are being demolished and large ostentation ones are being built, often filling the existing plots-many are also grey or cream which is totally out of keeping with the older brick built ones in the surrounding areas. Also this leads to many more cars on the roads in and around Radlett causing congestion-not to mention aggressive and bad tempered drivers</p> <p>52. There would appear to be no mention in the plan of provision of affordable housing or even social housing in order to maintain a mix of the wealthy and the not so well off.</p> <p>Green Belt Land</p> <p>53. Green Belt extremely important -- 2nd comment don't release Green Belt for housing (5)</p> <p>54. I cannot support any plan that supports giving up the Green Belt and I will vote against it, the rest of the policies are fine.</p> <p>55. I agree with the vision + aims of the plan. I have lived in Radlett for the past 25 years. I would hate to see the village-ness taken away but only enhanced over the years to come maintaining the green areas, parks etc is so important to me - to only walk around the corner and feel you are in the countryside!</p> <p>56. I realise that some improvements/development must take place. However I do feel that the village and surrounding green belt should be protected. I am dismayed at recent proposals for Radlett Car park and Scrubbits wood. These developments do nothing to enhance the village and its residents and need to be strongly resisted</p> <p>57. Minor development in less significant Green Belt areas should be permitted to achieve</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

					<p>housing gains</p> <p>58. Protection of green belt around the village unless very special circumstances are demonstrated</p> <p>Facilities / Village Centre</p> <p>59. Wholeheartedly agree. We need to encourage all residents, old and new, young and old, to spend time in the village and participate in activities and facilities available within it, to build community spirit.</p> <p>60. I feel that the high street has gone downhill and the range of shops very uninspiring. A good supermarket would help to lift the village – Waitrose and more boutique shops like we used to have, similar to Harpenden. Considering the huge premium that it costs to live in Radlett, the High Street is looking very downmarket and not reflective of the area. The redevelopment of park space next to Daisy’s would help and would be a good spot to encourage cyclists as a stopping station for refreshments, a lot like in Redbourne. Opening up the river and including cycle and footpaths would also be very attractive.</p> <p>61. More facilities for old & young, Public swimming pool, public garden for picnics, social meetings, children playground, yoga centre to promote yoga, which doesn't cost much</p> <p>62. Decent gastro pub, mixed shopping opportunities and films somewhere like the Radlett Centre would be a start</p> <p>63. Need a range of shops, the maths tutoring seems a white elephant, we do not need more hairdressers or restaurants, but need more practical choice (no hotels or supermarkets) or tacky kebab shops -- less chains (3)</p> <p>64. Poor range of shops eg too many hairdressers, no proper butcher. No up-market restaurants (2)</p> <p>65. Facilities for young mums -- play centres</p> <p>66. The Council needs to be more stringent on the types of shops that it brings into Radlett -- shops like Home Needs do not fit in with the character of the village</p> <p>67. In Newberries Car Park we do not need another hotel but M&S would be fine. (2)</p> <p>68. Radlett Station needs escalators/lift</p> <p>69. Need to improve appearance of Radlett High Street</p> <p>70. Absolutely agree about green spaces-eg the fight to keep the woodland area around Scrubbits</p> <p>71. Leave some areas wild to help the wildlife.</p> <p>72. It is also important to conserve the existing natural spaces in Radlett such as Scrubbits Wood. Perhaps encouraging more local activity around this might help and also create greater community cohesion.</p> <p>73. It is very important that affordable housing can be built for essential staff such as Doctors and Dentists in our village. Aldenham Parish Council must make residents cut back their hedges that are taking over paths and footpaths. We want affordable shopping like ALDI and LIDL</p> <p>74. This all too late, Radlett is no longer a village, and it has been ruined by too much building, mainly houses, in any space around. They are often out of character, often ugly, and ever large. The High Street is full of beauty parlours + coffee shops and it is impossible to buy routine everyday items-thus needing a car</p> <p>75. Newberries Car Park scheme has merit</p> <p>76. Would be good to have more community events and more information. Events on the High Street, gatherings for parents, events for primary school children, the older generation. Unlikely to attain a diverse mix of local residents but nice aim. We need to ensure the high street prospers and there aren’t vacant shops</p> <p>Getting Around</p> <p>77. Lower speed limit to 30MPH for the whole village including the exit and entry points</p> <p>78. Footpaths are becoming cyclepaths which is dangerous</p> <p>79. Certain roads very dangerous with accidents on Aldenham Road/Station Road.</p> <p>80. More lighting -- Newberries Ave</p> <p>81. Ban on paving over front gardens in order to reduce traffic through Radlett</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>82. Need to reduce the traffic in Radlett especially on narrow roads like Loom Lane.</p> <p>83. Pavements need more attention especially for the elderly & footpaths (3)</p> <p>84. do not increase parking facilities there are enough cars in Radlett already</p> <p>85. Provision of dedicated cycling lanes is important but not on Watling Street as this would significantly reduce traffic flow through the key village road causing congestion and pollution</p> <p>86. Agree with most of the comments. My observations would be that traffic build up through the village has increased significantly since the DPD depot arrived. This goes against the village feel, and over time more should be done to limit larger sized vehicles from passing through. Other than that, I think we are very fortunate to live in such a lovely location</p> <p>87. Radlett centre is best thing that has been done since 1988 Village is becoming too busy. Tooting constant in High Street because people can't park. And the road gets blocked</p> <p>88. Good accessibility should be an aim in its own right. Point 5 'A broad range etc' is too bland to be a useful (meaningful) statement</p> <p>89. By and large in favour of your policies, especially improvement of cycle paths</p> <p>90. Cycle paths – we support – as long as they do not impede the access for pedestrians + cars to shops/bus stop access</p> <p>91. We need to build a by-pass from Oakridge to Harper Lane to alleviate traffic</p> <p>92. Both the bus transport and the rail links need to be improved both from a punctuality and frequency point of view. The petrol station in Watling Street should be retained at all costs if it is possible</p> <p>93. Employ health promoters to tackle growing pandemic problem of obesity.</p> <p>94. Pavements have become very narrow due to foliage encroaching. Makes it very dangerous with speeding traffic-especially buses and lorries. Certainly problems along Shenley Hill, Shenley Road and Radlett lane</p> <p>95. Radlett's great problem is that it does not have enough central space to support the massive growth of residential dwellings that cover the hills on either side of the valley that is Watling Street. There is great reliance on cars. The Northern Shopping parade is very much dragged down by lack of parking space. It may be possible to alleviate this by building a car park adjacent to the railway (multi-storey including underground). Similar treatment could be employed in the Southern car park area, which might then give space for a commercial development</p> <p>96. Station needs a lift. Shame that Tykes water is not a feature in the village.</p> <p>97. Generally agree. Biggest concerns are the lack of parking and trend to squeeze new developments into any small spaces</p> <p>98. Having read the plan and having been resident in Radlett since 1965 I am generally in agreement with the objectives as set out. As I see it the biggest challenge facing Radlett is the access, particularly at peak times. Traffic and pollution needs to have more emphasis placed on it with a forward thinking plan of how to alleviate this ever-growing problem.</p>		
2	Short Survey send out via 'All household drop 'and link to longer detailed online survey		Objectives	Responses: 202	<p>Out of the 202 survey responses received 82% (167) stated that they can support the draft objectives (indicated by voting 8,9,10)</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/s/1x1ixy8lm7eukoi/Short%20survey_Vision%20and%20Objectives%20Questionnaire%20Summary%20.doc?dl=0</p>	This is very much welcomed and encouraging.	<p>Highlight section in document.</p> <p>Table diagram to be produced as part of Basic Condition statement</p>

3	Short Survey send out via 'All household drop' and link to longer detailed online survey		Summary of comments received by themes	Summarised and discussed by APC in October 2017	<p>General comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I support all 13 objectives 2. Thanks to the Steering group for working so hard 3. If you manage it, it will be a miracle 4. Very much agree, esp. nos 1,2,3 5. Well meaning but some objectives are contradictory eg. Protecting verdant character versus meeting new housing demand 6. Is Radlett to remain a village? Current plans appear to make it into a town 7. Whilst I am strong in favour of protecting Radlett's village feel, I am concerned that future plans will bring further development which will undermine your vision and contradict certain objectives 8. It is important for Radlett to remain a semi-rural village which is why a lot of people moved, and the petrol station should remain. 9. Radlett security and safety needs attention <p>Getting around</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improvements to transport infrastructure must include rail services 2. Local schools do not have safe routes for cycles 3. I find it extremely frustrating with the constant roadworks and temporary traffic lights in the high street and this work should happen at night, if companies get permission to develop sites in the high street 4. Too many pot holes 5. Is there an opportunity for a Radlett by-pass from Harper lane across to Watford? Traffic has increased dreadfully over last 30 years, with many lorries too 6. Cycling in Radlett is not really practicable 7. Don't agree N.09 – Village is too hilly for cycling + dedicated cycle paths on already narrow highways are inappropriate. 8. I would happy to support parking of vehicles on the outskirts of Radlett centre, so all the streets are not car parks 9. I would also like to see improved bus links with Stanmore + Edgware + Mill Hill 10. Improve street lighting after midnight on roads from station 11. Movement of traffic through Radlett is a major problem. Should some consideration be given to a bypass 12. Objective 3 should really be the top objective so that the village can move with times. Objective 12 – New Road bus route needs to widen urgently before a major accident happens. Also make the Ridgeway 20mph zone to prevent 4 wheelers zooming at high speeds. 13. More help to encourage independent shops to come to the area and free parking to remain 14. Objective 4 fails to recognise that Green Belt is not public land. 15. Why has the Radlett by-pass never happened? The congestion morning and evening gets worse and worse. <p>Housing & Design</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Really important less large houses, more smaller homes 2. Objective 3 is not being followed – permission should not be granted to knock down small houses and rebuild a Mamouth building 3. Affordable housing to be mandatory 4. Don't want to see new development of affordable housing in this village 5. Disagree with objectives 2 & 5 6. Put a stop to all new building of large mansion houses of more than 4 bed rooms. Increase new blocks of basic level flats in existing "large house" roads 7. The house that is being built on the corner of Newberries Avenue and Shenley Hill-how ever was the design approved? On such a small site and completely out of character 8. Concerned re sale of green belt 9. Green belt should not be built on 	<p>Thank you very much for the many helpful comments, ideas and concerns.</p> <p>It's an important question re village or town. We are already a 'District Centre' in planning terms and our traffic and related air quality problems along Watling Street do suggest we need to act and manage our busy centre more proactively. This without the anticipated growth in population in the borough over the next decade. The anticipated growth in the borough and region will only augment some of the current challenges hence a positive approach involving local stakeholders from the start is needed in our view. The Radlett Plan promotes meaningful involvement early on.</p> <p>The Radlett Plan supports improvements across a range of issues including a brownfield land first development approach, normal /smaller sized homes, better railway station access, improvements to the village centre and protection of the landscape quality and the verdant character of Radlett to mention a few.</p> <p>This even without the anticipated growth in population in the borough over the next decade or so. The anticipated growth in the borough will only augment some of current challenges hence a positive approach involving local stakeholders from the start is needed in our view. The Radlett Plan promotes meaningful involvement early on.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure the Radlett Village Centre Audit and Action Plan work considers all received feedback.
---	--	--	--	---	--	---	---

