

Schedule of Representations relating to The List of Proposed Modifications, and the Council's Response

Explanatory Notes

Representations on:

▪ The List of Proposed Modifications and the Council's Response to these Representations

The names of the commenters referred to in the Schedule are listed first.

Representations relating to The List of Proposed Modifications are then set out in a standard format:

Plan Reference:	i.e. that part of the Local Plan to which a representation relates. Representations are given in Plan order.
Modification Number:	i.e. that modification in the List of Proposed Modifications (to the Deposit Draft) to which a representation relates.
Representation Number:	i.e. a unique reference number for one representation covering a specific point. Each representation is from an individual or single organisation.
Representation:	i.e. a brief summary of the particular point.
Response:	i.e. a statement of the Council's intention to modify the Deposit Draft or a Proposed Modification, or not. Reasons for each intention are given. In cases where the Council proposed further changes to the Plan, wording of the change is given in the Schedule. However, note that all proposed changes are also brought together in a separate document entitled 'List of Proposed Further Modifications.'

This document should be read with reference to the Deposit Draft of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan (October 1998) and the List of Proposed Modifications (August 2003).

List of Commenters on The List of Proposed Modifications

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>		<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 3	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	008	PART 1	
M 4	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	015	PART 1	
M 5	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	020	Sustainable Development	Policy 1A
M 6	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	020	Sustainable Development	Policy 1A
M 7	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	020	Sustainable Development	Policy 1A
M 8	Mr. W.E. Helm		025	Development Strategy	Policy 1
M 10	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	027	Development Strategy	Policy 2
M 9	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	028	Development Strategy	Policy 2
M 11	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		030	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 12	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	030	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 13	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	030	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 14	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		031	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 15	Mr. Brian Ayling		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 16	Mrs. Patricia Ayling		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 17	Ms. Alexandra Bocker		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 18	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 19	E.L. Bocker		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 20	Mr. Pete Cull		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 21	Ms. Viviane Howarth		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 22	W.J. Howarth		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 23	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 24	Mrs. M.E. Keeton		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 25	Mr. Anthony King		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 26	Ms. Katrina King		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 27	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine & Moore		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 28	Mr. Peter Randall		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 29	Mrs. Heather Toms		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 30	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 31	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 836	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd		033	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 32	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	036	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 34	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	036	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 33	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	037	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 35	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		040	Development Strategy	Policy 3

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>
M 36	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 37	Mr. Brian Ayling	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 38	Mrs. Patricia Ayling	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 39	Ms. Alexandra Bocker	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 40	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 41	E.L. Bocker	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 42	Mr. John Bosworthick	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 43	Mrs. Julie Bosworthick	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 44	Mr. Ray Chamberlain	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 45	Mr. Pete Cull	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 46	Ms. Linda Davis	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 47	Mr. Paul Davis	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 48	Ms. Christine Evans	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 49	Ms. Liz Fey	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 50	Mr. Mark Fey	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 51	Ms. Viviane Howarth	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 52	W.J. Howarth	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 53	Mr. Andy Keen	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 54	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 55	Mrs. M.E. Keeton	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 56	Joan Kempself	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 57	Mr. Anthony King	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 58	Ms. Katrina King	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 59	Mr. & Mrs. R.J. Monk	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 60	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 61	Mr. Brian Parker	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 62	Mr. N.B. Prowse	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 63	Mrs. S.C. Prowse	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 64	Mr. Peter Randall	041	Development Strategy Policy 3
M 65	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	041	Development Strategy Policy 3

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>		<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 66	Mr. Andrew Shaw		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 67	Ms. Kate Shaw		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 68	Mrs. Heather Toms		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 69	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 70	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 71	Mrs. V.E. Welsh		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 72	Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright		041	Development Strategy	Policy 3
M 73	Mr. B. McKay	Bovingdon Parish Council	051	Development Strategy	Policy 3a
M 74	Mr. B. McKay	Bovingdon Parish Council	053	Development Strategy	Policy 3a
M 75	Mr. David Nobbs	Chipperfield Parish Council	054	Development Strategy	Policy 4
M 76	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	055	Development Strategy	Policy 4
M 77	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	061	Development Strategy	Policy 6
M 78	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. M. Glasser		061	Development Strategy	Policy 6
M 79	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	061	Development Strategy	Policy 6
M 80	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	061	Development Strategy	Policy 6
M 81	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	063	Urban Structure	Policy 7
M 82	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	065	Urban Structure	Policy 7
M 83	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	070	Development Control	Policy 9A
M 84	Beechwood Homes Ltd		081	Housing	Policy 17
M85	Vincent & Gorbong on behalf of Wilson Connolly Limited		081	Housing	Policy 17
M 86	Vincent & Gorbong on behalf of Wilson Connolly Limited		083	Housing	Policy 18
M 87	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		083	Housing	Policy 18
M 88	Mr. Colin Campbell	GO - East	086	Housing	Policy 19
M 89	Development Planning Partnership on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited		086	Housing	Policy 19
M 90	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	088	Housing	Policy 20
M 91	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	090	Housing	Policy 21
M 92	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	090	Housing	Policy 21
M 93	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	092	Housing	Policy 22
M 94	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	092	Housing	Policy 22
M 95	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	093	Housing	Policy 22
M 96	Mr. David Nobbs	Chipperfield Parish Council	094	Housing	Policy 23
M 97	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	105	Housing	Policy 27B
M 98	Mr. & Mrs. J. Armstrong		121	Housing	

Rep No. Name		MOD No. Plan Reference			
M 99	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	121	Housing	
M 100	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		126	Housing	
M 101	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	137	Housing	
M 102	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	137	Housing	
M 103	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	137	Housing	
M 104	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Mr. P. Mc Cann, Banner Homes		137	Housing	
M 105	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		137	Housing	
M 106	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	137	Housing	
M 107	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		137	Housing	
M 108	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		137	Housing	
M 109	Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of English Partnerships		137	Housing	
M 110	Kyle McClelland	West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust	137	Housing	
M 111	Vincent & Gorbng on behalf of Wilson Connolly Limited		137	Housing	
M 112	Beechwood Homes Ltd		137	Housing	
M 113	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	137	Housing	
M 114	Mr. & Mrs. M. Berman		137	Housing	
M 115	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		137	Housing	
M 116	Mr. R.D. Haynes	1st Leverstock Green Scout Group	137	Housing	
M 117	Faulkners on behalf of Mr. & Mrs. J. Armstrong		137	Housing	
M 118	Mr. P.S. Thring	CPRE Hertfordshire	137	Housing	
M 119	Barton Wilmore on behalf of Mr. P. Mc Cann, Banner Homes		137	Housing	
M 120	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	137	Housing	
M 121	Mr. Tony McWalter MP		137	Housing	
M 838	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd		137	Housing	
M 122	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		143	Employment	Policy 31
M 123	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		145	Employment	Policy 31
M 124	Mr. Andy Scare	Aylesbury Vale District Council	149	Employment	Policy 33
M 125	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	149	Employment	Policy 33
M 126	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		152	Employment	Policy 35
M 127	Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of English Partnerships		152	Employment	Policy 35
M 128	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		153	Employment	Policy 35
M 129	Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of English Partnerships		153	Employment	Policy 35
M 130	Mr. D. Morgan	Gazeley Properties Ltd	153	Employment	Policy 35

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>		<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 131	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	155	Employment	
M 132	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	156	Employment	
M 133	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	157	Employment	
M 134	Entec on behalf of The Crown Estate		157	Employment	
M 135	Jones Lang LaSalle on behalf of English Partnerships		157	Employment	
M 136	Mr. D. Morgan	Gazeley Properties Ltd	157	Employment	
M 137	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		163	Employment	
M 138	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		164	Employment	
M 139	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		168	Shopping	Policy 40
M 140	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		169	Shopping	Policy 40
M 141	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		170	Shopping	Policy 38
M 142	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		171	Shopping	Policy 38
M 143	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	173	Shopping	Policy 39
M 144	Peacock & Smith on behalf of W.H. Morrison Supermarkets PLC		173	Shopping	Policy 39
M 145	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		174	Shopping	Policy 42
M 146	Peacock & Smith on behalf of W.H. Morrison Supermarkets PLC		174	Shopping	Policy 42
M 147	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		175	Shopping	Policy 42
M 148	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		181	Shopping	Policy 41
M 149	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		181	Shopping	Policy 41
M 150	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		182	Shopping	Policy 41
M 151	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		183	Shopping	Policy 41
M 152	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	191	Shopping	
M 153	Development Planning Partnership on behalf of Tesco Stores Limited		191	Shopping	
M 154	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		197	Shopping	
M 155	Rapleys on behalf of Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd		198	Shopping	
M 156	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	203	Transport	Policy 52
M 157	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	209	Transport	Policy 55
M 158	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	210	Transport	Policy 56
M 159	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	210	Transport	Policy 56
M 160	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	214	Transport	Policy 58
M 161	Mr. Colin Campbell	GO - East	216	Transport	Policy 59
M 162	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		253	Transport	
M 163	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		254	Transport	

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>		<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 165	Mr. R. Grinter	Hertfordshire County Council	257	Social and Community Facilities	Policy 70
M 166	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		258	Social and Community Facilities	
M 167	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	258	Social and Community Facilities	
M 168	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	258	Social and Community Facilities	
M 169	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		259	Social and Community Facilities	
M 170	Kyle McClelland	West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust	261	Social and Community Facilities	
M 171	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	275	Leisure and Tourism	Policy 79
M 172	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	282	Leisure and Tourism	Policy 83
M 173	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		295	Leisure and Tourism	
M 174	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	295	Leisure and Tourism	
M 175	John Felgate Planning on behalf of Egerton Rothesay School		296	Leisure and Tourism	
M 176	Kyle McClelland	West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust	307	Leisure and Tourism	
M 177	Planning Perspectives on behalf of Morley Fund Management Ltd/Stanhope PLC		314	Leisure and Tourism	
M 179	Planning Perspectives on behalf of Morley Fund Management Ltd/Stanhope PLC		315	Leisure and Tourism	
M 180	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	319	Environment	Policy 96
M 181	Mr. Colin White	Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board	320	Environment	Policy 96
M 182	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	348	Environment	Policy 112
M 183	Mr. Colin Campbell	GO - East	352	Environment	Policy 99
M 184	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	363	Environment	Policy 110
M 185	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	363	Environment	Policy 110
M 186	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	375	Environment	Policy 114
M 187	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	376	Environment	Policy 114
M 188	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	378	Environment	Policy 115
M 189	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	379	Environment	Policy 116
M 190	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	382	Environment	Policy 118
M 191	Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association		387	Environment	Policy 109
M 192	Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association		387	Environment	Policy 109
M 193	Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association		387	Environment	Policy 109
M 194	Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of Mobile Operators Association		387	Environment	Policy 109
M 195	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	392	Part 4	Section 1.
M 196	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	396	Part 4	Section 2.
M 197	Tring Town Council		403	Part 4	Section 4.
M 164	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.		407	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 198	Mr. Brian Ayling	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 199	Mrs. Patricia Ayling	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 200	Mrs. Jill Blackie	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 201	Ms. Alexandra Bocker	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 202	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 203	E.L. Bocker	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 204	Laurence Bodiam	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 205	Mr. David Carrington	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 206	Mr. Pete Cull	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 207	Ms. Amanda Dorsett	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 208	Mr. Jack Duell	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 209	Mr. David Gurr	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 210	Mrs. Beverley Gurr	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 211	Miss S. Hazell	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 212	Mr. David Hopkinson	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 213	Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 214	Rona Howard	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 215	Ms. Viviane Howarth	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 216	W.J. Howarth	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 218	Brooke Hunt	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 219	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 220	Mrs. M.E. Keeton	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 221	Mr. Anthony King	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 222	Ms. Katrina King	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 223	Mr. N.B. Prowse	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 224	Mrs. S.C. Prowse	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 225	Mrs. Hazel Randall	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 226	Mr. Peter Randall	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 227	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 228	Mr. Nicholas Schramm	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 229	Mr. Alan Shearman	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 230	Mrs. Heather Toms	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 231	Mr. S. Valentine	419	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 232	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 233	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 234	Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 839	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	419	Part 4	Section 7.
M 235	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	425	Part 4	Section 7.
M 236	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	425	Part 4	Section 7.
M 237	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	428	Part 4	Section 7.
M 238	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	429	Part 4	Section 7.
M 239	Aitchison Rafferty on behalf of G.B. Kent and Sons Ltd	429	Part 4	Section 7.
M 240	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	432	Part 4	Section 7.
M 241	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	432	Part 4	Section 7.
M 242	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	433	Part 4	Section 7.
M 243	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	434	Part 4	Section 7.
M 244	Evelyn Adamson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 245	Mr. James Adamson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M246	Marjory Alexander	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 247	Mr. Robert Alexander	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 248	Mr. Brian Ayling	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 249	Mrs. Patricia Ayling	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 250	Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 251	Mrs. J.M. Baldwin	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 252	Mr. & Mrs. Barnett	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 253	R. Beckett	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 254	D. Bowers	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 255	Mr. S. Blundell	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 256	Ms. Alexandra Bocker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 257	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 258	E.L. Bocker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 259	Laurence Bodiam	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 260	Mr. John Bosworthick	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 261	Mrs. Julie Bosworthick	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 262	Mr. Paul Bowness	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 263	Ms. Denise Bradley	440	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 264	Mr. Stephen Bradley	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 265	Mr B.G.&Mrs S.F. Brittain	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 266	Mr. Brian Burgess	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 267	Mrs. J.D. Burgess	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 268	Mrs. Diane Carlin	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 269	Mr. David Carrington	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 270	Miss Sally Carter	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 271	Mr. Ray Chamberlain	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 272	Animilla Clark	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 273	Mr. Paul Clark	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 274	Ms. Helen Clarke	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 275	Mr. M. Clarke	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 276	Mrs. Melanie Clarke	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 277	Juliette Cockerill	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 278	Ngaire Cockerill	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 279	Rebecca Cockerill	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 280	Mr. Richard Cockerill	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 281	Mr. Michael Collman	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 282	Mr. Pete Cull	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 283	Mr. & Mrs. Cunningham	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 284	Miss P.M. Daniels	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 285	Ms. Linda Davis	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 286	Mr. Paul Davis	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 287	Denise Dickinson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 288	Ms. Amanda Dorsett	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 289	Mr. John Dowling	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 290	Mr. Jack Duell	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 291	Ms. Christine Evans	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 292	Ms. Liz Fey	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 293	Mr. Mark Fey	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 294	Mr. Ian Fisher	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 295	Debra Fox	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 296	Jill Galvin	440	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 297	Mr. Peter Galvin	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 298	Mrs. N. Garner	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 299	Mrs. Josephine Gilbert	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 300	Jennifer Gower	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 301	Mr. Mark Gower	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 302	Mr. Richard Green	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 303	Mr. Martin Greeves	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 304	Mrs. Shani Greeves	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 305	Miss Alexandra Groutage	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 306	Mrs. Barbara Groutage	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 307	Mr. Edward Groutage	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 308	Mrs. Beverley Gurr	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 309	Mr. David Gurr	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 310	Miss Alison Hall	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 311	Mrs. B. Hall	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 312	Mr. Nicholas Hall	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 313	Mrs. N.E. Hancocks	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 314	Judith Hardcastle	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 315	Mr. Timothy Hardcastle	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 316	Mr. Peter Harrington	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 317	Susan Harrington	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 318	Miss S. Hazell	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 319	Mrs. Melanie Henley	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 320	Mr. Ralph Henley	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 321	D. Hepwood	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 322	L. Hepwood	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 323	Christina Hill	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 324	Mrs. M.E. Holland	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 325	Mr. R. Holland	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 326	Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 327	Mr. David Hopkinson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 328	Rona Howard	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 329	Ms. Viviane Howarth	440	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 330	W.J. Howarth	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 331	Brooke Hunt	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 332	Mrs. Janet Izzard	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 333	Mr. J. Izzard	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 334	Deborah Johnstone	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 335	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 336	Mrs. M.E. Keeton	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 337	Joan Kempself	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 338	Mr. Anthony King	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 339	Ms. Katrina King	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 340	Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 341	T. Langley	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 342	Mr. John Lazenbatt	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 343	Kathleen Lazenbatt	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 344	Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 345	Mr. Lloyd Leadbeater	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 346	Diana Leeden	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 347	Mr. William Leeden	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 348	June Linsley	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 349	Mr. R. Lock	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 350	Mrs. V. Lock	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 351	Mr. Mark Mayhew	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 352	Mrs. Deborah McKinlay	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 353	Mr. Peter Mison	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 354	Mr. & Mrs. R.J. Monk	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 355	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 356	J. O'Connor	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 357	Mr. & Mrs. Daniel & Thelma O'Mahony	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 358	Mr. Anthony Parisi	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 359	Mr. Brian Parker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 360	Mrs. E.E. Parker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 361	Mr. J.E. Parker	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 362	Miss Sejal Pau	440	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 363	Vivien Plummer	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 364	A.G. Powell	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 365	Mr. N.B. Prowse	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 366	Mrs. S.C. Prowse	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 367	Mrs. Hazel Randall	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 368	Mr. Peter Randall	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 369	Mrs. Emma Richards	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 370	Mr. Martin Richards	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 371	Janet Richmond	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 372	Mr. Keith Richmond	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 373	Mr. D. Robinson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 374	Mrs. L. Robinson	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 375	Mr. David Russell	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 376	Miss Violet Saunders	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 377	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 378	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 379	Mr. Nicholas Schramm	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 380	Mr. Andrew Shaw	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 381	Ms. Kate Shaw	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 382	Millie Shaw	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 383	Mr. Daniel Smith	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 384	Mr. David Smith	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 385	Jennifer Smith	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 386	Mr. & Mrs. Stacey	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 387	Mr. Aaron Stormont	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 388	Mr. Richard Swaby	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 389	Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 390	Mohanlal Thakkar	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 391	Mr. Minesh Thakkar	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 392	Mrs. H. Toms	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 393	Mrs. Heather Toms	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 394	Mr. M. Toms	440	Part 4	Section 7.
M 395	Teresa Turton	440	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>		
M 396	Mr. S. Valentine	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 397	Mrs. Ann Venables	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 398	Mr. Dennis Venables	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 399	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 400	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 401	Sarah Watson	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 402	Mrs. V.E. Welsh	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 403	Joyce White	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 404	Mr. Pete White	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 405	Mr. David Wiggins	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 406	June Wiggins	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 407	Christine Williams	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 408	Mr. Peter Williams	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 409	Mr. Michael Wilton	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 410	Mrs. Theresa Wilton	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 411	Helen Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 412	Helen Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 413	Helen Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 414	Mr. John Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 415	Mr. John Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 416	Mr. John Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 417	Mr. John Wolfenden	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 418	Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 834	Mr. & Mrs. Ian and Emma Burrows	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 840	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	440	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 419	Ms. Sylvia Ackling	English Heritage	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 420	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 421	Evelyn Adamson	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 422	Mr. James Adamson	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 423	Marjory Alexander	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 424	Mr. Robert Alexander	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 425	Mr. Brian Ayling	441	Part 4	Section 7.	
M 426	Mrs. Patricia Ayling	441	Part 4	Section 7.	

