

WYMONDLEY PARISH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2015 – 2031

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

JUNE 2016 – amended February 2019

Development of the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Note on amendment:

Following the exploratory meeting with Deborah McCann and NHDC on 30th January, the Wymondley Parish Council has consulted the land owners of the designated green spaces. These responses have now been added to the consultation representations have been added to the table at the end of this document.

1. On 16 June 2015 Wymondley Parish Council (WPC) formally applied to North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) for designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area. At the same time, it submitted that it was qualified under the Localism Act 2011 to establish a steering group leading to the creation of a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) – to be known as the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan Forum (WPNPF).
2. The WPNPF was formally established in June 2015 (as confirmed in the WPC Minutes of 22nd June 2015), and has since developed a draft NP for Wymondley Parish on behalf of WPC. Its Constitution and Minutes of its meetings are made publicly available on the WPC website.
3. WPC has been regularly updated on progress throughout the NP development process, via WPNPF participation; reports from the WPNPF Chair to monthly Parish Council meetings; and ad hoc meetings and correspondence between WPNPF members and parish councillors. The WPC publicly approved the draft NP at its Annual General Meeting (AGM) on 18 April 2016.
4. We regard the Wymondley parishioners as our main stakeholder, and the driving force behind our NP. In July 2015, WPNPF conducted a survey of each property in the Parish, seeking views on how parishioners would like to see the Parish develop over the coming years; and to identify the issues of key importance to them. The results of that survey formed the basis of the policies set out in the NP and there has been on-going liaison with representatives of key interested parties, for example, our county council and accountable and neighbouring local authorities¹ throughout its development.
5. In addition to the parish survey, a presentation was given at public meeting held on 26th October 2015, attended by 58 members of the Parish and some county, local

and parish councillors present. Information was publicly available at the monthly public WPC meetings and AGM; and there have been ad hoc interviews published in the local press.

6. Informal discussions regularly occur during encounters with parishioners before and after WPNPF meetings – and on other occasions.

¹ Hertfordshire County Council, North Hertfordshire District Council and Stevenage Borough Council respectively

The legal requirements

7. Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 sets out what is required of a qualifying body in relation to publicising and consulting on its proposals for a neighbourhood development plan (NP) before the proposed plan is submitted to the local planning authority.

8. In this case, the qualifying body is Wymondley Parish Council (WPC) and the local planning authority is North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC).

9. In summary, regulation 14 requires that:

- a) details of the NP proposals are publicised in a manner that is likely to bring them to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area;
- b) details are provided of where and when the NP may be inspected, how to make representations, and the date by which those representations must be received;
- c) the consultation period is not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposals are first publicised;
- d) the qualifying body consults any of the statutory bodies whose interests it considers may be affected by the NP proposals; and

10. a copy of the proposed NP is sent to the local planning authority.

How we publicised and consulted

11. Formal public consultation on the draft NP began on 10 April 2016 at 14:24 hours. Consultation ended at 17.00 hours on 25 May 2016, thereby exceeding the statutory minimum 6 weeks consultation period.

12. Consultation began with an email sent to all parishioners who had completed the survey in the summer of 2015 on April 10 2016 at 14:24 hours.

13. Printed copies of the draft Plan were made available at the public houses and places of worship in the Parish, along with paper forms for those without internet access to be able to respond.

14. The consultation exercise was specifically publicised by distributing information leaflets to all the residences, businesses, public houses and places of worship in Wymondley Parish on 14 April 2016. The leaflet provided an outline of the key issues

covered by the NP; how to access the draft NP (either online or hard copy); how to respond via online and other means; details of the consultation closing date and telephone helpline; and notice of the forthcoming WPC AGM and its associated opportunity to gain more information. A copy of the leaflet is given at Annex 14

15. A local Press Release was also issued on 11 April 2016; and the consultation was informally publicised by providing responses to ad hoc enquiries from residents; promulgation of information amongst parishioners by WPNPF members at social events, (for example at Breakfast and Book Club meetings and to allotment/garden plot holders); and through provision of a the NP on a specific website www.wymondley.org which went live on 8 April 2016.

16. The website was established to publicise the draft NP and facilitate responses to the consultation via a specific online form, but was not the only means of response. Email responses were also acceptable; and paper response forms were also made freely available at key points within the Parish, for those without internet access, or who preferred to respond via hard copy. These paper responses were collected and collated immediately after the end of the consultation period and are included in the table that follows.

17. A telephone enquiry line has been available since July 2015, to answer any queries parishioners may have about the NP planning process or the public consultation.

18. It is not a requirement to provide a postal address. The requirement is that we do not exclude any sections of the community (i.e. those who cannot access the internet). We made it clear on the leaflet we put through people's doors that printed copies of the plan were available at various public places in the parish along with hard copy forms which they could complete and leave for us to collect. A telephone number was also made available both on the original survey (July 2015) and on the leaflet this April 2016 therefore, the dissemination of the plan, and the response mechanisms advertised were wholly inclusive for all sectors of our community.

Who we consulted

19. All residents and businesses within the Wymondley Parish

20. Paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 to the Regulations provides a list of statutory consultation bodies. In addition, WPNPF consulted a number of other interested parties, for example local organisations with which we had been in contact during the development of the draft NP, or who we believe may have an interest in it; and respondents to the Wymondley Parish Survey undertaken in July 2015. A consultation

list was included in the draft NP and is provided as Annex 10 to the Draft NP Consultation Statement.

21. Statutory consultees, and other parties known or believed to have an interest in the NP proposals, were contacted by e-mail or letter on 10 April 2016, notifying them of the consultation period, how to access the draft NP, and specifying means of response. (A copy of the standard letter is shown at Annex 14 of the plan)

22. To assist residents without internet access or with limited IT skills; and to facilitate discussion within local groups, (for example the Great Wymondley Breakfast and Book Clubs), printed reference copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan were made available in the public houses and places of worship, and loaned out on request by WPNPF members. They were also available at the WPC AGM.

Responses Received

23. We received a total of 55 formal responses to our public consultation on the draft Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Of these, 37 were via the online response form; 11 by e-mail; and 7 on paper response forms.

24. Of the responses received, only 3.6% were objections.

Issues raised and how we addressed them:

1. The table included with this consultation statement summarises the issues raised during our consultation activity, and indicates how they have been addressed. Where we consider that the draft NP did not warrant amendment, or has been amended in the light of comment(s) received, we have commented to that effect.

WYMONDLEY PARISH
RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION ON DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
11 APRIL 2016 – 25 MAY 2016

Date: 11/04/16 Reference No: 1 Respondent: Ana Antecky Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	<p>Comment: I can only say a big thank you for your work and effort all people involved in preserving the area. You have put across all points, which were of my concern also.</p> <p>I have read the Stevenage Housing Plan issued in January 2016, with a disbelief how many option they have defined to be valid to build over the Green Belt land. It appears that there is no protection of it at all, due to a possibility of applying a very lax interpretation of the regulation and the law.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that I cannot contribute my time at the moment to support local community, however I am more than grateful that you have taken on yourself the burden of actively caring for what should be in the utmost care of local councils: local people, land and wildlife.</p>
Date: 11/04/2016 Reference No: 2 Respondent: Simon Martin Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	<p>Comment: I am in full support of the WPNPF neighbourhood plan and the ethos in which it is representative of the communities aspirations. Preservation of the green belt is paramount as are the issues raised within the plan.</p>
Date: 12/04/16	<p>Comment: Thank you for inviting the Herts and Middx Wildlife Trust to comment on your neighbourhood</p>

<p>Reference No: 3</p> <p>Respondent: Herts. and Middx. Wildlife Trust</p> <p>Location: St Albans</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>plan. If you would like to discuss any of the suggestions below please do not hesitate to get in touch. Policies regarding the natural environment should be more specific to ensure the aims of NPPF and the local community are translated into the Wymondley neighbourhood plan. NPPF seeks to ensure that development results in net gains to biodiversity. In order to realistically achieve this, a method to measure existing biodiversity value is required. Application of this mechanism will then ensure that development will equal or exceed this figure. DEFRA, Natural England and the planning Inspectorate have endorsed the use of the Biodiversity Impact Calculator (Environment Bank 2015) as an appropriate way of objectively measuring the biodiversity value of any given area of land. This provides the most satisfactory way of meaningfully achieving net gains to biodiversity and should be explicitly referred to in the text. This will reduce dispute and speed up the assessment of ecological impacts. It is also important that any ecological information is supplied in accordance with the appropriate national standard - BS 42020. Therefore the following changes are recommended to make the plan more effective:</p> <p>6.7 While the Wymondley Transforming Station, located just outside Little Wymondley, may itself detract from the landscape, its site has much to commend it in terms of important flora and fauna. It is located within an old gravel pit, where there are interesting grassland habitats present – together with the small-leaved Sweet Briar Rose, which is a rare plant nationally. Additionally, it is the only location in Hertfordshire where there are important colonies of pyramidal bee orchids.</p> <p>6.8 Little Wymondley itself has important pipistrelle bat roosts; and polecats have been sighted near the allotments (and at Titmore Green). Other more common wildlife abounds, with a good variety of animals and birds throughout the Parish – including nesting Red Kites and swallow and house martin nests in Little Wymondley. A bat survey in Great Wymondley church has recorded three different species of bat in nursery roosts; and there are also swifts nesting in the church roof during the summer. There is also a large population of toads in the pond near Redcoats Green, and it has been long established practice, each year in the breeding season, for volunteer marshals to transport the toads across the busy road to the pond.</p> <p>6.9 Wymondley Woods, which is situated to the north of the Parish, was planted in two stages between 1997 and 2000, amidst mature woodlands. Consisting primarily of locally-grown oak and hornbeam, it was created as an educational resource for managed groups. It features a special nature conservation and field study area, adjacent to existing and newly planted forest environments which provide food and cover for a wide variety of wildlife all year round – in marked contrast to the surrounding arable fields. It forms part of the Garden City Greenway, which was funded (and is owned and managed) by the Heritage Foundation, to act as a permanent commemoration of Letchworth Garden City's first centenary in 2003.</p> <p>Add: '6.10 The Parish Council expects that the planning system should</p>
--	---