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission)	Objectives & Vision	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>“The objectives of the Radlett Plan include meeting housing demand in a sensitive manner, although it seeks to deliver the level of housing need set out in the current Local Plan 2012- 2027 and the current draft does not propose to meet any of this demand directly through specific housing allocations, notwithstanding the reference to the Starveacres site. The other objectives do not appear to be at odds with the priorities set out in the Issues and Options Report, but depending on the progress of the Radlett Plan any change to these objectives that occur throughout the Local Plan preparation process should be considered as part of the Radlett Plan.”</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The Draft Radlett Plan (Reg 14 Version) does not make any reference to housing numbers/targets. The numbers are changing regularly and required work to establish meaningful and financially viable development quantum at this stage is considered premature.</p> <p>Starveacres, a safeguarded site for housing in the current Local Plan, is located within the settlement envelope, but not referred to in the Vision and Objectives section as this would be very specific.</p>	
5	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission)	Objectives & Vision	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>“The PPG advises that “although a draft neighbourhood plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan, the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. For example, up-to-date evidence of housing need is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.”</p> <p>Hertsmere's new Local Plan is currently at a very early stage of production, but the overall approach being proposed through the Issues and Options report, along with the housing needs evidence that underpins this approach, should be considered as part of progressing the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Depending on the timetables for both plans, the RNP could come into force before the new Local Plan is adopted. In this case, some sections of the Neighbourhood Plan may need to be reviewed once the Local Plan is adopted and such a scenario ought to be explained in your plan. If the neighbourhood plan takes up to date housing need and other requirements into account at this stage, there may be less new evidence for you to collect as part of any review of the RNP”</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>Evidence base reviewed and added where appropriate. We are preparing our Basic Condition Statement over the course of the next month.</p> <p>See Introduction section of July Version : 1.11 “As new challenges and opportunities are likely to arise over the plan period, the intention is for the Radlett Plan to be reviewed every five to seven years.”</p> <p>New Regulations under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 clarify the need/possibility of regular updates for Nplans. The Radlett Plans main focus is summarised in the objectives which guided the policies. We are confident they will be relevant for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>We believe we have made sufficient provision aligning our plan with the Core Strategy, the Local Plan and the emerging New Local Plan issues. Increasing housing choices and design quality aspects that will remain an issue for some time.</p>	No other action required at this point.
6	Email/letter to Vivian Charrett (member of the Steering Group)	25 July 2017	Objectives & Vision	Resident J Caulton	<p>General Comments/Suggestions</p> <p>Structure: It may help to have a clearer structure- possibly a diagram to that effect- so non-professionals might better understand how the vision delivered the objectives which delivered the themes and the policies and vice versa. In other words how the structure evolved and ties together.</p> <p>Objectives</p> <p>Obj 1-This is the ONLY objective which specifically mentions character and identifies it in one word 'verdant'! Surely there is more than just a 'verdant character' to Radlett?</p> <p>Obj 2- "meeting new demand that is sensitive to the character of the village" but no-where is character actually explained?</p> <p>Obj 4 -_ Is it wise to even have the words "positive use of the surrounding Green Belt" in a policy? This objective appears to contradict itself. Its made worse by the fact there is no proposals plan showing where in the green belt the plan would accept proposals.</p> <p>Obj 6- Talks of protecting the high street but no mention of sustainability and mixed use.</p> <p>Obj 13- Is right but too vague and why only applies to large sites?</p> <p>Reactive vs Proactive- The Plan is good on review and strategy, but seems to lack on some detail and actual proposals. Although there are priority projects and some specific projects like Fairfield School</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>b) The design of the final Vision and Objectives pages will be reviewed and improved. Note the ‘Policy Intent’ section within each policy theme identifies the link between objectives and policy.</p> <p>c) In general: Objectives need to stand the test of time (as should policies) and should therefore be of sufficient detail to positively guide planning policies and applications without running the risk of being inflexible and becoming a burden for applicants or becoming too quickly out of date. They need to be underpinned by robust evidence base and be</p>	Review layout of Objective and Vision. Consider Design Code and a possible Article 4 Direction as recommendation for the Local Authority to action

				<p>and cycle proposals- there is no proposed plan....the possible cycle routes in and through the village; the village envelop extensions acceptable (Fairfield eg- where exactly and how big?); the location of green space in the east- where? In other words a proposals plan would help. Important issues for example not articulated spatially could be the ideal (more acceptable) locations for flats and higher density housing relative to the high street and access to public transport; the areas of growth (if any and all acceptable) like the key sites and greenbelt areas; the length and use character of the High Street etc. The latter for example is intensifying as we speak- recent developments on the fire station, Durrells and now the proposal for the petrol station- but no guidance in the NP in this regard, so reliant on Hertsmere. Although Hertsmere guidance exists, this is Radlett's plan, so one would assume the NP provides refined guidance (and actual proposals) in this regard.</p> <p>Detailed Comments/Suggestions Boundary of village- There is no clarification as to the accepted village envelope? Possibly in a proposals plan? Objectives- Say nothing about the TYPE of place Radlett should be- verdant maybe- but what else -village or town? Does the age profile suggest the village is changing its typology? Do we strive to move away from being a commuter village? Specifics- there is nothing on the proposed hotel on Newberries car park; nothing on the converting housing into HMOs or flats; nothing new on refining or modifying current guidance on parking SPD July 2014 etc etc. Sustainable growth or development- there is no mention of this at all it appears in this document. Dustbins- are becoming a significant problem in those areas where on site storage is limited- eg Station Road, Watling St etc ...which are in the main roads in and around the village centre. This has a knock on effect on pavements and hence pedestrians. There is no commentary on this. Design Guidance- there no suggestion on a Radlett focus Design Guide being developed. Given the village does have its unique character one would have thought a variation of the Hertsmere SPD useful- eg it might prevent eyesores like the Costa ramp- alternatives do exist to this design; the 'tank traps' to the Radlett United Synagogue- both very much on the main road through Radlett so both visible and part of the village character. Conservation Areas- Shown on Fig 7b is a poor graphic and not clear between key and plan for example clarity on conservation areas. There is no specific mention to the preservation of CAs- or their review. It is not uncommon to have traditional Wigg built homes in Radlett demolished in CAs and replaced or houses renovated using PVC windows and concrete tiles. Etc. Back land - or garden land according to the Plan should NOT be allowed at all I feel. This alone has drastically changed the character of Radlett, and impacted on intensification and movement about the village yet the policy H2.2 states 'weakly' garden land development should 'not be encouraged'! What does 'not be encouraged' actually mean? In this regard I also have no idea how "subserving in terms of height, mass and bulk to the surrounding homes" can be enforced. Density- there is no guidance in the Plan as to what's acceptable in the village, and where would higher densities be acceptable?</p>	<p>financially viable as far as one can reasonably assess this at this point in the stage. We have tried to balance these different aspects and feel through Policy H4 allow sufficient involvement and detail to be discussed at the Planning Application stage when 'character' can be more explored and resolved in context of an individual site.</p> <p>d) Protecting and enhancing the character of the built, natural and historic environment is a key ambition of the Radlett Plan. The Radlett Character Assessment and Design Policies as well as Open Space Policies do address this key matter guided by Objective 1, 2, 10 and the Vision. We would hope that together with the NNPF, Hertsmere's Policies, the Radlett Character Assessment and Conservation Area Appraisals, a sufficient level of information is already available which should though not prevent the applicant to carry out further studies as part of the design process (See policy H2.1 Understanding Local townscape and landscape patterns)</p> <p>e) The Green Belt does define the de facto settlement boundary / village envelope. f) It's a good question re Village or Town. Even London is made up of villages as people commonly say. There is great attachment to be living in a village although this can sometimes prevent from considering and taking measures perhaps more home to managing busy towns. Not actively managing transport demands, air quality and density are just a few of those. g) A Neighbourhood Plan cannot by law change strategic parking guidance, management of the public spaces (bins) and other strategic and non-land-use planning matters. We have struggled with these limitations of the Neighbourhood Planning legislation too. h) A Radlett Design Guide is a great idea and would be a great and useful piece of work. Perhaps the Radlett Village Centre Audit and Action Plan can pick up on this? An Article 4 Direction made by the Local Authority is another possible measure. The steering group has taken the view that the Newberries car park planning application process will be completed by the time this Radlett Plan is 'legally enforceable' hence the absence of detailed policies for that site. The landowner (HBC) could consider policy H4 and other policies before they are adopted. And it's worth noting that applications still need to adhere to policies even if they are not site specific. (Neighbourhood Plan after examination, Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework) i) Conservation Areas are not a matter for Neighbourhood Plans to determine and indeed enforcement issues are best reported to the Local</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

					<p>WEB SITE</p> <p>I did not properly fill-in the website as I find those sorts of questions in many ways obvious or 'self-fulfilling' - who would not want what is asked or suggested- it's whether each point covers all issues in each regard, or is itself the right question to ask, that is the main point. Given this I have taken the liberty of producing these few pages which I hope the NP Steering Group will find useful.</p> <p>Full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/wtwjruo7kc7qkw/SKM_C284e17012312510.pdf?dl=0</p>	<p>Planning Authority/ Heritage Officer so they can address your concern and suggestions.</p> <p>j) The provided evidence base in the Radlett Character Assessment re plot coverage should assist applicants in developing appropriate designs.</p> <p>k) Higher densities are acceptable even encouraged through the reference to townscape patterns, plot coverage and building typologies, typical of the central part of the village.</p> <p>Noted. Thank you.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

On the whole to what extent can you support this Draft Radlett Plan? (July 2017 Version)

7	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Draft Radlett Plan (July 2017 Version)	No of Responses: 95	Out of the 95 respondees 78% are in support of the draft policies with an additional 14% stating that that can support parts of the draft policies.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	No other action required at this point.
8	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Draft Radlett Plan (July 2017 Version)	No of comments: 16	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All the ideas are great and it would lovely if they could be a reality 2. Absolutely. No part of it offends, and all is consistent with a sensitive development future 3. I have sent a separate letter detailing ideas for improving the Tykes Water area. 4. Much future development in Radlett will be single dwelling applications, the Plan needs to address these as well as multiple developments. It is unsatisfactory that a relatively affordable dwelling is demolished and "replaced" by a luxury/unaffordable unit without the developer having to make any contribution to affordable provision. 5. Excellent - well done! This should preserve and enhance the local area. 6. to give more power to APC with planning rather than being overridden by Hertsmere planning 7. Pale, male, stale. Must try harder. 8. Something needs to be done 9. I am skeptical Hertsmere Planners will take any notice - they don't apply their own rules often! 10. On the whole we are well disposed towards the plan. On first reading it appeared superficial but there is much to recommend it. 11. May I congratulate the steering group on an excellent piece of work that must have taken a great deal of effort 12. This is not a plan but a series of aspirations. Some of the ideas appear mutually contradictory and there is no indication how any of it will be achieved. 13. Overall, this looks pretty good and is in line with what I think is important in order to maintain and develop the attractive character of Radlett and keep it desirable as a place to live. 14. Very well put together and comprehensive. Seems well balanced in respect to the different 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>We have tried hard to work in the interest of many and with a cross section of our community. The level of detail we can direct is constrained by regulations, existing policy frameworks and viability considerations.</p>	No other action required at this point.

					community interests. 15. Very Good 16. Excellent work		
<h1>Housing Design Policies</h1>							We changed the name to Housing & Design Policies HD 1 to HD 9
9	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	HOUSING DESIGN POLICIES H1 to H4	No of Responses: 95	Out of the 95 respondees 73% are in support of the draft policies with an additional 12% stating that they can support parts of the draft policies.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	No other action required at this point.
10	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	HOUSING DESIGN POLICIES H1 to H4	No of comments: 14	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is not always feasible for front gardens to include 30% vegetation or for boundary walls at the front to be limited to 1m due to the number of houses on hills. However there should be a maximum % that the footprint of a house can take up of the plot to avoid overdevelopment. 2. These are all good ideas but developers in the past have always pushed the boundaries in the past 3. In too many instances this boat has already been missed 4. Could draft say flat roofs are likely to be resisted? New affordable housing should be controlled by s.106 agreement so that it remains affordable in perpetuity, eg a clause that future buyers satisfy financial and local connection criteria to the satisfaction of APC or HBC or a local trust which retains the freehold. 5. Again, unsure of the impact of extending residential properties. 6. some of this was already in previous questions 7. Is this going to make Radlett more affordable for young people? No. Hard pass. 8. Smaller more affordable housing and Social Housing are required 9. Strongly agree that the building of ever bigger houses for single families/owners is to be resisted. Enough is enough. Radlett needs economic and generation diversity too. 10. Much of this seems to have been covered by earlier statements and the objections are the same. Just in Aldenham Avenue, the two most recent new builds (29 and 35a) contravene in a number of ways the principles outlined. Until there is some indication of how these controls are to be achieved, these are just aspirations. 11. Overall, this makes sense but, in my view, some of the restrictions seem a little too strict (e.g. ridge height, distance between properties). 12. This rating excludes H1, H4 & H2.4, already commented. Strongly supports H2, excluding H2.4 13. Fully Support. Have you considered Charnwood and the Brickfields as areas for future development 14. We are losing the village feel of Radlett so these policies are important 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>Building more affordable /reasonably priced homes in perpetuity is an important challenge not just for Radlett - where the residential market values are even higher than in other communities in commuting distance of London. The maximum proportion of affordable housing developers are required to delivery is regulated on borough level . It is subject to financial viability considerations.</p> <p>Policy H4 encourages applicant of major development to provide relevant information so that this can be understood better. The often observed lack of transparency regarding viability facts and reduced affordable housing delivery is a key issue which has for instances led London Boroughs and the Mayor of London to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>Design Guidance is a starting point and aims to contribute to enhancing character and appearance while maintaining a number of characteristic such as scale and rhythm between building and landscape elements.</p>	b) Added to H4 need to share factual information so affordable housing, infrastructure and community benefits generated by development are better understood