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 427	Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 428	Mrs. J.M. Baldwin	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 429	Mr. G. Barnett	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 430	Mrs. Barnett	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 431	D. Bowers	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 432	Holly Beckett	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 433	R. Beckett	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 434	Mr. M.E. Bess	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 435	Mr. S. Blundell	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 436	Ms. Alexandra Bocker	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 437	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 438	E.L. Bocker	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 439	Laurence Bodiam	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 440	Mr. John Bosworthick	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 441	Mrs. Julie Bosworthick	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 442	Mr. Paul Bowness	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 443	Ms. Denise Bradley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 444	Mr. Stephen Bradley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 445	Diane Bremner	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 446	Mr. Stuart Bremner	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 447	Mr B.G.& Mrs S.F. Brittain	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 448	Mr. Brian Burgess	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 449	Mrs. J.D. Burgess	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 450	Mrs. Emma Burrows	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 451	Mr. Ian Burrows	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 452	Mrs. Diane Carlin	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 453	Mr. David Carrington	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 454	Miss Sally Carter	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 455	Mr. Ray Chamberlain	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 456	Animilla Clark	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 457	Mr. Paul Clark	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 458	Ms. Helen Clarke	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 459	Mr. M. Clarke	441	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No. Name</i>		<i>MOD No. Plan Reference</i>		
M 460	Mrs. Melanie Clarke	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 461	Juliette Cockerill	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 462	Ngaire Cockerill	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 463	Rebecca Cockerill	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 464	Mr. Richard Cockerill	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 465	Mr. Michael Collman	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 466	Mr. Pete Cull	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 467	Miss P.M Daniels	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 468	Ms. Linda Davis	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 469	Mr. Paul Davis	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 470	Mr. Brian Dennis	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 471	Denise Dickinson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 472	Ms. Amanda Dorsett	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 473	Mr. John Dowling	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 474	Mr. Jack Duell	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 475	Ms. Christine Evans	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 476	Ms. Liz Fey	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 477	Mr. Mark Fey	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 478	Mr. Ian Fisher	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 479	Debra Fox	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 480	Mr. Peter Galvin	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 481	Jill Galvin	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 482	Mrs. N. Garner	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 483	Mrs. Josephine Gilbert	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 484	Jennifer Gower	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 485	Mr. Mark Gower	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 486	Mr. Richard Green	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 487	Mr. Martin Greeves	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 488	Mrs. Shani Greeves	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 489	Miss Alexandra Groutage	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 490	Mrs. Barbara Groutage	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 491	Mr. Edward Groutage	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 492	Mr. David Gurr	441	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 493	Miss Alison Hall	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 494	Mr. Nicholas Hall	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 495	Mrs. N.E. Hancocks	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 496	Judith Hardcastle	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 497	Mr. Timothy Hardcastle	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 498	Mr. Peter Harrington	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 499	Susan Harrington	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 500	Miss S. Hazell	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 501	Mrs. Melanie Henley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 502	Mr. Ralph Henley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 503	D. Hepwood	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 504	L. Hepwood	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 505	Christina Hill	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 506	Mrs. M.E. Holland	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 507	Mr. R. Holland	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 508	Mr. David Hopkinson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 509	Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 510	Rona Howard	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 511	Ms. Viviane Howarth	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 512	W.J. Howarth	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 513	Brooke Hunt	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 514	Mrs. Janet Izzard	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 515	Mr. J. Izzard	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 516	Evelyn Jones	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 517	Mr. David Jury	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 518	Kathryn Jury	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 519	Margaret Jury	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 520	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 521	Mrs. M.E. Keeton	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 522	Joan Kempself	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 523	Mr. Anthony King	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 524	Ms. Katrina King	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 525	Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi	441	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 526	T. Langley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 527	Mr. John Lazenbatt	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 528	Kathleen Lazenbatt	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 529	Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 530	Diana Leeden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 531	Mr. William Leeden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 532	June Linsley	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 533	Mrs. V. Lock	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 534	Mr. Mark Mayhew	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 535	Mrs. Deborah McKinlay	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 536	Mr. Peter Mison	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 537	Mr. & Mrs. R.J. Monk	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 538	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 539	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 540	J. O'Connor	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 541	Mr. & Mrs. Daniel&Thelma O'Mahony	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 542	Mr. Brian Parker	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 543	Miss Sejal Pau	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 544	Ms. Carole Phillips	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 545	Mr. Michael Phillips	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 546	Vivien Plummer	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 547	Mr. N.B. Prowse	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 548	Mrs. S.C. Prowse	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 549	Mrs. Hazel Randall	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 550	Mr. Peter Randall	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 551	Mrs. Emma Richards	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 552	Mr. Martin Richards	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 553	Janet Richmond	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 554	Mr. Keith Richmond	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 555	Mr. D. Robinson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 556	Mrs. L. Robinson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 557	Mr. David Russell	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 558	Miss Violet Saunders	441	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 559	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 560	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 561	Mr. Nicholas Schramm	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 562	Mr. Andrew Shaw	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 563	Ms. Kate Shaw	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 564	Millie Shaw	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 565	Mr. Daniel Smith	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 566	Mr. David Smith	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 567	Jennifer Smith	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 568	Mr. & Mrs. Stacey	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 569	Mr. Aaron Stormont	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 570	Mr. Richard Swaby	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 571	Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 572	Mr. Minesh Thakkar	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 573	Mohanlal Thakkar	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 574	Mrs. Heather Toms	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 575	Mrs. H. Toms	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 576	Mr. M. Toms	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 577	Teresa Turton	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 578	Mr. S. Valentine	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 579	Mrs. Ann Venables	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 580	Mr. Dennis Venables	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 581	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 582	Sarah Watson	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 583	Mrs. V.E. Welsh	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 584	Mr. Tony Wharfe	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 585	Amanda Wharfe	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 586	Joyce White	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 587	Mr. Pete White	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 588	Mr. David Wiggins	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 589	June Wiggins	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 590	Christine Williams	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 591	Christine Williams	441	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 592	Mr. Peter Williams	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 593	Mr. Michael Wilton	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 594	Mrs. Theresa Wilton	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 595	Helen Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 596	Helen Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 597	Helen Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 598	Mr. John Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 599	Mr. John Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 600	Mr. John Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 601	Mr. John Wolfenden	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 602	Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 832	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 833	Mr. R. Lock	441	Part 4	Section 7.
M 603	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	445	Part 4	Section 7.
M 604	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	449	Part 4	Section 7.
M 605	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	453	Part 4	Section 7.
M 606	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 607	Mrs. Diane Carlin	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 608	Evelyn Adamson	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 609	Mr. James Adamson	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 610	Marjory Alexander	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 611	Mr. Robert Alexander	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 612	Mr. Brian Ayling	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 613	Mrs. Patricia Ayling	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 614	Mrs. J.M Baldwin	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 615	Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 616	D. Bowers	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 617	Mrs. Barnett	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 618	Mr. G. Barnett	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 619	Holly Beckett	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 620	R. Beckett	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 621	Mr. S. Blundell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 622	Ms. Alexandra Bocker	454	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 623	Ernst - Jurgen Bocker	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 624	E.L. Bocker	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 625	Laurence Bodiam	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 626	Mr. John Bosworthick	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 627	Mrs. Julie Bosworthick	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 628	Mr. Paul Bowness	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 629	Ms. Denise Bradley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 630	Mr. Stephen Bradley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 631	Diane Bremner	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 632	Mr. Stuart Bremner	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 633	Mr B.G. & Mrs S.F Brittain	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 634	C.R. Buckell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 635	Mrs. C. Buckell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 636	Mr. Brian Burgess	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 637	Mrs. J.D. Burgess	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 638	Mrs. Eileen Burnell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 639	Mr. Ronald Burnell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 640	Mrs. Emma Burrows	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 641	Mr. Ian Burrows	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 642	Mr. David Carrington	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 643	Miss Sally Carter	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 644	Mr. Ray Chamberlain	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 645	Animilla Clark	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 646	Mr. Paul Clark	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 647	Ms. Helen Clarke	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 648	Mr. M. Clarke	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 649	Mrs. Melanie Clarke	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 650	Juliette Cockerill	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 651	Ngaire Cockerill	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 652	Rebecca Cockerill	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 653	Mr. Richard Cockerill	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 654	Mr. Michael Collman	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 655	Mr. Pete Cull	454	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 656	Miss P.M. Daniels	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 657	Ms. Linda Davis	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 658	Mr. Paul Davis	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 659	Mr. Brian Dennis	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 660	Denise Dickinson	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 661	Ms. Amanda Dorsett	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 662	Mr. John Dowling	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 663	Mr. Jack Duell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 664	Ms. Christine Evans	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 665	Ms. Liz Fey	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 666	Mr. Mark Fey	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 667	Debra Fox	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 668	Jill Galvin	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 669	Mr. Peter Galvin	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 670	Mrs. N. Garner	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 671	Mrs. Josephine Gilbert	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 672	Jennifer Gower	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 673	Mr. Mark Gower	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 674	Mr. Richard Green	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 675	Mr. Martin Greeves	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 676	Mrs. Shani Greeves	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 677	Miss Alexandra Groutage	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 678	Mrs. Barbara Groutage	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 679	Mr. Edward Groutage	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 680	Mrs. Beverley Gurr	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 681	Mr. David Gurr	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 682	Miss Alison Hall	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 683	Mr. Nicholas Hall	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 684	Mrs. N.E. Hancocks	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 685	Judith Hardcastle	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 686	Mr. Timothy Hardcastle	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 687	Mr. Peter Harrington	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 688	Susan Harrington	454	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 689	Miss S. Hazell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 690	Mrs. Melanie Henley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 691	Mr. Ralph Henley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 692	D. Hepwood	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 693	L. Hepwood	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 694	Christina Hill	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 695	Mrs. M.E. Holland	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 696	Mr. R. Holland	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 697	Mr. Stephen Holmes	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 698	Mr. David Hopkinson	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 699	Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 700	Rona Howard	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 701	Ms. Viviane Howarth	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 702	W.J. Howarth	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 703	Brooke Hunt	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 704	Mrs. Janet Izzard	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 705	Mr. J. Izzard	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 706	Deborah Johnstone	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 707	Mr. David Jury	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 708	Kathryn Jury	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 709	Margaret Jury	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 710	Mr. Andy Keen	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 711	Mr. J.R.B. Keeton	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 712	Mrs. M.E. Keeton	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 713	Joan Kempself	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 714	Mr. Anthony King	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 715	Ms. Katrina King	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 716	Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 717	T. Langley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 718	Mr. John Lazenbatt	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 719	Kathleen Lazenbatt	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 720	Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 721	Diana Leeden	454	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 722	Mr. William Leeden	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 723	Mr. Lloyd Leadbeater	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 724	June Linsley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 725	Mr. Robin Linsley	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 726	Mr. R. Lock	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 727	Mrs. V. Lock	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 728	Mr. Adam MacDonnell	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 729	Mr. Mark Mayhew	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 730	Mrs. Deborah McKinlay	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 731	Mr. Peter Mison	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 732	Mr. & Mrs. R.J. Monk	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 733	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 734	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 735	K. Myatt	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 736	J. O'Connor	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 737	Mr. & Mrs. Daniel & Thelma O'Mahony	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 738	Mr. Brian Parker	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 739	Mrs. E.E. Parker	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 740	Mr. J.E. Parker	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 741	Miss Sejal Pau	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 742	Ms. Carole Phillips	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 743	Mr. Michael Phillips	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 744	Vivien Plummer	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 745	Mr. N.B. Prowse	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 746	Mrs. S.C. Prowse	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 747	Mr. Cliff Randall	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 748	Mrs. Diane Randall	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 749	Mr. Peter Randall	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 750	Mrs. Emma Richards	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 751	Mr. Martin Richards	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 752	Janet Richmond	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 753	Mr. Keith Richmond	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 754	Mr. D. Robinson	454	Part 4	Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>
M 755	Mrs. L. Robinson	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 756	Mr. David Russell	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 757	Miss Violet Saunders	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 758	Florence Scott	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 759	Mr. James Scott	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 760	Mrs. Beverley Schramm	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 761	Mr. Nicholas Schramm	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 762	Barbara Sear	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 763	Mr. Andrew Shaw	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 764	Ms. Kate Shaw	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 765	Millie Shaw	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 766	Mr. Alan Shearman	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 767	Mr. N.G. Skeates	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 768	Mr. Daniel Smith	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 769	Mr. David Smith	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 770	Jennifer Smith	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 771	Mr. & Mrs. Stacey	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 772	Mr. Aaron Stormont	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 773	Mr. Richard Swaby	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 774	Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 775	Mohanlal Thakkar	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 776	Mr. Minesh Thakkar	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 777	Mrs. Heather Toms	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 778	Mrs. H. Toms	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 779	Mr. M. Toms	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 780	Mr. Denis Turton	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 781	Mr. S. Valentine	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 782	Mrs. Ann Venables	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 783	Mr. Dennis Venables	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 784	Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 785	Mr. Peter Vincent Jones	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 786	Sarah Watson	454	Part 4 Section 7.
M 787	Mrs. V.E. Welsh	454	Part 4 Section 7.

<i>Rep No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>MOD No.</i>	<i>Plan Reference</i>	
M 788	Amanda Wharfe	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 789	Mr. Tony Wharfe	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 790	Amanda Wharfe	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 791	Mr. Tony Wharfe	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 792	Joyce White	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 793	Mr. Pete White	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 794	Mr. David Wiggins	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 795	June Wiggins	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 796	Christine Williams	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 797	Mr. Peter Williams	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 798	Mr. Michael Wilton	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 799	Mrs. Theresa Wilton	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 800	Helen Wolfenden	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 801	Mr. John Wolfenden	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 802	Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 835	J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	454	Part 4	Section 7.
M 803	Mr. Andy Keen	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 804	Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 805	Mr. Alan Shearman	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 806	Mr. N.G. Skeates	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 807	Mrs. V.E. Welsh	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 837	Boyer Planning on behalf of J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Development Ltd	455	Part 4	Section 7.
M 808	GVA Grimley on behalf of Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.	469	Part 4	Section 7.
M 809	Mr. B McKay	Bovingdon Parish Council	476	APPENDIX 1
M 810	Mr. B McKay	Bovingdon Parish Council	476	APPENDIX 1
M 811	Dr. Nick Michael	Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	477	APPENDIX 2
M 812	Beechwood Homes Ltd		478	APPENDIX 3
M 813	Ms. Jennifer Bissmire	Markyate Parish Council	480	APPENDIX 5
M 814	Peacock & Smith on behalf of W.H. Morrison Supermarkets PLC		480	APPENDIX 5
M 815	Peacock & Smith on behalf of W.H. Morrison Supermarkets PLC		480	APPENDIX 5
M 816	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	482	APPENDIX 7
M 817	Mr. Colin Westwood	Berkhamsted Town Council	484	APPENDIX 9

Representations on the List of Proposed Modifications

Plan Ref:
PART 1

General Updating

Modification Number: 008

Representation No: M 3

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The objector asks for clarification as to how changes made to land designation at Hemel Hempstead ski centre relate to Markyate.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

This Proposed Modification does not affect Markyate. Map 7 relates to the open land boundary at Hemel Hempstead Ski Centre. Objection has arisen from confusion over map numbering. Decision 39 (k) on Background to Policy 3 refers to the map showing the Green Belt boundary around Markyate being renumbered as Map 7. This is an error in the Statement of Decisions – in fact it is renumbered as Map 8. This numbering relates to the sequence of maps showing additions to and exclusions from the Green Belt, not to the Map Numbers in the Proposed Modifications.

Plan Ref:
PART 1

Using the Plan

Modification Number: 015

Representation No: M 4

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for clearer instructions on using the plan.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Sustainable Development

Policy 1A

Sustainable Development

Modification Number: 020

Representation No: M 5

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the introduction of a new section - 'Policy 1A Sustainable Development Framework'.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 6
Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the local character and distinctiveness passages from the new section on Sustainable Development.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 7
Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

It is suggested that Part 1 (Protect and enhance the environment) should be modified further to include a more specific reference to protect and/or enhance the historic environment.

Response:

Amend the Proposed Modification.

The policy text clearly states that the list of aims is not exhaustive. However, the absence of any direct reference to the historic environment is acknowledged.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend 4th clause under sub-section 1 – *Protect and enhance the environment*, to refer to the need to protect and/or enhance the historic environment.

Amended text to read:-

‘Conserve, protect and enhance the countryside, natural features, designated areas, historic environment and wildlife’

Plan Ref:		
Development Strategy	Policy 1	Towns

Modification Number: 025
Representation No: M 8
Commenter: Mr. W.E Helm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Concern is expressed as to the absence of a qualification to the supporting text to Policy 1: “..the acknowledgement of the possibility of limited peripheral development at Berkhamsted...”
An additional statement should be added to this clause:
"due regard being taken of the necessity of avoiding coalescence with neighbouring settlements and the encroachment of urban into rural areas."

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

No changes have been proposed to the supporting text of Policy 1 relating to Berkhamsted. Berkhamsted is already surrounded by Green Belt and any peripheral development would be in the Green Belt and therefore contrary to Policy 3. The reference to limited peripheral development relates solely to the proposal sites at Bank Mill Lane (H1) and Durrants Hill lane / Shootersway (H52). No additional development is intended. Paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 (revised) sets out the

purposes of including land in Green Belts. These include preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another and assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The modified text clarifies (Inspector's recommendation 4.3.52) the circumstances under which greenfield sites will be considered. Any site in the Green Belt it would also need to be considered under Policy 3, which would control peripheral development.

Plan Ref:

Development Strategy

Policy 2

Large Villages

Modification Number: 027

Representation No: M 10

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection because Markyate is small and should therefore be seen as a small village.
Support for the protection of industrial sites because they are confinable.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The population of Markyate in 1991 was 2,863 and is expected to have increased when the results of the 2001 Census become available. It therefore falls within the Council's definition of a 'large village' i.e. housing a population of between 2,500 and 5,000. The Parish Council's support for the protection of existing industrial sites is welcomed and noted.

Modification Number: 028

Representation No: M 9

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection because the map is inadequate and therefore judgement is difficult. The map indicates the whole area towards Studham is not Green Belt. Does this compromise the previous defined Green Belt boundary?

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This objection appears to relate to the clarity and extent of the Green Belt boundary at Markyate, rather than to Modification 26 (Policy 2) itself. It is assumed that the comments therefore relate to Map 9, which is covered by Modification 28.

Whilst it is accepted that the clarity of the map base in the List Of Proposed Modifications would have been improved had it been reproduced at a larger scale, this was not possible or convenient in a document of this size and format. The problem of map clarity will be addressed when the coloured Proposal Maps are printed following the adoption of the Plan.

The objector raises concerns over the reduction in the amount of Green Belt around Markyate from the position in the Deposit Draft. This issue was considered at the Local Plan Inquiry and the revisions to the Green Belt reflect a clear recommendation from the Inspector (Recommendation 4.8.33 in the Inspector's Report).

Modification Number: 030

Representation No: M 11

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The proposed change to this part of the Green Belt boundary, in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, will enable the comprehensive development of sites H52 and C1/L1. This development will provide significant benefits to the local community, including greatly improved school facilities for Egerton-Rothesay School, new playing fields with an element of community use, housing to meet local requirements (including some affordable housing), woodland management and nature conservation benefits the safeguarding of important archaeological interests, highways and transportation improvements, and the release of an additional windfall site at Charles Street.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 12

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The loss of Green Belt land at New Lodge, Bank Mill Lane, Egerton Rothesay and Durrants Lane is regretted. There is concern that extra traffic will burden Shootersway and the junction at Kingshill. Traffic impact plans must be sought.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Town Council's regret regarding the loss of these two sites to development is noted. However, the Inspector supported their continued inclusion within the Housing Schedule. The traffic implications were discussed at the Public Local Inquiry and are covered in the Inspector's Report.

Details on the highways issues of both schemes will be covered through the production of Development Briefs. The Highways Authority will be involved in the production of these documents.

Representation No: M 13

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Extension of Green Belt in the Markyate area in order to divert development emanating from Luton.
Addition to Green Belt between Flamstead and Markyate and to the east and north east of Markyate. Map 8 (in favour) Decision 39 Revise Map 10 to delete land to the west of A5 and Pickford Road from the area to be added to the Green Belt.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

This objection appears to be in part a statement of fact. It is assumed that whilst welcoming the inclusion of land to the north and north-east of Markyate within the Green Belt, the Parish Council

objects to this designation not extending to the south and west of the village.

As previously stated (see response to Modification 26), the Green Belt boundary set out in the Proposed Modifications clearly reflects Inspector's recommendation 4.8.33.

Modification Number: 031

Representation No: M 14

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The proposed change to this part of the Green Belt boundary, in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation, will enable the comprehensive development of sites H52 and C1/L1. This development will provide significant benefits to the local community, including greatly improved school facilities for Egerton-Rothesay School, new playing fields with an element of community use, housing to meet local requirements (including some affordable housing), woodland management and nature conservation benefits the safeguarding of important archaeological interests, highways and transportation improvements, and the release of an additional windfall site at Charles Street.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 033

Representation No: M 836

Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 15

Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 16
Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 17
Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 18
Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 19
Commenter: E.L Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 20
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 21
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 22
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 23
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 24
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 25
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 26
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 27
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 28
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 29
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 30
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 31
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 036

Representation No: M 32
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Amend Map 6 to reflect new boundary at the Manor Estate. Development at Markyate etc. if compatible with the maintenance and enhancement plus the maintenance of the Green Belt boundary. Amend settlement boundary. Map 3. The Parish Council is against this, the Parish Council does not want houses built at Manor Farm, and this should be in Green Belt.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Some confusion appears to have arisen between the Proposed Modifications relating to the Manor Estate, Hemel Hempstead (Modification 33) and Manor Farm, Markyate (Modification 36). It is assumed that the Parish Council intended to object to the latter site (i.e. Modification 36 rather than Modification 33 as stated).

The inclusion of Manor Farm as a Housing Proposal Site in Part II of the Housing Schedule is reasonable in planning terms as it conforms with recommendation 7.61.31 of the Inspector's Report. The Inspector, in considering issues, was satisfied that this would be an appropriate housing site.

A fuller response to objections to the designation of this site is set out under Modification 137 (Representation No. M101).