contribute to the conservation and enhancement of these ecological assets and to the ecological systems that support them. In accordance with the NPPF, development policies will seek to maximise the benefits of planning decisions to biodiversity, within the context of sustainable development. 6.11 In order to accurately determine whether no net loss and enhancement to biodiversity can be delivered by development, the Parish Council expects that, when requested, precise ecological assessment by suitably qualified people to accepted national standards be undertaken, sufficient to determine net gain. 6.12 The DEFRA and NE endorsed Biodiversity Impact Calculator (Environment Bank 2015 or as amended) has been designed to determine and quantify existing biodiversity value, in terms of habitats, and the consequent measures required to ensure no net loss and where possible net gain. Policy: When determining development proposals the Council will ensure that decisions will minimise impacts and result in net gains to biodiversity. Net gain will be determined by applying the Biodiversity Impact Calculator. Determining planning applications affecting sites of significant biodiversity interest 6.13 When determining planning applications where there is a requirement to conserve and enhance biodiversity the following principles will be applied. 6.14 If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (by locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission will be refused. 6.15 Planning permission will be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as; ancient woodland, traditional orchards, aged, veteran, champion trees, or trees of a high conservation value located outside ancient woodland, unless the need for and benefits of the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss. In this instance substantial compensation consistent with the Biodiversity Impact Calculator will be required. Policy: In considering development resulting in significant ecological impact there will be a presumption against such development unless clear and significant ecological gains can be demonstrated. Sites of acknowledged nature conservation value 6.16. Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are non statutory designated sites. There are also many non designated sites that conform to the definition of Priority Habitat, as defined by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC) 2006. These are of varying degree of importance for nature conservation and receive varying degrees of protection. 6.17 Herts Environmental Records Centre (HERC) hold records of all known sites of nature conservation value in Wymondley. 6.18 There are also several known sites of critical importance to species of national and international importance, such as bat roosts. Records of these are held by HERC and/or specialist recording groups. 6.19 The Parish Council will consider applications for development affecting any of these sites against criteria commensurate with their relative ecological status and protection within a local, national and international status. Their local context is particularly important. Development

affecting any of these sites or species is expected to result in a net gain to their area or populations. Policy: In determining development proposals affecting designated sites and Priority Habitats or Species, the council will ensure that their nature conservation value is protected in accordance with their status. Development affecting such sites or species is expected to deliver a net gain in biodiversity. In granting permission the Council will impose conditions or seek planning obligations that secure appropriate management regimes to deliver biodiversity gain in-perpetuity. Networks of biodiversity and Green Infrastructure 6.20 The protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets is dependent on robust networks of Green Infrastructure which facilitate movement and genetic exchange. 6.21 Green Infrastructure is expected to positively contribute to the conservation, restoration, re-creation and enhancement of networks of biodiversity on a landscape scale. The size and location of G.I. is expected to be suitable for the function it is intended to fulfill. Where required, G.I. should ensure permeability for wildlife through development and provide sufficient beneficial habitat to support target species, independent of its connective function. 6.22 Monitoring of GI and habitat creation to ensure that it develops in accordance with its stated intention will be expected. If it is not achieving satisfactory condition within stipulated time-frames, remedial measures will be required. Mechanisms to achieve this must be outlined in development proposals. 6.23 Buffering of watercourses is important to protect the aquatic environment from pollution and disturbance, and to create movement and habitat corridors for wildlife. Development will not be permitted within 12m of a watercourse. 6.24 Many species are entirely dependent on human habitation for their reproductive success. Modern housing standards virtually eliminate opportunities for these species. Consequently where appropriate, features for biodiversity within development will be expected. Simple inexpensive measures can result in significant gains such as, integrated bat roost cavities, integrated swift or house martin boxes. These measures, if required, are expected to be permanent in order to deliver meaningful ecological gain. Therefore these features will be expected to be built in to suitable structures rather than provided as vulnerable, isolated and temporary boxes. 6.25 Bat populations are particularly sensitive to development that severs or disturbs movement corridors. Where appropriate, flight corridors should be identified and protected or enhanced to ensure the ecological functionality of bat populations. Examples of suitable measures include green bridges, underpasses or tunnels that are situated on the exact traditional routes of bat populations and free from disturbance. Policy: In considering development proposals the Parish Council will expect Green Infrastructure to provide permeability for wildlife through and around development. GI should be connective and functional as wildlife habitat in its own right not just as a link between habitats. Policy: All suitable development will be expected to include integrated bat and bird roosting devices within the fabric of the

brickwork. Policy: In considering development proposals that negatively impact upon bat movement corridors the Council expects that these corridors are identified, protected and enhanced to ensure continued ecological functionality of bat populations. Policy: Development will not be permitted within 12 m of a watercourse. Ecological survey standards 6.26 The provision of quality ecological information is critical in determining the impacts of development and securing meaningful ecological gains. Survey and mitigation measures must therefore conform to the following principles: 6.27 Ecological information must be provided by suitably qualified personnel. Details of qualifications and experience must be provided with all ecological reports. 6.28 Ecological surveys must answer the following questions; what features are present, what is the ecological value of these features, how will these features be affected by the development proposals, how can these impacts be avoided, mitigated or compensated so that there is a net gain to biodiversity. 6.29 Survey methodology and reporting must conform with nationally accepted standards. All surveys and reporting must be conducted in accordance with British Standard 42020: Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development. 6.30 Where European Protected Species (EPS) licenses are required, answers to the 3 tests of the license must be supplied for consideration by the Council. Failure to do so will result in applications being refused because the LPA will be unable to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Policy: In considering ecological information in support of planning applications the Council expects that surveys are undertaken by suitably qualified personnel and are consistent with nationally accepted standards i.e. British Standard 42020: Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development. Wildlife and lighting 6.31 Lighting within and around development is expected to respect the ecological functionality of movement corridors. Certain species of invertebrate and mammal are highly sensitive to inappropriate lighting. In these circumstances surveys are expected to determine where these movement corridors are and measures put forward that demonstrate how these will be protected and enhanced. Policy: In considering development involving potentially adverse lighting impacts to wildlife the Council will expect surveys to identify movement corridors and ensure that these corridors are protected and enhanced. Wildlife and landscaping 6.32 Landscaping design can have a significant beneficial effect on wildlife. Landscaping schemes will be expected to maximise opportunities for wildlife. The Council expects the selection of ecologically appropriate species in such schemes, of local provenance where possible. 6.33 Tree planting schemes where the primary purpose is to provide ecological enhancement should look to maximise diversity of species. Species selected should be suitable to the soil conditions and be comprised of appropriate vegetation communities consistent with National Vegetation Communities (NVC). 6.34 Naturalistic tree planting should not be in straight lines. 6.35 The establishment and management regimes of

	naturalistic planting schemes are critical to their success. These must be stipulated in development proposals together with mechanisms to monitor and address any deficiencies in the fulfillment of their stated objective. Policy: In considering landscaping schemes the Council will expect that appropriate native species are used whenever possible and that benefits to biodiversity are maximised.'
	ACTION – all aspects considered and where necessary the plan amended
Date: 12/04/16 Reference No: 4 Respondent: Christine Marshall Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: Pleased to see that the village is being cared for and in good hands wishing you success.
Date: 14/04/16 Reference No: 5 Respondent: Robert Bacon Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: The contents list of the local plan appears to cover all of the things that have been mentioned at the local meeting at the school so I suggest we put it forward to NHDC and await developments
Date: 15/04/16	Comment: Living in Little Wymondley on Stevenage Road I am pleased that the flooding issue is at last being addressed.