11	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy Housing Design 'POLICY H1 - HOUSING CHOICES: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES'	No of Respondees: 98	Out of the 98 respondees 66% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 33% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	
12	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy Housing Design 'POLICY H1 - HOUSING CHOICES: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES'	No of comments: 40	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I realise that it is important to have a mix of housing but we are an area that attracts families and we need suitable accommodation for them as well. 2. Need more smaller properties so young people can start on the property ladder 3. Absolutely . We have had enough of enormous houses with more bathrooms than bedrooms 4. More homes needed for downsizers - executive style smaller houses or chalet bungalows NOT flats. 5. Objective 1 Requires more detail in relation to Tykes Water. 6. Overall supportive, but concerned about undue restriction on modest expansion of smaller properties to accommodate growing families - as inevitably influenced by personal self-interest! In my case, possible prevention of a mooted loft extension (taking us from 3 to 4 bedrooms) may, given the prohibitive cost of moving to a medium sized family house in Radlett, lead to us having to move elsewhere. 7. This should be implemented without delay. 8. We are in a 3-bed house on Goodyers Avenue. We bought it due to our understanding that we would be able to extend it substantially to a 5 bed house at least. 9. Depends where the mixed housing is based. Gills Hill Lane is already overcrowded with traffic and a development with a number of small properties compared to a fewer number of larger properties would mean that the traffic issues would become worse. 10. Affordable homes should be included in all developments and no company should get away with not doing it after promising they will. Affordable should also be looked into being actually affordable for people not just the percentage of the ridiculous Radlett house cost. 11. Build more goddam houses. 12. The policy has my full support on the basis that the "and" at the end of (a) should read "or" 13. Concerned about increasing the size of Radlett. 14. Will only be possible if developer are prevented from building large houses 15. it is vitally important to offer those residents who have lived long term in the community the opportunity when 'downsizing' to remain in the community with family and friends 16. I fully support new smaller and affordable homes being built although I don't see Hertsmere planners taking any notice. 17. we desperately need homes to downsize to and no more huge detached properties 18. There should also be a focus on preventing over-development of sites 19. The policy reflects a mature approach to housing choices and types but still think that we need to work in partnership with council planning to ensure this isn't at the compromise of Green Belt areas. 20. GOOD IDEA ON Watling STREET.. not in other areas 21. Its all very well to have a housing mix but from where cometh the land 22. We need very clear indication that the practice of destroyed perfectly good homes to build expensive replacements will be halted. 23. Very pleasing to see the emphasis on the need for smaller houses suitable for downsizing (I declare an interest!) and also to help people get into the village (the latter point needs more emphasis - Radlett should not just be a place people move to when they have 'made it'). We do not need endless blocks of luxury flats! 24. Provision for more retirement type homes allowing independent living with accessible amenities/care 25. Support provided this does not mean plots of older houses knocked down for blocks of flats or complexes. 26. This is a policy without a plan for implementation. As the draft plan acknowledges, efforts 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>Our research showed that there is an on-going shift in the local housing stock towards very large homes. This is relates to extensions of existing buildings (80%).</p> <p>Over the 3 years of local planning applications analysed out of the 247 consented housing applications, about 57% (141) resulted in an increase of gross floor area of 5+ bedroom properties in Radlett. About 20 (8%) are considered new build. Increasing 3 and 4 bedroom properties to 5 and 6 bedroom properties describes the most common shifts.</p> <p>The policy aims to encourage developers to delivery more 1 to 3 bedroom homes. This policy does not prevent larger extension it simply shifts the emphasis and support for average sized dwellings.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - H1.1 Radlett Plan policy amended to address key concerns e.g. clarifying that applications for homes with up to 3 bedrooms, more affordable homes and designed with people of all abilities in mind are principally supported without closing off the opportunities to extend current family homes. In practice, we see this policy mostly applied to new builds. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amended to highlight need to provide homes for people with local connection. HD2 now provides a policy for DEVELOPMENT AT STARVEACRES - We added a policy on Open Space provision, protection and characteristics (OS Policies)

					<p>to control the nature of building in Radlett over the last 20 years have been an abject failure. Until the planning officers fully support these aims and until the appeals process ceases to be weighted in favour of the developers, this will continue to be the case.</p> <p>27. I support the provision of more affordable, smaller housing and bungalows but also think that there will be circumstances where it will be reasonable/not detrimental to permit the development of larger houses too - I wouldn't want to see this policy become too "extreme" in its interpretation or impact.</p> <p>28. Can developers be stopped from buying their way out of providing affordable housing in Radlett</p> <p>29. Not at the exclusion of residents being able to gain a return on investment from developing their homes</p> <p>30. We would love to downsize to an affordable bungalow in Radlett</p> <p>31. Why is the question on the survey put before the relevant text not after it ?? Fully support</p> <p>32. Do we need supersized homes? New builds MUST be in keeping with the surrounding housing.</p> <p>33. Policy (a) implies that residents would not be permitted to extend their home if it adds an extra bedroom to a three bedroom house.</p> <p>34. Yes, more "smaller and financially affordable" homes are needed in Radlett but Green Belt land MUST be protected at all costs.</p> <p>35. 'Resisted' this needs to be stronger than resisted for H1.2, I would say firmly rejected. The H1 policy should be so watertight that it cannot be broken by developers on appeals.</p> <p>36. Great need for homes for downsizing. The average size of household in Radlett is 8165/3145 or 2.6 per house so Radlett needs more smaller houses.</p> <p>37. The current practice of demolishing 3/4 bedroom homes to build mansions on insufficient space should be curtailed</p> <p>38. What are the plans for housing the elderly who wish to remain living in Radlett?</p> <p>39. Currently small houses are turned into large ones by extensions loft conversions - what is to stop this happening to new housing? Affordable only has any meaning if the properties are not subject to Right to Buy- otherwise they will just be sold on to the highest bidder.</p> <p>40. desperately need more smaller homes and opportunities to downsize</p>		
13	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission)	Policy Housing Design 'POLICY H1 - HOUSING CHOICES: MIX OF HOUSING TYPES'	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>Policy H1.1</p> <p>Housing Choices: Mix of housing types</p> <p>1. The policy, as worded, is problematic on various levels. It does not cross-reference any other policies and could be interpreted as permitting any development which simply meet one or more of the criteria listed below. It doesn't address how proposals for larger dwellings would be considered and potentially conflicts with Policy H2.1, in that the prevailing local character in a particular locality may already be defined by larger properties. Finally, it is unclear how a policy covering housing types can relate to both new dwellings and householder extensions.</p> <p>2. It would be clearer if the policy simply supported the provision of smaller and/or affordable dwellings (if the evidence supports this) with other dwelling types considered on their individual merits against the other policies of the RNP and Hertsmere Local Plan. It may also be appropriate, where this can be supported by local evidence, to include an expectation that the development of larger sites (as defined by Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy) should reflect the particular housing need which has been identified locally.</p> <p>3. The Lifetime Homes standard has been superseded by the National Technical Housing Standards (Oct 2015) in England, which introduced optional housing standards in October 2015. Part M of the Building Regulations was amended allowing higher access standards to be set in planning policy if evidence shows they are necessary and viable.</p> <p>(Part M (4) Category 1 is the default standard, designed to be 'visitable' by disabled people, Category 2 largely reflects the Lifetime Homes standard, and Category 3 is broadly equivalent to the</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>1) We believe that the HBC policy of not supporting Tandem Development leads to larger buildings within permitted development rights in single occupancy. This particularly on long and often thin plots which are so typical of Radlett's settlement structure. Policy H1 intends to encourage development for smaller homes while all other relevant policies apply. This includes new homes not just conversions and rebuilds. Please see adopted Woodcote NPlan for reference.</p> <p>2) Noted. Agreed.</p> <p>3) Noted. H1 promotes 'Lifetime Homes Standard' as the gold standard as of current Local Plan. We have amended the wording reflecting the change in Building Regs. We make now reference to the Building Regulations Requirement M4(Level 2) with the addition of stating that applications for</p>	<p>Action: Former Policy H1.1 and H1.2 have been amended and consolidated under HD1</p>

					<p>Wheelchair Housing Design Guide).</p> <p>Setting a requirement for anything above the baseline standard (Category 1, visitable by disabled people) is only permitted where this would address a clearly evidenced need, and where the impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>4 Current policy</p> <p>Policy CS22 of the current Hertsmere Local Plan 2012-2027, adopted prior to the national standard coming in, includes a requirement for 100% of new residential units are built to Lifetime Homes Standards 'where practicably possible'.</p> <p>5 Evidence of need</p> <p>The South-West Herts SHMA 2016 points to a significant need for specialist housing in Hertsmere as a whole up to 2036. This is expected to be provided primarily through retirement/sheltered housing; however an alternative may be to substitute some of this provision with a mix of small units built to Lifetime Homes standards (now Part M Category 2) in order to attract older people.</p>	<p>wheelchair adaptable dwellings will be looked at favourable.</p> <p>4) We would very much welcome if the LA opted in to Category 2 as the standard for new homes given the aging population and the significant local shift stemming from 'downsizers generation' from larger existing properties into smaller new homes. This could be determined into more detail in design and planning briefs (H4)</p> <p>5) Agreed. We will add this to our evidence base. Thank you. This is very helpful</p> <p>Current Local Plan "Policy CS7 deals with housing mix and sets out that housing developments in excess of 10 units (gross) contain some variation within their housing mix, with sites over 25 units or 1 hectare reflecting identified variations within the Borough's housing need, subject to proposals respecting the prevailing character of the area. On large sites allocated in the Site Allocations DPD and large windfall sites, the need for a proportion of sheltered or extra care housing is considered as part of the overall housing mix."</p>	<p>Added to supporting text. > Need for Specialist Housing for Older Persons, 2013-36 for Hertsmere estimated at 1321 in that period.</p>
Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy H2 Policy Housing Design	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>Please see our comments dated 16 May that points a), b) and c) are not able to be read as separate criteria or policy points.</p> <p>1) The points a), b) and c) are not criteria or separate policy points, and they cannot be read separately. Suggest:</p> <p>To secure efficient land use and ensure that development reflects the size, pattern and character of Radlett, development proposals are expected to:</p> <p>a) respond positively to the local townscape and landscape character; and b) demonstrate clearly and succinctly how proposed development respects and enhances the character of the local town and landscape with regard to the specific characteristics described in the Radlett Character Assessment. Applicants are expected to demonstrate this through scale illustrations of height, mass, bulk and appearance and views of the proposed development in its landscape, topographical and street scene context.</p> <p>2) Policy H2.3 Design rules for extensions and alterations to detached and semi-detached residential dwellings outside Conservation Areas - Point c) – presumed that this means there should be 2m between the side elevation of a proposed building/extension and the property boundary, but this is not clear from the policy. This could be taken to mean 2m spacing between buildings, or 2m between the rear elevations of two houses, which would be very close and would not allow for privacy. - Point g) – remove Hertfordshire Puddingstone and chalk from the list of acceptable materials, as they are not commonly-used as building materials. Hertfordshire Puddingstone is a relatively rare</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>1) Noted .Changed already in Reg 14 Version of Plan prior publication in July 2017.</p> <p>2) Policy H2.3. Comments noted.</p>	<p>We consolidated the Design Policies as HD3 to HD7 with specific Radlett Design Codes</p> <p>We added 'side elevation' to be clearer and deleted ref to Hertfordshire Puddingstone</p>	

				<p>material, and is also often protected for its geological value (e.g. there is a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) to the rear of Newberries Avenue which is protected from development due to deposits of Hertfordshire Puddingstone having been found there). Chalk bricks have been used historically in some parts of the region and are still produced primarily for restoration purposes, but they are not commonly found in this area, and are not a modern material of choice as they are not very durable.</p> <p>Additional comment (letter dated 30/10/2017)</p> <p>a) This section contradicts the aim of Policy H1.2 which seeks smaller and more affordable dwellings.</p> <p>It also contradicts itself, as developments that reflect the character of the area (large houses on large plots) will not make efficient use of the land. Building smaller houses on large plots would be inefficient and would not make them more affordable.</p> <p>It is reasonable that new development should respect and respond to local character, but, as mentioned in the previous comments on policy H1, this policy should not be so inadvertently restrictive as to make it impossible for smaller dwellings to be built where this does not already form part of the prevailing local character.</p> <p>Suggested wording:</p> <p>"a) To secure efficient land use and ensure that development reflects the size, pattern and character of Radlett, Development proposals are expected to respond positively to the local townscape and landscape character."</p> <p>In respect of b), as the RNP is currently drafted, Hertsmere BC will not be able to use this point to take decisions on individual planning applications because the Radlett Character Assessment (RCA) (2016) has no formal status. Although extracts from the RCA have been included on the preceding pages, if you are seeking to include reference to the RCA in the wording of a policy, the RNP needs to more clearly incorporate the RCA and its overall findings into the document.</p> <p>Policy H2.2</p> <p>Garden land developments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy SADM3 does not permit tandem developments but the policy as worded, due to criteria b) and d) could be construed as allowing garden land or tandem development subject to meeting the criteria stated. - It is also not clear whether this section refers to new houses only or to residential extensions as well. - The policy ought to define those scenarios where the redevelopment of land and buildings within existing residential curtilages is potentially acceptable and then either cross reference other relevant policies or introduce any criteria that are not already covered. <p>Policy H2.3</p> <p>Design rules for extensions and alterations to detached and semi-detached residential dwellings outside Conservation Areas</p> <p>a) See comment above on H2.1 a). This policy reads as contradictory to policy H1, and application of this policy could preclude developments of smaller houses as these would have a greater level of plot coverage than existing development in the area.</p> <p>d) This part of the policy would be very difficult to enforce because paving over a front garden is</p>	<p>a) We do not think this is the case. Housing more households on one plot in smaller properties is considered to contribute to more sustainable development if done well.</p> <p>Please note: Character Assessments are a common piece of local evidence base produced by Neighbourhood Forums and Parish Councils. The document is published and accessible on www.radlettplan.org</p> <p>Please proposals are always considered within the whole policy framework not just a single policy</p> <p>H2.2</p> <p>Noted. We believe H2.2 Point c) makes it clear that tandem development is not supported.</p> <p>The policy relates to planning applications that are made for development on garden land as part of the permitted development rights.</p> <p>H2.3</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>H1 is not intended to preclude development. It merely supports more development that addresses housing need as identified in the SHMA,2016 and our</p>	<p>- Deleted 'To secure ...'</p> <p>- We added 'garden land' to be clearer.</p> <p>- We deleted the reference to bungalows etc.</p>
--	--	--	--	---	---	---