Representation No: M 34
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Map 9 altered to Green Belt areas to rural? Map 14.
This has been discussed previously.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Some confusion appears to have arisen between the Proposed Modifications relating to the Manor Estate, Hemel Hempstead (Modification 33) and Manor Farm, Markyate (Modification 36). It is assumed that the Parish Council intended to object to the latter site (i.e. Modification 36 rather than Modification 33 as originally stated).

The inclusion of Manor Farm as a Housing Proposal Site in Part II of the Housing Schedule is reasonable in planning terms as it conforms with recommendation 7.61.31 of the Inspector's Report. The Inspector, in considering issues, was satisfied that this would be an appropriate housing site.

Modification Number: 037

Representation No: M 33

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Decision 39 - Amend Proposals Map to reflect changes to Green Belt boundaries at Markyate. Changes to Green Belt at Markyate area altered to be added. Delete.
The Parish Council feels that there is a preference towards small villages.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The village boundary has been carefully defined in Markyate having regard to the maintenance of the Green Belt boundary, the long-term housing needs of the village and the suitability of Markyate to accommodate new development. These issues were discussed at length during the Public Local Inquiry and the Council has accepted the Inspector's conclusions on this. Therefore, the Council is satisfied that the revised boundary is appropriate.

Modification Number: 040

Representation No: M 35

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the designation of areas shown on Map 17 as 'Open Land'. The changes to the settlement boundary are covered by Modification No. 126 but there is no reference made to Open Land policy.

In the case of the larger of these two areas (land bounded by Durrants Lane and Shooters Way), this area is designated as Site C1/L1 for a new school and playing fields. Its designation as Open Land could potentially conflict with these important proposals, since although Policy 7 allows development for educational purposes, this is limited to "uses which are open in character...". The designation of this site as Open Land is not supported by any recommendation in the Inspector's Report.

Response:

Further Modification required.

The Council accepts that there was no direct recommendation from the Inspector to designate the land affected by Proposals C1/L1 as Open Land.

However, the Council believes that the Inspector intended the land fronting the junction of Shootersway/Durrants Lane to be designated as Open Land. This view is supported in paragraph 4.19.23 of the Inspector's report and is consistent with his treatment of nearby land at Cox Dell.

In principle, the Inquiry Inspector in his report certainly supported designating land to the north and south west of the Egerton Rothesay school as Open Land when he considered changes to the Green Belt boundary in the area. Paragraph 4.19.23 clearly states that he felt the designation of the western field south of the school as open space under Policy 110 would be sufficient to protect it from subsequent pressure for development – an obvious indication that he thought that such a designation would be reasonable. With regards to Cox Dell, the Inspector (para. 4.19.24) was careful to ensure that the removal of the land from the Green Belt was treated in a consistent manner i.e. to designate this as open space (Recommendation 4.19.28). This recommendation was accepted and listed as Decision 50 in the Statement of Decisions on the Inspector's Report, and shown on Map 17 in the List of Proposed Modifications.

However, there was a drafting error in the List of Proposed Modifications and the Open Land

designation shown on Map 17 should only have affected the parcel of land to the south west of the Egerton Rothesay School. The Council intends to correct this by removing the Open Land designation from the adjoining eastern parcel of land as a Further Modification.

Whilst both the Inspector and Council's intentions are clear, the objector is correct in highlighting that the Council has made no direct reference to this consequential change of designation in the List of Proposed Modifications. [The designation to open land should have been originally reflected through the Council's decisions on Inspector's recommendations 4.19.28 and 7.45.47, which were carried through as specific modifications.] To address this omission Map 17 and the Open Land Strategy for Berkhamsted under Policy 110 are to be corrected through Further Modifications.

Notwithstanding this error, the Council does not agree that this open land designation is in direct conflict with Proposals C1/L1. These proposals specifically allow development of the land for a school with new dual use playing fields and new informal leisure space. The purpose of the Open Land designation on the western parcel of land is to protect it from future pressure from unsuitable development, given its prominence in the landscape.

Proposed Further Modifications:

Map 17

Remove Open Land designation from land to the south east of Egerton Rothesay School (see map in Annex 4).

Policy 110:

Amend the Open Land Strategy for Berkhamsted as indicated on Map 141 (Annex 4).

Modification Number:	041
-----------------------------	------------

Representation No: **M 36**

Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: **M 37**

Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 38
Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 39
Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 40
Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 41
Commenter: E.L Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 42
Commenter: Mr. John Bosworthick
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 43
Commenter: Mrs. Julie Bosworthick
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 44
Commenter: Mr. Ray Chamberlain
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 45
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 46
Commenter: Ms. Linda Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 47
Commenter: Mr. Paul Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 48
Commenter: Ms. Christine Evans
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 49
Commenter: Ms. Liz Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 50
Commenter: Mr. Mark Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 51
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 52
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 53
Commenter: Mr. Andy Keen
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 54
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 55
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 56
Commenter: Joan Kempself
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 57
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 58
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 59
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. R.J Monk
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 60
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 61
Commenter: Mr. Brian Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 62
Commenter: Mr. N.B Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 63
Commenter: Mrs. S.C Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 64
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 65
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 66
Commenter: Mr. Andrew Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 67
Commenter: Ms. Kate Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 68
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 69
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 70
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 71
Commenter: Mrs. V.E Welsh
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 72
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Plan Ref: Development Strategy	Policy 3A	Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt
---	------------------	--

Modification Number: 051

Representation No: M 73

Committer: Mr. B McKay Bovingdon Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The infill area shown in Map 26 includes the prison playing fields. The Map 26 designation would give the opportunity for the playing fields to be developed for housing or other commercial use.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE:

This representation has been considered under Modification 51, as it relates to the infill area, rather than the extent of the Major Developed Site. The objection to Map 26 (the infill area) is considered under modification 476 (M809)

The Parish Council's support for the proposed infill area is welcomed.

Modification Number: 053

Representation No: M 74

Committer: Mr. B McKay Bovingdon Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection relates to the designation of the Bovingdon Brickworks site as an infill area suitable for redevelopment. This would lead to further sub-division of the site leading to more developments in the Green Belt. It would cause an increase in traffic on a stretch of road used as a rat run. It would enable uses which are detrimental to the amenity of the Green Belt, are in an unsuitable location, and pose an environmental threat.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE:

This objection has been considered under both Modifications 53 and 476, as the objection relates to the both the issue of infill and the extent of the Major Developed Site itself.

The objection concerns Bovingdon brickworks being designated as an infill area within a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.

The inclusion of a new policy relating to Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt including references on limited infill development follows recommendation 4.11.41 of the Inspector's Report. The inclusion of Bovingdon Brickworks as one of these sites is an integral part of this recommendation. There have been no changes to the site boundary from the Deposit Plan.

Policy 3A has been worded to limit infill development to that which complies with a number of strict criteria. These criteria reflect those set out in Appendix C of PPG2 and seek to tightly control development.

Plan Ref: Development Strategy	Policy 4	Selected Small Villages in the Green Belt
---	-----------------	--

Modification Number: 054

Representation No: M 75

Commenter: Mr. David Nobbs Chipperfield Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objector considers that the proposed deletion of clause (iii) of Policy 4 to accord with the Inspector's recommendation would be harmful to Chipperfield's character. Whereas the previous policy of judicious small-scale in-filling in small gaps in the road frontage accords with the traditional building pattern, the availability of backfilling in wider gaps brings forward the prospect of the construction of cul-de-sacs to serve clusters of new houses. These are specifically advised against in the Chipperfield Design Statement.

The development of land to the rear of existing properties would also be detrimental to the informal mix of housing and open land, which is another important characteristic of the village as described on p.8 of the Design Statement.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The deletion of clause (iii) of Policy 4 results from a specific recommendation made by the Inquiry Inspector (Recommendation 4.42.66).

The Inspector considered that limiting development to gaps in an otherwise built-up frontage to be unduly restrictive. He considered clause (i), which requires development to be sympathetic to its surroundings, to be a sufficient safeguard against poorly designed or visually intrusive schemes. He also supported the limit of two extra dwellings (Inspector's Report para 4.42.21) which would preclude clusters of housing.

The Chipperfield Design Statement has been adopted by the Borough Council as supplementary planning guidance. Its advice regarding infilling and backland development will be a material consideration in all relevant planning applications and protect the village's distinctive character.

Modification Number: 055

Representation No: M 76

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The addition of a new paragraph on village design statements is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Development Strategy	Policy 6	Selected Small Villages in the Rural Area
---	-----------------	--

Modification Number: 061

Representation No: M 77

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The additional paragraph explaining the particular importance of Aldbury is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 78
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. M Glasser
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Supports the additional land to be included within the village boundary to form a logical and functional part of the village.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 79
Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The additional paragraph explaining the particular importance of Aldbury is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 80
Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The addition of a new paragraph at the end to cover village design statements is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Urban Structure	Policy 7	Land Use Division in Towns and Large Villages
--	-----------------	--

Modification Number: 063

Representation No: M 81
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The whole of this section is considered to need closer scrutiny in agreement with the Proposed Modification.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 065

Representation No: M 82
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Show land to the rear of Pickford Road (identified as proposal 56) which is within the settlement boundary of Markyate as open land.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification. No reasons were given by the objector.

Plan Ref: Development Control	Policy 9A	Infrastructure Provision and Phasing
--	------------------	---

Modification Number: 070

Representation No: M 83

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

New policy on infrastructure provision and phasing is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Housing	Policy 17	Supply of New Housing
------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

Modification Number: 081

Representation No: M 84

Commenter: Beechwood Homes Ltd

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Concern is raised over the land supply calculations and assumptions underpinning those calculations provided by the council in meeting the remainder of the structure plan requirement for the period 2001 to 2011. Particular concern is raised because the objector believes that not enough provision has been allowed for the period 2001-2006.

It is noted that the calculations have been moved on from 1997 to 2001. At the time of the local plan inquiry, the housing supply figures were updated to 1999. All the figures up to that time were available for scrutiny by objectors and the Inspector. The Inspector concluded that the methodology and assumptions put forward by the council, particularly in relation to unidentified sites that may come forward as well as recommending that the assumed dwelling capacity of the identified sites be raised in line with PPG3 density ranges.

Whilst it is appreciated that the Council have attempted to do this as part of the Proposed Modifications, the concern is that there is not enough information provided to determine whether assumptions the council has made, particularly in relation to the unidentified sites, are indeed healthy enough to provide some certainty that the level of unidentified sites assumed will come forward as predicted over the remainder of the plan period and especially between 2001 - 2006. Unlike the previous figures put forward in 1999, the 2001 base date calculations have not had the benefit of independent analysis.

PPG3 states that the local plan should ensure a 5 year minimum supply of identified sites for housing development. The 5 year requirement from the residual structure plan requirement is 1888 from 2001 - 2006 (3777 divided by 10 multiplied by 5). The council indicate that of the Part 1 sites, 2124 dwellings remain to be completed as at 2001 but that only 696 have planning permission. Updated information is required as to what proportion of the remainder has planning permission or has been completed. The concern is that there will be a shortfall which will not be made up by windfall sites over this period.

Finally, there appears to be little or no mention of the urban capacity study referred to in the Inspector's report that was supposed to help inform the council about the potential of windfall sites.

In view of the above, it is our view that the council should bring forward one or two of the greenfield sites eg H43 - Land to the rear of Watford Road, Kings Langley so as to provide certainty that the proposed land supply is indeed adequate for the first 5 years of the plan period.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector raises a number of concerns about the land supply calculations and assumptions underpinning the housing programme to Policy 17, especially in view of the updating of the figures to 2001. The objector is concerned that the Plan has not been informed by an urban capacity study and concludes that there will be a shortfall in dwelling provision between 2001-2006. In order to address this problem the objector suggests bringing forward one or two of the greenfield housing sites in Part II of the Housing Schedule.

The Inspector specifically encouraged the Council to update the figures to 2001, and it is inevitable that the figures would change. However, the Council, has taken full account of his revised methodology in rolling forward the windfall sites to 2001. All relevant figures have been amended in the background to the policy and additional text added to explain any changes in approach. Furthermore, a new summary table has been incorporated to explain the different sources of assumptions used in the revised housing programme. The Council believes that these provide a clear and reasonable level of detail to support the assumptions behind the housing programme.

The Inspector in his report specifically responded to concerns about a 5-year housing supply required by PPG3 (paras. 7.4.46-7.4.51). The Inspector looked at all Part 1 sites, not just those with planning permission, and took into account that not every site would come forward. He was satisfied at the time that the Plan did identify sufficient land to accommodate at least 5-years supply of housing development in the Plan in national guidance.

Following the approach to the 5-year housing supply adopted by the Inspector (para. 7.4.49) the position at 1.4.01 is:

- (a) Remaining 10 year Structure Plan requirement = 3,777
- (b) Annual rate of provision $(3,777/10) = 378$
- (c) 5 year provision $(378 \times 5) = 1,890$
- (d) Total Phase 1 sites = 2,542
- (e) Excess over 5 year figure $[(d) - (c)] = 652$

The above calculations indicate that there is an excess of 652 dwellings over the 5-year housing requirement. Therefore given the preceding points and that the Council has followed the Inspector's methodology, it is satisfied that there is a sufficient 5-year housing land supply identified in the Plan.

The objector raises concerns about the level of allocated sites with planning permission. This was not an issue that unduly concerned the Inspector when he was considering a 5-year supply. In any event, the update of the position demonstrates that subsequent to 2001 many more of the schemes in the Housing schedule had benefited from planning permission and/or were being implemented. Two significant housing sites in Part 1 of the Housing Schedule are greenfield and unlikely to commence until close to the adoption of the Plan. However, they are expected to progress within the period to 2006. Policy 18 would ensure that the housing supply is monitored and allow greenfield sites to come forward if needed.

The Inspector in his report made reference to the progress of an urban capacity study in the Borough (paras. 7.4.41-7.4.43). This study related to work led by the County Council to inform assumptions about the type and amount of housing land in respect of the Structure Plan review (SPR). The results have been considered as part of the consultation on the deposit draft of the SPR. The Council and County Council concluded that greenfield sites are still required as insufficient previously developed sites can be identified, which supports the Inspector's conclusion. Furthermore, he did not make any direct reference to an urban capacity in his recommendations to Policy 17 (7.4.174-7.4.176). The Inspector, based on his detailed consideration of the housing supply, was doubtful that the urban capacity study would reveal that the Council had overlooked large amounts of previously developed land that could be built on over the Plan period (para. 7.4.42).

Given the above points, the Council does not consider that the objections raised justify bringing forward any Part II proposal sites.

Representation No: M 85
Commenter: Wilson Connolly Limited
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

In accordance with PPG3, the time period for the Borough Local Plan should be amended to extend to December 2013 or April 2014. Accordingly Policy 17 requires amendment to include additional housing provision. Based on the Structure Plan requirement 1991-2011 (i.e. 360 dwellings per annum), some 1,000 additional dwelling units will need to be provided for.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council accepts that a new ministerial statement has been issued requiring Local Plans to make provision for a 10 year supply of housing from the date of adoption of the Plan. However, it considers that it would be inappropriate to identify a housing programme to 2013 or beyond (effectively the objector is asking to identify an additional 20% or more housing supply than currently in the Plan).

The Structure Plan covers the period 1991-2011. It sets out the Borough's housing contribution that needs to be met over this period of time. PPG12: Development Plans, clearly states that local plans must be in general conformity with structure plans (paragraph 6.1). Furthermore, where possible, local plans should be prepared to the same period covered by structure plans (paragraph 6.8).

To extend the Plan to December 2013 or April 2014, as suggested by the objector, would be well beyond the time period in the Structure Plan. Nor would it be reasonable given the absence of confirmed strategic advice on district housing levels post 2011. The review of the Structure Plan will cover the time-scale 2001 to 2021. It is currently on hold and it is not anticipated that the document will be progressed to adoption. Work on the review of Regional Guidance (RPG 14) is at an early stage and is expected will provide the local housing requirements. The issue of housing land provision beyond 2011 should therefore be addressed once strategic guidance is in place, and this should be progressed and tested through the new Local Development Framework (LDF). The Council hopes to commence work on the LDF document in early 2004.

The issue of a 5-year housing supply is dealt with in the Council's response to similar objections from Beechwood Homes (Representation No. M84).

Plan Ref: Housing	Policy 18	Control over Housing Land Supply
------------------------------------	------------------	---

Modification Number: 083
Representation No: M 86
Commenter: Wilson Connolly Limited
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Reference is made in the policy to sites in Part II of the schedule not being released before 2006 provided there is no substantial oversupply of housing. It is added that further advice to assist the process will be set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance.

In the light of the concerns over the adequacy of housing land supply and given that we are now well into the second half of 2003, it is considered that the SPG should be made available as soon as possible in order to help landowners/developers and the local community know about the mechanics of the process.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The need for clear advice regarding the release of Part II greenfield sites is accepted. As acknowledged by the objector, it is the Council's intention to produce a timetable setting out this process. This timetable and any associated advice regarding the housing land reserve will be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. The production of this document is a priority and is intended to be brought forward as soon as possible.

Representation No:**M 87**

Commenter:

Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

The references to a 5 year or 6 year land supply should be revised in the light of recent clarification of Government policy.

Policy 18 states that housing sites listed in Part II will normally be released after April 2006, provided there is not an oversupply of housing. The definition of a substantial oversupply is now proposed to be reduced to "a minimum of 6 years supply", following the Inspector's recommendation.

However, in July 2003, Mr Keith Hill, the Minister for Housing and planning, issued a statement which clarified the Government's position on this issue. The statement makes it clear that Local Plans should provide for a 10 year supply of housing, of which at least 5 years supply should be in the form of identified sites. This supply should be calculated from the expected date of adoption.

The Proposed Modification to the final paragraph of policy 18 should therefore be altered to state that a substantial oversupply will be in excess of 10 years supply. This will also require a consequential change to substitute 10 years in place of 5 years in sub-paragraph (a) of the Policy.

In addition, in the Deposit Draft, Policy 18 allowed 'Part III' sites to be brought forward either if there was a land supply shortfall, or to provide affordable housing, or where there were "overriding planning advantages". With the deletion of Part III and the revised policy wording, some of these exceptions have been lost. The amended version of Policy 18 allows Part II sites to be released early if necessary to ensure a 5 year supply, but omits the exceptions relating to affordable housing and overriding benefits. If these exceptional circumstances were previously considered to justify the early release of Part III sites, there is no logical reason in principle why the same considerations should not be allowed to exceptionally justify the release of Part II sites, either (i) before April 2006; or (ii) after April 2006 in circumstances where for example housing supply considerations alone do not require the development, but other planning benefits justify bringing it forward.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector raises similar arguments to Wilson Connolly over the recent ministerial statement on housing. The Council's response to this issue can be found in its response to Wilson Connolly under Proposed Modification 81.

The objector also suggests that when considering the issue of oversupply the policy should be amended to reflect a 10-year period. The Inspector considered this issue in detail in his report (para. 7.5.38-7.5.43), but had serious reservations about the appropriateness of using periods in excess of 6 years, particularly with regards to ensuring that priority is given to the reuse of urban land before greenfield sites. Therefore, it does not consider changes to the wording to Policy 18 are warranted.

In dealing with the (then) Part III sites referred to in Policy 18 in his report, the Inspector specifically considered objections to the role of affordable housing and “overriding planning advantages” in justifying the earlier release of housing reserve sites (paras. 7.5.46-7.5.49). With respect to the former criterion, he concluded that it was no longer appropriate for greenfield sites identified for implementation beyond the Plan period to be released early solely on the grounds that the site would be used for affordable housing. However, the Inspector has inserted new wording in the policy to make clear that Part II sites could be released earlier. This would be where all of a site is used for affordable housing and where it meets any shortfall in the target provision of this type of housing sought under Policy 21. The Council has accepted the amended wording.

In terms of the role of planning advantages, the Inspector felt that this factor was unacceptably ambiguous and could be open to abuse. He considered the criterion should be deleted, but added that its absence would not prevent the Council granting permission for a reserved site if they were satisfied that other material considerations existed of sufficient weight to justify a departure from the Plan.

Given the aforementioned points, the Council does not consider it necessary to make any changes to the policy suggested by the objector.

Plan Ref:	Policy 19	The Size of New Dwellings
Housing		

Modification Number: 086

Representation No: M 88

Commenter: Mr. Colin Campbell GO - East

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The requirement that at least 10% of all dwellings on housing sites accommodating 25 or more dwellings shall be designed as life-time homes should be removed as the internal design of buildings is not a land use matter.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of lifetime homes was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector agreed that the Council should indicate more clearly its support for the provision of such dwellings, in the light of the framework for sustainable development set out in the Structure Plan and advice contained in RPG9 and PPG3. By implication, it is reasonable to assume that the Inspector was satisfied that this was a land-use matter.

Dwellings designed as lifetime homes do not differ significantly from standard housing except in terms of their internal layout. However, some specific requirements apply to external design features, such as the use of ramps rather than steps, the absence of door-sills and the provision of wider doorways to allow wheelchair access.