Reference No: 6	
Respondent: Jacqueline Fautley	
Location: Little Wymondley	
Type: Support	
Date: 18/04/16	Comment: Section 5 - how many surveys were distributed and how many returned? How representative are these figures? if less than 10% returned the survey, the answers are probably not as representative as stated.
Reference No: 7	
Respondent: Joanna Bacon	Section 12 - the school is full but a considerable number (30-40%) come from Hitchin and Stevenage. If only village children attended there would be more space and fewer cars as most of the village children walk to school. Therefore there is space for more Wymondley children, however Hitchin and Stevenage would need more spaces in their schools. Also that would reduce the parking issues outside the school, not increase them.
Location: Little Wymondley	Section 15 - land was purchased for building a village hall, so the location is defined however planning and funding have not been progressed.
Type: Comment	Annex 10 - Wymondley Baptist Church was not consulted in the generation of the plan, so please do not imply that it was. Individuals within it may have been but there was no consultation with the leadership of the church. Throughout - please use the name 'Wymondley Baptist Church', when referring to the church on Stevenage Road in Little Wymondley
Date: 20/04/16	Comment: I support the neighbourhood plan. Also I support designating the parish green areas as Local Green Spaces. I support designating the three allotment sites in the parish, Great Wymondley, Siccut Road and Stevenage Road Little Wymondley as Assets of Community Value.
Reference No: 8	

Respondent: Robert Howard Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	
Date: 20/04/16 Reference No: 9 Respondent: John Mann Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: I fully support the views expressed in this plan.
Date: 28/04/16 Reference No: 10 Respondent: Kim Tulley Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: I support the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan. Thank you.
Date: 03/05/16 Reference No: 11 Respondent: Ivor Hancock	Comment: I don't want our village to be swamped by too big a development with all the problems of road congestion increased flood risk that would bring

Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	
Date: 03/05/16 Reference No: 12 Respondent: Clare Hancock Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	<p>Comment: We are a small village with our own green space around us and we don't want to be swallowed up by the larger towns around us</p>
Date: 06/05/16 Reference No: 13 Respondent: Adrian Gurney - Hitchin Forum Planning Group Chair Location: Little Wymondley Type: Comment	<p>Comment: I am writing as chair of the Hitchin Forum Planning Group: the views expressed here reflect those expressed in discussion at our meeting on 4th May.</p> <p>Thank you for sending to Hitchin Forum the draft Plan you have drawn up, and for including us in your consultation process. It is a most comprehensive document, supplying a complete picture of the status of Wymondley parish and the wishes of its residents as regards future development proposals and need. You are to be congratulated on it, and the information regarding flooding problems etc is especially informative.</p> <p>We acknowledge that finding the right line to draw between what is reasonable and unreasonable development is a challenging one, and this goes alongside deciding what might be a reasonable incursion in the Green Belt. It appears that the suggestion that a maximum of 50 dwellings could be accommodated was the lowest number option offered to residents, and clearly resident consultees are likely to select that lowest option given the opportunity.</p> <p>However, the District Council is obliged to identify a large amount of development over the next 15 years, and the difficulties this presents are shared ones throughout the district. Clearly most communities will be able to present a case against large scale development, but in such circumstances we wonder whether such a low figure as that in the Neighbourhood Plan is likely to be accepted by the Council.</p>

<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 14</p> <p>Respondent: Tim Dean</p> <p>Location: Great Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: I fully support the proposals.</p>
<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 15</p> <p>Respondent: Laura Davidson-Dean</p> <p>Location: Great Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Excellent, well constructed plan which I fully support.</p>
<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 16</p> <p>Respondent: Nina Turvey</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Well done Team. A strong plan that cannot be ignored. Such attention to detail is astounding.</p>

<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 17</p> <p>Respondent: Chris Turvey</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Having been involved in the compilation of this plan, I naturally wholeheartedly support it and the aspirations it contains. Protecting the Green Belt, addressing flood risk, solving traffic problems and upgrading the current infrastructure are paramount in the plan. The whole of Wymondley Parish will be the better for the adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 18</p> <p>Respondent: Maggie Charles</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Many thanks to WAF for putting together a parish plan which is well thought out and put together. The plan raises the important issues identified by residents in a professional, clear way highlighting the concerns and offering sound reasoning behind reasons for putting forward the plan. I fully support the plan. Thanks</p>
<p>Date: 16/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 19</p> <p>Respondent: Tracey Owen and Karl Davies</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: As residents of Little Wymondley we are very grateful that a group of like minded individuals have dedicated the time necessary to produce the neighbourhood plan presented. Well done, well said and thank you for highlighting what so many of us feel.</p>

<p>Date: 17/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 20</p> <p>Respondent: David Lucas</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: The plan contains other crucial recommendations for the maintenance and improvement of the Parish - I congratulate the authors on their diligence, sensitivity and determination in preparing a valid and professional submission to the local planning process.</p> <p>Crucially, it is absolutely vital that green belt separation of Hitchin and Stevenage remains in tact - as soon as building is allowed it will encourage more and more building bringing the beautiful market town of Hitchin into ever closer contact with Stevenage. It will also create enormous local stresses on roads, safety and quality of life which are easily ignored in the desperate scramble for housing quota fulfillment.</p> <p>Wymondley Parish boundaries maintain this separation and must at all costs be protected from development. Clearly any spaces within non-green belt areas that can justifiably be developed should be considered as proposed in the neighborhood Plan.</p>
<p>Date: 17/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 21</p> <p>Respondent: David Blakey</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Don't spoil the village way of life. I paid a premium a few years ago to live in a small village not a small town which it will become under the proposal to build 300 plus houses along with industrial units. The flooding, traffic and school are quite enough going through the village without adding to it.</p>
<p>Date: 17/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 22</p> <p>Respondent: Cathy Kerby</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: Once the Green Belt has gone and the rural environment destroyed we can never get it back. While recognising the need for more dwellings, it is vital for current and future generations that any development is appropriate, i.e. of the right type, size and location and does not negatively impact on the things we value most. Short-term gain often results in long-term loss.</p>

Date: 18/05/16 Reference No: 23 Respondent: Wymondley Parish Council Location: Wymondley Parish Type: Support	In respect of the standing of the WPC they are correctly referenced as a consultee in the NP and they approved the draft plan on 18 th April 2016. We included them as a consultee as part of our audit trail.
Date: 18/05/16 Reference No: 24 Respondent: Wayne Tamcken Location: Little Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: I support the plan and I am against the building on green belt land. I would support a local shop for the village
Date: 18/05/16 Reference No: 25 Respondent: D. Yates Esq. Location: Todds Green Type: Support	Comment: Three very big problems for the plan are 1. - Flooding, any more loss to open drainage ground, will precipitate flooding in the area. and the only water run off for the area is the A1 ! 2 - The rush hour jams at junc. 8 are already chronic, any extra vehicles can only increase the mayhem already happening. 3.- Their are also the schooling problems in the villages., or should I say the lack of senior schooling ! Turning rural communities into towns without increasing all the basic supports towns need, is a receipt for disaster.

<p>Date: 19/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 26</p> <p>Respondent: Mrs Crowe</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>Comment: Why can't the Council build on these sites because that is what we need , so that if residents in the village want a smaller place then they can or get a bigger one, instead they have to leave the village where they have lived all of there life's. It is wrong to keep building houses that residents won't be able to afford. When I was growing up I lived in Great Wymondley but went to school in Little Wymondley and the villagers were all related in one way or another, we all helped each other. Now there are so many strangers, the village is not the same it has lost the community sprit .</p>
<p>Date: 23/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 27</p> <p>Respondent: Jenny and Bryant Sykes</p> <p>Location: Todds Green</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Hi. We are residents of Todds Green where we have lived for 25 years. We would like to start by congratulating you on a truly marvellous piece of work. It must have taken a great deal of time, energy and dedication to have produced such a professional document. Our comments are as follows: 1. 7. Green Belt. You say that Todds Green falls within the Green Belt and this is very precious to us. However our village is blighted by two semi industrial sites called Shangri La. The owners used to run a turkey farm from these sites, which closed approximately fifteen years ago. Since then they have tried to develop storage and semi industrial operations from both sites. This development is unlawful, as they had not been granted planning permission to use this Green Belt land for such activities. The ground has been covered in concrete and ramshackle sheds and outbuildings have been allowed to grow. One of these turkey farm sites is also the location of Margaret's wood, which is a designated protected ancient woodland and a country wild life site. However this has done little to curtail the activities going on there. Recently the Local Authorities have realised what has been going on and have tried to clamp down on their activities. Failing miserably. There is a group of residents in Todds Green that have been valiantly battling to keep the the Green Belt green in this village in the wake of a stream of planning applications from the Shangi La owners. We suggest you contact Tom Donavan of North Herts District Council and Clive Inward of Stevenage Borough Council for more information. Why, oh why are SBC proposing to build industrial estates in the countryside? Stevenage New Town has a very adequate industrial area round the back of Gunnels Wood Road where there are many</p>

vacant units and it is already depressingly semi derelict and under used, with the air of abandonment. This is a specially designated area for this kind of activity. Any industrial activity should be put there instead of developing further industrial sites in the countryside. 2. 8. Flood risk. As you state, Todds Green is on slightly higher ground and flooding is not a risk to us. However, in heavy rain, Stevenage Road at the bottom of the incline before the bridge over the A1M often floods. This is because SBC never clean the drains, which are permanently blocked. If the infrastructure was properly maintained things might run a little smoother. 3. 11. Traffic Management. This is a huge problem for us. Todds Green is plagued by an unacceptable amount of traffic. At commuter times the road through the village is a rat run for people avoiding the main roads and can rapidly descend into gridlock. Absolutely nothing is done about controlling this. Although many residents have complained and asked for traffic restrictions to be put in place, the relevant authorities have simply ignored us. However the two Shangri La sites supply a majority of the unwanted traffic, which blights this village during the day, evening and night. This includes vans, (often with noisy rattling trailers hitched to the back) lorries of all sizes and huge HGVs. These sites have increased the traffic through our village hugely. When HGVs are leaving the sites, this can cause additional problems. Most vehicles want to head to junction 8 on the A1M, so they go straight through the village. When turning out of the site in the middle of the village, these vehicles dangerously straddle the whole width of the road causing traffic hold ups and they mount the pavement on the opposite side of the road in order to make the turn. Already a lorry cutting the corner has smashed the cover of the BT underground cable duct. They have also damaged the fence of our neighbours on the other side of the access road. There are times when it looks like a lorry could easily go into the front gardens of our neighbours across the road. This road is simply not designed for long articulated lorries turning at such a tight angle. Once they have made the turn into the Stevenage road, a further few yards along, the road makes a sharp turn, which the HGVs again find impossible to make without mounting the pavement. There is a blind corner within yards of the access. We have first-hand knowledge of the blind bend in the middle of the village. Our front wall has been demolished five times by drivers who have misjudged the sharpness of the bend. The last time was in broad daylight by a driver who was teetotal. A few yards further on they have to negotiate the mini roundabout, which is at the end of the village in order to get on to Chantry Lane. We have witnessed an HGV trying to get round this roundabout. It takes several goes with lots of reversing and holding up traffic in all directions. It looks like it is about to jack-knife. It then has to go round another mini roundabout and over the narrow humped back bridge over the railway line before it reaches a road that is suitable for vehicles of that length and weight. This is a rural location and the roads are wooded often without pavements or footpaths. These huge vehicles tear into the overhanging branches, bringing them down. Residents in Todds Green are fighting on many fronts. Trying to keep the Green Belt