					<p>generally permitted development (with certain conditions) so a planning application is not normally required.</p> <p>As mentioned in the comment on H2.1 above, the reference to the character assessment should be removed from the policy wording as this document has no status.</p> <p>Policy H3. 3 The Radlett Bungalows / Please refer to our comments from 16 May 2017.</p> <p>“H3 The Radlett Bungalows <i>Policy H3.2 Local List</i> - This section would be better-placed in the supporting text as it is not a policy relating to the use or development of land. Delete the reference to identified distinct clusters of bungalows as ‘Non-Designated Heritage Assets: Grade B’ as this does not exist in Hertsmere.</p> <p><i>Policy H3.3 Replacement of Bungalows</i> - Is this policy stating that bungalows must be replaced with bungalows, or that the overall scale and massing of a replacement dwelling should be the same height as the existing structure? (For example, some chalet bungalows) have significant ridge heights which are capable of being replicated in a two story house).</p> <p>- There are two issues relating to bungalows – their function as an accessible form of housing for downsizing, and their form as a housing typology in urban design terms. Many of the bungalows in Radlett do not perform this function as they are very large and may have steps leading up to them, but there may be some bungalows which are more genuinely accessible.</p> <p>-Is the intention of this policy for replacement dwellings to replicate bungalows in design terms only, or does it intend that where a bungalow is genuinely accessible and provides for a need for that form of housing, any replacement should also provide single-level, accessible accommodation?”</p>	<p>own research.</p> <p>We are not of the view that smaller homes do necessary relate to larger plot coverage.</p> <p>Re status of the Radlett Character Assessment. See previous comment. And please check with colleagues in other Local Authorities or with DCLG.</p> <p>Policy H3. 3 Noted. We propose to add those to your Local List and believe this sits well in the policy section. Please see Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan as reference.</p> <p>Noted. We agree. A bungalow is not necessary a one story building.</p> <p>Noted: It is assumed that 1 storey buildings are easier/ often cheaper to adapt to become fully accessible homes. The policy supports the adaptability and townscape function.</p>	<p>Amended H3.3 to HD8 Undertook up-dated research (Addendum to Character Assessment 2016: Radlett Neighbourhood Plan Area - Bungalows with individual and/or group value, up-dated in July 2018, Aldenham Parish Council 2018 incl. Mapping and a photographic register.</p>
14	‘On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation’	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy H2.4 Housing & Design ‘Trees’	No of Respondees: 98	Out of the 98 respondees 85% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 9% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	Policy now called HD6 and emphasized the protection of healthy high quality trees and hedges
15	‘On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation’	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy H2.4 Housing & Design ‘Trees’	No of comments: 22	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think retaining trees is very important but with plot sizes getting smaller there must be some recognition that trees close to housing stock may not be an option. However we could plant more trees around Radlett in common areas 2. Need to stop developers ‘accidentally’ knocking down trees when developing sites 3. Maintaining the verdant nature of Radlett is paramount 4. There is a need to protect both existing properties and new build properties from the removal of existing trees and appropriate (not over planting) of replacement trees where appropriate. 5. Planning As the draft plan says, control should require the retention of at least 30% green/unbuilt on open land at the front of properties. 6. Excellent idea but.....Hertsmere needs to impose more hefty fines for the felling of trees with preservation orders on them. 7. Number 3) has punctuation or words missing. 8. Hedges preferable to walls, especially facing the street. 9. Trees are nice. 10. This policy is most important in order to maintain the existing verdant nature of the village 11. when developers remove trees they are changing the look of the entire area 12. I support but have seen so many occasions where developers simply take out trees knowing the worst that will happen to them is a trivial fine. Needs serious penalties 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>We highlight the importance of trees for character, biodiversity and flood risk.</p>	<p>Action: Policy amended by making reference to flood risk and bufferzone We also added a policy on Open Space (H2.5) and OS2 Policy now called HD6 and emphasized the protection of healthy high quality trees and hedges</p>

					<p>imposed.</p> <p>13. Very important feature</p> <p>14. Support any measures to protect existing gardens and trees</p> <p>15. An increase in the number of TPOs is not supported; the current number is adequate.</p> <p>16. What will constitute 'exceptional circumstances'?</p> <p>17. not all trees worth keeping; some trees are far too big and this policy then says replace with two!</p> <p>18. I think there should be some flexibility to cater for unusual circumstances - I don't think it is helpful, for example, to have a single tree get in the way of an otherwise useful or reasonable development. But I support the overall intent here.</p> <p>19. Support the condition of replacing trees removed but why on a two for one basis? The important point is no net loss of trees.</p> <p>20. The Tree Preservation policy should be that as part of this new RNP, ALL of the trees within our district of a certain size/age/merit should be recorded and tagged over a short period of time, to prevent people cutting them down prior to submitting a planning application.</p> <p>21. Tree Surveys should be carried out independently and not by the Developer</p> <p>22. many new developments are cutting down trees, which changes the nature of the village</p>		
16	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy H4 Housing & Design 'DESIGNING with LOCAL Knowledge'	No of Respondees: 97	Out of the 97 submissions 79.5% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 9% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging.	
17	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Policy H4 Housing & Design 'DESIGNING with LOCAL Knowledge'	Comments received: 22	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corollary is equally true that the Council and planning committee respect all this process and doesn't permit any exception 2. Need to stop over development - large houses with no adequate garden 3. space. 4. Policy should in part be extended to cover demolition of single dwellings and their replacement by a much larger single dwelling. 5. Hertsmere Borough seems to have little control now over developers now. Will these same money grabbing people take any notice of a group of locals with their rational ideas?? 6. It should also be looked into that developers cannot just do a public consultation through a time of year when nobody notices (i.e. August, Christmas). It should also see a way of stopping developers getting away with more than 5 dwellings but splitting them or have different companies so they can get away without doing a DDB. 7. No high gates unless exceptional reasons 8. Let's be honest, this is just a backdoor for the kind of NIMBYism that has made outer London and the Home Counties unaffordable for the people who make the city run. 9. This policy is most important in order to allow the involvement of residents in adequate consultation concerning key locations in the village , and also any other important sites 10. Very commendable but only if the planning authority enforce it 11. we are losing the village feel and need to retain and increase the feeling of a mixed and diverse community 12. Yes, absolutely 13. Fully support this well-rounded, inclusive approach - it is important for developers to share detail in this manner to ensure we are not making poor decisions that jeopardise the long term vision of Radlett/surrounding areas. 14. The objective sounds a good one. 15. Perhaps a timely list of applications in consideration could be published on the Parish Council Website to aid transparency of the proposals. 16. As long as this is based on 'expectations', it seems unenforceable. 17. There should be no increase in retail space, indeed retail space should be reduced. Radlett does not need more charity shops, as retailers find that they cannot buck the national 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>The Statement of Community Involvement and National Planning Policy Framework do place great emphasis on good and meaningful pre-application consultation. As steering group we have great faith in the ability of the local community to support developers in creating better places by tapping into the local knowledge we hold and power to object poor development.</p> <p>This is an important policy particularly when it comes to the growth in population and employment anticipated over the next 15 years and for the borough as a whole.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy shortened - Reference made to financial information sharing re rational for affordable housing, infrastructure, community benefits. - Consider idea re notification re planning applications on Parish Council website

					<p>trend of consumers not needing so many and such large shops.</p> <p>18. Too many oversized detached houses built lately</p> <p>19. Support the idea of consultation with local residents for developments of 5 or more dwellings BUT the Design & Development brief is over detailed putting developers to a large amount of work and cost.</p> <p>20. As long as the Green Belt is protected.</p> <p>21. I would like to downsize and remain in Radlett but where do I go</p> <p>22. How are national health provisions hospitals/dentists included in the infrastructure plans?</p> <p>23. residents should have a say in large developments</p>		
18	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy H4 Housing & Design POLICY H4 DESIGNING with LOCAL Knowledge	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>'Please refer to our comments from 16 May 2017'</p> <p>It states: "Policy H4 Designing with Local Knowledge - While the intent behind the policy is understood, there is a risk that this policy goes beyond the scope of a Neighbourhood Plan and unnecessarily duplicates the Local Planning Authority's requirements in terms of pre-application engagement and information to accompany planning applications. - Delete the reference to HBC from policy H4.1 as follows: "Development Proposals which include five or more dwellings and/or include 500m2 of office, community and retail uses are expected to prepare and submit a detailed Design and Development Brief to Hertsmere Borough Council and Aldenham Parish Council for further public consultation, prior to submitting a planning application for the respective site." We have an existing pre-application process which we would not want to replace with this requirement as to do so would be resource-intensive and would not bring in a fee to cover the costs involved. - It is recommended that the policy focuses on any sites which are allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan which HBC would be able to cross-reference in its Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>Please see referenced NNPF and adopted NPlans. We also refer to section 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 of the recommended pre-application consultations for major development in HSB's Statement of Community Consultation, adopted 2017. There is very little experience of larger development in the borough and we feel strongly about encouraging developers and landowners to work with APC and the local community and the knowledge we hold as enabling a smoother and faster application process.</p> <p>Hertsmere Borough Council is the Planning Authority hence the requirement for a Design and Development Brief, a common requirement for major applications, should be welcomed and managed by the Planning Authority if produced by the promoter.</p> <p>Much of the content of the Design and Development Brief is commonly included in Design and Access statements. Efforts of integrating and opening up the 'internal project design process' with this policy intention is very welcomed and applauded and should lead to a more efficient process and less objections further down the application process.</p> <p>It's not clear how a policy could only apply for sites allocated in a Neighbourhood Plan. Please share the legal basis for that and consider its implications.</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <p>- Amendments made as considered necessary incl. a reference to major projects (as this has changed) , to section 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7 and a link to the Local Validation List.</p>

19	Email/letter to Vivian Charrett (Member of the Steering Group)	25 July 2017	Housing Design Policies	Resident J Caulton	<p>Policy HOUSING</p> <p>3.19 is confusing - "Delivering well-designed homes near local amenities and services/ the high street for downsizers needs to be considered more comprehensively. This approach will have to take account of the large proportion of 4+ bedroom properties in Radlett, the needs of an ageing population, young people's access to housing, exceptional low residential densities and high local property prices". How does the latter deliver with regards the first sentence?</p> <p>3.21 is similarly confusing- "We note that there might be a relationship between the prevalence of long and thin plot sizes in the Neighbourhood Plan area (relationship to what?) ,the design guidance from HBC for example, limiting tandem developments (a second row in back gardens, also known as two tier development s) and the large number of planning applications for extensions of existing buildings leading to larger buildings in single occupancy (See Figure 8d to 8f). There are few other ways to expand or add value to properties." I'm not sure what this all means? Are you saying these expand or add value developments are acceptable, or not...especially when you precede this with the issue about housing for the young and old and follow it with commentary on the loss of smaller properties..</p> <p>Radlett Bungalows - are by their nature for older residents yet all in Radlett are on the periphery of the village with no public transport - yet there is nothing in the plan to say otherwise. For example 3.19 states ..."Delivering well-designed homes near local amenities and services/ the high street for downsizers needs to be considered more comprehensively" ...But where ...there is no proposals plan?</p> <p>H4 Designing with Local Knowledge- although applauded is not easy to enforce and deliver - often community and APC are not architects yet have to deal with them on design . It is suggested the APC have a local design review team- as often used in other parts of the country.</p> <p>H4.1 Design and Development Briefs (DDBs) needs more careful thought- maybe all developments needs DDBs. The APC must be conscious of the number of developments that are carefully handled to bypass social housing standards? Developers making multiple applications .</p> <p>FLATS Flats are mentioned only twice in the whole document- there is nothing on new builds, conversions ,multiple house occupations, location s,types . etc</p> <p>Full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/wtwjqruo7kc7qkw/SKM_C284e17012312510.pdf?dl=0</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments and ideas aimed at improving the draft Radlett Plan. Very helpful indeed.</p> <p>H1 does address the need to increase the supply of smaller homes suitable for downsizers and build to good standards and needs.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>There are four sites identified in the local centre (see maps in the appendix)</p> <p>That's a great idea. It is hoped that related to the Newberries car park the landowner is open for some innovation and well tested tools supporting design quality.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>It is anticipated that flats will be part and parcel of more housing choices, particularly for downsizers.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We simplified 3.19 and 3.21 - We added evidence re need for specialist housing.
20	Letter	19 September 2017	Housing Design Policies	<p>Statutory Consultee</p> <p>Environmental Agency</p> <p>Thomas Campbell Sustainable Places Planning</p>	<p>We do not have many detailed comments to make as many of the wider environmental issues concerning the Environment Agency are covered within Hertsmere Borough Council's Local Plan. However, we have the below points to make which may strengthen your plan in its protection of the local natural environment.</p> <p>Flood Risk The Radlett neighbourhood area includes areas of Flood Zone 2, 3a and 3b, associated with the floodplain of the Radlett Brook and its tributaries. Flood Zone 2 is defined by Table 1 of the National Planning Practice Guidance, Flood Risk and Coastal Change (Section 25) as having a medium probability of flooding (1 in 1000 year), Flood Zone 3a as having a high probability of flooding (1 in</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>We feel that Flood Risk is a key issue and although it is well covered by the Local Plan, we have added a section on buffer zone policy to our plan and highlighted the importance of trees and front gardens as measures to reduce flood risks.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy now called HD7 - Added 'Bufferzone Policy' <p>The Radlett Plan strongly supports an increase in the number of Tree Preservation Orders to enhance and protect the verdant and biodiverse character of Radlett. This includes that any application</p>