The requirement regarding lifetime homes is therefore considered to be a land-use matter and an appropriate issue to be addressed through Local Plan policy.

The proposed wording for Policy 19 is taken directly from the Inspector’s Recommendation (7.6.26).

Representation No: M 89
Commenter: Tesco Stores Limited
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The commitment to undertake a study of the need for live work units is a general requirement and not one that should be associated only with the H4 site.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This objection is more appropriately related to Modification 86, rather than Decision 127 as stated. Although raised in connection with Proposal H4 the issue of live / work units is dealt with under Modification 87 (Policy 19).

The objector's comment that this is a general rather than site-specific requirement is accepted. Any study of the need / demand for live-work units will cover the whole Borough. It is not intended to relate solely to Housing Proposal Site H4.

Plan Ref: Housing	Policy 20	Conversions
------------------------------------	------------------	--------------------

Modification Number: 088

Representation No: M 90

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Supports the insertion of a new paragraph in the policy to state that the Council will actively encourage the use of vacant commercial premises and upper floors above shops for housing in line with Government guidance in paragraph 41 of PPG3.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Housing	Policy 21	Affordable Housing
------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Modification Number: 090

Representation No: M 91

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the cut in affordable housing provision. The District needs more affordable homes to meet the housing requirements of key workers.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of the overall target for affordable housing was discussed in a round table discussion at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector was of the opinion that the Council's aspirational target of 2,900 affordable homes over the plan period was unrealistic. He recommended a more achievable target of 1500 dwellings between 1999-2011. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to reinstate a higher figure.

As part of the Modifications to the plan, the Council has updated the housing programme to cover

the 10 year period from 2001-2011. The indicative affordable housing target has been updated accordingly. Achieving 125 dwellings a year over this 10 year period equates to a total of 1250 dwellings. The revised figure is considered to be reasonable and justifiable.

It should be noted that lowering the overall target will not lead to any reduction in the level of affordable housing provision sought on individual housing sites. Indeed, Proposed Modification 90 to Policy 21 introduces a new lower threshold for affordable housing contributions in Tring, the small villages and other specified locations.

Representation No: M 92
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Concerns are raised over negotiations between developers and Dacorum Borough Council with regard to affordable housing provision in large villages, without reference to the Parish Council.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

This representation is interpreted firstly as an objection to affordable housing being a negotiated element of new housing schemes, rather than a mandatory requirement. Secondly, the Parish Council objects to their lack of involvement in the negotiation process.

The planning requirements for sites contained within the Housing Schedule – such as Manor Farm in Markyate – clearly sets out the percentage of total units that should be set aside as ‘affordable.’

On windfall sites, (i.e. those not listed within the Housing Schedule), it is important to negotiate with developers the type and level of contribution towards affordable housing. This is to ensure the contribution is fair and reasonable, taking into account the individual site characteristics. Such an approach is required through government guidance. In practice, Parish Councils do not get directly involved with these negotiations. However, any negotiation usually takes into account local circumstances, such as the level and type of accommodation identified in local needs assessments for that area (see below).

The Housing Needs Survey is an independent assessment of need throughout the Borough, carried out by private consultants appointed by the Council. However, Parish Councils are encouraged to become involved in the issue of affordable housing. For example, involvement in the production of Village Appraisals can help to identify housing need at the local level. Parish Councils can also be directly involved in undertaking / supporting local needs surveys and in promoting small-scale sites to meet any identified need.

Plan Ref: Housing	Policy 22	Density of Development in Residential Areas
------------------------------------	------------------	--

Modification Number: 092
Representation No: M 93
Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Concern is raised over the impact as it will change the character of a town, especially where larger plots come up for development: it will cause developers to strive for larger schemes such as already under appeal on Graemsdyke Road.

Strong concern that local character will be lost over the years.

Special guidance will need to be worded very tightly if we are to avoid poorly integrated schemes; 'compatible with..' is open to interpretation in unexpected ways.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Policy 22 has been carefully worded to ensure that the issue of local character is fully considered. The fifth paragraph (as amended) clearly states that housing proposals will not be permitted if the density of the scheme would adversely affect the amenity and/or existing character of the surrounding area. The character advice contained in Development in Residential Areas (to become Supplementary Planning Guidance) remains a material consideration in all relevant planning applications.

The new paragraphs setting out density requirements reflect government advice contained in PPG3: Housing (revised). The Inspector specifically recommended their inclusion within the policy (Recommendation 7.9.17).

Representation No:

M 94

Commenter:

Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Policy 22 - Careful consideration will be given to the density of all new housing proposals to ensure that they make the most efficient use of the land available. Density will generally be expected to be in the range of 30-50 per hectare net.

The Parish Council feel that there is not one area that this does not apply to and it must be determined whether a small village or not. They should be built to fit into the location in order to encourage wildlife and not built on top of hills, etc. They should be built within the core of the village but the village atmosphere must be maintained.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of whether Markyate should be categorised as a small or large village is considered in the response to Modification 27.

Agree with the objector's statement that new development within Markyate should be built to fit in with its location and maintain its village atmosphere. Plan policies would direct new development to existing locations within the village. Policy 22 has been carefully worded to ensure densities are appropriate to their locations, including rural villages.

The new paragraphs setting out density requirements reflect government advice contained in PPG3 (revised). The Inspector specifically recommended their inclusion within the policy (Recommendation 7.9.17). As a general principle, it is important that when land becomes available for housing that it is used efficiently, taking into account the existing character of the surrounding area. Higher density housing can help to achieve a more sustainable pattern of development and limit the impact of development on the countryside.

Modification Number: 093

Representation No: M 95

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Supports the insertion of additional paragraph referring to the general principles behind the creation of sustainable residential environments given in PPG3, particularly the mention of the role of character area appraisals and statements.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Housing

Policy 23

Extensions to Dwellings in the Green Belt and the Rural Area

Modification Number: 094

Representation No: M 96

Commenter: Mr. David Nobbs Chipperfield Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Supports the clarification of the size of permissible extensions and their establishment at a reasonable level.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Housing

Policy 27B

Residential Moorings

Modification Number: 105

Representation No: M 97

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Supports the insertion of a new policy on Residential Moorings in the Housing Chapter, particularly the reference to the historic or visual character of the canal.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Housing

Schedule of Housing Proposal Sites

Modification Number: 121

Representation No: M 98

Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. J Armstrong

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Site H44 should be reinstated in the proposed Housing Schedule List and the relevant maps amended accordingly for the following reasons:-

The Local Plan Inspector has incorrectly identified the position with regard to the provision of the additional playing fields for Markyate. Markyate has an acknowledged deficiency of open space which can only be addressed as part of a development on site H44.

Development of the site H44 would not increase the dangers and risks to pedestrians and users to the junction of Buckwood Road / High Street. The Inspector noted that the Highway implications were marginally better for sites H45 and H44 than at Manor Farm. This would clearly be even better if only site H44 were developed.

The amended site H44 does not extend the existing settlement edge of the village, further in the westerly direction and the attached plan introduces a strengthening of the settlement boundary edge. Elsewhere the Inspector has commented that the new boundary planting would be acceptable as part of Green Belt boundary adjustments.

The Inspector was incorrect in his assessment of the impact of development on H44 notably in paragraph 7.38.13 where he indicated that the site was visible from footpath 1 A5 to Windmill Road. Factually, this is incorrect.

Site H44 is well contained within the landscape by mature hedgerows and the property known as "Gooseacre" as well as being at the bottom of a dry valley. The Inspector's criticisms of the impact that the development would have within the landscape are overstated and in our opinion unduly influenced by the impact of site H45. In any event, the amended site H44 was not considered by the Inspector.

The amended site area of H44 is 0.5 hectares. Using the Government's density range in PPG3 this would provide housing of between 15 to 25 units of which approximately 50% would be affordable.

The Council members have expressed a commitment to reduce the amount of green field developed sites proposed in the Local Plan.

Given the recent additional housing numbers within and around Markyate, it is clear that there is no longer a need to allocate a green field site for development of 40 units within the plan period, as this would clearly substantially exceed what was reasonably and genuinely required. It would also clearly be at odds with the Inspector's recommendation that a higher level (more than 120 to 130) dwellings of housing was not warranted in Markyate.

With regard to housing numbers within the village, we would refer to the Local Planning Authority's document 524 Representation 4741 DBC/2/A. The Council's evidence suggested 120 to 130 additional dwellings should be provided at Markyate for the period 1991 to 2011. The evidence of the Local Plan Inquiry indicated that completions between 1991 and 1999 amounted to 39 dwellings. It was estimated that the level of housing from regeneration from 1999 to 2001 would provide an additional 40 dwellings and that green field sites would provide a further 40 dwellings making a total of 119 dwellings. An additional 10 dwellings were added, making a total of 130 dwellings. By our calculations, the Council is expecting an annual build rate within Markyate village of 3.33 dwellings per annum for the period 1999 to 2011. It is apparent that with completions since 1999 and having regard to recent planning permissions, it can be reasonably expected that the number of dwellings from regeneration estimated by the Council will be substantially exceeded.

The case for 40 dwellings on a green field site adjoining the village can no longer be substantiated. This is a material change in circumstances, since the evidence produced before the Local Plan Inspector. This change should be reconsidered as part of the modifications.

There is no justification on the basis of current evidence of a need for 40 dwellings on a green field site in Markyate and it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to identify housing beyond the plan period since this clearly goes beyond the Council's own submissions and the Inspector's recommendations. There is no development site allocated in the Local Plan beyond the plan period and no case has been made that Markyate should be an exception.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Both the Council and the Inquiry Inspector accept that there is a shortfall of formal recreational space in the village. The objector has offered land that was being used temporarily as playing fields as permanent open space. However, the Inspector did not consider that it was reasonable to link the offer of permanent play space to the proposal, as the development of the site itself does not require the provision of additional recreational space. He attached limited weight to the offer. The Council supports his view and does not consider that the site should be reinstated in the Plan.

The Inspector in his report had serious reservations over highway issues in dealing with the development of H44, which he considered separately from H45. Indeed the revised scheme continues to put forward a similar number of dwellings despite the reduction in site area. Whilst he acknowledged that the highway implications could be marginally worse in respect of Manor Farm (Proposal H50A), he was not convinced that the difference was so great as to make the sites at Buckwood Road (H44 and H45) preferable in highway terms (para. 7.61.15). Furthermore, the Inspector was satisfied that Manor Farm was more sustainable than the latter sites (para. 7.38.39), would have considerably less impact on the character of the AONB (para. 7.61.5), and, unlike H44 or H45, would not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the village (paras 7.38.18, 7.39.7 and 7.61.6). The reduction of the site area does not address the Inspector's key criticisms of H44 because a similar amount of housing is proposed, the village is extended to the west (with hedgerow loss to provide an access) and substantial planting is required to provide a western boundary. Given these points the Council is not satisfied that the revised scheme would be materially different from that originally considered.

The Council agrees that the Inspector may have accepted the role of new boundary planting in limiting the impact of development in the case of other greenfield sites he supported. However, the Inspector indicates that the visual impact is heightened by the lack of existing landscape features. He did consider the issue of new landscaping along the western boundary, but concluded the western edge of the village was already well defined. He was not satisfied that this factor was sufficient to outweigh the serious impact on the character of the AONB.

The Council disagrees with the objector over how visible the site is from footpath FP1. It accepts the Inspector's view at para. 7.38.13 of his report, that H44 is visible from FP1.

The fact that the amended scheme does not extend beyond the existing line of the settlement is not considered to be a significant factor in support of the revised proposal. In assessing H44, the Inspector was clearly not satisfied with the location of the site in terms of its impact on the CAONB (e.g. its position on the valley side, its prominence and the removal of existing hedgerows etc.) and on the character of the village. Therefore, even with a reduction in the size of the site, it would still raise fundamental concerns and not have a significant effect on the impacts identified by the Inspector.

The objector questions the need to identify proposal H50A given the high levels of current completions and commitments and the concern that these would exceed what is considered to be reasonably required to meet the local needs of the village. The Council accepts the broad level of figures supplied by the objector to support this view. However, the Council considers that the updated figures should be modified to reflect the net change on each site and those that are actually located within the village boundary as follows:

Completions 1991-99	39
Completions 1999-01	18
Completions 2001-03	2
Commitments 1.4.03	57
Total	116

The identification of H50A (40 units) would apparently give a current total of 156 dwellings.

However, the objector accepts that there is doubt with at least one of the commitments (Harts Motor site – 9 dwellings). This alone would reduce the supply to 107 dwellings. The Inspector indicated in his report at para. 7.38.7, that the Council's conclusion that around 120-130 dwellings would be appropriate to meet local need does not appear unreasonable. It is acknowledged that retaining the H50A proposal in the Plan exceeds by up to 17 dwellings the level of dwellings the Inspector concluded to be appropriate to meet local need. Whilst it would be an option to reduce the extent of H50A by some 17 dwellings, on balance it is concluded that this would not be appropriate. H50A contributes to meeting the district wide housing requirement as well as the local needs of Markyate. A reduction in its contribution would require the identification of an additional site elsewhere if the overall housing figures are to be maintained. An additional site for 17 dwellings would have to be either a site already considered and rejected by the Inspector or a wholly new site not subject to any previous assessment or comparison. Conversely, in site specific terms, the whole of the H50 site was found to be acceptable by the Inspector. To carry out a further site search assessing all potential sites in the district on a comparative basis would significantly delay the adoption of the plan and it is not considered that the scale of the `excess` on site H50A justifies such delay. The Council considers that priority should be given to making progress on the Local Plan.

The release of Manor Farm will be governed by criteria in Policy 18 (Control over housing land supply). The policy allows for the monitoring of the housing supply and if no requirement exists at 2006 the site will not come forward. The Council considers that this will control the release of H50A. The policy will be supplemented by a SPG on the release of housing land reserve sites. This will consider in detail the priority of release of the Manor Farm site in relation to other greenfield sites and the overall housing land supply. It would also need to specifically take account of housing supply in the village in relation to local housing need.

The Inspector had critical concerns about the suitability of the H44 site, which do not appear to have been overcome through this revised proposal. On balance therefore, the Council considers that the site should be retained in the Plan.

Representation No: M 99

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the deletion of Housing Proposal Site H44.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council is satisfied that the removal of Housing Proposal H44 from the Housing Schedule is appropriate and justified. This accords with the Inquiry Inspector's recommendation to delete the site on the basis of concerns over its impact on the character of the AONB and of the village, and the potential impact on highway safety. The objector offers no reasoning as to why this proposal should not be deleted.

Modification Number: 126

Representation No: M 100

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The proposed change in the Settlement boundary accords with the Inspector's recommendation, and will enable the comprehensive development of sites H52 and C1/L1, to provide for a new school, playing fields and housing, thus providing substantial benefits to the local community.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 137

Representation No: M 102

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the Schedule of Housing Proposal Sites. Particular reference to H4 - programme of archaeological evaluation; H49A - to respect the setting; H52 - archaeological requirements in relation to remnants of Grims Ditch; H50 - archaeological requirements; H50A - harmonising with the conservation area.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 103

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Deletion of Housing Sites H44 and H45 is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 104

Commenter: Mr. P Mc Cann Banner Homes

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the inclusion of the Manor Farm site in Part II of the Schedule of Housing Proposal Sites.

It provides an opportunity for the extension of the built up area of Markyate to meet an acknowledged need for housing in the village. It also will make a valuable contribution to the district wide housing requirement. It will enable the growth of the village in the form of a traditional pattern of development along the valley. We agree with the Inspector that it is the best location for an extension to the village particularly as the boundaries elsewhere are well defined by landscape features and vegetation. As accepted by the Inspector development will not result in an adverse harmful impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the character of the village or the setting of the Conservation Area. Nor will it be detrimental to the setting of the historic park of Markyate cell or have a direct impact on the Listed farmhouse or its setting.

The development proposals for this site will include benefits for the wider community. The most significant of these are the delivery of much needed affordable housing for the village, the proposed parking for the visitors to the burial ground, highway improvements to the High Street, and a new footpath link from the site providing access to the school.

Bearing in mind these significant benefits, it would be preferable if the site would be made available earlier than April 2006. We have submitted a separate objection solely to the timing of the site's release.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council has followed the Inspector's recommendation of placing small greenfield sites in Part II of the Housing Schedule. He was clear in his report that any greenfield sites in Markyate should be treated in a similar way to sites elsewhere in the Borough in the spirit of advice in PPG3 (para. 7.38.10). Furthermore, in dealing with Manor Farm the Inspector would have been

fully aware of a range of benefits to the village of developing the site (including the amount of affordable housing), but was still satisfied that it should remain as a housing land reserve. Therefore, the Council considers that it is appropriate for the site to continue to be retained in Part II of the Housing Schedule.

The release of Manor Farm will be governed by criteria in Policy 18 (Control over housing land supply). The Council considers that this is an appropriate mechanism for judging when H50A should be released. Whilst the benefits the proposal brings are welcomed, they are not considered to warrant an early release of the site.

The policy is to be supplemented by a SPG on the release of housing land reserve sites. This will consider in detail the priority of release of the Manor Farm site in relation to other greenfield sites and the overall housing land supply. It would also need to take account of housing supply in the village in relation to local housing need.

The Council accepts that there is an acknowledged shortfall of burial space in the village. However, it would be unreasonable to include the extension of the burial ground as a planning requirement as the development itself would not directly necessitate this. In any event, the Council feels that it would be more appropriate for the issue of the cemetery extension to be explored through the production of the Development Brief). No date is yet fixed for the brief and will be related to the timing of the likely release of the site.

Representation No: M 105
Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the proposal to bring forward Housing Site H52 into Part II of the Schedule. This development, combined with the proposed development of Site C1 / L1 for educational and leisure uses will provide significant benefits to the local community, and will make the best use of previously developed land.

Whilst the notional capacity of the site is shown as 100 dwellings, it should be noted that the area proposed for housing development is 4.4ha, and allowing for the preservation of archaeological remains where necessary, and other possible planning requirements, the net site capacity may be in the region of 140 - 160 units.

The proposed amendments to the text relating to affordable housing, off-site highway works and education contributions are noted, and will need to be discussed in the context of the overall development package for sites H52 and C1 / L1

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 838
Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:**M 101**

Commenter:

Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objection to the new Housing Proposal site H50A at Manor Farm because it will elongate the village; increase traffic problems at a very busy junction; include 12 more houses than are needed; five parking spaces at the cemetery are insufficient. Concern is also expressed regarding the school footpath.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Note: This objection relates to the Housing Schedule and has therefore been considered under Modification 137, rather than 131 as specified by the objector.

The identification of this new proposal site stems directly from Inspector's recommendation 7.61.31, which the Council has accepted.

The Inspector considered a number of issues in detail, including the impact on the character of the village and highway issues. In respect of the issue of character, he concluded in his report that the site would be a natural extension of the traditional linear form of the village (para. 7.61.6).

The Inspector was not persuaded that the immediate and wider highway effects of the site would rule it out as an appropriate location for housing (paras. 7.61.10-7.61.16). He also compared the highway implications of Manor Farm to sites at Buckwood Road. The inspector considered (para. 7.61.15) that development of H44 and H45 would be less than ideal in highway terms, that the highway differences between these two sites and Manor Farm were not so significant as to make them more preferable, and that in comparing landscape implications he considered that H50A was a better site overall.

The objector is concerned about whether the site is needed, given recent planning permissions for housing in Markyate. The implication of the objection, therefore, is that the high levels of current completions and commitments together with proposal H50A would exceed what is considered to be reasonably required to meet the local needs of the village.

The site has been identified to meet the local needs of the village. The Inspector felt that a level of 120-130 dwellings over the Plan period would be reasonable and that H50A would contribute towards this. It is included as a Part II proposal for development after 2006.

The Council accepts that there have been a number of housing schemes approved in Markyate. The position has been quantified and is set out in the response to proposal H44. However, there is no guarantee that all sites with planning permission will come forward (e.g. Harts Motor site – 9 dwellings). The Inspector indicated in his report at para. 7.38.7, that the Council's conclusion that around 120-130 dwellings would be appropriate to meet local need does not appear unreasonable. It is acknowledged that retaining the H50A proposal in the Plan exceeds by up to 17 dwellings the level of dwellings the Inspector concluded to be appropriate to meet local need. Whilst it would be an option to reduce the extent of H50A by some 17 dwellings, on balance it is concluded that this would not be appropriate. H50A contributes to meeting the district wide housing requirement as well as the local needs of Markyate. A reduction in its contribution would require the identification of an additional site elsewhere if the overall housing figures are to be maintained. An additional site for 17 dwellings would have to be either a site already considered and rejected by the Inspector or a wholly new site not subject to any previous assessment or comparison. Conversely, in site specific terms, the whole of the H50 site was found to be acceptable by the Inspector. To carry out a further site search assessing all potential sites in the district on a comparative basis would significantly delay the adoption of the plan and it is not considered that the scale of the `excess` on site H50A justifies such delay. The Council considers that priority should be given to making progress on the Local Plan. Policy 18 allows for the monitoring of the housing supply and if no requirement exists at 2006, the site will not come forward. On balance therefore, the Council considers that the site should be retained in the Plan.