	<p>green, trying to get some sort of traffic management that will regulate the inappropriate use of HGVs and reduce the amount of overall traffic going through the village along with the associated noise and pollution it brings with it. Unfortunately we have had little or no support from the Parish Council. Our issues are never mentioned in your Newsletters or ever appear as agenda items at your meetings. We would dearly like some support and for our issues to be highlighted in forward planning. We really do have some big problems here. Problems that must not be replicated in any future planning. Jenny and Bryant Sykes Thornboro Todds Green</p> <p>ACTION – We believe the area referred to in the above is outside of the Wymondley Parish.</p>
<p>Date: 23/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 28</p> <p>Respondent: Julian Tribe</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: I support the plan.</p>
<p>Date: 23/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 29</p> <p>Respondent: Hayley Ward</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: 100% support the plan, no building on greenbelt, and protect the rest of the Parish's green spaces. Plus, the flood risk and flood incidents need to be remedied, the drains in our street haven't been cleaned in at least 5 years and are subsequently now blocked and no longer functioning as drains, light painful causes the road to flood. Likewise, the drains along Stevenage Road are all full of soil, so they are no longer functioning as drains at all either. Considering the expense HCC went to to commission a report on the flood incident of Feb 2014, it seems nonsensical that nothing since has been done, maybe it would have been better to spend the money on cleaning and maintaining the drainage systems we have rather than spending money on a report and HCC having no money then to spend on actually doing something!</p> <p>The roads are at capacity at peak hours and we need to be diverting traffic away from our parish and onto the major roads where practicable. The most sensible and sustainable solution to the local area's housing need would be an entirely new garden city, where the infrastructure, employment areas and quantity of housing could be built to provide for the area for many, many years to come, this is the only sensible course</p>

	of action and one I sincerely hope NHDC adopt a new garden city as the only way forward.
Date: 24/05/16 Reference No: 30 Respondent: Diane Kennedy Location: Great Wymondley Type: Support	Comment: I would like the entrance to and from Little Wymondley, Cory's Mill end free from business units. Yes to a few houses. North Road leave alone it is to busy and does not warrant.a Gypsy site or business units. Protect Priory Lane as its banks are disappearing due to so much traffic and heavy Lorraine's.
Date: 24/05/16 Reference No: 31 Respondent: St Ippolyts Parish Council Location: Hitchin Type: Comment	Comment: My Council has no objections but note less housing is being promoted than envisaged in North Hertfordshire District Council's Local Plan
Date: 24/05/16 Reference No: 32 Respondent: North Herts District Council Location: Letchworth Garden City Type: Object	Comment: Thank you for consulting the District Council on the pre-submission version of the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan. There are a number of fundamental concerns about the Plan and the processes that have been followed which we have outlined in three sections below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the processes followed; 2. the format and content of the policies and evidence; and 3. conformity with the Local Plan, National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging Local Plan. All of these concerns will need to be addressed before the neighbourhood plan can be progressed.

1. Processes

The first concern is that there was no formal endorsement from the Parish Council of the pre-submission neighbourhood plan before consultation started. It is the Parish Council which is the qualifying body responsible for the neighbourhood plan not the Neighbourhood Planning Forum. This should have been made explicit in the consultation document.

There is a question as to whether the consultation period should have been extended to allow for this endorsement to be made explicit in the consultation materials.

In addition, in the minutes of the meeting of the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum (WPNPF) on 21st April 2016, as posted on the Wymondley Parish Council website, it is noted that a leaflet drop would be carried out over the weekend of 15th – 17th April, a few days after the start of the consultation period itself. This could be seen as restricting the length of the consultation period for those residents relying on this publicity.

Secondly, in terms of consultation there does not appear to be any mechanism by which people can write letters and post them to a published contact address – rather that people are directed through the website. Whilst we acknowledge that this is a more efficient way of gathering information it does create a barrier for some sections of the community. The website is also very difficult to find through the various search engines which does not help the transparency of the consultation.

2. Form and content of the policies and evidence

The pre-submission consultation neighbourhood plan does not include a map of the designated area for neighbourhood planning. The plan should include the map of the area designated by the District Council in August 2015. The only map to be included in the consultation document shows the Parish of Wymondley which is not the area designated for neighbourhood planning purposes – this is misleading. We would also expect the map to be included at the front of the document to help set the scene for the neighbourhood plan.

In addition to the more detailed comments provided to some of the policies below, the policies tend to be written as statements and do not provide the necessary guidance or criteria that the parish may wish to be considered as part of determining a planning application.

In paragraph 6.17 there is a mention of a comprehensive list of listed buildings – the definitive list is kept by

Historic England – this would be a more up to date and accurate list to refer to.

Next Steps – Paragraph 17.2 is factually incorrect. The WPNPF is not recognised as the qualifying body for the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan – it is the Parish Council which is the qualifying body under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Annex 10 – Wymondley Parish Council should not be listed as a consultee which might have an interest in the policies in the Plan because it is the Parish Council which has overall responsibility of the plan. The other group identified in the Annex as a consultee is the Wymondley Action Forum but this group is noted in paragraph 4.1 as being defunct.

Evidence base – whilst the consultation document includes many references to other evidence studies it would also be useful to include one complete list of these as an annex in the document.

3. Conformity with the Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework and the emerging Local Plan

Our comments in respect of these issues are outlined in the following paragraphs.

Does the neighbourhood plan support the strategic development needs set out in the emerging Local Plan, including the draft policies for housing and economic development?

The Preferred Options version of the Local Plan caters for growth of an additional 14,200 dwellings over the period 2011-2031, representing a 26% increase in the number of dwellings. The plan also encourages growth of 3,600 additional jobs.

The majority of the district's new development will be located within the main towns (including urban extensions to existing towns) in the district. However:

Little Wymondley is defined as a Category A village, in which development will be allowed within a defined boundary and sites allocated towards meeting the district's overall housing totals; and

Great Wymondley is defined as a Category B village, which will be allowed to accommodate infill development that does not expand the built core of the village into the surrounding countryside. This plan does not define the 'built core' of these

villages and suggests that this may be explored and defined through the neighbourhood planning process.

One site (land south of Little Wymondley) is allocated in Wymondley for an estimated 300 additional dwellings. Taking into account completions since 2011 and permissions at 2014 the parish is estimated to see 313 additional dwellings over the plan period.

Wymondley has a number of small businesses, notably along Stevenage Road in Little Wymondley. Although not sufficiently large to designate as an employment area, the Plan suggests that it does perform an important role in providing local employment and facilities and the Council will therefore seek to protect the employment function of this area.

The draft neighbourhood plan expresses reluctant support for housing development in the parish, with policy HOD1 stating that, in considering housing proposals impacting on the Parish, consideration will be taken of demographic trends and community needs. However, there is no clear policy articulating a local vision of where and how the strategic development needs set out in the emerging Local Plan will be accommodated. Instead, policy is expressed in general terms, with policy HOD2 stating that development should be well-designed and located appropriately, i.e. where they will enhance or maintain the vitality of our community; reflect the identity of our parish; and respond to our local character and history. A handful of agricultural buildings are identified as being suitable for conversion to dwellings but the scale of the development envisaged is significantly smaller than in the emerging Local Plan, with paragraph 16.10 suggesting no more than 50 dwellings of the right type, in the right place, at the right price. This is not consistent with the strategic development needs of the district, undermines emerging Local Plan policy and therefore does not comply with the requirements of paragraph 184 of the NPPF. The WPNPF should give consideration as to how the strategic development needs articulated in the emerging Local Plan can be accommodated within the Parish, providing an additional level of detail to the approach set out in the Local Plan,

particularly with regard to Little Wymondley (category A – development within a defined boundary and allocated housing sites) and Great Wymondley (category B – infill development within the built core).

Does the neighbourhood plan outline a positive approach towards supporting local development?

The vision of the neighbourhood plan is expressed in positive terms, with reference made, for example, to encouraging rural economic growth and employment and promoting sustainable development. Delivery of the latter will be achieved partly through identifying possible “deliverable” sites within the Parish. However, very few development opportunities are identified in the neighbourhood plan.

In relation to housing, as outlined above, the scale of development envisaged falls a long way short of the strategic needs outlined in the emerging Local Plan.

In relation to economic development, whilst there is some supportive policy this is in general terms only and focuses on supporting the growth of existing businesses rather than the development of new businesses in the area. More importantly, no specific opportunities are identified for the development of new business space. The emphasis instead is on ensuring:

- ensuring that any proposed business development within Wymondley Parish is appropriate in terms of location, scale and type; and is otherwise in keeping with the intrinsic character and environment of our parish (policy SLBE2); and
- carefully scrutinising any proposals for the development of additional industrial premises in, or directly adjacent to, the ParishG Where there is evidence that such development would have a detrimental effect on existing parish businesses; be wholly inappropriate due to inconsistency with the look and feel of the area; or would exacerbate existing infrastructure problems (particularly in relation to flood risk and traffic management) we will oppose them (policy SLBE3).