				<p>Advisor Direct dial: 0208 474 7633 E-mail: HNLsustainablePlaces@environment-agency.gov.uk</p> <p>100 year), and Flood Zone 3b as having the highest probability of flooding (1 in 20 year). Development should be kept out of these areas where possible. In particular, no development should take place within Flood Zone 3b. We would object in principle to any planning applications in the future that propose such development, unless for either water compatible or essential development. This is due to the role of Flood Zone 3b as the functional floodplain, with the purpose of safely storing floodwater during times of flooding. For any new development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, a Sequential Test should be undertaken in order for the development to be considered appropriate in this location. Should the site pass the Sequential Test, a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will need to be submitted with a planning application, in line with paragraph 103 of the NPPF. The FRA must demonstrate that the development is safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and where possible reduces flood risk overall. Whilst we note that the plan does not propose any built development within the floodplain, a specific flood risk policy within the neighbourhood plan would aid in ensuring flood risk is considered with any new development within Radlett.</p> <p>Buffer zone to the Radlett Brook The Radlett Brook, which is classified as a main river, runs through Radlett, along with its tributaries. Your neighbourhood plan should specifically refer to protecting the watercourses in the area and their associated habitats. We would recommend including a strongly worded policy specifying that any scheme adjacent to the river and its tributaries should be designed with a naturalised buffer zone of at least 9 metres from the top of the bank of the brook in order to protect and enhance the conservation value of the watercourse and ensure access for flood defense maintenance. This requirement is in line with Hertsmere’s 2016 adopted Local Plan policy ‘SADM16 – Watercourses’.</p> <p>All buffer zones should be managed for the benefit of biodiversity, e.g. by the planting of locally appropriate, UK native species, and we would expect the buffer zone to be otherwise ‘undisturbed’ by development, and left free from buildings, hard landscaping, fencing, footpaths or other development. This buffer zone would also help to provide vital space for flood waters, provide improved habitat for local biodiversity, and would also help to provide attractive amenity space on the site. With any development alongside watercourses, consideration should also be given to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive (WFD), which includes causing no overall deterioration in water quality or the ecological status of any waterbody. The plan could specifically refer to the WFD. You should also be aware that any development within eight metres of a main river may also require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 from the Environment Agency. This permit is separate to and in addition to any planning permission granted, and any development taking place within this proximity of the watercourse without a permit could be breaking the law.</p> <p>Groundwater Protection The Radlett neighbourhood area is partially located within a Source Protection Zone 1 and a Source Protection Zone 2, where groundwater is most vulnerable and is used for drinking water abstraction. Any new development would need to ensure that there are no negative impacts upon groundwater quality, and where appropriate should contribute towards the remediation of any land contamination on the site.</p> <p>Link to letter: https://www.dropbox.com/s/e0ttv0dvlavq2ew/Radlett%20Neighbourhood%20Plan%20-%20EA%20Response.pdf?dl=0</p>	<p>adjacent to the Radlett Brook / Tyeswater and its tributaries should be designed with a naturalised buffer zone of at least 9 metres from the top of the bank of the brook in order to protect and enhance the conservation. the watercourse and ensure access for flood defense maintenance.</p>	
21	Letter	25 September 2017	Housing Design Policies	<p>Statutory Consultee Historic England</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Historic England about your Neighbourhood Plan. As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment, Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p>	<p>Actions: - Information on listed buildings and Building Preservation order added.</p>

				<p>Edward James Historic Places Advisor, East of England Edward.James@HistoricEngland.org.uk</p> <p>cc: Andrew Robely, Conservation Officer, Hertsmere Borough Council</p>	<p>local planning process.</p> <p>Your Neighbourhood Plan encompasses both Radlett North and Radlett South Conservation Areas, and includes a number of other designated heritage assets including 23 Listed Buildings, of which one, Battlers Green House, is listed Grade II*.</p> <p>There is also a Building Preservation Notice in force at Wild Farm on Harper Lane. It will be important that the plan identifies these heritage assets appropriately, and that strategy you put together for this area safeguards those elements which contribute to the significance of those heritage assets. This will ensure that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure it is in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>The conservation officer at Hertsmere Borough Council will be the best placed person to assist you in the development of the Plan with respect to the historic environment and can help you to consider and clearly articulate how a strategy can address the area's heritage assets. Although the neighbourhood area does contain a number of designated heritage assets, at this point we don't consider there is a need for Historic England to be involved in the detailed development of the strategy for your area, but we offer some general advice and guidance below.</p> <p>In general, we welcome this comprehensive and useful document. We are pleased to note the Plan's Objectives includes specific mention of conserving the local distinctiveness and aesthetic qualities of the village. However, we would suggest that Objective 10 is reworded slightly to read "To require development and public realm improvements to make a positive contribution to the natural, built and historic environment". This Objective should also be referenced in later policies designed to maintain the design quality of the townscape, including H2 and H3.</p> <p>We welcome the detailed discussion in Section 2 of the plan setting out the development and history of Radlett, and consider that it provides the reader with a good understanding of the town's characteristics, and the unique elements of Radlett's historic environment. The inclusion of a map showing the distribution and location of heritage assets on page 24 is also useful. We recommend that the supporting text and Key Policy References section of the plan make reference to the presence of the two conservation areas and their respective appraisals, in addition to the Character Appraisal produced by the forum. We would also recommend that the forum consider inserting an additional policy that seeks to improve any specific areas of the conservation areas that the appraisals identify as contributing negatively to their character and appearance.</p> <p>Link to full letter: https://www.dropbox.com/s/r3pcc9d0koj2k8j/Historic%20England%20Reg%2014%20Radlett%20Plan%20Response.pdf?dl=0</p>		<p>- Objective 10 changed and referenced with H2 and H3</p> <p>- Public realm and buildings identified in conservation area appraisals as contributing negatively are now specified in the 'Village Centre Policy section' as area of improvements (RV1 b.)</p>
<h2>(former) Green Belt Land Policies</h2>							
22	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	GREEN BELT LAND Policies Policies GB1 and GB2	No of Respondees: 98	Out of the 98 respondees 78.5 % are in support of the draft policy with an additional 11% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging.	Action: We moved key recommendations for the Green Belt to the Executive summary and detailed proposals for access to the green belt into the project section. The protection of the Green Belt through the new NPPF 2018 is confirmed and the New Local Plan will provide strategic policies and possible site allocations. Therefore we deleted

							the Green Belt Policy section because a Neighbourhood Plan cannot legally make strategic policies in or for the Green Belt.
23	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	GREEN BELT LAND Policies Policies GB1 and GB2	No of comments: 21	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I strongly agree with the defence of the green belt. It does not seem unreasonable to alter it to align with gardens and I have no views of the development of starveacres. I would also support Fairfield school being relocated but only if the is not a step down a slippery slope. 2. We agree with all of that 3. It is dangerous to contemplate the possibility of GB development as at planning inquiries appellants' counsel will submit this means in principle development in the GB is OK. This will be the case in particular for land adjacent to existing development. If GB development is going to be allowed, it is preferable to define exactly what and where and declare nothing else allowed. 4. Affordable housing should be built on the site of Fairfield school and a new school built on New Road seems an excellent idea. 5. The movement of Fair Field is not a great idea since the move would then potentially mean that the County Council will suggest moving St John's redeveloping that and if the move means making Fair Field bigger the County will then say you do not even need Newberries. Access to the site is not suitable for a school due to the busy nature of the road and would significantly create worse traffic due to crossings and all those who might have parked in the Battlers Green end all trying to park nearer Watford Road. 6. The Green Belt is a middle-class, white affectation from the days before the housing crisis. Burn the Green Belt and build skyscrapers on it. 7. I strongly support the principle of protecting Green Belt land. However, the potential opportunity to resite Fairfield Academy on Green Belt land will free up land suitable for development as affordable housing d 8. Without the Green Belt Radlett will become part of Greater London 9. Fair Field Academy School governors would need to be satisfied that any new school facilities were of at least the current standards in terms of class room size and other matters 10. Green Belt should be free from developments except Very Special Circumstances such as for a secondary school 11. not convinced about moving Fairfield school 12. I am opposed to any encroachment onto the Green Belt. 13. We should free up contiguous green belt to build more houses. 14. Only support move of Farfield School if current sizes of rooms are maintained 15. Starvacres good solution to retaining Radlett boundaries & provide affordable housing 16. GB1 (d) in addition consult with local residents. 17. OK with footpaths, if no residential dwellings are affected 18. I support GB2 but expect opposition from landowners 19. As 7 Above 20. I cannot support the release of green belt land in any circumstances- its retention is essential to the integrity of the village. 21. a retirement village at Starveaces would be wonderful 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>The concerns for the Green Belt are shared while the need for new homes and services are understood too. Developing land within the settlement and in walking distance to services and the railways are a first priority.</p> <p>Green Belt boundaries can only be changed in exceptional circumstances. The Local Plan making process provides an oportuity to do the required work for this process. Changing the Green Belt boundaries is underpinned by a host for research and subject to tests and possible challenged at the examination stage of the Local Plan. We invite all residents and landowners to provide input in to that process.</p>	<p>Action: Share important evidence with the public: Request for production and timely publication of a rigorous and detailed assessment of the green belt and brownfield sites from the Local Authority that are put forward by landowners and developers as part of the call for sites.</p>
24	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy GB 1	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior	<p>Development Principles</p> <p>The opportunity does exist to set out clearer expectations for 16 Watford Road (Starveacres), which is currently safeguarded for housing and so could potentially be allocated as part of our new Local Plan. We would urge you, in consultation with the site owner, to consider including this as a provisional allocation, albeit one which will be dependent on the review of our Local Plan, as this will enable appropriate parameters to be defined for any future development of the site.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>Agreed. The acute need for homes for more mature households, the elderly as well as first-time buyers is underpinned by a host of data and by public opinion.</p>	<p>Action: -See HD2</p>

				Planning Officer			
25	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy GB 2	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	Policy GB2 ' Beneficial use of the Green Belt - CIL Priorities Please refer to our comments from 16 May 2017.' The CIL priorities (e.g. creation/upgrading of footpaths) are perfectly valid aspirations, but are not land use policies and do not require planning permission, so should be removed from the policy and placed separately in the community projects section.	Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful. Our approach links NPPF principles with local needs and circumstances. (see Little Aston NPlan, Kentish Town Nplan, POLICY SP1: KENTISH TOWN SQUARE PHASE 1 – CIL PRIORITY Map 8) In light of promoted changes to the Green Belt boundary by HBC, we feel it is very important to identify spatial priorities to secure and improve the beneficial use of the Green Belt and support proposals to that end.	Action: Move clearer recommendations in Executive Summary
26	Email/letter to V Charrett (Member of the Steering Group)	25 July 2017	Housing Design Policies	Resident J Caulton	GBI development in the green belt principles- Confusing, as the plan appears to accept development of the green belt. I think its written specifically due to Starveacres and Fairfields.This will set precedents likely to be contested by developers unless clear and shown on a plan. What's to stop Newberries doing the same? Once the schools locate in the greenbelt ,what's to stop developers applying for housing around them? Full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/wtwjqruo7kc7qkw/SKM_C284e17012312510.pdf?dl=0	Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful. Starveacres is safeguarded land and no longer in the Green Belt. Note Fair Fields Academy school is a site that is considered due to the wider benefits of a new school and the possibility to explore the relocation of the school into the Green Belt and public land. An application for a school in the Green Belt might be considered a very special circumstance under the National Planning Policy Framework. Homes would normally not constitute such a very special circumstance hence there is no direct link between relocating the school into the Green Belt and building homes in the Green Belt.	Action: Move clearer recommendations in Executive Summary
<h1>Radlett Village Centre Policies</h1>							
27	17 July to 30 September 2017		RADLETT VILLAGE CENTRE POLICIES RC1.1 to RC1.9	No of Respondees: 97	Out of the 97 respondees 75% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 15% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	No further action required at this point.
28	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	RADLETT VILLAGE CENTRE POLICIES RC1.1 to RC1.9	No of comments: 22	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need to keep a balance of shops in the village 2. See my comments on control of traffic flow on Question 4 above 3. All ideas listed are of strong merit 4. I am not in favour of the Village Institute being demolished to make way for a Medical Hub 5. A one way system embracing Cross Path and Station Road should be developed. 6. CIL contributions should be available for expenditure at the Radlett Centre. 7. Should be full consultation with the residents of Radlett on the future of Newberries car park 8. There should be a genuine commitment that any development involving the current Sorting Office, does not mean this moves out of Radlett. The green area at the front of the Post Office should be retained equally as this helps disperse school children waiting for buses in the morning to ensure they do not totally block the pavement and have a safe place away from the road. I also believe that a Petrol Station is a useful commodity for Radlett to maintain since there are not that many nearby (especially if you turn off to 	Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful. This is an important policy particularly when it comes to the growth in population and employment anticipated over the next 15 years and for the borough as a whole.	Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop list of recommendations for non land-use planning matters which are outside the scope of an NPlan - Car parking and bicycle parking policy added to RV policies where need is most likely. - Ensure that comments are brought to the attention of the Local Authorities' consultants