The release of Manor Farm will be governed by criteria in Policy 18 (Control over housing land supply). The Council considers that this will control the release of H50A. The policy will be supplemented by a SPG on the release of housing land reserve sites. This will consider in detail the priority of release of the Manor Farm site in relation to other greenfield sites and the overall housing land supply. It would also need to specifically take account of housing supply in the village, as raised by the objector, in relation to local housing need.

The Inspector considered the issue of a footpath link to the school in his report (para. 7.61.4). He believed that there would be benefits in securing the link as it would be a virtually traffic free route, it would shorten the distance between the site and the school, and that the route would be on land in the same ownership as H50A. Given these points the Council feels it is reasonable to retain reference to a footpath link.

The issues of highway improvements, parking spaces for the cemetery, school footpath and public open space were considered at the inquiry and the detail will be explored through the production of a development brief, which is a planning requirement for the site. No date is yet fixed for the brief and will be related to the likely timing of the release of the site. The level of parking proposed for the cemetery was recommended by the Inspector and is a minimum. He set this level having regard to what he felt to be a reasonable amount to serve the cemetery.

Representation No:

M 106

Commenter:

Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objection to the designation of Site H4 as solely for housing use. There is concern that the Borough's latest designation will conflict with the possibility for mixed development, thereby generating employment in the Town. If Tesco are intransigent about selling the site, an alternative mix of housing and supermarket should be considered, thereby reducing out of Town shopping travel and meeting aspects of Policy 1A.

The Borough should have a target for 50% (as opposed to 33%) affordable homes where possible.

This secondary access is unacceptable because it is a narrow congested residential street.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of whether this site should be allocated for a mixed-use scheme, incorporating both housing and food retail was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry.

In the light of commercial considerations and the statutory powers the Council has to acquire land, the Inspector agreed that there still remains a reasonable prospect of the site being developed for housing during the Plan period and the designation should therefore remain unchanged. In addition, the Inspector was not satisfied that further convenience shopping provision of the scale envisaged was required in Berkhamsted during the Plan period. Designating Site H4 for retail uses would have a detrimental impact on the vitality and viability of Berkhamsted town centre and would therefore be contrary to the retail strategy set out within the Local Plan. He therefore concluded that a mixed use scheme was not appropriate.

The Council remains of the view that a supermarket development on part of the site would undermine the town centre and those policies that seek to ensure the town centre remains both vital and viable.

No final decision has yet been made regarding the provision of secondary access points to the site. The planning requirements only state that access from Belton Road / Riverside Gardens should be investigated. This investigation will be carried out as part of the Development Brief process.

The percentage of units to be set aside for affordable housing was not discussed at the Inquiry. As no changes were therefore put forward as part of the Council's Proposed Modifications, this part of the Town Council's objection is not considered to be duly made. However, the Council considers that the level of affordable housing is fair and reasonable given the site's size, nature and location.

Representation No: M 107
Commenter: The Crown Estate
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The requirements should make it clear that local health facilities could be provided off-site and that this development should only be expected to make a contribution towards such facilities that is fairly and reasonably related in scale (in accordance with Annex B of Circular 1/97 'Planning Obligations').

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The precise scale and nature of any proposed health facilities and their location will be assessed fully through the Development Brief process.

The role and scope of planning conditions and obligations is clearly set out in Policy 11 of the Deposit Draft Plan (incorporating Proposed Modification 73). This policy was supported by the Inspector and reflects guidance set out in Annex B of Circular 1/97. All developer contributions will be expected to comply fully with this guidance.

Representation No: M 108
Commenter: The Crown Estate
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The increase in the area allocated for housing is supported as this will help reduce reliance on unidentified sites. It is however noted that the net capacity of the site is indicated as being 350 dwellings. This equates to a density of 30 dwellings per hectare if the land to be retained for open space is excluded from the site area (11.6ha).

It is suggested that the following is added to the planning requirements:

"The net capacity of the site given above is for indicative purposes only. The capacity of the site will be established through preparation of a masterplan. The capacity of the site should be optimised."

This amendment accords with guidance in Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 'Housing,' which states at paragraph 57:

"policies which place unduly restrictive ceilings on the amount of housing that can be accommodated on a site, irrespective of its location and the type of housing envisaged or the types of household likely to occupy the housing, should be avoided"

A higher density of development would also be in keeping with the character of existing development, for example Hunters Oak adjacent to the site has a density of 37.5 dwellings per hectare (242 dwellings on 6.45 hectares).

The planning requirements should also be amended as follows.

The reference to a development brief should be extended to make reference to the fact that this will be prepared in conjunction with the land-holders and other stakeholders.

The reference to a 30m wide landscape buffer is considered to be too prescriptive and should be deleted. If the text is retained it should be amended to read (amendment shown in bold): "the

buffers should be effective and contain semi-mature and mature broad leaved native trees".

The reference to vehicular access is also considered too detailed. The Inspector commented that it would be better for the requirements to be left reasonably flexible in order not to preclude detailed consideration. The reference to vehicular access should therefore be deleted.

The planning requirements also state that the site cannot be developed in the absence of a comprehensively planned transport infrastructure and off-site highway improvements, including completion of the North East Hemel Hempstead Relief Road. This statement is at odds with the requirements relating to E4 which allows for phased road improvements. More fundamentally it is considered that the reference to detailed requirements will again preclude detailed consideration, bearing in mind that any contributions towards off-site improvements should be fairly and reasonably related in scale (in accordance with Annex B of Circular 1/97 'Planning Obligations'). The requirements should therefore be deleted. If they are retained they should be amended to read: "appropriate contributions will be sought towards the provision of off-site infrastructure, which will be provided on a phased basis."

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The support for the increase in the site area allocated for housing is welcomed.

The issue of appropriate dwelling capacity was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector considered it important to give the Council sufficient flexibility to ensure that a satisfactory relationship could be achieved with the adjacent employment site and to provide adequate open space to meet the future recreational needs of the additional population. He therefore recommended a capacity of 350 dwellings and the Council has accepted this recommendation. In principle, a higher level of housing could be considered by the Council when the site comes forward for development, provided this is not to the detriment of other planning requirements for the site and complies with other policies in the Plan.

The Council will seek the involvement of the general public, landowners and other interested parties when producing the development brief for the site. This approach is in accordance with advice from central government set out in PP12: Development Plans. The planning requirements for H27 include a clear cross-reference to Proposal E4 and state that development should be planned comprehensively with this adjacent site. The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for E4 states that Dacorum Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, Hertfordshire County Council and the landowners will all be involved in future joint working, with the aim of preparing a masterplan and planning briefs. It is therefore not considered necessary to add any further text regarding this issue.

The requirements relating to highways issues remain unaltered from the Deposit Draft, although they are now in Part 3 rather than Part 4 of the Plan. It is not considered that this text is inconsistent with that contained in the proposed SPG for site E4. Whilst the wording incorporated in the planning requirements for H27 is less explicit and detailed than that relating to E4, it does not state that these highway works cannot be phased, just that it must be comprehensively planned. This issue of phasing will be examined as part of the Development Brief process. Although separate objections have been raised to Site E4 itself (Modification 157), these do not relate to highway matters.

The Council does not consider that any further clarification is required regarding contributions towards these highway works. Policy 11 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations – sets out the Council's position regarding this issue. This Policy (as amended by the Proposed Modifications) accords with government guidance contained in Circular 1/97 and was supported by the Inspector.

The issue of both the content and level of detail contained in the planning requirements was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Council has supported the Inspector's suggested

amendments and changed the wording accordingly (Recommendations 7.28.38 and 16.2.22). The very size and complexity of H27 mean that it will inevitably have a longer list of development requirements than many of the other sites within the Housing Schedule.

No objections were raised to the inclusion of reference to the buffer strip in the Deposit Draft plan. No changes are proposed to the wording of this reference under Modification 137. The reference has just been relocated from Part 4 of the Plan. The Council considers that the requirement for this buffer strip is worded in a flexible manner that can be considered within the Development Brief. Its inclusion within the planning requirements remains appropriate.

With regard to the highways and transportation issues, the wording is a summarised version of that contained in Part 4 of the Deposit Draft plan. No objections were raised to this text. The length and level of detail reflects the importance of these aspects of the scheme and the need to ensure that the highway requirements are clearly set out within the Plan and accords with the level of detail expressed by the Inspector (see paragraph 16.3.16 of his Report).

Representation No: M 109
Commenter: English Partnerships
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The increase in the area allocated for housing is supported as this will help reduce reliance on unidentified sites. It is however noted that the net capacity of the site is indicated as being 350 dwellings. This equates to a density of 30 dwellings per hectare if the land to be retained for open space is excluded from the site area (11.6ha). It should be made clear that the net capacity of the site is indicative only.

A higher density of development would be in keeping with the character of existing development, for example Hunters Oak adjacent to the site has a density of 37.5 dwellings per hectare (242 dwellings on 6.45 hectares).

The reference to a Development Brief should make clear that this will be prepared in conjunction with the land-holders and other stakeholders.

The planning requirements state that the site cannot be developed in the absence of a comprehensively planned transport infrastructure and off-site highway improvements, including completion of the North East Hemel Hempstead Relief Road. This statement is at odds with the requirements relating to E4 which allows for phased road improvements. It should be made clear that any improvements will be in accordance with Annex B of Circular 1/97 'Planning Obligations'. The requirements should therefore be deleted.

The second paragraph of the planning requirements contains a level of detail which is considered to be too prescriptive and should be included within a Development Brief. This is contrary to the Inspector's concerns regarding the complexity and high level of detail in the Plan.

If this level of detail is to be retained, the following amendments are required:

- deletion of the width of the landscape buffer required (30 metres) and its replacement with a reference to the buffer being effective.
- deletion of the details of vehicular access and connection details for the pedestrian and cycle routes.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The support for the increase in the site area allocated for housing is welcomed.

The issue of appropriate dwelling capacity was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector considered it important to give the Council sufficient flexibility to ensure that a

satisfactory relationship could be achieved with the adjacent employment site and to provide adequate open space to meet the future recreational needs of the additional population. He therefore recommended a capacity of 350 dwellings and the Council has accepted this recommendation. In principle, a higher level of housing could be considered by the Council when the site comes forward for development, provided this is not to the detriment of other planning requirements for the site and complies with other policies in the Plan.

The Council will seek the involvement of the general public, landowners and other interested parties when producing the development brief for the site. This approach is in accordance with advice from central government set out in PP12: Development Plans. The planning requirements for H27 include a clear cross-reference to Proposal E4 and state that development should be planned comprehensively with this adjacent site. The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for E4 states that Dacorum Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, Hertfordshire County Council and the landowners will all be involved in future joint working, with the aim of preparing a masterplan and planning briefs. It is therefore not considered necessary to add any further text regarding this issue.

The requirements relating to highways issues remain unaltered from the Deposit Draft, although they are now in Part 3 rather than Part 4 of the Plan. It is not considered that this text is inconsistent with that contained in the proposed SPG for site E4. Whilst the wording incorporated in the planning requirements for H27 is less explicit and detailed than that relating to E4, it does not state that these highway works cannot be phased, just that it must be comprehensively planned. This issue of phasing will be examined as part of the Development Brief process. Although separate objections have been raised to Site E4 itself (Modification 157), these do not relate to highway matters.

The Council does not consider that any further clarification is required regarding contributions towards these highway works. Policy 11 – Planning Conditions and Planning Obligations – sets out the Council's position regarding this issue. This Policy (as amended by the Proposed Modifications) accords with government guidance contained in Circular 1/97 and was supported by the Inspector.

The issue of both the content and level of detail contained in the planning requirements was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Council has supported the Inspector's suggested amendments and changed the wording accordingly (Recommendations 7.28.38 and 16.2.22). The very size and complexity of H27 mean that it will inevitably have a longer list of development requirements than many of the other sites within the Housing Schedule.

No objections were raised to the inclusion of reference to the buffer strip in the Deposit Draft plan. No changes are proposed to the wording of this reference under Modification 137. The reference has just been relocated from Part 4 of the Plan. The Council considers that the requirement for this buffer strip is worded in a flexible manner that can be considered within the Development Brief. Its inclusion within the planning requirements remains appropriate.

With regard to the highways and transportation issues, the wording is a summarised version of that contained in Part 4 of the Deposit Draft plan. No objections were raised to this text. The length and level of detail reflects the importance of these aspects of the scheme and the need to ensure that the highway requirements are clearly set out within the Plan and accords with the level of detail expressed by the Inspector (see paragraph 16.3.16 of his Report).

Representation No:**M 110**

Commenter:

Kyle McClelland West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objection to Housing Proposal Site H28 because it seriously weakens the flexibility for Hemel Hempstead General Hospital to expand which was previously available in the Deposit and Adopted Local Plan.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector is seeking greater flexibility in the designations affecting the site and surrounding land to allow for the outcome of a review of acute hospital services. This position has also been supported by the Dacorum Health Action Group. The Council has followed a clear recommendation from the Inspector to subdivide the site into its separate land-use components (H28, C5 and L11). They are important in that they reflect suitable locations for different activities (such as the expansion of the hospital), they take into account important constraints like the Wildlife Site and the need for the development to be planned comprehensively.

The Inspector acknowledged that, at the time of the Public Local Inquiry, there remained a degree of uncertainty with respect to the scale of future expansion at Hemel Hempstead Hospital. However, he concluded that this uncertainty was not sufficient reason to prevent the designation of the front portion of the site for housing. The Council remains of this opinion.

Since the Inspector made his recommendations further information has come forward. A planning application, submitted by the NHS Trust and landowner, has been approved subject to a legal agreement. The distribution of uses accord with the broad land use divisions recommended by the Inspector. However, the application indicated that the net developable area of the housing element would be smaller than originally envisaged. Proposal H28 was amended accordingly and incorporated into the Modifications. No decision at that stage had been made on the strategic review of hospital facilities. Given these factors, the Council felt that it was appropriate to take forward the principles of the Inspector's recommendations.

The NHS Trust have now announced the outcome of their acute services review, which is to support the option of a 'surgicentre' at Hemel Hempstead rather than the site of a major acute hospital (see response to Modifications to L11 and C5). It is still uncertain how the NHS Trust's proposals will impact upon hospital services and how any changes will translate into development on the site.

However, the Council does not consider that the existing arrangement in the Plan would necessarily prevent a future hospital scheme coming forward, as potentially developable land is protected from development in the Plan (i.e. Leisure Space) and so reserves the option for future consideration if required. Given this position, the Council believes it would be inappropriate to amend the Plan designations affecting the site.

In the light of the Inspector's recommendation and the flexibility provided by the Development Brief, the Council considers that Site H28 should be retained in Part II of the Housing Schedule.

Representation No:**M 111**

Commenter:

Wilson Connolly Limited

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objection to the deletion of H34 from the Housing Schedule. Suggestion that a reduced scale development in the order of 300 dwellings would be appropriate.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council has accepted the Inspector's recommendations to delete sites H34, H51 and H54 at West Hemel Hempstead from the Plan. The Council remains satisfied that it has identified sufficient sites in its housing programme to 2011, together with robust assumptions about unidentified sites, to meet its Structure Plan housing requirement, without the need to retain these sites (see response to Modification 81).

In considering the Inspector's recommendations, the Council was not satisfied with the site's suitability on sustainability grounds and did not believe it was superior to other housing sites recommended by the Inspector.

Representation No: M 112
Commenter: Beechwood Homes Ltd
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection raised to the movement of H43 from Part I to Part II of the Housing Schedule. The site should remain in Part I to deal with a potential shortfall of housing land supply up to 2006. The site is eminently suitable to come forward fairly quickly and it should be noted is already partially developed.

It should be made clear that the net capacity is only indicative. In our view more than 17 dwellings could be successfully accommodated without detriment to the character of the surrounding area.

It should be made clear that affordable housing numbers are indicative only and the eventual number will be dependent on the criteria for assessing affordable housing set out in Policy 21.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The transfer of this site from Part I to Part II of the Housing Schedule was recommended by the Inquiry Inspector (Recommendation 7.37.68). All greenfield sites will be subject to control through Policy 18 and the sequential test as advocated by PPG3: Housing. The only greenfield sites in Part I of the Housing Schedule are large sites with substantial infrastructure requirements and long lead in times. The priority to be given to the release of Part 2 sites will be examined through the preparation of an SPG which will determine the order the Part II sites will be released. This is consistent with the Council's approach towards similar Part II greenfield sites within the Plan. Policy 18 controls the timing of when sites come forward. If a housing supply shortfall were to arise in the period up to 2006, consideration of the early release of Part II sites is allowed for by Policy 18.

Policy 22 (incorporating Proposed Modification) clearly states that the net capacity of sites listed in the Schedule of Housing Proposal Sites is expected to be met. In principle, a higher level of housing could be considered by the Council if this still satisfies the planning requirements for the site and is appropriate in terms of the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the environment of the area.

The level of affordable housing specified is a specific development requirement, rather than an indicative figure. No objections were made to the level of affordable housing in the Deposit Draft. The minimum requirement for 7 affordable units is reasonable as it equates to 35% of the 20 units originally proposed for this site. Part of the site has been developed separately (now Proposal H43A) with six units built. The capacity of H43 has been amended accordingly. However, no affordable housing contribution has yet been made. It is therefore considered appropriate that the affordable housing contribution remains unchanged, given it was part of a larger proposal site and its requirement sought in full through this remaining development. Policy 8 - Optimising the Use of Urban Land (incorporating Proposed Modifications) clearly states that development may be implemented in phases provided that each individual phase does not frustrate the objectives of providing an appropriate level of affordable housing.

The Council would expect the minimum level of affordable housing set out in the planning

requirements to be met through any development. If this level could not be achieved, then it needs to be demonstrated why this was not appropriate. The preparation of a Development Brief for the site should provide an early opportunity to raise this issue.

Representation No: M 113
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

H46A Harts Motors 9 net capacity. (Planning previously approved)

Question:

Approval date for planning permission and was this outlined permission.

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

The Parish Council's objection appears to be to the lack of information provided regarding the redevelopment of this site.

The Housing Schedule does not normally include detailed information on planning applications, other than the general planning status of the scheme. However, the Council accepts that for Site H46A, the progress section should indicate that outline rather than full planning permission exists.

The most recent application (4/01984/01/OUT), granted on 31.1.01 comprises 4 flats, 5 elderly persons' flats and offices, and has yet to be implemented.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend Proposed Modification to read as follows:-
Progress: ~~D~~ Q

Representation No: M 114
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. M Berman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to Housing Proposal Site H50 planning requirements. The Scout Hut serves a local population, many of whom walk to meetings. Moving the Scout Hut will cause disruption to the group's activities and will mean that some scouts might no longer be able to attend.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector's concerns are noted.

The issue of relocation of the Scout Hut was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector concluded in paragraph 7.43.57 of his Report that there could be "significant advantages in considering its relocation." The detailed issue of access to H50 and therefore whether or not relocation of this building is required to achieve a successful housing scheme will be addressed fully through the Development Brief process. If relocation is necessary, a satisfactory equivalent alternative must be found. As the existing building clearly serves the local community, any replacement facility would need to be located within close proximity of the existing site.

Representation No: M 115
Commenter: The Crown Estate
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The requirements should make it clear that local health facilities could be provided off-site and that this development should only be expected to make a contribution towards such facilities that is fairly and reasonably related in scale (in accordance with Annex B of Circular 1/97 'planning Obligations').

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The precise scale and nature of any proposed health facilities and their location will be assessed fully through the Development Brief process.

The role and scope of planning conditions and obligations is clearly set out in Policy 11 of the Deposit Draft Plan (incorporating Proposed Modification 73). This policy was supported by the Inspector and reflects guidance set out in Annex B of Circular 1/97. All developer contributions will be expected to comply fully with this guidance.

Representation No: M 116
Commenter: Mr. R.D Haynes 1st Leverstock Green Scout Group
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the movement of the Scout Hut as a result of Housing Proposal Site H50. Relocation will take the group away from its catchment area.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector's concerns are noted.

The issue of the relocation of the Scout Hut was discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The Inspector concluded in paragraph 7.43.57 of his Report that there could be "significant advantages in considering its relocation." The detailed issue of access to H50 and therefore whether or not relocation of this building is required to achieve a successful housing scheme will be addressed fully through the Development Brief process. If relocation is necessary, a satisfactory equivalent alternative must be found. As the existing building clearly serves the local community, any replacement facility would need to be located within close proximity of the existing site.