The overall message in relation to economic development, therefore, is that the development of additional business premises in the parish would not be appropriate. This is explicitly stated in paragraph 14.17.

In relation to both housing and economic development, therefore, the plan does not positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of the area, as required by the NPPF, and is not in general conformity with the ambition of the emerging Local Plan to support significant housing and economic growth in the area.

Has the qualifying body set out the national policies that it has considered in formulating the neighbourhood plan, and how the policies in that draft neighbourhood plan take account of national policy and advice?

Some national policy is referenced in the neighbourhood plan. However, the role of national policy in shaping the plan is not clearly or comprehensively articulated. Two revisions to the plan may be helpful in demonstrating compliance with this requirement:

Section 3 of the neighbourhood plan outlines how the plan fits into the wider planning system. This includes some reference to the NPPF and to the principle of sustainable development. However, the plan includes an interpretation of sustainable development which is not entirely consistent with the NPPF. Paragraphs 7 to 9 of the NPPF provide a fuller explanation of the Government's definition of sustainable development in this context and it may be helpful for the plan to make a more comprehensive reference to this and explain how it has been applied. For example, the NPPF explains that sustainable development has economic, social and environmental dimensions and it will be important for the plan to demonstrate how each of these have been addressed. In addition, and crucially, it will be important for the plan to include an explanation of how the NPPF's presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 14) has been applied in the plan. This is a key principle in current Government planning policy and needs to be fully reflected in the

neighbourhood plan. It is not referred to in the draft plan.

In each of the sub-sections of the plan, relevant national policy should be referenced so that it is clear how this has been applied in the plan. This approach has been adopted in section 15 of the neighbourhood plan and could be usefully applied throughout the document.

Has the qualifying body demonstrated how the neighbourhood plan will contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions or that consideration has been given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset?

Whilst the draft plan addresses economic, social and environmental conditions, the approach to addressing these different dimensions of sustainability does not appear to be systematic. As suggested by Planning Practice Guidance this requirement could be addressed through the use of sustainability appraisal. It would be important for the use of such a tool to be proportionate so a ‘light-touch’ approach may be appropriate. For example, the WPNPF could utilise the sustainability appraisal objectives being used in the preparation of the Local Plan and summarise how each of them has been addressed in the preparation of the neighbourhood plan, including identifying any mitigation measures proposed for any adverse effects identified. This could form a useful annex to the plan.

There is very little reference to emerging Local Plan policy in the draft version of the neighbourhood plan and, as already discussed in section 4.1, there are significant discrepancies between the two. There are other parts of the draft plan which challenge emerging Local Plan policy and, as outlined in section 2.2, this is not permissible.

In order to demonstrate compliance with this requirement for neighbourhood plans, as with the requirement for conformity with national policy (section 4.3) it would be helpful for each sub-section of the plan to be prefaced with reference to the relevant

emerging Local Plan policy so that it is clear how it has been applied in the plan.

Has a screening assessment been carried out on the neighbourhood plan to determine whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the plan is necessary?

There is no evidence that the WPNPF has undertaken a screening assessment of the neighbourhood plan and the District Council has not been requested to carry one out either.

Is the neighbourhood plan likely to have a significant effect on a European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects)?

Given the nature of the neighbourhood plan, the limited development opportunities identified and the strong focus on the preservation and protection of the natural and historic environment, it is highly unlikely that the plan will have any significant effect on a European site. However, this requirement should be explicitly addressed in the plan, particularly in relation to the development opportunities identified in section 16.

At the moment, I do not consider that the pre-submission neighbourhood plan is an adequate plan to take forward without considerable amendment.

Finally, before the next stages of the neighbourhood plan are progressed, I would urge the Parish Council, as the Qualifying Body and the WPNPF to liaise fully with my team to ensure that the plan can progress in the correct manner.

Response to NHDC's Comments on the draft plan:

Item 2:

2. The Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan has been formulated by the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum as directed in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
3. It is based around the demands of the Residents drawn from the Local Survey
4. The map of the designated is that of the original application of the Wymondley Parish Council and

	<p>regrettably the correspondence dated between Adrian Hawkins - Chair WPNPF and David Scoles CEO NHDC remains unanswered by the NHDC in relation to the legal determination of the Plan Area. As this remains unresolved, the original Parish Area remains central to our Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The Historic England details are corroborated with our Neighbourhood Plan. 6. Correspondence has been issued by Wymondley Parish Council confirming the formal appointment of the WPNPF as a recognised sub-committee of the WPC. 7. In respect of the standing of the WPC they are correctly referenced as a consultee in the NP and they approved the draft plan on 18th April 2016. We included them as a consultee as part of our audit trail. <p>Item 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has not been possible for the WPNPF to take cognisance of the NHDC Local Plan that has not been ratified by the Public or the Planning Inspectorate. 2. Whilst the WPNPF were formally appointed by WPC and NHDC, no attempt has been made by NHDC to formally advise their Local Plan details in so much as they affect the Wymondley Parish 3. Whilst a proposal named WY1 has been mentioned by the NHDC, at no time has any detail been provided as to the development proposed or who in fact was the developer 4. We acknowledge receipt of correspondence received from DLP Planning on behalf of Bovis Homes which arrived at the prescribed email address on the 26th May outside of the Consultation period and certainly outside of any period of consideration during the evolution of the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan. 5. It has not been possible to consider developments within the Parish as land options have not become available and the vast majority of the area is within the Green Belt. 6. A Neighbourhood Plan Forum is not permitted to consider development within the Green Belt. 7. The proposal received on the 26th May from DLP proposes a site larger than that suggested by the NHDC in their details for WY1 as published in their draft plan in 2014. 8. We appreciate the acknowledgement that the vision of the NP is expressed in positive terms. 9. Your comments regarding the wider relevance to the NPPF are noted and actions taken where applicable.
--	--

<p>Date: 24/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 33</p> <p>Respondent: Ken Crowe</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: A well worked document that deserves to be fully supported</p>
<p>Date: 24/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 34</p> <p>Respondent: Paul Kennedy</p> <p>Location: Great Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: I agree with the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan. A maximum of 30 houses to be built in Little Wymondley but no further industrial units and certainly no gypsy site. The traffic and flooding issues definitely need addressing for Little Wymondley. For Grt Wymondley there should be no building taking place as the traffic problem on Arch Rd., Gravely Lane and Priory Lane is bad. The banks on Priory Lane are rapidly being eroded by the increase in articulated lorries and cars trying to pull over to let them pass. It really concerns me that permission has been given to Wymondley Hall Farm to build a road off Priory Lane into the farm buildings.</p>
<p>Date: 24/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 35</p> <p>Respondent: Jennie Hawkins</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: I support the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan and agree with the content and the output that has arisen from the local survey.</p>

<p>Date: 24/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 36</p> <p>Respondent: Adrian Hawkins</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	<p>Comment: I support the Neighbourhood Plan. I believe it to be an excellent piece of work, fully supporting the parishioners responses from the local survey.</p>
<p>Date: 25/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 37</p> <p>Respondent: Hertfordshire County Council (Lead Local Flood Authority)</p> <p>Location: Hertford</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Having reviewed the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood plan (Draft document for consultation April 2016), as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we are pleased to read that the flooding issues are raised through the whole document and fully included in the objectives. Although we do not have any major concern with the contents of the Neighbourhood plan, we are taking the opportunity of this consultation stage to provide some comments. In the section 8.9, it states the HCC Flood Investigation Report on the Little Wymondley flood and the Flood alleviation Feasibility Study on Little Wymondley undertaken by McCloy Consulting failed to take into account the run-off from the southern site of the valley. However, we confirm the whole Ash Brook catchment area has been included in the study, including the southern side of the valley and the Tower close area. The whole area that may generate runoff to the village has been considered, and technical evidence has been considered in order to define the most accurate contributing catchment “The extent of the modelled area is dictated by the hydrological catchment upstream of the downstream model extent located at grid reference 520573 227437. The catchment area contributing has been delimited using an automated process utilising terrain model date. These mode extents were further verified onsite by visual inspection. The entire catchment contributing from the downstream extent of the model is approximately 17.69km². This catchment has been split into smaller catchments using the same process to determine individual catchments for the [...] inflow points [...].” (Flood alleviation Feasibility Study - Little Wymondley, Appendix C hydraulic Model Parameters, McCloy Consulting) Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) was made a statutory consultee within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on the 15 April 2015 to advise Local Planning Authorities (LPA) on the suitability of surface water drainage arrangements in relation to new development. . The Flood Risk Management Team is consulted by the 11 Hertfordshire Local Planning Authorities if any new development meets the following criteria: - Major Planning applications (as defined in Town and Country Planning Act 1990) in relation to surface water management - Major Planning applications (as defined in Town and</p>