					<p>Moor Mill to main roads from there there are none for miles) and for those on that end of Radlett is the only place nearby for them to buy bread and milk and any development should consider such provision. Although not specifically mentioned in the Plan I completely cannot support any move for the Radlett War Memorial. The location may not be ideal but it should be maintained in the centre of the village for all to see every day, so hiding it in a park with trees blocking the front being a about two metres below road level and being right next to a station where it will be noisy are not reasonable adjustments for the importance of it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. It's all pretty mealy-mouthed, isn't it? Is that the best we can all come up with? 10. Answers need to be found to encourage free traffic flow 11. No real indication of how these will be implemented 12. I cannot support the proposed market on Sunday as it will interfere with the ability of residents to get to Church. 13. Dont want a Sunday market. Lets have one day of peace and quiet. 14. In Watling Street there ate two sites-Petrol filling site and diagonally opposite waste land behind offices shop should be residential to consider offices in a declining sector makes a nonsense of common sence 15. The objective is right and it is important to follow through with this plan. 16. The need to develop is acknowledged, but must not be overly prescriptive. 17. Not bothered about the smart technology 18. It is not clear what is meant by some of the terms used: 'a greater range of shops' and 'encourage and nurture a more vibrant and social high street experience for local residents, youth and visitors'. Use of these premises will be determined by economic viability. 19. Important that medical hut have adequate parking including for large delivery vehicles 20. Response to RC1.6 at question 4. The Oakway parade suffers from limited parking leading to the turnover of units. Would it be appropriate to allow shops to convert to residential? 21. Please do not relocate the War Memorial 22. Where is everyone going to park!!! 		<p>working on the town centre study for the new Local Plan and the County Council's Transport team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that the production of the Village Centre Audit reviews all ideas and concerns presented.
29	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	RC1.6 RADLETT VILLAGE CENTRE AUDIT AND ACTION PLAN - Community Infrastructure Priority	No of Respondees: 93	Out of the 93 respondee 85% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 5% stating that that can support parts of the draft policy.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	
30	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	RC1.6 RADLETT VILLAGE CENTRE AUDIT AND ACTION PLAN - Community Infrastructure Priority	No of comments: 17	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent would traffic flow through the village be within the remit of the Radlett Plan? 2. Collaboration with key stakeholders is absolutely vital at every stage 3. the local high street has a very poor range of shops and restaurants for an area with such a high value of housing. Shops which would add to the high Street should be encouraged by the council and perhaps given some financial incentives. 4. Improvement of lighting in centre does not seem necessary seen as the new lampposts are ridiculously bright and it should be looked more into how to have low energy but not need sunglasses on. 5. If you wanted to do something, you'd militate against sky-high commercial rents along Watling Street. But you don't, and you haven't. 6. This Community Priority Project is most important in order to ensure that the vitality of the village centre is maintained , and hopefully enhanced. 7. Will only work with the active participation of the business community 8. It would be brilliant to rid the High Street of unnecessary signs, posts and clutter. It could look so much better and more open than it does 9. I am concerned about loss of Red House and Sorting office which Hertsmere has simply 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>Radlett Village Action Plan is now a priority for the Parish Council even with the Radlett Plan not yet adopted.</p> <p>This will ensure that aspects a neighbourhood plan policy cannot be made for by law (such as traffic management issues) will be addressed and discussed in an integrated and comprehensive manner with Herts County Council and other partners.</p> <p>Comments will help in the scoping of Radlett Village Centre Audit and Action Plan which the Parish Council has now made a priority even without the Radlett Plan being adopted. The comprehensive</p>	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Change order of policies and consolidate - Ensure that the production of the Village Centre Audit reviews all ideas and concerns presented.

					<p>invited developers to develop. I doubt there is the will to seriously tackle the traffic, speeding and parking issues though.</p> <p>10. Concerned this may lead to felling of trees prior to planning application</p> <p>11. Fully appropriate</p> <p>12. This is terribly vague: there needs to be active discouragement of vehicular traffic through Radlett. The introduction of a 20 mph speed limit throughout the village and traffic calming measures would be a good start. There needs to be greater restrictions on parking.</p> <p>13. There are four zebra crossings from the Oakway parade to the (old) post office, additional crossings will impair traffic flow. There are laybys for buses in the centre of the village and just north of the station - why do we need more?</p> <p>14. As part of this plan we must ensure that responsibility for maintaining existing and new improved structures/landscaping/lighting/trees etc. is identified and clearly spelt out that if damaged, then the owning body replaces like for like quickly. Also, let us get serious about improving the lands behind Newberries Parade with enforcements and an extensive plan to get rid of unused vermin housing garages and use the space for shopkeepers parking and deliveries.</p> <p>15. More encouragement needed for pedestrians.</p> <p>16. How are facilities such as bus stops, parking areas, disabled parking, traffic flow to be policed ?- currently cars park in the bus stops, non disabled people park in disabled bays, people park " just for a minute!" on yellow lines and pavements - if no one polices it , it is a waste of time.</p> <p>17. good to get a professional view</p>	<p>analysis, planning and regeneration of our village centre is considered a high priority for the health, well-being and prosperity of the whole community. This might include a design guide/code as mentioned earlier.</p>	
31	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy RC1 Radlett Village Centre Vitality	<p>Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response</p> <p>Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer</p>	<p><i>From the letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017</i></p> <p><i>Policy RC1 Radlett Village Centre Vitality</i> <i>RC1.1 A diverse range of shops and places to meet</i></p> <p>- This policy is not enforceable/not useable in a development management context because Permitted Development rights allow A1 to change to A2 (and vice versa) without the need for a planning application. Certain A1 and A2 units can also change to A3 and to residential use without needing and application, so control over these is limited.</p> <p>- RC1.1 c) is contradictory to the current Local Plan 2012-2027 which expressly does not seek any new development at Battlers Green Farm.</p> <p><i>Policy RC1.3</i></p> <p>- This policy should either allocate a site for the hub or should be moved to the section on community priorities as a CIL priority. It is not a land use policy in its current form.</p> <p><i>Policy RC1.5, RC1.6 and RC1.8</i></p> <p>- These are not land use policies, and as they cannot be delivered through the planning process they would be better placed within the 'Community Priority Projects' section and listed as CIL priorities rather than being within the policy.</p> <p>- The PPG suggests that wider community aspirations dealing with non land use matters should be clearly identifiable, e.g. set out in a companion document or annex.</p> <p>- Other Neighbourhood Plans have done this (e.g. Riseholme Neighbourhood Plan – could look at the Examiner's Report for this one)</p> <p>18.</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p><i>RC1.1</i></p> <p>a) Noted. We would like to indicate though that shops, places to meet incl. cultural venues are a priority especially in light of the growing population and vitality of the high street in the after office hours.</p> <p>b) We also would like to suggest to consider an Article 4 Direction for the District Centre or areas defined in the Radlett Action Plan Area (a new district centre boundary?). This to gain / keep more planning management control for the District centre especially outside the Conservation Areas.</p> <p>c) We feel that Policy SADM43 - Primary Frontages and Policy SADM44 - Secondary Frontages cannot be applied as intended due to the situation that the northern end of the centre is defined as Primary Frontage and the middle section as Secondary Frontage.</p> <p>d) NOTE: We asked awhile if you could review and change the Primary and Secondary Frontage definition for Radlett District Centre. The review of the Local Plan provides a good opportunity for that. We would also suggest to redraw the District Centre boundary to recognise and actively manage all matters highlighted by the NNPF when it comes to town centre viability and vitality including car parking. It would be helpful to provide guidance for</p>	<p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changed name RC to RV. - Added a set of Recommendations dealing with those matters that are not land-use matters in the scope of a Neighborhood Plan <p>- Simplified the policies where necessary re shops and added community and cultural uses</p> <p>- Clarified /simplified policy re support for the medical center within the District Centre. Confirmed support for new version of Medical center from Surgery</p> <p>- Add support for improvements and development of station area (RV1 f.)</p> <p>- Added more detail for supporting digital connectivity</p> <p>- We would welcome and support the LA in developing a strong set of polices for our District Centre delivering on the ambition set out in Section 7 of current Local Plan and in light of the expected population growth.</p>

						<p>the Newberries car park regarding secondary frontages too.</p> <p>RC1.1 c) Noted. We are unclear on the evidence supporting this Local Plan policy for Battlers Green. Further, we believe that the current Local Plan does not accommodate for expected growth in population and retail needs of the population. We think the changes in population projections have materially changed. Also note as far as we know there is no threshold for an Impact Assessment locally defined hence in our view it would be difficult to refuse development under 2500 sqm (See NNPF para 26)</p> <p>Policy RC1.3 to RC 1.8:</p> <p>Noted. Please see reference to NNPF Paragraphs 23 to 27 also See PPG Guidance ‘ Ensuring the vitality of town centres’ . We feel that our set of policy priorities are supporting these intentions.</p> <p>Policy RC1.3 Noted. Supporting the locating of a medical hub in the Village centre ideally in the District Centre is a spatial policy aimed at highlighting a local priority of locating key services in walking distance for many, contributing to the vitality of the centre and retaining a community services. Access to health services is of particular relevance to our ageing population.</p> <p>This draft policy does not constitute a site allocation. It states a preferred use aligned with Hertsmere Borough’s Planning Brief 2016 for key locations in the District Centre, SPD (Draft) On page 21 it states: “Potential use : 9.10 The current use of the location is mixed and part is used as a doctors’ surgery, whilst the other part is used as a post office, which includes a sorting office. The Council considers the use of the Red House Surgery site to be a key social or community function and it is the main doctors’ surgery within Radlett. The use of the post office is also considered a social or community function, though the sorting office on this same site would not be considered as a social or community function. Any change of the use of this location away from social or community functions would therefore be opposed, in line with Core Strategy Policy CS19 (Key community facilities). 9.11 On this basis the Council would support the continued use of the location for social and community functions. However, it is understood that the Red House Surgery is looking for improved premises. Were a suitable and appropriately located site be found elsewhere within Radlett, the change of use of the existing Red House site could, in principle, be acceptable. If</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>the Red House Surgery were to move location, prior to the Council considering any change of use of its current site away from a community facility, it would have to be demonstrated that any replacement accommodation elsewhere is satisfactory for all of its users.”</p> <p>Policy RC1.5: Please note supporting street markets is a common town centre planning policy. New name RV4 Outdoor Street Market</p> <p>RC1.6 Supporting improvements to town centres is a common planning policy approach.</p> <p>RC1.8 Supporting high quality communications infrastructure. New name RV6 Digital Connectivity.</p>	
32	Letter	29/09/2017	Radlett Village Centre Vitality	<p>Landowner</p> <p>Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of Royal Mail Group Ltd (Royal Mail)</p> <p>Contact: ellen.bailey@cushwake.com 020 329</p>	<p>ROYAL MAIL GROUP REPRESENTATIONS: Aldenham Parish Council – Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 2017</p> <p>We are instructed by our client, Royal Mail Group Ltd (Royal Mail), to submit representations to Aldenham Parish Council – Draft Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 2017.</p> <p>[...] Impacted Royal Mail Property</p> <p>Radlett Delivery Office (“the Delivery Office”) is affected by the content of the Neighbourhood Plan. The Delivery Office is set back off Watling Street, close to the junction with Aldenham Avenue. The Delivery Office has a statutory duty to provide efficient mail sorting and delivery services within the Parish of Aldenham. The Delivery Office is within Royal Mail’s leasehold ownership with no plans to relocate in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Representation</p> <p>Cushman & Wakefield has reviewed Aldenham Parish Council draft Neighbourhood Plan document in the context of its impact on the operations of the Royal Mail’s property within the parish. The Delivery Office is of strategic importance to Royal Mail in ensuring they are able to continue to fulfil their statutory duty for mail collection and delivery.</p> <p>The subject of this representation is to ensure that Aldenham Parish Council is aware of Royal Mail’s operations at this location and the need to robustly protect their assets.</p> <p>Future Land Use Allocation – Sorting Office and former Post Office, Radlett</p> <p>The draft Neighbourhood Plan document allocates the Delivery Office site for redevelopment.</p> <p>We note that the draft Neighbourhood Plan policy RC1.3 Medical Hub states that “the Radlett Plan strongly supports and promotes a medical hub in Radlett to serve the local population. An extended Red House Surgery building, either using the former Post Office site/the Sorting Office or a new facility on the Village Institute site are supported”.</p> <p>Policy RC1.4 Sorting Office and former Post Office further states that “development proposals for the Sorting Office and former Post Office Building site which include a medical facility are</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>This draft policy does not constitute a site allocation. It states a preferred use aligned with Hertsmere Borough Council’s Planning Brief 2016 for key locations in the District Centre, SPD (Draft)</p> <p>On page 21 it states: “Potential use9.10 The current use of the location is mixed and part is used as a doctors’ surgery, whilst the other part is used as a post office, which includes a sorting office. The Council considers the use of the Red House Surgery site to be a key social or community function and it is the main doctors’ surgery within Radlett. The use of the post office is also considered a social or community function, though the sorting office on this same site would not be considered as a social or community function. Any change of the use of this location away from social or community functions would therefore be opposed, in line with Core Strategy Policy CS19 (Key community facilities). 9.11 On this basis the Council would support the continued use of the location for social and community functions. However, it is understood that the Red House Surgery is looking for improved premises. Were a suitable and appropriately located site be found elsewhere within Radlett, the change of use of the existing Red House site could, in principle, be acceptable. If the Red House Surgery were to move location, prior to the Council considering any change of use of its current site away from a community facility, it would have to be demonstrated that any replacement accommodation elsewhere is satisfactory for all of its</p>	<p>Action: - We have consolidated the draft policy.</p>