Representation No: M 117
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. J Armstrong
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The Manor Farm site should be deleted as a proposed Housing Site and the maps amended accordingly.

The Inspector in paragraph 7.61.10 had a major concern regarding the site's suitability for housing due to the effect on the Highway network and the increased danger of accidents occurring. Whilst visibility could be increased it was well below the standard (paragraph 7.61.11). He also noted a greater concern of increased right hand movements on to the A5 (7.61.12). He also indicated the Highway implications could be marginally worse at Manor Farm compared with sites H45 and H44 (paragraph 7.61.15).

It is understood that as part of the proposed policy in the modifications for development at Manor Farm, provision is to be made to extend the cemetery. It is proposed that this be incorporated

within a development brief for the Manor Farm proposal. Criticism had previously been made by the Council that promoter's of site H44 could not reasonably include making available in perpetuity to the residents additional playing fields to address the current deficiency since this would not accord with Government Guidance in Circular 197 as it failed to meet the tests in paragraph 7, in particular not being directly related to the proposed development. If this is the case, then clearly the extension to the cemetery linked with the manor Farm proposals cannot be treated any differently. It should be out in the open and known to all interested parties that the modification for development at Manor Farm could not require the extension of the cemetery.

Given the recent additional housing numbers within and around Markyate, it is clear that there is no longer a need to allocate a Green Field site for development of 40 units within the plan period, as this would clearly substantially exceed what was reasonably and genuinely required. It would also clearly be at odds with the Inspector's recommendation that a higher level (more than 120 to 130) dwellings of housing was not warranted in Markyate.

The Council's evidence suggested 120 to 130 additional dwellings should be provided at Markyate for the period 1991 to 2011. The evidence of the Local Plan Inquiry indicated that completions between 1991 and 1999 amounted to 39 dwellings. It was estimated that the level of housing from regeneration from 1999 to 2001 would provide an additional 40 dwellings and that Green Field sites would provide a further 40 dwellings making a total of 119 dwellings. An additional 10 dwellings were added, making a total of 130 dwellings. By our calculation, the Council is expecting an annual build rate within Markyate village of 3.33 dwellings per annum for the period 1999 to 2011. It is apparent that with completions since 1999 and having regard to recent Planning Permissions, it can be reasonably expected that the number of dwellings from regeneration estimated by the Council will be substantially exceeded.

The case for 40 dwellings on Green Field site adjoining the village can no longer be substantiated. This is a material change in circumstances, since the evidence produced before the Local Plan Inspector. This change should be reconsidered as part of the modifications.

There is no justification on the basis of current evidence of a need for 40 dwellings on a Green Field site in Markyate and it would be inappropriate for the Local Plan to identify housing beyond the plan period since this clearly goes beyond the Council's own submissions and the Inspector's recommendations. There is no development site allocated in the Local Plan beyond the plan period and no case has been made that Markyate should be an exception.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector has raised concerns about the site's suitability in terms of highway matters and local housing need and argues for the benefits of retaining H44.

The concern over local housing need is dealt with in the response to comments raised by the objector to Housing Proposal H44.

In respect of H50A, the Inspector looked in detail at highway matters in his report (paras. 7.61.10 – 7.61.15). He acknowledged a number of highway deficiencies as highlighted by the objector, but felt that they could be appropriately addressed through a range of measures. Overall, the Inspector was not persuaded that the highway effects of the site were so significant as to rule it out as an appropriate housing location (para. 7.61.15). He also concluded (para. 7.61.15) that development of H44 and H45 would also be less than ideal in highway terms, that the highway differences between these two sites and Manor Farm were not so significant as to make them more preferable, and that in comparing landscape implications he considered that H50A was a better site overall.

The requirement relating to the cemetery is for the provision of a minimum of 5 parking spaces. The development proposal will lead to the loss of parking on the stub road that currently serves the cemetery. The Inspector in his report felt that it was reasonable to make replacement parking

a requirement to address the development's impact on the operation of the cemetery and to minimise highway effects (paras. 7.61.13 and 7.61.18).

The Council accepts that there is an acknowledged shortfall of burial space in the village. However, it would be unreasonable to include the extension of the burial ground as a planning requirement as the development itself would not directly necessitate this. The planning requirements to the site do not require an extension to the cemetery. However, given that it is intended to seek parking spaces on the site, it is appropriate for the issue of the cemetery extension to be explored in the production of the Development Brief, (a planning requirement for the site). No date is yet fixed for the brief and will be related to the likely timing of the release of the site.

Representation No: M 118
Commenter: Mr. P.S Thring CPRE Hertfordshire
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the inclusion of Housing Site H50A because of the damage to the Chilterns AONB. The site would intrude visually upon the footpath in the area and, lying upon the top of a crest, would be visible from other neighbouring vantage points. The development would also extend and reinforce the linear nature of Markyate along the Ver valley and could lead to future pressure for ribbon development north-westwards along the A5 trunk road.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This representation has been considered as an objection to Proposed Modification 137, rather than to Decision 184.

The issue of the impact of housing proposal site H50A Manor Farm, Markyate upon the surrounding countryside was discussed in detail at the Public Local Inquiry. Whilst the Inquiry Inspector accepted that any development would have an impact, he did not consider that it would be significant as it could be reasonably accommodated through the existing landscaping / topography, and would be partially obscured by existing buildings and have less impact than the Buckwood Road proposals H44 and H45. Furthermore, the planning requirements suggested by the Inspector have been carefully worded to ensure that the character of the AONB is safeguarded (Inspector's Report para 7.61.31(b)).

The Council is satisfied that the proposed development would be in keeping with the existing village structure. The Inspector considered the site would represent a natural extension of the linear form of the settlement.

Additional residential development on greenfield sites to the north of the village would be resisted through Policy 3 – Green Belt / Policy 5 – Rural Area.

Representation No: M 119
Commenter: Mr. P Mc Cann Banner Homes
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the placement of H50A into Part II of the Housing Schedule. Although it is recognised that Policy 18 allows for sites to be released early in order to ensure a 5 year supply of housing land, we consider that in this instance there are material circumstances which support it being made available for release sooner.

There is an urgent need for extra burial space in the village, as confirmed by the letter from the St Albans Diocesan Registry. The land within the curtilage of Manor Farm abuts the existing burial ground and the landowner is willing, subject to negotiation, to sell part of this extensive garden for this use. There is already a proposal to provide new parking spaces for visitors to the burial

ground in association with manor Farm housing proposal. The allocation of additional land for an extension to the burial ground would be entirely consistent with this approach.

There is a need for affordable housing in Markyate and there is no prospect in the near future for any provision as no other sites which are large enough for affordable housing are coming forward.

The marginally earlier release of the Manor Farm site by placing it in Part 1 would encourage the submission of planning application for a development which would be able to deliver both the burial ground extension and the new parking plus around 50 % affordable new homes, i.e. 20 units. Bearing in mind that there is a limited supply locally of housing, this is not likely to produce an 'oversupply' which would undermine planning policies. The proposed allocation for Manor Farm could be amended to include the additional land required for the burial ground.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council has followed the Inspector's recommendation of placing small greenfield sites in Part II of the Housing Schedule. He was clear in his report that any greenfield sites in Markyate should be treated in a similar way to sites elsewhere in the Borough in the spirit of advice in PPG3 (para. 7.38.10). Furthermore, in dealing with Manor Farm the Inspector would have been fully aware of a range of benefits to the village of developing the site (including the amount of affordable housing), but was still satisfied that it should remain as a housing land reserve. Therefore, the Council considers that it is appropriate for the site to continue to be retained in Part II of the Housing Schedule.

The release of Manor Farm will be governed by criteria in Policy 18 (Control over housing land supply). The Council considers that this is an appropriate mechanism for judging when H50A should be released. Whilst the benefits the proposal brings are welcomed, they are not considered to warrant an early release of the site.

The policy is to be supplemented by a SPG on the release of housing land reserve sites. This will consider in detail the priority of release of the Manor Farm site in relation to other greenfield sites and the overall housing land supply. It would also need to specifically take account of housing supply in the village in relation to local housing need.

The Council accepts that there is an acknowledged shortfall of burial space in the village. However, it would be unreasonable to include the extension of the burial ground as a planning requirement as the development itself would not directly necessitate this. In any event, the Council feels that it would be more appropriate for the issue of the cemetery extension to be explored through the production of the Development Brief. No date is yet fixed for the Brief and it will be related to the likely timing of the release of the site.

Representation No:

M 120

Commenter:

Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Vehicular access via High Street. Alter junction and other highway improvements required minimum of five parking spaces for cemetery, public open space, school footpath etc.
How long are you prepared to discuss the above and what further action will be required?

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

It is assumed that the Parish Council is seeking clarification regarding the likely timetable for development of this site and resolution of highway / parking issues.

The detailed issues raised by the Parish Council will be addressed fully through the Development Brief process as part of the planning requirements for the proposal. This will set out what specific

actions are required to bring forward the development. No firm date has yet been set for the production of this Brief. This site is included within Part II of the Housing Schedule and is therefore not intended to come forward for development until after 2006.

Representation No: M 121
Commenter: Mr. Tony McWalter
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Plan Ref:		
Employment	Policy 31	General Employment Areas

Modification Number: 143

Representation No: M 122
Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the deletion of references in the Two Waters GEA to non-food retail warehousing. Support is also given for the deletion of Proposal Site TWA9 (Homebase/Wickes) from the Table of Employment Areas under Policy 31.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 145

Representation No: M 123
Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given to the deletion of General Employment Area notation from retail warehouse sites in Apsley including Homebase/Wickes.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:		
Employment	Policy 33	Conversion of Employment Land to Housing and Other Uses

Modification Number: 149

Representation No: M 124
Commenter: Mr. Andy Scare Aylesbury Vale District Council
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the proposed Modification to Policy 33.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No:

M 125

Commenter:

Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objector concerned that if warehouses were closed down, houses would be built. Dacorum Borough Council is looking for anywhere to build and contrary to comments, Markyate is a small village. If this were done then there would be no need to build 40 houses in Manor Farm. This site is in the flood plain and is known to have sewage problems.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Markyate Parish Council did not raise any formal objection to the inclusion of this site in Policy 33 at the Deposit Draft stage and the site was not specifically discussed at the Public Local Inquiry. The only change proposed to the entry for London Road is the inclusion of a reference to educational and affordable housing contributions. No changes have been made to the designation itself.

Policy 33 (incorporating Modification 149) clearly states that uses appropriate to a residential area other than housing may also be permitted, provided they comply with Policy 7. There is no pressure on existing firms to move and it is not assumed that any individual site will come forward during the plan period.

The inclusion of Manor Farm as a Housing Proposal Site in Part II of the Housing Schedule is reasonable in planning terms as it conforms with recommendation 7.61.31 of the Inspector's Report. The site will help meet the longer term housing needs of the village and provide for a significant proportion of affordable housing at the same time. Both the Manor Farm and London Road sites are seen as contributing (along with other sites) to the overall housing supply in the villages over the Plan period to 2011, rather than being alternatives to each other.

The precise size and nature of any educational provision, if required, will be determined at the planning application stage, following advice from the County Council. The level of affordable housing will be negotiated with the developer, having regard to Policy 21 and the site's characteristics.

The Environment Agency and Thames Water will be consulted at the planning application stage with regard to the issue of flood risk and sewage. A new policy has been included as part of the Proposed Modifications dealing specifically with the issue of flood prevention (Policy 111A).

The issue of whether Markyate is a large or small village is discussed under Modification 27.

Plan Ref:

Employment

Policy 35

Land at North East Hemel Hempstead

Modification Number:

152

Representation No:

M 126

Commenter:

The Crown Estate

Obj/Sup:

Support

Representation:

The amendment of Policy 35 to reflect the wording in the adopted Structure Plan is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 127

Commenter: English Partnerships

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

The amendment of Policy 35 to reflect the wording in the adopted Structure Plan with regard to Land at North East Hemel Hempstead is supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 153

Representation No: M 128

Commenter: The Crown Estate

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The supporting text to Policy 35 includes a definition of specialised technological activities and other uses in the national or regional interest. The definition of specialised technological activities is based on work undertaken on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council which we understand is yet to be finalised. The landowners have expressed serious concerns about the practicality of the proposed definition, the extent to which it will detract would be investors and the extent to which it is 'fit for purpose' as a development control tool.

The use of sectors, derived from the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), as a basis for defining STAs is supported in principle. The recognition that some high tech activities do not fall neatly within the SIC is also welcomed.

We are however concerned about the other criteria put forward in the policy which appear to narrow down the range of activities within these sectors that could be accommodated on site. This is particularly the case for firms that have a manufacturing / production element (i.e. uses within B1c).

The other proposed criteria will be difficult to implement through development control, for example, how could the existence of links with a research facility be monitored and enforced? Would the loss of a linkage with a research facility make a company liable for enforcement under this criteria?

These criteria will impact fundamentally on the marketability and developability of the site in two ways. Firstly because of the uncertainty faced by prospective occupiers who are likely to have difficulty in determining to what extent they meet the criteria now or in the future; and secondly because of the adverse impact on its attractiveness to investors. Investors will be discouraged because of the uncertainty and possible difficulty in finding future occupiers, should the current tenants vacate, when the criteria are so complex.

Too restrictive a definition will not allow flexibility for occupants to change the nature of their business over time, e.g. to move from research and development into production.

Support is given for the inclusion of a reference to potential occupiers whose requirements are of 'national and regional interest', as stated in the current Structure Plan. However, we object to the extension and complication of the criteria by reference for the first time to "special scale, status, market significance and spin offs". These complications of the criteria provide no further clarity of meaning and are not readily measurable. We question how this additional wording can be used to determine applications? In particular how can spin offs be assessed as being greater than those associated with a 'conventional' development.

The definition of specialised technological activities should be deleted from the plan and included in SPG to be prepared in consultation with the landowners and other stakeholders. If a definition has to be included in the plan it should be based on sectors and activities only.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The principle of locating Specialised Technological Activities and activities in the national and regional interest at Employment Proposal Site E4 and their definition were considered at the Public Local Inquiry. The Council has followed the Inspector's Recommendation 8.9.14 (see Decision 200 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). In making this recommendation the Inspector took into account the practicality of including a definition of STAs and the principles of how the definition might best be made. Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 concluded that the whole site should be used for STAs and the Council has followed this.

The objective of the criteria is to achieve STA development. They have been the subject of detailed work. Two of the four criteria need to be met. There is no new evidence presented that the criteria will affect the marketability and developability.

The definition of activities in the national and regional interest includes reference to special scale, status or market significance and reflects the Inspector's conclusions in para 8.9.4 of his report. It does not form part of the criteria. The level of spin-offs for the local economy does not form part of the definition but identifies the type of impact these activities may have.

Representation No:

M 129

Commenter:

English Partnerships

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

The supporting text to Policy 35 includes a definition of specialised technological activities and other uses in the national or regional interest. The definition of specialised technological activities is based on work undertaken on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council which we understand is yet to be finalised. The landowners have expressed serious concerns about the practicality of the proposed definition, the extent to which it will detract would be investors and the extent to which it is 'fit for purpose' as a development control tool.

The use of sectors, derived from the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), as a basis for defining STAs is supported in principle. The recognition that some high tech activities do not fall neatly within the SIC is also welcomed.

We are however concerned about the other criteria put forward in the policy which appear to narrow down the range of activities within these sectors that could be accommodated on site. This is particularly the case for firms that have a manufacturing / production element (I.e. uses within B1c).

The other proposed criteria will be difficult to implement through development control, for example, how could the existence of links with a research facility be monitored and enforced? Would the loss of a linkage with a research facility make a company liable for enforcement under this criteria?

These criteria will impact fundamentally on the marketability and developability of the site in two ways. Firstly because of the uncertainty faced by prospective occupiers who are likely to have difficulty in determining to what extent they meet the criteria now or in the future; and secondly because of the adverse impact on its attractiveness to investors. Investors will be discouraged because of the uncertainty and possible difficulty in finding future occupiers, should the current tenants vacate, when the criteria are so complex.

Too restrictive a definition will not allow flexibility for occupants to change the nature of their business over time, e.g. to move from research and development into production.

Support is given for the inclusion of a reference to potential occupiers whose requirements are of 'national and regional interest', as stated in the current Structure Plan. However, we object to the extension and complication of the criteria by reference for the first time to "special scale, status, market significance and spin offs". These complications of the criteria provide no further clarity of meaning and are not readily measurable. We question how this additional wording can be used to determine applications? In particular how can spin offs be assessed as being greater than those associated with a 'conventional' development.

The definition of specialised technological activities should be deleted from the plan and included in SPG to be prepared in consultation with the landowners and other stakeholders. If a definition has to be included in the plan it should be based on sectors and activities only.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The principle of locating Specialised Technological Activities and activities in the national and regional interest at Employment Proposal Site E4 and their definition were considered at the Public Local Inquiry. The Council has followed the Inspector's Recommendation 8.9.14 (see Decision 200 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). In making this recommendation the Inspector took into account the practicality of including a definition of STAs and the principles of how the definition might best be made. Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 concluded that the whole site should be used for STAs and the Council has followed this.

The objective of the criteria is to achieve STA development. They have been the subject of detailed work. Two of the four criteria need to be met. There is no new evidence presented that the criteria will affect the marketability and developability.

The definition of activities in the national and regional interest includes reference to special scale, status or market significance and reflects the Inspector's conclusions in para 8.9.4 of his report. It does not form part of the criteria. The level of spin-offs for the local economy does not form part of the definition but identifies the type of impact these activities may have.

Representation No:

M 130

Commenter:

Mr. D Morgan Gazeley Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

The supporting text to Policy 35 includes a definition of specialised technological activities and other uses in the national or regional interest. The definition of specialised technological activities is based on work undertaken on behalf of Hertfordshire County Council which we understand is yet to be finalised. The landowners have expressed serious concerns about the practicality of the proposed definition, the extent to which it will detract would be investors and the extent to which it is 'fit for purpose' as a development control tool.

The use of sectors, derived from the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), as a basis for defining STAs is supported in principle. The recognition that some high tech activities do not fall neatly within the SIC is also welcomed.

We are however concerned about the other criteria put forward in the policy which appear to narrow down the range of activities within these sectors that could be accommodated on site. This is particularly the case for firms that have a manufacturing / production element (i.e. uses within B1c).

The other proposed criteria will be difficult to implement through development control, for example, how could the existence of links with a research facility be monitored and enforced? Would the

loss of a linkage with a research facility make a company liable for enforcement under this criteria?

These criteria will impact fundamentally on the marketability and developability of the site in two ways. Firstly because of the uncertainty faced by prospective occupiers who are likely to have difficulty in determining to what extent they meet the criteria now or in the future; and secondly because of the adverse impact on its attractiveness to investors. Investors will be discouraged because of the uncertainty and possible difficulty in finding future occupiers, should the current tenants vacate, when the criteria are so complex.

Too restrictive a definition will not allow flexibility for occupants to change the nature of their business over time, e.g. to move from research and development into production.

Support is given for the inclusion of a reference to potential occupiers whose requirements are of 'national and regional interest', as stated in the current Structure Plan. However, we object to the extension and complication of the criteria by reference for the first time to "special scale, status, market significance and spin offs". These complications of the criteria provide no further clarity of meaning and are not readily measurable. We question how this additional wording can be used to determine applications? In particular how can spin offs be assessed as being greater than those associated with a 'conventional' development.

The definition of specialised technological activities should be deleted from the plan and included in SPG to be prepared in consultation with the landowners and other stakeholders. If a definition has to be included in the plan it should be based on sectors and activities only.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The principle of locating Specialised Technological Activities and activities in the national and regional interest at Employment Proposal Site E4 and their definition were considered in detail at the Public Local Inquiry. The Council has followed the Inspector's Recommendation 8.9.14 (see Decision 200 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). In making this recommendation the Inspector took into account the practicality of including a definition of STAs and the principles of how the definition might best be made. Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 concluded that the whole site should be used for STAs and the Council has followed this.

The objective of the criteria is to achieve STA development. They have been the subject of detailed work. Two of the four criteria need to be met. There is no new evidence presented that the criteria will affect the marketability and developability.

The definition of activities in the national and regional interest includes reference to special scale, status or market significance and reflects the Inspector's conclusions in para 8.9.4 of his report. It does not form part of the criteria. The level of spin-offs for the local economy does not form part of the definition but identifies the type of impact these activities may have.

Plan Ref:

Employment

Employment Proposal Sites

Modification Number: 155

Representation No: M 131

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

H46 site to go ahead. H47 to be omitted.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

This appears to be simply a factual statement about the Modification.