	<p>Country Planning Act 1990) in relation to surface water management - Any development site containing an ordinary watercourse (local arrangement with LPA's), or lying within an area known to have flooding issues That means that any planning application for new development within or in the vicinity of Little Wymondley should not be granted without prior consultation of the LLFA on the surface water drainage matters. With reference to: (Section 8.19) "There is currently no legislative requirement in England and Wales for designers and planners to consider, in an urban context, the interaction between drainage and roads – and ensure that adequate measures are taken to protect roads' structural integrity and address related issues." Although there may be no single legislative requirement but there are a number of relevant requirements that need to be considered as part of the development planning process. The current (3rd) edition of Roads in Hertfordshire, launched in February 2011, provides detailed design advice on road improvements made by the County Council, its agents, developers or any other third party. Information related to this policy can be find online (http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/highwaysinfo/hiservicesforbus/devmanagment/roadsinherts/) . Moreover the HCC Highways department is currently working on a SuDS Design Guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework states under the paragraph 103 (footnote20) that a specific flood risk assessment is required for proposals of 1 hectare or greater in Flood Zone 1 ; all proposals for new development (including minor development and change of use) in Flood Zones 2 and 3, or in an area within Flood Zone 1 which has critical drainage problems (as notified to the local planning authority by the Environment Agency); and where proposed development or a change of use to a more vulnerable class may be subject to other sources of flooding. The submitted FRA must provide a suitable basis for assessment to be made of the flood risks arising from the proposed development, and must demonstrate that the development will not increase risk elsewhere and where possible reduces flood risk overall. I hope those comments make sense and are admissible. Yours sincerely Claire CASSANY Senior Flood Risk & SuDS Officer Environmental Resource Planning Hertfordshire County Council, County Hall, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8DE Postal point CHN215 t: 01992 556547</p>
Date: 25/05/16 Reference No: 38 Respondent: Una Bracey Location:	Comment: Corey's Mill roundabout not suitable for all the cars. No Underpass for cycles, prams wheelchairs, walkers etc. School not big enough. Stevenage to big now, larger than promised, flooding village in a valley.

Type: Support	
Date: 11/04/16 Reference No: 39 Respondent: Rt. Hon. Peter Lilley MP Location: Westminster, London Type: Comment	Comment: Thanks for sending your very professional, comprehensive and constructive draft Parish Plan which I read with interest.
Date: 11/04/16 Reference No: 40 Respondent: Debbie Horner (Stevenage Borough Council) Location: Stevenage Type: Comment	Comment: Thank you for your email. We welcome the opportunity to review your Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I wonder, however, if you have the Plan in an alternative format, perhaps PDF? If so, I would be grateful if you could forward this to me. Many thanks ACTION: Replied to advise there is the PDF version on the website
Date: 11/04/16 Reference No: 41 Respondent: Sir Oliver Heald QC MP Location: Westminster, London Type: Comment	Comment: Many Congratulations

<p>Date: 13/04/16</p> <p>Reference No: 42</p> <p>Respondent: Stephen McPartland MP</p> <p>Location: Westminster, London</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>Comment: Thank you for the plan. It seems it covers an area that is smaller than the Parish or am I mistaken? Has there been pressure to lose the rest of the parish to the housing North Herts would like to have included as West of A1M? If so, who put pressure on whom and why was it given in too? I cannot represent you, as unfortunately you are not my constituents, but I would be interested in the background. It will have quite an impact on how many houses North Herts try to force upon the village in the end.</p> <p>Response: Thank you for your recent email regarding our Neighbourhood Plan. Part of our parish was removed by NHDC using designated powers against our wishes. We are currently demanding the return of the “safeguarded area”. As you rightly point out this area has huge strategic importance with regard to proposals for the West of Stevenage – and any “bolt on” by NHDC. It is inconceivable from our point of view that any development in this area, which will have a huge impact on the demographic of our Parish, could be carried out without reference to those affected. This flies in the face of the whole concept of Locality. The arbitrary removal of Green Belt protection, further jeopardizing our countryside, also directly contravenes the concept of urban separation. We will keep you informed of our progress.</p>
<p>Date: 14/04/16</p> <p>Reference No: 43</p> <p>Respondent: Jenny Volp (Highways England)</p> <p>Location: Bedford</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>Comment: Thank you for consulting Highways England regarding your draft neighbourhood plan, I have no comments to make.</p>
<p>Date: 15/04/16</p> <p>Reference No: 44</p> <p>Respondent: Peter Radwell (UK Power Networks)</p> <p>Location: Potters Bar</p>	<p>Comment: Please approach us directly for any new or altered connections to our Network.</p>

Type: Comment	
<p>Date: 25/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 45</p> <p>Respondent: Stevenage Borough Council, Planning and Transport Policy</p> <p>Location: Stevenage</p> <p>Type: Object</p>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment on your draft Neighbourhood Plan (WPNP). As you will be aware, the production of your plan is linked to Stevenage through our conterminous administrative boundaries and shared infrastructure.</p> <p>We recognise that reaching this stage of plan production has required some considerable work and we commend you for the courage to take-on this work.</p> <p>However, we must advise you that we feel your plan has some serious flaws that render it unfit for purpose. Some important basics are missing: for instance, we are unclear even at what stage in the statutory plan-making process your plan has reached.</p> <p>There are a number of generic issues that we feel the plan needs to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is internally inconsistent in its approach and does not reflect the 'golden thread' of positivity towards new development established in the NPPF; • It is not made clear that the Parish in its entirety is <u>not</u> the Neighbourhood Plan area; • There is a lack of good quality local mapping, particularly illustrative contextual mapping; • There is no proposals map; • The plan attempts to address matters that the statutory land-use planning system is unable to address (eg, policies TL2, TL3, TB1, SCW2) • The plan concerns itself inappropriately with areas outside the Parish (eg, policies TM1; SLBE3; SLBE4),

whilst simultaneously;

- The WPNP fails to place the plan area in its broader context (eg, policies SLBE1; HOD1);
- Most of the policies are statements of intent and are incapable of being used to determine planning applications. You should re-assess your policies in the context of how they will be used.

From the perspective of Stevenage Borough Council, the most serious flaw is that the WPNP appears to view itself as an island. The WPNP does not address itself to the wider role that the plan area can play in helping to meet the needs of North Hertfordshire District or Stevenage Borough.

Taking the sections of your plan in order, our other comments are:

How the Neighbourhood Plan fits into the planning system

It would be useful to set out here why you think your plan does not need to carry out Sustainability Appraisal (SA)/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) or Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA).

About the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Planning Forum

In para 4.5, you refer to 'local planning authorities' a number of times in your bullet points. It would be useful if you were more specific on which local authorities you are referring to.

Strategic Overview of our planning policies

Para 5.4 details how you intend your policies 'to be in line with core national planning policies, and relevant to our neighbourhood'. You should also note here that your policies need to accord with the strategic policies of the North Herts District Plan, when published.

	<p>Policy Chapters</p> <p>Natural and Historic Environments</p> <p>We support your aim set out in this chapter. However, Policy NHE1 is not an effective, positive policy. We suggest that this policy should identify areas of natural environment and landscape character, and relate them to the proposals map. It should set out what is expected in a positive way.</p> <p>Policies NHE3, NHE4, NHE5 and NHE6 are also not effective and not positively worded.</p> <p>Green Belt</p> <p>It would be useful, here, to have an accurate map showing the outline of the plan boundary within the wider NHDC Green Belt.</p> <p>Policies GB1, GB2 and GB3 are not effective and not positively worded. They are statements of intent.</p> <p>We understand your desire to protect the Green Belt but your plan fails to recognise the broader context within which it needs to be set. It also fails to reflect that NHDC have identified a site south of Stevenage Road in Little Wymondley for the development of 300 dwellings. This site is currently designated as Green Belt.</p> <p>Stevenage is significantly under-bounded. Whilst it can meet the majority of its development needs to 2031 within the Borough boundary, it will not be able to do so after this date. We ask that your plan should at least note this fact.</p> <p>Flood Risk</p>
--	--

We support your aims as set out in this chapter. We support your desire to improve flood management in Little Wymondley.

The development at EC1/7 in our Local Plan has been subject to a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and will be subject to a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment when permission is sought. Both of these documents will be signed off by the Environment Agency prior to any development commencing. The Borough Council will not permit development in Stevenage Borough to increase the risk of flooding in the WPNP area.

Your policies FR1, FR2, FR3, FR4 and FR5 are not effective and are not positively worded.

Green Infrastructure and Spaces

We support your aim, as set out in this chapter. It would be useful if you note that green infrastructure is not the same as Green Belt. Green infrastructure, as you state, is a 'network of multi-functional green space' and is not necessarily within or adjacent to Green Belt.

Policy GIS2 is not effective and not worded positively. It is a statement of intent and is not robust enough to address your concerns with regard to designating or protecting local green spaces.

Transport Links

Policy TL2 is about supporting local bus services, which is not a matter amenable to control under the town and country planning acts. TL3 is about liaison and maintenance. We do not necessarily disagree with these aims, but they are not topics suitable for planning policies.

Traffic Management

We understand your concerns regarding traffic volume on the A1(M) and at Junction 8 and the A602.

However, policy TM1 refers to a site (Junction 8) which is wholly outside your plan area and North Herts District. Whilst we do not necessarily disagree with your ambitions, this is not a policy and should not appear as such in your plan. Your policies TM2, TM3, TM4 and TMS are not effective and not positively worded. For example, TM3 serves little purpose. Monitoring the roundabout at Junction 8 will not solve the problem nor offer a solution: it also falls foul of the same problem as TM1, as the site concerned does not lie in your plan area.

Education

Policies E1, E2 and E3 are not effective and not positively worded. Again, they are statements of intent. Your policies should be reworded to enable development in accordance with your aims.

Telecommunications and Broadband

Policy TB1 is about a topic not amenable to control under the town and country planning acts. It is a statement of intent about lobbying and liaison. Again, we do not necessarily disagree with the stated ambition: but it is not a planning policy.