					<p>supported. Other additional uses, retaining active commercial/retail and community uses with access at street level and with offices and/or residential use above, are supported.”</p> <p>Royal Mail objects to the allocation of the Delivery Office as a redevelopment site set out in policies RC1.3 and RC1.4, for a medical hub, and/or other commercial and residential uses as currently drafted and suggests alterations to the wording of the document.</p> <p>The Delivery Office is an established operation serving the district and its retention in this area is vital to ensure that it continues to comply with the statutory duty to maintain a ‘universal service’ for the UK pursuant to the Postal Services Act 2011.</p> <p>However, should Royal Mail’s site be brought forward for redevelopment, relocation will need to be commercially viable for Royal Mail. The proceeds from the disposal of its site will need to yield both sufficient value to fund the purchase and fit-out of a new site and the relocation of their operations thereto. In addition, it would be essential that any new facility is provided prior to the demolition of the existing to ensure the continuity of service.</p> <p>Royal Mail therefore formally requests that the text is amended with additional text as follows:</p> <p>“Should Royal Mail’s site be brought forward for redevelopment, relocation will need to be commercially viable for Royal Mail. The proceeds from the disposal of its site will need to yield both sufficient value to fund the purchase and fit-out of a new site and the relocation of their operations thereto. In addition, it would be essential that any new facility is provided prior to the demolition of the existing to ensure the continuity of service.”</p> <p>Such a policy amendment will better serve the protection of RMG’s future operation and property interests.</p> <p>This approach accords with adopted Government guidance set out in the NPPF which advises that local planning authorities should help achieve economic growth by planning proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century. The NPPF also</p> <p>advises that local planning authorities should support the existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Royal Mail would welcome further engagement with Aldenham Parish Council.</p> <p>I trust that these representations are acceptable and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt and keep me informed of future stages of the adoption of the Aldenham Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan and other planning policy documents.</p> <p>If you require any further information or wish to discuss these representations further please contact me at ellen.bailey@cushwake.com Full letter here / Link to letter:</p> <p>https://www.dropbox.com/s/7lpeimvz9cutjqi/Aldenham%20Parish%20Council%20-%20Written%20Representation.pdf?dl=0</p>	users.	
33	Email/letter to V Charrett (Member of the Steering Group)	25 July 2017	Housing Design Policies	Resident J Caulton	<p>CENTRE</p> <p>RVI Radlett Village Centre Vitality - no mention of size of the high street- how long would be acceptable ;should it be characterised by different uses? No mention of mixed use- flats over retail...unless 3.63 subtly mentions it with a 'balanced approach' for an evening economy?</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>The focus is on a mix of uses at street level and a support for homes in walking distance.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>- We have consolidated the draft policy.</p>

					Policy RC 1 Radlett village centre vitality- NO mention of mixed use and flats over commercial uses.		
					Full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/wtwjqruo7kc7qkw/SKM_C284e17012312510.pdf?dl=0		
<h1>Getting Around Policies</h1> <p>(Note: we changed the, number, order and numbering of policies)</p>							Added the term 'Infrastructure' to underpin the importance of the policies. Changed order and numbering of policy . Now only GA1 and GA2 polices.
34	On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	GETTING AROUND POLICIES GA1 to GA5: Promoting sustainable modes of transport and healthy communities - Community Infrastructure Prior ities	No of respondees: 95	Out of the 95 respondees 79% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 15% stating that that can support parts of the draft policies.	This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.	No further action required at this point.
35	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	GETTING AROUND POLICIES GA1 to GA5: Promoting sustainable modes of transport and healthy communities - Community Infrastructure Prior ities	No of comments: 23	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cycle routes would be brilliant and lifts at the station 2. We agree with all of that particularly the landscaping of Tykes water and a bus to Stanmore station 3. Better bus links needed. 4. Safe cycle routes long the A5183 to St Albans and Theobad Street to Borehamwood would be much appreciated. 5. Fully support cycling routes, but would like to point out there are not really any to improve just need addition. On buses recent changes have meant school services to St Albans are hampered since bus was 7:27 now 7:08 then next one was 8ish now 8:01 then there was a 8:30 and 9:30 bus and now only one at 9:05. Lateness of bus also difficult as cannot stay at university of Hertfordshire too late (not past 7) otherwise have to get 602 leaving 7:30 getting back at 9 or leaving 9 getting back at 10:30. Minimal weekend provision also. The problem with lack of buses is it makes people think why would I want to rely on buses as they are not regular so buses are further unused and exaggerates the problem even more. 6. It takes 45 minutes to get to Watford via public transport, at a cost of around £4.50 for a return trip - and that route doesn't even go outside the centre, meaning that anyone who doesn't have access to a car faces a two-leg journey to get anywhere other than the shopping mall - let's say to places like the hospital. You know, that unimportant little place on the edge of town. What about improving the piss-poor, unaffordable bus links with surrounding towns? What about militating against eyewatering train fares that rise well above inflation year-on-year? What about working with Oliver Dowden to bring Radlett into the Oyster zone? This really is a poor effort. C-, must try harder. 7. Better links particularly to North London are required 8. Fully support better public transport and cycling provision but can't see any real will to tackle traffic & parking issues. 9. need facilities for electric car charging 10. Need for better cycle parking and facilities for unloading deliveries in Radlett Centre not addressed. 11. A safe cycle route to Bushey schools including a crossing of 	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>Your comments will be added considered as part of Radlett Village Centre Audit and Action Plan which the Parish Council has made their priority even without the Radlett Plan being adopted. The comprehensive analysis, planning and regeneration of our village centre is considered a high priority for the health, well-being and prosperity of the whole community. This might include a design guide/code as mentioned earlier.</p> <p>The Radlett Plan Steering Group wants to make sure that Radlett functions well as a place where people of all abilities find it easy to get around. The health benefits of walking and cycling as well as the importance of the ease of accessing a well connected and affordable public transport network and parking facilities are key for a well functioning and attractive place where many visit, work and learn.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning is however not a very sharp tool for addressing the complex issues around design of existing streets and accessing public transport but the Radlett Plan highlights our priorities so infrastructure providers and stakeholders are aware of our needs, concerns and wishes. Partnership working with Herts County Council as the highways authority and landowners and channeling funding into identified priorities will be key in making progress in improving the networks.</p>	<p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policies amended/ changes to order and focus on sustainable modes of transport. - Car parking and bicycle parking policy added to RV policies where need is most likely. <p>- We strengthened the requirement for digital connectivity and required infrastructure.</p> <p>- Discuss idea re electric hopper type bus? Or perhaps just a free shuttle service within the village for elderly with Steering Group and Parish Council</p> <p>4. Ensure that comments are broad to the attention of the Local Authorities' consultants working on the town centre study for the new Local Plan.</p> <p>5. Possibility of the station car park as mixed use development site incl. car and cycle parking. Is there an option for an access from The Drive. Policy added to RV 1</p>

					<p>the A41 is desperately needed. Parking and traffic are a significant issue exacerbated by building work closing the main road frequently</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. object to second deck of station car park. This would vastly increase the traffic volumes in and out of radlett 13. We currently have little experience upon which to base our comments. 14. Pleased to see the emphasis on cycling & walking - not just cars. 15. GA4.1 should be Shenley hill not Shenley road. Feel this may cost a lot and may not get much use. 16. GA6 - regarding BUSES, I would only support the deployment of small, (ideally electric) electric hopper type buses running at high frequency or on regular schedules e.g. daily to Barnet general morning and night with enables app booking systems. Waiting 30mins between buses on highly used routes is not a useful service and discourages uses of public transport on regular commuter routes. Bus service provers should be tasked with completing user reports to allow analysis of how much wasted driving of (near) empty buses adds to needless general traffic and pollution. Put a % of use target in place for operators to force proper route and schedule provision. 17. Increasing parking provision will encourage the use of cars in the village. This immediately contradicts the principle of 'Promoting sustainable modes of transport and healthy communities' and does nothing to address the pressing issue of air quality along the major routes into Radlett. 18. Not entirely convinced about adding in cycle lanes to existing roads. Think this could lead to more congestion and may not improve protection for cyclists. I am very keen for the Oyster card scheme to be extended to Radlett and this doesn't appear to be included in the policies. 19. Good idea to have bus service to Stanmore 20. Cycles should NOT take precedence over cars. 21. More emphasis needed on encouraging walking within the village, which would reduce parking problem and have a greater impact than supporting cycling. In particular there is a need to improve pavements and maintenance of the many footpaths in Radlett - e.g. the footpath from the back of the station to Radlett Park Road. 22. Bus route to Stanmore good idea. Oyster Card from Radlett Good Idea Second Deck on Station Car park and on Newberries Car Park Good Ideas 23. Especially need lifts at the station, elderly, infirm, mothers with buggies 		
36	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy GA Getting Around	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton	<p>“Please refer to our comments from 16 May 2017” Getting Around</p> <p>a) Suggest changing the section title (e.g. ‘Movement’), as it reads as though it is a section on how to get around having to comply with policies (it has been read this way by more than one person in our office seeing it for the first time!).</p> <p>Context and reasoned justification</p> <p>a) Para 3.73 ‘exasperate’ (or ‘exacerate’) should be ‘exacerbate’. Policy GA1 to GA6</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>We have found that ‘Getting Around’ helps to support the active modes such as walking, cycling and using public transport.</p> <p>In light of the anticipated growth in population and jobs we feel even more strongly about the need of communicating to the full range of stakeholders what our ambitions and needs are when it comes to basic infrastructure / how this growth needs to be</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>- We have amended the policies to highlight more clearly the specifics of the policy so developers and partners can take guidance from it (see mapping). Section 4 of the Plan provides further details.</p>

				Senior Planning Officer	<p>b) These are not land use policies, and as they cannot be delivered through the planning process they would be better placed within the 'Community Priority Projects' section and listed as CIL priorities rather than being within the policy.</p> <p>c) Examiner's report on a similar concept within Dunstan NP: "This policy section also includes a Proposal (BEP1). I have already concluded, see 3.10, earlier, that such recommendations can remain in the body of the plan, provided their status is made clear and they are distinct from the land-use policies of the plan. I recommend that the Proposal is renamed "Community Proposal" and it, together with the supporting Justification, are all placed in a box or other graphic device to distinguish it from the policies."</p>	<p>facilitated/enabled. Getting around is one key infrastructure aspect here.</p> <p>Thank you for your reference to the Dunstan NPlan.</p>	
37	Email/letter to V Charrett (Member of the Steering Group)	25 July 2017	Policy GA Getting Around	Resident J Caulton	<p>GETTING AROUND</p> <p><i>Policy GA Getting Around-</i> Promoting sustainable modes of transport and healthy communities .</p> <p>I have a specific request here- include a POLICY GA 6- about resolving the poor situation at the north end of the High St around the Radlett Synagogue and Oakway Parade (para 3.60 mentions this in passing) for pedestrians, parking and drop off to the RUS. Redesign of this area could improve traffic flow, allow drop-off for the RUS; improve pedestrian safety on narrow dangerous pavements and prevent parking on pavements.</p> <p>Full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/wtwjqruo7kc7qkw/SKM_C284e17012312510.pdf?dl=0</p>	<p>Noted. Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>Your comments will be added considered as part of Radlett Village Centre Audit and Action Plan which the Parish Council has made their priority even without the Radlett Plan being adopted. The comprehensive analysis, planning and regeneration of our village centre is considered a high priority for the health, well-being and prosperity of the whole community. This might include a design guide/code as mentioned earlier.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>- Ensure that comments are brought to the attention of the Local Authorities' consultants working on the town centre study for the new Local Plan and the County Council's Transport team.</p>
<h1>Former Community Facilities Policy</h1>							<p>Changed name to Open Space Policies and focused on this aspect of community facilities</p>
38	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	<p>Overall on a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support the</p> <p>COMMUNITY FACILITIES POLICIES under CF1 Education, Parks, Open Spaces, Allotments, Recreational, Faith and Cultural Places</p>	No of Respondees: 97	<p>Out of the 97 respondees 58% are in support of the draft policy with an additional 24% stating that that can support parts of the draft policies.</p>	<p>This is very much welcomed and encouraging. Thank you.</p>	<p>No further action required at this point.</p>
39	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	<p>Overall on a scale from 1 to 5, to what extent can you support the</p> <p>COMMUNITY FACILITIES POLICIES under CF1 Education, Parks, Open Spaces, Allotments, Recreational, Faith and Cultural Places</p>	No of comments:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A sports centre and swimming pool in Radlett would be a great bonus 2. It is unsatisfactory that other parts of Hertsmere have leisure facilities provided and supported by HBC whilst Radlett has none. 3. Please protect the Brickfields from an unnecessary sports development. 4. Parking issues as already discussed. 5. A community sports hall good idea, as long as Hertsmere leisure do the activities Hertsmere Leisure run in the rest of Hertsmere there. The location however would mean increased Watford Road traffic due to it not being an easily accessible location for all of Radlett. Also yes there should be other provisions in the east side 	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p>	<p>Action:</p> <p>'Local Green Space Designations' is taken out since the feel the spaces identified in Fig 20 have a good degree of 'projection' already through planning policy designations as park, playing fields, covenants or/and are owned by the Parish Council and HHC.</p> <p>We would like to promote the protection and enhancement of</p>