Modification Number: 156

Representation No: M 132

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the insertion of a sentence to the end of the 'Planning requirements' to refer to archaeological evaluation and mitigation.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 157

Representation No: M 133

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the insertion of additional relevant text to the 'planning requirements' section for E4 in the Schedule of Employment Proposal sites.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 134

Commenter: The Crown Estate

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection raised to the text in Proposal E4 because it does not comply with Policy 15 of the Adopted Hertfordshire Structure Plan, which states that priority will be given to specialised technological activities or other activities which are in the national or regional interest. The planning requirements should also be amended to reflect the fact that priority is to be given to specialised technological activities or other activities that are in the national or regional interest.

The planning requirements refer to the need for a development brief. The reference to a development brief should be extended to make reference to the fact that this will be prepared in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders.

The need for Supplementary Planning Guidance and a development brief for this site is questioned. It is considered more appropriate for a development brief to be prepared (in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders). The development brief could include the matters currently set out in the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance and this could be adopted as SPG.

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

In adding the reference to activities in the national and regional interest the Council has followed Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 (see Decision 207 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). However, for consistency with Policy 35 and the Structure Plan, it is accepted that the wording should be amended.

The reference to the Development Brief does cross-refer to the draft SPG for the site. Within the draft SPG a reference is made to the need for further joint working in the preparation of a master plan and planning briefs for the site.

The requirement for a development brief is considered to be essential to the proper development

of the site to give detailed guidance on bringing the site forward. Therefore, in line with Inspector's recommendation 16.2.22 (see Decision 384 in the Council's Statement of Decisions) this requirement has been included a part of the planning requirements for Employment Proposal Site E4 rather than being included in the draft SPG.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend description of proposal to read:

New estate of business, industry and storage and distribution units for specialised technological industries and or other activities in the national or regional interest.

Representation No: M 135
Commenter: English Partnerships
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The text of the proposal refers to a new estate for 'specialised technological activities and activities in the national or regional interest.' This does not comply with Policy 15 of the Adopted Hertfordshire Structure Plan, which states that priority will be given to specialised technological activities or other activities which are in the national or regional interest. The proposal should be consistent with the terminology of policy 15 of the Structure Plan. Reference should be made in the Planning Requirements to "or other activities which are in the national or regional interest."

The Planning Requirements refer to the need for a development brief. This should be expanded to make clear that it will be prepared in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders.

The need for Supplementary Planning Guidance and a development brief for this site is questioned. It is considered more appropriate for a development brief to be prepared (in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders). The development brief could include the matters currently set out in the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance, and be adopted as SPG following consultation. This would accord with the recommendations of the Inspector in paragraphs 16.2.1 to 16.2.9 of his report. References to SPG in addition to a development brief should be deleted.

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

In adding the reference to activities in the national and regional interest the Council has followed Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 (see Decision 207 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). However, for consistency with Policy 35 and the Structure Plan, it is accepted that the wording should be amended.

The reference to the Development Brief does cross-refer to the draft SPG for the site. Within the draft SPG a reference is made to the need for further joint working in the preparation of a master plan and planning briefs for the site.

The requirement for a development brief is considered to be essential to the proper development of the site to give detailed guidance on bringing the site forward. Therefore, in line with Inspector's recommendation 16.2.22 (see Decision 384 in the Council's Statement of Decisions) this requirement has been included a part of the planning requirements for Employment Proposal Site E4 rather than being included in the draft SPG.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend description of proposal to read:

New estate of business, industry and storage and distribution units for specialised technological industries and or other activities in the national or regional interest.

Representation No: M 136
Committer: Mr. D Morgan Gazeley Properties Ltd
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection raised to the text in Proposal E4 because it does not comply with Policy 15 of the Adopted Hertfordshire Structure Plan, which states that priority will be given to specialised technological activities or other activities which are in the national or regional interest. The planning requirements should also be amended to reflect the fact that priority is to be given to specialised technological activities or other activities that are in the national or regional interest.

The planning requirements refer to the need for a development brief. The reference to a development brief should be extended to make reference to the fact that this will be prepared in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders.

The need for Supplementary Planning Guidance and a development brief for this site is questioned. It is considered more appropriate for a development brief to be prepared (in conjunction with the landowners and other stakeholders). The development brief could include the matters currently set out in the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance and this could be adopted as SPG.

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

In adding the reference to activities in the national and regional interest the Council has followed Inspector's Recommendation 8.15.12 (see Decision 207 in the Council's Statement of Decisions). However, for consistency with Policy 35 and the Structure Plan, it is accepted that the wording should be amended.

The reference to the Development Brief does cross-refer to the draft SPG for the site. Within the draft SPG a reference is made to the need for further joint working in the preparation of a master plan and planning briefs for the site.

The requirement for a Development Brief is considered to be essential to the proper development of the site to give detailed guidance on bringing the site forward. Therefore, in line with Inspector's recommendation 16.2.22 (see Decision 384 in the Council's Statement of Decisions) this requirement has been included a part of the planning requirements for Employment Proposal Site E4 rather than being included in the draft SPG.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend description of proposal to read:

New estate of business, industry and storage and distribution units for specialised technological industries and or other activities in the national or regional interest.

Modification Number: 163

Representation No: M 137
Committer: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support the deletion of proposal site TWA9.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 164

Representation No: M 138

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of Proposal TWA9 from the Proposals Map.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Shopping

Policy 38

Uses in Town Centres and Local Centres

Modification Number: 170

Representation No: M 141

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment to both the policy and the supporting text, which clarifies that Jarman Field, while classed as a local centre, performs a district shopping function. It is agreed that the range of services within Jarman Fields does not sit comfortably within the definition of a local centre given in PPG6. The facilities on offer include a superstore, along with some non-retail services, therefore making them more appropriately designated as district shopping centres. It is appreciated that restructuring the whole hierachy is not necessarily required but the recognition in policy of the role of Jarman Fields is appropriate.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 171

Representation No: M 142

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment to both the policy and the supporting text, which clarifies that Jarman Field, while classed as a local centre, performs a district shopping function. It is agreed that the range of services within Jarman Field does not sit comfortably within the definition of a local centre given in PPG6. The facilities on offer include a superstore, along with some non-retail services, therefore making them more appropriately designated as district shopping centres. It is appreciated that restructuring the whole hierachy is not necessarily required but the recognition in policy of the role of Jarman Field is appropriate.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
Shopping

Policy 39

**The Scale of Development in Town
Centres and Local Centres**

Modification Number: 173

Representation No: M 143

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the Scale of Development in Town Centres and Local Centres.

The former size restriction must have deterred developers: but any new build should incorporate possibilities of smaller units or subdivisions, otherwise the usual high street retailers will be the only tenants able to afford rentals or command custom to support occupancy. This will not foster diversity.

The objector has examined the issues in detail and conclude that parking for shoppers, movements and access by Heavy Goods vehicles, whilst retaining a 'conservation area' ambience will result in many conflicting issues that will prevent a satisfactory outcome.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The former size restriction applied to local centres not town centres. In considering an objection to this, the Inspector in his report (paras. 9.3.1-9.3.3) felt that other criteria in the policy offered sufficient control over the scale of development, and that the baseline figure did not appear to be based on a detailed assessment of existing local centres. He therefore had doubts about the appropriateness of retaining the size restriction in the main part of the policy.

The removal of the size restriction has no bearing on development along the High Street in Berkhamsted, which is identified as a town centre in the Plan. In principle, the Council supports the objector's wish to see new development provide for a range of size of units including smaller shops, to help foster diversity in centres. Both Policies 39 and 42 encourage development that is of a scale appropriate to the size, function and character of a centre. This could include the provision of smaller units in appropriate circumstances. However, there may also be instances where larger units could also be beneficial to a centre.

The Council will have to carefully assess the benefits to the health of the centre new shopping development brings against any potential highway and parking problems, when considering historic centres, such as Berkhamsted. Criteria to protect a centre's historic or special local character, particularly in Conservation Areas, are included in the policy and any proposal will need to satisfy this. The Inspector effectively considered this issue in recommending new retail development on Proposal S2 (Recommendation 9.15.10). In reaching a decision he was satisfied that the centre could reasonably accommodate the impact of the development (see Council's response to related Modification 396).

Representation No: M 144

Commenter: WH Morrison Supermarkets PLC

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to draft Policy 39 because it is unnecessarily restrictive and may prevent retail development of a scale appropriate to meet identified needs from coming forward on sequentially preferable sites.

It is suggested that the plan be amended as follows:

"The height or massing of building, the area occupied by the use or the level of activity it generates would significantly exceed that associated with the surrounding pattern of buildings

and uses (unless the scale of development is necessary to meet identified needs)."

Response:

Retain Proposed Modifications.

PPG6 makes clear that in meeting identified needs on a sequentially preferable site, the scale of development should be appropriate to the size of the centre. Simply satisfying identified need on such sites by itself should not override all other planning objectives. The PPG also urges developers to tailor schemes to fit local circumstances.

The Inspector in his report (paras. 9.3.6-9.3.7) considered whether the policy should recognise other material considerations, such as need. He felt that the policy ought to be read in the context of the Plan as a whole, including other shopping policies, that Section 54A of the Act would allow other material considerations to be taken into account, and that he was satisfied that the wording would not prevent other factors being considered. Furthermore, he was of the view that adding further qualifications into the policy would not necessarily improve the decision-making process.

Therefore, the Council is satisfied that the criterion is important and relevant, and follows government advice. It does not consider that the amendments suggested by the objector are appropriate.

The former size restriction applied to local centres not town centres. In considering an objection to this, the Inspector in his report (paras. 9.3.1-9.3.3) felt that other criteria in the policy offered sufficient control over the scale of development, and that the baseline figure did not appear to be based on a detailed assessment of existing local centres. He therefore had doubts about the appropriateness of retaining the size restriction in the main part of the policy.

The removal of the size restriction has no bearing on development along the High Street in Berkhamsted, which is identified as a town centre in the Plan. In principle, the Council supports the objector's wish to see new development provide for a range of size of units including smaller shops, to help foster diversity in centres. Both Policies 39 and 42 encourage development of a scale appropriate to the size, function and character of a centre. This could include the provision of smaller units in appropriate circumstances. However, there may also be instances where larger units could also be beneficial to a centre.

Plan Ref:

Shopping

Policy 40

The Main Shopping Hierarchy

Modification Number: 168

Representation No: M 139

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment and relocation of policy 40 to the start of the section on shopping.

In particular, the amendments to criterion C now reflect the advice in PPG6 and clarify the status of town centres and local centres in the sequential test. The removal of the reference to retail warehousing in general employment areas is also appropriate.

The amendments to the supporting text, and in particular the reference to Jarmans Field and Wood Hall Farm, differing from other centres in that they provide an important local function in addition to a wider role convenience shopping, is also supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 169

Representation No: M 140

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment and relocation of Policy 40 to the start of the section on shopping.

In particular, the amendments to criterion C now reflect the advice in PPG6 and clarify the status of town centres and local centres in the sequential test. The removal of the reference to retail warehousing in general employment areas is also appropriate.

The amendments to the supporting text, and in particular the reference to Jarmans Field and Wood Hall Farm, differing from other centres in that they provide an important local function in addition to a wider role convenience shopping, is also supported.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Shopping	Policy 41	Assessment of New Shopping Proposals
-------------------------------------	------------------	---

Modification Number: 181

Representation No: M 148

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the revised Policy 41. The policy clearly represents guidance set out in PPG6 and the assessment criteria for out-of-centre applications.

The supporting text has also been amended to better represent the guidance in PPG6, with specific reference to the Donaldson Report and the potential additional floorspace capacity in 2006 and 2011. The supporting text identifies a new allocation at Jarman Fields local centre, providing a retailing opportunity within a defined centre (Shopping Proposal S6). The text states the benefits of the site and concludes that it is a sustainable and central location for a varying scale of retail development, either as part of a mixed commercial scheme or a retail park. It is considered that this proposal could accommodate and provide greater choice and flexibility in meeting the growth in floorspace to and beyond 2006 identified in the study for central locations and / or retail warehousing.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 149

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the inclusion of Homebase and Wickes in the Table of Main Out of Centre Retail Locations. Support also for the new wording of Policy 41 since this now reflects national Planning Policy Guidance in PPG6.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 182

Representation No: M 150

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the revised Policy 41. The policy clearly represents guidance set out in PPG6 and the assessment criteria for out-of-centre applications.

The supporting text has also been amended to better represent the guidance in PPG6, with specific reference to the Donaldson Report and the potential additional floorspace capacity in 2006 and 2011. The supporting text identifies a new allocation at Jarman Fields local centre, providing a retailing opportunity within a defined centre (Shopping Proposal S6). The text states the benefits of the site and concludes that it is a sustainable and central location for a varying scale of retail development, either as part of a mixed commercial scheme or a retail park. It is considered that this proposal could accommodate and provide greater choice and flexibility in meeting the growth in floorspace to and beyond 2006 identified in the study for central locations and / or retail warehousing.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 183

Representation No: M 151

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendments to Prposals Map 6, which now shows the Homebase/Wickes site as an 'Out of Centre Retail Location'.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Shopping

Policy 42

New Shopping Development in Town Centres and Local Centres

Modification Number: 174

Representation No: M 145

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment to Policy 42, adding criteria to assess retail developments within town and local centres. The policy now clearly sets out the sequential approach to site selection, the possible requirement for a Trade Capacity and Impact Study for major shopping schemes and a number of criteria against which proposals are assessed.

The supporting text has also been considerably amended to support the policy and, in particular, takes account of the guidance set out in PPG6. The supporting text identifies sites within town centres which are suitable for comparison development and which are considered to be sustainable.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 146
Commenter: WH Morrison Supermarkets PLC
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to draft Policy 42 with particular reference to criterion (a) which restricts the scale of new shopping development in Town Centres and Local Centres. It is considered that this criterion, as currently worded is unnecessarily restrictive and may prevent retail development of a scale appropriate to meet identified needs from coming forward on sequentially preferable sites. It is suggested that criterion (a) of Draft Policy 42 should be amended to read "(a) are of a scale appropriate to meet identified needs."

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objection is similar in nature to that made by the objector to Policy 39 (under modification 173). The Council does not accept the suggested amendment to criterion (a) on the basis of its previous response.

Modification Number: 175

Representation No: M 147
Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment to Policy 42, adding criteria to assess retail developments within town and local centres. The policy now clearly sets out the sequential approach to site selection, the possible requirement for a Trade Capacity and Impact Study for major shopping schemes and a number of criteria against which proposals are assessed.

The supporting text has also been considerably amended to support the policy and, in particular, takes account of the guidance set out in PPG6. The supporting text identifies sites within town centres which are suitable for comparison development and which are considered to be sustainable.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
Shopping

Shopping Proposal Sites

Modification Number: 191

Representation No: M 152
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the revision of planning requirements to Proposal S2 to provide guidance on the form of development, to indicate how constraints might be resolved and to include reference to an archaeological evaluation and mitigation measures.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 153
Commenter: Tesco Stores Limited
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection because the floorspace requirements are insufficient to allow a viable foodstore to be developed.

Also the description of intended uses should allow for mixed use development and other forms of retailing. The suggested parking requirements would be insufficient to support foodstore and other town centre uses. The boundary of the site should be expanded further to incorporate adjoining land and allow for a wider redevelopment opportunity.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The foodstore proposal stems directly from the Inquiry Inspector considering the possibility of alternative and sequentially preferable sites to a proposed out of centre foodstore promoted by the objector. It also arose in conjunction with the Inspector dealing with a specific objection to the site. The Inspector felt that there was a reasonable prospect of achieving a viable scheme on the site given:

- a flexible approach to the development (including the parking) from any developer;
- the potential use of compulsory purchase powers;
- that there was a reasonable period remaining in the Plan to bring forward the scheme; and
- that in the absence of any detailed assessment there was no evidence that a viable scheme could not be found.

He did not find the evidence presented at the Public Local Inquiry on viability persuasive and the objector has provided no new evidence. Furthermore, the Inspector was very clear about the extent of the site boundary for the proposed store needed for this.

The objector suggests that the nature of the scheme should be extended to include other uses. The proposal has been identified to meet the requirements of the Inspector's recommendation 9.15.10 and his specific concerns over the role of food shopping in respect of the long term vitality and viability of the town centre. In principle, an alternative mixed-use scheme may be acceptable providing it does not undermine achieving the level of convenience floorspace sought and that it was appropriate in terms of scale/impact in relation to the historic character of the centre. In addition, other forms of retailing may be acceptable on a similar basis. Therefore, the Council does not believe it needs to widen the requirements to Proposal S2 to specifically accommodate other uses.

The Inspector expressly considered the form of parking needed for the development of S2 (paras. 9.15.6-9.15.7). This was also considered in dealing with the site as a sequentially preferred location to an out of centre development proposed by the objector (paras. 9.19.41-9.19.42). He was satisfied that parking could be provided within the site for a smaller scheme provided a developer was flexible about such arrangements, it included remodelling of the existing public car park, and that the parking was provided within a multi-level layout. Furthermore, the scale of parking required would need to take account of advice in PPG13, the accessibility of the location and the form of parking proposed.

The objector has not provided any evidence as to why the suggested parking requirements would not be sufficient.

The Inspector did consider the opportunity for the redevelopment of an enlarged site (para. 9.19.40), as suggested by the objector, in dealing with the previously mentioned out of centre development. He was not satisfied in any event that a larger scheme would be viable, he was concerned about the loss of existing retail units and the impact this would have on the vitality of the centre, and he felt that a bigger building would detract from the historic character of the town. Overall, the Inspector was not convinced that the option of a smaller site had been sufficiently explored which might meet the actual level of need that would arise over the Plan period.

Modification Number: 197

Representation No: M 154

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the new Shopping Proposal Site S6 at Jarman Fields.

This proposal is for an area of Jarman Fields, St Albans Road, identified as being within a local centre with district shopping function for a mixed use scheme including shopping, offices, leisure, catering establishments and residential. Non-food retail warehousing is also acceptable as part of a mixed scheme or a stand-alone park. The proposal also sets out a number of planning requirements to be considered for any proposals. The designation of this site for retail proposal is in line with Government guidance and is sustainable.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 198

Representation No: M 155

Commenter: Ladbroke Group Properties Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the new Shopping Proposal Site S6 at Jarman Fields.

This proposal is for an area of Jarman Fields, St Albans Road, identified as being within a local centre with district shopping function for a mixed use scheme including shopping, offices, leisure, catering establishments and residential. Non-food retail warehousing is also acceptable as part of a mixed scheme or a stand-alone park. The proposal also sets out a number of planning requirements to be considered for any proposals. The designation of this site for retail proposal is in line with Government guidance and is sustainable.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:

Transport

Policy 52

Development and Transport Impacts

Modification Number: 203

Representation No: M 156

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for additional text relating to 'Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Roads in the Chilterns'.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Transport	Policy 55	Highway Design
-------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

Modification Number: 209

Representation No: M 157

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for additional text relating to 'Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Roads in the Chilterns'.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Transport	Policy 56	Traffic Management
-------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Modification Number: 210

Representation No: M 158

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the insertion of a new paragraph referring to the design of traffic management schemes including reference to the minimisation of the visual impact of street signs.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 159

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for a new reference to environmental traffic zones schemes in rural areas.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Transport	Policy 58	Provision and Management of Parking
-------------------------------	------------------	--

Modification Number: 214

Representation No: M 160

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The Parish Council is not satisfied that the parking enforcement will work and that any survey of parking within Markyate, then the village should be involved.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This representation has been considered as an objection to Proposed Modification 214 (Policy 58 – Provision and Management of Parking), rather than to Decision 154 as specified by the Parish Council.

The new parking enforcement regime only came into force within the Borough on 6th October 2003, after the publication of the Modifications. It is therefore too early to judge whether it has been successful in resolving the particular problems affecting Markyate.

As stated in Policy 58 (incorporating Proposed Modifications), the Council's Parking Management Strategy will be kept under review to ensure that the measures continue to reflect the needs of individual areas. If any changes are proposed to the current arrangements further public consultation will be undertaken. This will provide both the Parish Council and local residents with the opportunity to become involved in the decision-making process.

Plan Ref: Transport	Policy 59	Private Parking Provision
--------------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------------

Modification Number: 216

Representation No: M 161

Commenter: Mr. Colin Campbell GO - East

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

There is a lack of clear reference to parking standards in Policy 59 and it is therefore assumed that Appendix 5 is part of Policy 59.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objector is correct in assuming that Appendix 5 is part of Policy 59. A cross-reference is included to this appendix in paragraph 3 of the policy. However, due to a typographical error, this cross-reference was not highlighted as new text, (through underlining), in the List of Proposed Modifications.