Supporting Local Business and Employment

The Supporting Local Business and Employment chapter is inward-facing and dogmatic without being helpful to a decision-maker. This chapter requires the most work to bring it into line with the NPPF.

Policy SLBE1 only addresses 'the economic growth of our local businesses': it does not address inward investment from outside the parish. SLBE2 is ambiguously worded: is inward investment welcomed or will it be refused? Under what conditions will employment development be permitted?

	<p>The chapter deliberately fails to identify sites where new employment could be established or opportunities for existing businesses to expand (para. 14.17 refers).</p> <p>Policy SLBE3 talks about opposing development proposals that ' have a detrimental effect on existing parish businesses' when competition is not a planning matter: this could be construed as unlawful. The use of the phrase 'be wholly inappropriate due to inconsistency with the look and feel of the area' is unhelpful. Is something that is 'inappropriate' but less than 'wholly inappropriate' acceptable? Define what is meant by ' look and feel' - how can feelings be controlled by the town planning system? It also refers to using these criteria to come to a view about proposals in Stevenage Borough, which is inappropriate.</p> <p>Policy SLBE4 is immoderate, unbalanced and unjustified: it comes to judgements about development in Stevenage Borough unsupported by facts and reason. Green Belt issues are dealt with more temperately elsewhere in your plan.</p>
	<p>Social Cohesion and Well-being</p> <p>We support your desire to ' enrich the overall quality of life and well-being of the people who live and work in Wymondley Parish'.</p> <p>Whilst the intent of your Policies SCW1 and SCW2 is admirable, SCW1 is too imprecise to deliver your objectives, whilst SCW2 is about maintenance (not a topic capable of being addressed under the planning acts) and vague in its ambitions for upgrading and enhancing sites.</p> <p>Housing and Other Development</p> <p>Policy HOD1 fails to recognise the contribution that the plan area can make to meeting the housing needs of other parts of Hertfordshire, specifically the long-term needs of Stevenage. Whilst we do not ask anything of you at the moment, it would only be realistic to advise readers of your plan that proximity to a</p>

large, under- bounded urban area is likely to lead to development pressures in the longer-term.

NHDC have safeguarded land to the west of the A 1(M) to meet the long-term needs of Stevenage beyond 2031. Whilst this is outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan area, it is not reflected at all in the plan. Also, there is no reference to setting a housing target for the parish.

HOD5 and then HOD1 (which we assume should read HOD6) are, again, statements of intent and are ineffective as policies. These should be reworded so that they are robust and can deliver the needs of the Parish through development. There is clearly conflict between the second policy HOD1 and SLBE4 (one emphasises positivity and collaboration; one emphasises a predetermined position).

We cannot support the plan in its current format and unfortunately have to object to large parts of it. Whilst our comments may appear negative, they are designed to improve your plan. The Borough Council is committed to continued, pro-active working with you so that our respective plans may, together, present a holistic vision for future development in the area. Good luck in the future.

RESPONSE:

1. The Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan has been formulated by the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum as directed in accordance with the Localism Act 2011.
2. It is based around the demands of the Residents drawn from the Local Survey
3. The map of the designated area is that of the original application of the Wymondley Parish Council as noted in the Appendix and regrettably the correspondence dated between Adrian Hawkins - Chair WPNPF and David Scholes CEO NHDC remains unanswered by the NHDC in relation to the legal determination of the Plan Area. As this remains unresolved, the original Parish Area remains central to our Neighbourhood Plan Area.
4. Correspondence has been issued by Wymondley Parish Council confirming the formal appointment of the WPNPF as a recognised sub-committee of the WPC.
5. It has not been possible for the WPNPF to take cognisance of the NHDC or SBC Local Plan that has not

	<p>been ratified by the Public or the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>6. Whilst the WPNPF were formally appointed by WPC and NHDC, no attempt has been made by NHDC or SBC to formally advise their Local Plan details in so much as they affect the Wymondley Parish</p> <p>7. Whilst a proposal site has been mentioned by the SBC for an Industrial site, at no time has any detail been provided as to the development proposed or who in fact was the developer. No details have been received from the Developer within the consultation period.</p> <p>8. It has not been possible to consider developments within the Parish as land options have not become available and the vast majority of the area is within the Green Belt.</p> <p>9. A Neighbourhood Plan Forum is not permitted to consider development within the Green Belt.</p> <p>10. We appreciate the acknowledgement that the vision of the NP is expressed in positive terms.</p> <p>11. Your comments regarding the wider relevance to the NPPF are noted and actions taken where applicable.</p> <p>12. There is an inconsistency in the SBC response in that at paragraph 5. "appears to view itself as an island" and the preceding bullet point 6 "the plan concerns itself inappropriately with areas outside the Parish"</p> <p>13. It is noted that the WPNPF brought to the attention of SBC the issues around Zone 3 Flood Risk which SBC were previously unaware of.</p> <p>14. We welcome the assurance provided that the "Borough Council will not permit development to increase the risk of flooding in the WPNPF area" as detailed in your letter of the 25th May.</p>
--	--

<p>Date: 09/05/16</p> <p>Reference No: 46</p> <p>Respondent: Hertfordshire County Council, Spatial Planning & Economy Unit Minerals and Waste Team</p>	<p>Comment: I am writing in response to Wymondley Parish's Draft Neighbourhood Plan and provide comments on behalf of the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority.</p> <p>Previous comments were provided in August 2015 in respect of the designation of the Neighbourhood Plan Area in relation to the sand and gravel belt, previous extraction sites, previous waste operations within the Plan Area and existing waste facilities in close proximity to the Plan Area.</p> <p>Further comments are provided at this consultation stage with regards to the integration of the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plans within the overall planning system. As the Minerals and Waste Local Plans form part of the Development Plan as defined in section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Planning Act 2004, it is considered that paragraph 3.2 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan should also refer to the following</p>
---	--

Location: Hertford Type: Comment	<p>documents:</p> <p>Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document adopted November 2012; Waste Site Allocations document, adopted July 2014; & Minerals Local Plan, adopted March 2007.</p> <p>In respect of Policy 1: Strategy for the Provision for Waste management Facilities, within the Waste Core Strategy and Development Management Policies document, the Neighbourhood Plan does not refer to the northern part of the Plan Area being covered by one of the county council's areas of search for Local Authority Collected Waste Treatment and Transfer (Area of Search D). This is one of the three areas within the county that have been designated for the provision of new appropriate and adequate Local Authority Collected waste management facilities for the treatment and/or transfer of this type of waste. Whilst this is a broad area and not a specific site, there could be potential for such a facility to be developed within the broad area of search, which the Neighbourhood Plan may wish to recognise.</p> <p>Should you require any further information or clarification of issues raised please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
Date: 03/05/16 Reference No: 47 Respondent: Natural England Location: Worcester Type: Comment	<p>Comment: Natural England is pleased to see that good consideration has been given to environmental issues in the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan. Since the plan does not appear to making any site allocations Natural England considers it low risk and therefore will not be making detailed comments.</p> <p>Should you require any further advice please do not hesitate to contact me directly and will endeavour to assist.</p>
Date: 25/05/16 Reference No: 48 Respondent:	<p>Comment: Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for the Wymondley Parish. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment.</p> <p>Together with Natural England, English Heritage and the Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning. This sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on</p>

<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>Location: Hatfield</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>incorporating the environment into neighbourhood plans. I have attached the guidance with this letter.</p> <p>To help you with any revisions you need to make I have split up our comments in line with the document.</p> <p>4.5 Overall vision</p> <p>We are pleased to see you have incorporated flood risk mitigation clearly in your overall vision. We welcome the reference to the future effects of climate change, importance of sustainable development proposals and their effects on flood risk and potential to contribute to future infrastructure. You could go further by explaining that the neighbourhood plan needs to ensure that it builds on the local plan while ensuring positive outcomes for your own community.</p> <p>8 Flood Risk</p> <p>The main sources of flooding in this area are surface water and flooding from the ordinary watercourse (Ash brook) through Little Wymondley. The Local Authority and Hertfordshire County Council will be able to provide more detail on the areas at risk from surface water flooding (including groundwater and sewerage) and flooding from ordinary watercourses. The Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.</p> <p>8.17 Policies</p> <p>Policy FR1: We would recommend rewording this policy to clarify what is meant by Flood Prevention Measures. We assume this may be referring to the maintenance of the ordinary watercourse (Ash Brook) running though Little Wymondley. It is pleasing that there appears to be good communication between the Local Authority and the Parish in managing this. However, with funding limited in many areas for maintenance, securing greater maintenance for this watercourse may be difficult. The community could suggest other methods of ensuring maintenance such as: working with riparian owners along the watercourse or creating and conducting their own parish maintenance schedule. This is something that the St Ives and Hemingford area engage in and is in addition to what the Local Authority and EA are scheduled to do. This method has been reported to have worked well in this area and may be something you wish to investigate further.</p> <p>Policy FR2: Given that surface water management is a key issue in this area, we agree that developing and implementing a SWMP is very important. Once in place, the SWMP may give rise to a SUDS policy which can be implemented for any proposed developments in the area to ensure that the development will not</p>
--	--