					<p>of Radlett.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Let's be realistic: very little of this will matter to the kids using it, because nobody can go to secondary school in the area, because there ain't one. All the schools you've listed in §3.102 are either a) private, b) faith schools, c) quite some way out of town and hence inaccessible without a car, or d) both. So there is nowhere for kids to locate their social life within Radlett, so they've already built up friendship groups and social networks in other towns. 7. Efforts have been made for over 50 years to provide a secondary school which is still required 8. It would be really nice if we could see a return to football or other games being played up at the Phillimore recreation ground. We need to be inspiring our youngsters to be more active. 9. We need equality of facilities with other parts of Hertsmere like sports facilities provided by Hertsmere Leisure, not just a small hall at Battlers Green 10. We would like more information for this activity. 11. Don't think you need another play area on the east of the village. Existing playground is adequate. 12. This section is not well enough developed and has bundled too many issues into a single lump. Needs to be reviewed and opened out e.g. education needs its own subsection. Green Spaces need to be better identified for purpose and facilities eg which facilities are required 13. I am opposed to development of the Green Belt. It is unclear to me where the play area on the east side of Radlett will be located. 14. Strongly support CF1.1, do not support CF1.2 (where) and support CF1.3 15. Not sure of the value of a play area to the east of the village would be - gardens are large enough to accommodate play. 16. Totally Agree 		all existing and future open spaces in Radlett and the suggested policy makes provision for that.
40	'On-line Survey Draft Radlett Plan, Regulation 14 Consultation'	17 July to 30 September 2017	Final Question in survey: Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?	No of comments: 42	<p>Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think the majority of bungalows are not suitable for our elderly population. I therefore feel that some of these could be redeveloped although I would support the building of suitable bungalows that meet the needs of today's older population. 2. I did not find this survey easy with having to open up the plan and scroll up and down to find the correct section for each question. I was told it would only take 20 minutes to do and I have been going to 45 minutes now! 3. Any proposal to build on prime agricultural land should not be allowed as we are not self-sustainable re food production as a Nation. 4. Yes. Concerns that the HCC and HBC will over-ride the principles of the plan when it suits them. Radlett has become a rather dreary and untidy looking village with vastly over-exaggerated housing developments which are out of keeping with the essential and original character. 5. If Fairfield School is relocated has consideration been given to relocating St John's School adjacent to the new site for Fairfield School? The present site for St John's School could then be released for new housing. 6. I am concerned that in most areas office space is being converted 	Noted. Thank you for your concern and ideas provided. We greatly appreciate your time taken for this survey.	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A stall at the Sunday Market was set up and run in the autumn of 2017 to raise further awareness about the Radlett Plan, a meeting with the Radlett Youth Council and will continue working with the younger residents of Radlett. - For the next rounds of consultation and the referendum we will develop a social media action programme as part of the overall communications. - A Key Proposal Map to provide a quicker way for people to review the key aspects of the Radlett Plan

					<p>to flats as more people work from home and spend less time in the office so would question any need for an office development in a residential area. Decontamination differences for petrol station between land used for office and residential use. There is a need for executive downsizing properties. Must keep and provide more car parking in an ever growing community. Limit developers greed! Have a say in reducing overpriced new build properties and over development of land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. One way traffic should be considered in Radlett's heavily parked residential roads for safe cycling. 8. I feel quite strongly about the lack of provision in the Parish from HBC, HBC leaves all leisure provision to APC and then charges APC for the 1 hour free car parking in Newberries car park. APC needs to take a much stronger policy stance in terms of seeking investment from HBC, not least at a time when HBC seeks to gain financially from Newberries car park, where HBC has the opportunity to provide indoor leisure provision as it has done in many places elsewhere in its area. 9. The aspects of the plan related to community consultation and engagement regarding planning are laudable and sensible. However, it will only truly represent the views of Radlett if efforts are made to engage more residents in these processes. It appears that often 'contraversial' planning discussions and debates are dominated by a vocal group, possibly a minority. It's hard to be sure without the statistical evidence, but it does feel that in Radlett there is a silent majority who do not object to much development and/or are ambivalent. We must use this plan to drive out the real views of Radlett - whatever they may be - and not default to an anti development or development nervous stance. One person's 'over development' is another person's 'wonderful investment' in Radlett!! 10. Very impressed with the Plan, its thoroughness and the amount of work that has gone into it, but concerned it may not have been effectively communicated to all resident demographics. Could more be done through social media/email to convey the essence of the plan and garner feedback? Encouraging posts on the Village FB help, but I fear for some, interest will wane when landing at a 70 page Plan. Tricky as the Plan is inevitably detailed and "worthy" and hard to convey in a few soundbites. 11. How will we know that these excellent ideas are being listened to? When will we get any feed back?? 12. To preserve Radlett as a community with a feel of a village and not a town. Preserve the character and to stop over build and the widening gap of rich and poor 13. I think that the report tackles the main issues around parking, housing and quality of the high street. 14. WD25 8NL 15. You cannot hold back development but you can attempt to ensure it fits in with the environment and the surrounding properties. It is also essential to preserve the "village" feel 16. Many thanks to the members of the steering group for their hard work in producing the plan. 17. Why is everyone on the panel old and white? Were there no young people, no people of colour who wanted a say in Radlett's future direction? Or didn't you ask around? This is an old white person's plan written by a group of old white people. I suspect 		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>you're all comfortably middle-class, as well, and have paid off your mortgages. The lack of empathy in this plan is appalling. There is a full-blown housing crisis in Britain; in Hertsmere alone, the median house price to earnings ratio increased from 8.91 to 13.98 from 2010 to 2016 (ONS: 2017). This plan does nothing to militate against this, or the manifold problems that come with living in Radlett without fitting a very specific demographic profile. Radlett is no longer a place for the poor; the disabled; the young; the elderly. It is not a place to run a business or make a life: it is a commuter dormitory for the very wealthy and privileged. You blow past all that in a display of sheer self-satisfaction. Your plan disgusts me.</p> <p>18. We live next door to a "development" (on Watford Road). We know very well how Hertsmere Planning and Enforcement operates and it is not at all impressive. We are keen for APC to have much more input in to village related proposals - especially where Developers are involved. We are also aware that Developers pretend to be ordinary residents - so we are also keen for APC to have involvement where it might not immediately seem to be a "development".. And we are keen for Radlett to maintain its diversity of all kinds.</p> <p>19. Without the support of local councils this will fail</p> <p>20. I think you should avoid being overly prescriptive in terms of design of new buildings and types of materials. It leaves no scope for imaginative architecture.</p> <p>21. Needs some radical thinking to make things work. I doubt local councils have ability to provide this.</p> <p>22. Thanks for all the hard work. Good luck.</p> <p>23. It is unclear to what extent the Village Institute currently contributes to village life: I have never met a member!</p> <p>24. Don't touch Newberries car park. Leave it as a car park. It is very much needed. Raise the charges if necessary to create more funds.</p> <p>25. WEST SIDE OF WATLING STREET FROM RED HOUSE SURGERY TO WATFORD ROAD IS IN GENERALLY POOR ORDER AND SHOULD BE COMPLETELY REDEVELOPED TO A HIGH STANDARD... THIS LETS THE WHOLE AREA DOWN. ALSO THE MAIN RAILWAY BRIDGE ON SHENLEY HILL SHOULD BE PAINTED ON BOTH SIDES.. IT GIVES A VERY RUSTY VIEW AS PEOPLE ARRIVE IN RADLETT</p> <p>26. A high school would be a great bonus for our children's future.</p> <p>27. Lack of understanding, planners not having recognition of commercial undertakings compared to planning law</p> <p>28. There must be full and open discussion throughout the process with no hidden agenda. So much effort has gone into this plan, such that it would be a tragedy if the objectives were scuppered by ill considered compromise.</p> <p>29. A very good start but some sections are insufficiently expanded e.g. community facilities, transport</p> <p>30. It would be great to see new builds include a percentage of affordable housing and not have developers pay their way out of this requirement. Less of the huge "megamansions" to be built in Radlett please.</p> <p>31. Achieving even some of the aims of this plan depends on the whole-hearted support of the Hertsmere planning officers and on their professional competence. These ease with which most of the developments in Radlett have been pushed through over the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					<p>last 20 years does not inspire confidence in either.</p> <p>32. The only real interest is in development proposals and how these are to be funded. Most of the Plan states that "virtue is noble".</p> <p>33. Delighted by the detailed effort that gives weight looking to preserve and improve our community for the future. Fingers crossed for carrying it through.</p> <p>34. Our real concerns include the traffic congestion, pollution, parking problems and issues (eg selfish stopping & parking) and building works & their impact</p> <p>35. as 10</p> <p>36. Main concern is project delivery. Yes we need more affordable houses but who will develop them and where.</p> <p>37. As the planning department has previously OK'd all the monstrous developments (eg, changing 3 bed to 6+ bed) how will they now be reigned in to stop future over-development of verdant plots in the village ?</p> <p>38. Great start and has my full support, but we need to build in muscle and steel into these policies otherwise others who do not care about the Radlett area will find ways to break the good work for their own greed.</p> <p>39. Do not move War Memorial. Can a car park be put at the back of the shops in the Oakway. If the Newberries Car Park had another deck or even 2 decks could parking be removed from the front of the Newberries Parade Shops and the shops enhanced by having a covered walkway along their length thereby stopping the congestion on the roundabout at the Watling Street Shenley Hill Junction.</p> <p>40. Footpaths are becoming cycle tracks and unfriendly for walkers.</p> <p>41. I will post my comments as this web site offers little chance of proper comment and/or engagement hence the above.</p> <p>42. Protecting the Green Belt is important 2. A greater mix of housing is needed and replacement of existing houses by mansions should be stopped.</p>		
41	Letter from Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority	30 October 2017 (Late submission) And referenced to Letter dated 16 May 2017, submitted June 2017	Policy CF Community Facilities	Hertsmere Borough Council Planning Authority Reg 14 Response Grace Middleton Senior Planning Officer	<p>"Education, Parks, Open Spaces, Allotments, Recreational, Faith and Cultural Places Please refer to our comments from 16 May 2017"</p> <p>CF Education, Parks, Open Spaces, Allotments, Recreational, Faith and Cultural Places</p> <p><i>Context and reasoned justification</i> Policy CF1.1 Local Green Spaces All of these spaces are currently designated as Open Spaces, Sports and Leisure Facilities through Policy SADM34 of the Local Plan 2012-27, which affords them a level of protection.</p> <p>Policy CF1.2 and CF1.3 a) These are not land use policies, and as they cannot be delivered through the planning process they would be better placed within the 'Community Priority Projects' section and listed as CIL priorities rather than being within the policy. b) If the Fairfield School site was allocated for housing through this Plan, and a site was also allocated for the replacement school, then policy CF1.3 could form part of the site specific requirements for the school.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>CF1.1 Noted. We opted for more detailed set of criteria aimed at protecting our open and leisure spaces.</p>	Action: We redrafted the policy.

42					<p>CF1.2 Local Play Areas-- The Radlett Plan strongly supports and promotes a new play area in the east of the villageWhere?</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments. They are very welcome and useful.</p> <p>There are a few options. Chiefly on the Open Spaces within settlement area or in the Green Belt. This would be decided as and when the nature of the play area(s) are explored (eg more formal play areas or perhaps more natural adventure playgrounds in the Green Belt)</p>	<p>No further action at this point required.</p>

- END of Document -