	<p>increase flood risk elsewhere in the community and where possible reduce the risk overall.</p> <p>Policy FR3: As there appears to be agricultural and open land around the parish villages, you could look to engage with Natural England and Catchment Sensitive Farming to work with and encourage land owners to “create space for water” or “slowing the flow”. The Rural Payment Agency provide grants to landowners who agree to use their land to store water during peak flow events while also having the added benefit of creating habitat. These methods can also work for surface water management and possibly could be implemented in the Ice Age River Bed referred to in the Policy FR2. This method would need to be investigated further as it would depend on the topography of the land and engagement with the local land owners.</p> <p>Policy FR4: We consider that this policy is too strongly worded as it suggests the Parish Council will oppose any development proposals that do not contribute towards reducing flood risk to the community. The National Planning Policy Framework only requires that new development does not increase existing flood risk and ideally reduces flood risk overall. This policy needs to be in accordance with any flood risk policies in the local plan. Flood risk betterment could be achieved through new developments through the use of SUDS or through S106 contributions towards flood risk management infrastructure.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please get in touch</p>
--	--

<p>Date: 02/06/16 [Re-submitted failed response of 25/05/16]</p> <p>Reference No: 49</p> <p>Respondent: Anglian Water</p> <p>Location: Peterborough</p> <p>Type: Comment</p>	<p>Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Wymondley Neighbourhood Plan. Please find enclosed comments on behalf of Anglian Water.</p> <p>Please note that Anglian Water provides wastewater services to Wymodley Parish. The views of Affinity Water who are responsible for water services within the Parish should also be sought on the content of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.</p> <p>Policy FR4</p> <p>This policy includes a statement that the Parish Council will only support development proposals where required mitigation to mitigate or reduce flood risk to the local community is provided.</p> <p>In relation to foul drainage it is important that applicants demonstrate that there is capacity available within the foul sewerage network to serve the development or that capacity can be made available within the</p>
---	---

	<p>network prior to the occupation of the proposed development.</p> <p>We encourage developers to make use of Anglian Water's Pre-planning service to identify feasible drainage solutions prior to submitting formal applications to the relevant Council for their consideration.</p> <p>Further details of this service are available to view at the following address:</p> <p>http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-planning-service-.aspx</p> <p>Policy FR5</p> <p>We welcome the reference to the provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems in development proposals.</p> <p>Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.</p>
--	--

Date: See Statement Reference No: 50 Respondent: Jackie Harding Location: Gt Wymondley Type: Comment	<p>Generally I support this report.</p> <p>On the subject of housing I accept that a small amount of low cost housing is required and the number of 50 seems reasonable. However, I am totally against any development on "greenbelt" and feel the Stevenage road industrial units should remain. Small developments on brown field sites would be ideal.</p>
---	---

Date: See Statement Reference No: 51 Respondent: Paul Harding Location: Gt Wymondley Type: Comment	<p>I do support a high quality well prepared and considered plan. I would however like to offer a couple of comments. The greenbelt argument is key and must be won. To do so it is important to prove some 50 houses can be built as infill harming the greenbelt and Brownfield. This is not proven and needs greater detail and more adventure + examples.</p>
---	---

<p>Date: See Statement</p> <p>Reference No: 52</p> <p>Respondent: Nancy Bidmead</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	I am worried about inappropriate development, losing our village identity.
<p>Date: See Statement</p> <p>Reference No: 53</p> <p>Respondent: Mrs PJ Smith</p> <p>Location: Gt Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	I support the Neighbourhood plan and I am concerned about the amount of traffic and the loss of greenbelt.
<p>Date: 24/05/2016</p> <p>Reference No: 54</p> <p>Respondent: Cherry Carter</p> <p>Location: Gt Wymondley</p> <p>Type: Support</p>	I support the neighbourhood plan as I have grave concerns over the issue of losing the green belt. TO keep our village from merging into the surrounding towns. Once it's lost, it is gone forever. The scale of the proposed building in Little Wymondley will mean greatly increased traffic through great Wymondley which is already overwhelmed by commuter traffic. That disrupts and lowers the quality of life in a rural community and causes difficulties. For commuters, the closure of the Great Wymondley to Hitchin Road highlighted the dramatic loss in traffic going through. It was halved and we could hear the birds singing.

Date: 24/05/2016 Reference No: 55 Respondent: Derek Carter Location: Gt Wymondley Type: Support	The draft plan reflects the thoughts and concerns of the majority of the parishioners. Building on the flood plain would increase an existing problem of flooding in little Wymondley. There are significant existing traffic issues in the Parish which will only become worse by a <u>disproportionate</u> number of additional houses. Gridlock in Arch Rd is a frequent occurrence with existing rush hour volumes. It is vital to keep the green spaces between Wymondley and the neighbouring towns. The Wymondley residents have shown no desire to become part of the greater Stitchin or Letchin.
Date: February 2019 Respondent: Fields in Trust Location: Little Wymondley Green Spaces Map Loc No.6	<p><i>As a charity that has a long history of advising planning authorities on the provision of outdoor space through our '6 acre standard', we support any designation that affords outdoor open space some protection within the planning system, such as Local Green Space, of Green Belt.</i></p> <p><i>We would therefore have no issue with the Queen Elizabeth II Playing Field being proposed as receiving Local Green Space designation. Given that the field is part of the Queen Elizabeth II Fields programme, and held and protected by us for the sole purpose of our objects pertaining to recreation, we would suggest that such a designation would not be strictly necessary. It is our assertion that protection with Fields in Trust is in fact more robust than that of designations within the planning system. However, as already stating we would not preclude such a designation being assigned and it is compatible with the way the land is managed and maintained. We would then leave it to the parish council and/or community forum that might be drafting the Neighbourhood Plan to decide on whether this is indeed necessary and desired.</i></p>
Date: February 2019 Respondent: Letchworth Heritage Foundation Location: Little	<p><i>"Do you have a plan of the precise designation and the policy wording which will accompany it? From our perspective I have no objection in principle to the designation. However, we would only be able to formally confirm our agreement once our Board of Trustees have had an opportunity to consider this. Our next meeting is on 12th March, where I can add this to the agenda."</i></p> <p>I responded to David Ames as follows, and he replied saying it was fine to inform the Examiner as I suggested:</p>

<p>Wymondley Green Spaces Map Loc No.1</p>	<p><i>"At the moment, I cannot provide you with a precise designation or policy wording, other than to refer you to section 9 of the Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan (NP), which contains a Google Earth map of Wymondley Woods, and current wording of the relevant green spaces aim and policy. We will shortly be putting together a chart for submission to the Examiner, which will contain details such as size, location and importance of the various green spaces referred to in the NP. Wymondley Woods has been included because it is regularly used by Wymondley Parish residents for dog walking and general recreational purposes. (If you could provide me with size information, it would be most helpful.) The Examiner intends to make some modifications to the NP, which may involve the Green Spaces section and/or the wording of that policy. So, for that reason I cannot confirm the policy wording at this time. I will keep you and your colleagues posted on developments, but it would be helpful if you could discuss the matter at your Trustees' meeting on 12 March. In the meantime, if you have no objection, I will inform the Examiner that you support designation in principle, subject to formal confirmation of Trustees' views after 12 March."</i></p>
<p>Date: February 2019</p> <p>Respondent: Steven Foster</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Green Spaces Map Loc No.9</p>	<p><i>"Thank you for your email, we know how hard pressed you are personally for time, however, we are surprised NHDC have only provided 8 days to reply on this.</i></p> <p><i>Additionally, no personal reflection on yourself, but having no confidence in the representation we have had on our private land being compulsory included within the Green Spaces for this Parish, we wish to represent ourselves direct to NHDC.</i></p> <p><i>Due to the lack of time and save you further work, we have therefore ccd Clare Skeels to request this.</i></p> <p><i>Whilst writing, we do not accept that privately owned land situated outside the Village border should be included, especially when other green land, far closer to the Village that the Parish Council controls, is not included in the green spaces application. The Parishioners who use these allotments can be counted on one hand, so this does beg the question whether this land's inclusion is due to the personal interest from members of the Neighbourhood Plan committee."</i></p> <p>Cathy Kerby spoke to Steve on the telephone and subsequently e-mailed a response as follows:</p> <p><i>"Thank you for your e-mail, and for outlining your views in our telephone conversation last night.</i></p>

	<p><i>As I mentioned last night, the deadline is not of NHDC's making. WPC has until the end of the month to provide the required information to the Examiner, who set the deadline agreed at the 30 January Exploratory Meeting. She has refused any further time to respond.</i></p> <p><i>The deadline for landowners to respond is mainly due to this, and the fact that I have not managed to write to landowners before now, due to pressure of other work and my court commitments.</i></p> <p><i>Once again, I apologise.</i></p> <p><i>I will pass on, to the Examiner, any response received from you."</i></p>
<p>Date: February 2019</p> <p>Respondent: North Herts Homes</p> <p>Location: Little Wymondley</p> <p>Green Spaces</p> <p>Map Loc</p> <p>No.7,8,10</p>	<p><i>No Response received as at the 26th February 2019</i></p>

Consultation Email: Sent 10th April 2016:

Adrian Hawkins 

To: Adrian Hawkins

Public Consultation - Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum (WPNPF)

We are pleased to inform you that we have completed our Draft Neighbourhood Plan and it is being officially released tomorrow.

The draft Plan for the Parish of Wymondley can now be viewed on our new website:-

www.wymondley.org

We look forward to receiving any comments you may wish to make. Please use the "have your say page" on the website or follow the link below

www.wymondley.org/have-your-say.html

This public consultation period will close on the 25th May 2016, so please ensure you make any comments before this date.

For and on behalf of,
Wymondley Parish Neighbourhood Plan Forum (WPNPF)

Adrian Hawkins
Chair WPNPF