Plan Ref: Transport	Transport Proposal Sites
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Modification Number: 253

Representation No: M 162

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the insertion of a new proposal relating to the signalisation of the Durrants Hill Road/London Road junction as Transport Proposal Site TWA15A.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 254

Representation No: M 163

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the inclusion of Transport Proposal Site TWA15A - the signalisation of Durrants Hill Road/ London Road Junction.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Social and Community Facilities	Policy 70	Education
--	------------------	------------------

Modification Number: 257

Representation No: M 165

Commenter: Mr. R Grinter Hertfordshire County Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Many schools in Dacorum are located in the Green Belt. Few of these are identified as 'Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt'.

The statement that extensions of existing educational facilities will not be acceptable in the Green Belt, in Policy 70, is unnecessary. The County Council, in promoting development on Green Belt school sites, would expect the need to demonstrate that educational need would provide 'very special circumstances' to set against policy objections in Policy 3. Policy 70, as re-drafted, could have a severe impact on the ability to provide an up to date educational estate in rural areas.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This representation has been considered as an objection to Proposed Modification 257, rather than to Decision 280 as specified by the Objector.

The change to Policy 70 clarifies that extensions to schools are not normally considered appropriate development within the Green Belt. This is in accordance with PPG2. Furthermore, it highlights the different approach that will be taken compared with schools that are now designated as Major Developed Sites under Policy 3A. The Inspector clearly specified which schools within the Borough should be covered by this new designation.

This Proposed Modification accords with recommendation 11.3.10 of the Inspector's Report and the Council considers that the change remains appropriate. It is important that extensions to existing schools are carefully controlled along with other forms of development, so as to safeguard the openness of the Green Belt. Educational needs should not override the requirement to protect the amenities of the Green Belt. However, the Council does not believe that such an approach would necessarily prevent new development coming forward, provided very special circumstances are demonstrated and any scheme is sympathetic to the Green Belt.

Plan Ref: Social and Community Facilities	Social & Community Proposal Sites
--	--

Modification Number: 258

Representation No: M 166

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the proposed changes to Proposal C1 and site boundary as shown on Map 127 (new school site at Durrants Lane).

The development of a new school campus for Egerton-Rothesay School on Site C1 will provide major benefits for the District and surrounding areas. The school plays a very important role in the

education of pupils across the whole spectrum of abilities, including children with Special Educational Needs, for whom the school has a range of facilities and specialist teaching expertise which is unique in Hertfordshire. The relocation of the school has a range of facilities and specialist teaching expertise which is unique in Hertfordshire. The relocation of the school from its two existing sites, into new purpose-built facilities on a single site, will secure the future of the school and provide for its on-going development to meet the needs of local children, parents and the Education Authorities of Hertfordshire and surrounding areas. The site now proposed has the support of the school and the relevant landowners. Subject to confirmation of the proposed development of Site H52 for housing, the development of the new school is expected to proceed within the plan period.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Note: It has been assumed that this objection relates to Modification 258 – Social and Community Site C1 rather than Modification 291 as stated by the objector. Modification 291 relates solely to the Proposals Map showing area L1, rather than to the redevelopment scheme itself.

Representation No:

M 167

Commenter:

Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup:

Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment of planning requirements for C1 to reflect the changes in the categorisation of sites C1/L1 and H52.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No:

M 168

Commenter:

Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Objection because the proposed modification will increase vehicle traffic onto Shootersway and create a very congested junction at Kingshill / Kings Road.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Note: It has been assumed that this objection relates to Modification 258 – Social and Community Site C1 rather than Modification 291 as stated by the objector. Modification 291 relates solely to the Proposals Map showing area L1, rather than to the redevelopment scheme itself.

The traffic implications of designating this site and area for housing / new school / leisure space were fully discussed at the public local inquiry.

The planning requirements clearly state that any necessary improvements to the local road facilities must be investigated through a Development Brief and provided for. The only change recommended by the Inspector is the inclusion of a requirement for a school travel plan to be prepared and submitted.

The Council agrees with the Inspector's assessment that once these requirements are implemented, the increase in traffic levels on the surrounding road network can be safely catered for.

Modification Number: 259

Representation No: M 169

Commenter: Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the proposed changes to Proposal C1 and site boundary as shown on Map 127 (new school site at Durrants Lane).

The development of a new school campus for Egerton-Rothesay School on Site C1 will provide major benefits for the District and surrounding areas. The school plays a very important role in the education of pupils across the whole spectrum of abilities, including children with Special Educational Needs, for whom the school has a range of facilities and specialist teaching expertise which is unique in Hertfordshire. The relocation of the school has a range of facilities and specialist teaching expertise which is unique in Hertfordshire. The relocation of the school from its two existing sites, into new purpose-built facilities on a single site, will secure the future of the school and provide for its on-going development to meet the needs of local children, parents and the Education Authorities of Hertfordshire and surrounding areas. The site now proposed has the support of the school and the relevant landowners. Subject to confirmation of the proposed development of Site H52 for housing, the development of the new school is expected to proceed within the plan period.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 261

Representation No: M 170

Commenter: Kyle McClelland West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection because Proposal Site C5 will weaken the flexibility for Hemel Hempstead General Hospital to expand.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Inspector acknowledged that, at the time of the Public Local Inquiry, there remained a degree of uncertainty with respect to the scale of future expansion at Hemel Hempstead hospital. Nevertheless, the Council has followed a clear recommendation from the Inspector to subdivide the site into its separate land-use components (see response to Modification 137).

One option under consideration by the Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire Strategic Health Authority is to develop this site as the major acute hospital for West Hertfordshire. The objector believes that the changes set out in the Proposed Modifications would seriously weaken the flexibility of Hemel Hempstead Hospital to expand to fulfil this role. However, at the meeting of the Acute Services Review panel on 3rd November 2003 this option was not supported. The expansion of Hemel Hempstead hospital is now likely to be considerably smaller in scale, requiring a limited expansion to the existing site into the top field. This corresponds to part of the site proposed for hospital expansion by the Inspector (Proposal Site C5). In effect, this decision overcomes the NHS Trust's principal reason of objection and strengthens the Inspector's original conclusion.

The proposed changes to Policy L1 will provide for a substantial area of new playing fields to be provided, as part of the development of a new school campus for Egerton-Rothesay School in accordance with policy C1. The school has expressed its willingness to provide for an element of shared use by the local community, in order to address the acknowledged deficiency of recreational provision in this part of Berkhamsted.

The development of the new school and playing fields is dependent on the development of housing on the adjacent site H52 as part of a comprehensive package, as proposed in the draft local plan. Subject to the confirmation of these comprehensive proposals in the adopted plan, the school intends that the development of the new campus, including playing fields, will be implemented within the plan period.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No:

M 174

Commenter:

Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup:

Support

Representation:

Support for the modification of planning requirements in the light of amended requirements for Housing Proposal Site H52 and Social and Community Facilities Proposal Site C1.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number:	296
-----------------------------	------------

Representation No:

M 175

Commenter:

Egerton Rothesay School

Obj/Sup:

Support

Representation:

Support for the proposed changes to Proposal L1 and site boundary as shown on Map 127 (new playing fields).

The proposed changes to Policy L1 will provide for a substantial area of new playing fields to be provided, as part of the development of a new school campus for Egerton-Rothesay School in accordance with policy C1. The school has expressed its willingness to provide for an element of shared use by the local community, in order to address the acknowledged deficiency of recreational provision in this part of Berkhamsted.

The development of the new school and playing fields is dependent on the development of housing on the adjacent site H52 as part of a comprehensive package, as proposed in the draft local plan. Subject to the confirmation of these comprehensive proposals in the adopted plan, the school intends that the development of the new campus, including playing fields, will be implemented within the plan period.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 307

Representation No: M 176

Commenter: Kyle McClelland West Herts Hospitals NHS Trust

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to Proposal Site L11 because it will weaken the flexibility for Hemel Hempstead General Hospital to expand in the future.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Inspector acknowledged that, at the time of the Public Local Inquiry, there remained a degree of uncertainty with respect to the scale of future expansion at Hemel Hempstead hospital. Nevertheless, the Council has followed a clear recommendation from the Inspector to subdivide the site into its separate land-use components (see response to Modification 137).

One option under consideration by the Bedfordshire & Hertfordshire Strategic Health Authority is to develop this site as the major acute hospital for West Hertfordshire. The objector believes that the changes set out in the Proposed Modifications would seriously weaken the flexibility of Hemel Hempstead Hospital to expand to fulfil this role. However, at the meeting of the Acute Services Review panel on 3rd November 2003 this option was not supported. The expansion of Hemel Hempstead hospital is now likely to be considerably smaller in scale, requiring a limited expansion to the existing site into the top field. This corresponds to part of the site proposed for hospital expansion by the Inspector (Proposal Site C5). In effect, this decision overcomes the NHS Trust's principal reason of objection and strengthens the Inspector's original conclusion.

Modification Number: 314

Representation No: M 177

Commenter: Morley Fund Mgmt Ltd/Stanhope PLC

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of Proposal Site L14. However, it is considered that the decision not to reallocate the site for a mix of uses comprising residential, employment and ancillary retail, community and leisure uses is a missed opportunity.

A high-density mixed-use development would provide the critical mass to improve local services, public transport accessibility and the built environment in the Maylands employment area. This would help existing employment and residential areas operate more effectively whilst improving the perception and image of Hemel Hempstead.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of allocating the site for development at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Council followed the Inspector's recommendation relating to the site.

Modification Number: 315

Representation No: M 179

Commenter: Morley Fund Mgmt Ltd/Stanhope PLC

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support deletion of Proposal Site L14 from Proposals Map 4. However, it is considered that the decision not to reallocate the site for a mix of uses comprising residential, employment and ancillary retail, community and leisure uses is a missed opportunity.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The issue of allocating the site for development at the Local Plan Inquiry. The Council followed the Inspector's recommendation relating to the site.

Plan Ref:		
Environment	Policy 96	Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Modification Number: 319

Representation No: M 180

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support the addition of text relating to the economic and social well-being of communities. Support is also given to the addition of 'light pollution' to criterion (a).

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 320

Representation No: M 181

Commenter: Mr. Colin White Shadow Chilterns Conversation Board

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the updating of text.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:		
Environment	Policy 99	High Quality Agricultural Land

Modification Number: 352

Representation No: M 183

Commenter: Mr. Colin Campbell GO - East

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The encouragement of applicants for farm diversification schemes to prepare farm plans is welcomed. However, the objector is concerned by the proposal that these plans should then become a commitment as part of the planning approval to limit the nature and scale of activity and limit the level of contribution to the maintenance of agricultural activity.

With any type of business, a farm diversification must change and adapt to market forces. A new enterprise may have to alter significantly if the level of business achieved does not match that predicted by market research carried out prior to establishment. Planning conditions can be used to control levels of activity. Any significant increase in activity and/or introduction of new activity would normally be subject to a further planning application. The imposition of a commitment to a farm plan prepared before an enterprise has been established, adds unnecessary burden and complication to the existing planning controls.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

GO-East's support for the principle of producing farm plans as part of farm diversification schemes is welcomed and their concerns noted.

The Inspector considered production of farm management plans to be important (para 4.43.21 of his Report).

It is not the Council's intention that these plans should prevent farms from adapting and responding to market forces. They are not an automatic requirement and are intended to be used in specific cases, such as within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, where it may be appropriate to limit the scale and extent of diversification on landscape grounds. The long-term management of farms has a very important role to play in protecting landscape character.

Plan Ref: Environment	Policy 109	Electronic Communications Apparatus
--	-------------------	--

Modification Number: 387

Representation No: M 191

Commenter: Mr. Norman Gillan MRTPI Mono Consultants Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment of the first paragraph as it corresponds with the advice set out in PPG8. It encourages mast / site sharing, whilst respecting the operational and technical requirements of the operators.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 192

Commenter: Mr. Norman Gillan MRTPI Mono Consultants Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of the second paragraph as this is now adequately covered by the new criterion.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 193

Commenter: Mr. Norman Gillan MRTPI Mono Consultants Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Whilst the main thrust of the paragraph is supported, there is concern over the weight which may be given to these policies when determining applications. The MOA recognises the importance of the natural environment, this however, must be balanced against the needs of a new and modern industry which brings economic and social benefit, especially to rural areas. Whilst regard will always be had to other relevant policies within the Local Plan and indeed the Plan should be read as a whole rather than a part, the operational requirements and technical constraints faced when building a telecommunications infrastructure differ from other forms of development. These considerations are set out in PPG8. The telecommunications policy within a Local Plan should be robust and comprehensive enough to form the main assessment criteria for development. Further to this, reference should then be made to other policies such as those mentioned. In this regard, their inclusion is supported, however, the wording 'particular regard' may leave proposals being predominantly assessed against these policies where there will be no mention of the operational and technical requirements specific to telecommunications infrastructure, rather than being assessed mainly against Policy 109.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 194
Commenter: Mr. Norman Gillan MRTPI Mono Consultants Ltd
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the changes. As previously worded, the paragraph reads in a very negative manner, contrary to the advice in PPG8, which encourages planning authorities to 'respond positively to telecommunications development proposals.' The addition of criterion (f) also ensures that applications will be assessed with regard to the possibility of sharing existing masts, buildings or other structures.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Environment	Policy 110	Open Land in Towns and Large Villages
--	-------------------	--

Modification Number: 363

Representation No: M 184
Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Every new development should have a S106 requirement for a commuted sum earmarked towards Leisure Space. Berkhamsted is some 21ha deficient according to these guidelines, making it very difficult to meet the community, social and recreational needs of the community.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council is already aware of the leisure space deficiency within Berkhamsted and the modification merely converts the measurement from acres to hectares.

The Deposit Draft Plan already includes policies to secure additional play and leisure space in developments of an appropriate size (e.g. Policy 77). In fact the thresholds under Policy 77 have been reduced in the case of residential development to reflect the importance of securing leisure space. Furthermore, additional dual-use leisure space in Berkhamsted is already identified through Proposals H52/C1/L1 (minimum 3.9 ha). It would not be appropriate to include a blanket requirement covering all new development proposals such as that suggested by the Town Council.

The Council accepts Inspector's Recommendation 12.33.30 which calls for the leisure space deficiency to be alleviated, and is committed to carrying out an audit of open space and recreation facilities as required by PPG17 (revised).

Representation No: M 185
Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

This objection relates to the Open Land Strategy for Markyate.

The small areas of amenity space at Roman Way, Long Meadow and the junction of Pickford Road and Sebright Road do not meet the open land criteria, but are important in the village context.

The Parish Council feels these are areas of conservation where wildlife can move around freely. Can this be changed in any way to further protect these sites if it deemed essential?

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council remains of the opinion that it is neither appropriate nor practical to include these three small and physically discrete areas within the open land strategy for Markyate. They are not identified as being of sufficient size nature conservation value to warrant specific designation and/or protection. The approach to the strategy was the same as for the other Large Villages.

Policy 103 does seek to protect local wild-spaces in urban areas, such as those referred to by the objector.

All open space in the Borough will be surveyed as part of the audit required for PPG17 (revised).

Plan Ref:**Environment****Policy 112****The Canalside Environment****Modification Number: 348****Representation No: M 182**

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the extension of the final sentence of the first paragraph of the policy to refer to the historic character of the canal.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:**Environment****Policy 114****Important Archaeological Remains****Modification Number: 375****Representation No: M 186**

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the strengthening of archaeological policies.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 376**Representation No: M 187**

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the insertion of additional paragraphs referring to liaison between developers and County Archaeological Group, and the English Heritage Extensive Urban Survey programme.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Environment	Policy 115	Development affecting Listed Buildings
--	-------------------	---

Modification Number: 378

Representation No: M 188

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for clearer advice on development affecting listed buildings, in line with PPG15.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Environment	Policy 116	Development in Conservation Areas
--	-------------------	--

Modification Number: 379

Representation No: M 189

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the addition of a new final paragraph referring to Character Statements.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref: Environment	Policy 118	Historic Parks and Gardens
--	-------------------	-----------------------------------

Modification Number: 382

Representation No: M 190

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment of policy to strengthen protection for historic parks and gardens, both registered and unregistered.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
Part 4

Section 1.

**Hemel Hempstead Town Centre
(including Old Town Centre) Strategy**

Modification Number: **392**

Representation No: **M 195**

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the revision of the ninth paragraph 'Town Centre Structure' in the Strategy to refer to using vacant space above shops for housing.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
Part 4

Section 2.

Berkhamsted Town Centre Strategy

Modification Number: **396**

Representation No: **M 196**

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

There is concern that any large scale project for this area will not be achieved without unacceptable interpretation and / or application of Policy 39. The Planning brief for this area must be subject to prior consultation because residents have conflicting views on possibilities for this area.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The new shopping development (S2) referred to in the modification to Policy BTC1 is in response to a recommendation from the Inquiry Inspector (9.15.10).

The Inspector considered in detail the acceptability of a new foodstore in the town centre in dealing with objections to the site itself and in assessing an alternative location to an out of centre foodstore in the town. He felt that a small modern foodstore would be a more appropriate scale of development overall (9.19.41-9.19.43) and suggested that this would help reinforce the vitality and viability of the town centre (9.15.7). Therefore, in recommending a smaller scale of development he was satisfied that this would be appropriate to Berkhamsted, and the site and town centre could accommodate the associated parking and traffic generated.

Alternatively, the Inspector had serious reservations about development on an enlarged site. The Inspector rejected a larger scheme on the grounds of its viability, loss of existing shop units and adverse impact on the historic nature of the town (para. 9.19.40).

The proposal is subject to a development brief. This will provide an opportunity to consider design matters in detail and to consult with key stakeholders, as sought by the objector.

Plan Ref:
Part 4

Section 4.

Tring Town Centre Strategy

Modification Number: 403

Representation No: M 197

Commenter: Tring Town Council

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the recognition of the existing Tring Town Council Strategy and, by implication, support for the aspirations of the Town Council in refurbishing the Cattle Market site and improving the market facilities.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
Part 4

Section 7.

Two Waters and Apsley Inset

Modification Number: 407

Representation No: M 164

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the insertion of the sentence in the Retailing paragraph which states:
"Further growth should be restricted to prevent detrimental impacts on established shopping centres and to foster a better balance of land uses in the area."

The sentence is contrary to the proposed Policy 41 on out-of-centre retail locations and also to PPG6 which contains no reference to restricting retail growth to foster better balances of land-uses.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Note: The Council assumes the objector is referring to Modification 407 and not 256 as originally stated in their representation.

The new statement about restricting the growth in retailing in the Two Waters and Apsley area is appropriate. The Inquiry Inspector in his report (para. 17.6.1) endorsed restricting growth here as a retailing objective in the Inset. It reflects concern about the effects of significant levels of retailing in the area on established centres such as Hemel Hempstead town centre and Apsley and Kings Langley local centres. This approach accords with PPG 6 and the fundamental aim of safeguarding and strengthening the important role of such centres.

The statement is also a reference to the Council's existing land use strategy for the area under Objective (d) in the Two Waters and Apsley Inset. Retailing should not be separated from other legitimate planning aims in the Plan. This takes into account the need to provide land for a range of uses and not simply retailing. Land should be made available for a variety of uses, particularly in meeting the Borough's housing requirements and ensuring there is a sufficient amount and range of employment land. Government guidance, for example in PPGs 1,3 and 4, is clear about the importance of ensuring land is available for housing and employment.

Such an approach is not contrary to Policy 41. The policy needs to be considered against other policy aims in the Plan. It does not exclusively seek to encourage out of centre retailing to the detriment of other planning objectives.

Modification Number: 419

Representation No: M 839

Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 198

Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 199

Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 200

Commenter: Mrs. Jill Blackie

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 201

Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 202
Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 203
Commenter: E.L Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 204
Commenter: Laurence Bodiam
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 205
Commenter: Mr. David Carrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 206
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 207
Commenter: Ms. Amanda Dorsett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 208
Commenter: Mr. Jack Duell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 209
Commenter: Mr. David Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 210
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 211
Commenter: Miss S Hazell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 212
Commenter: Mr. David Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 213
Commenter: Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 214
Commenter: Rona Howard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 215
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 216
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 218
Commenter: Brooke Hunt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 219
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 220
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 221
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 222
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 223
Commenter: Mr. N.B Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 224
Commenter: Mrs. S.C Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 225
Commenter: Mrs. Hazel Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 226
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 227
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 228
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 229
Commenter: Mr. Alan Shearman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 230
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 231
Commenter: Mr. S Valentine
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 232
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 233
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 234
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 425

Representation No: M 235
Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of reference to Proposal Site TWA9 in the third paragraph and for the alternative uses permissible if the site comes forward for re-development.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 236
Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the new text on access considerations for Proposal TWA9. It is suggested that the any reference to a link road should be deleted, even as an option. Instead the approach should be to consider all options (as proposed in relation to Policy 41). It is proposed that the new wording should be:

'This may create new job opportunities and enable key route proposals to be implemented: I.e. the environment of the river corridor and a new footpath link. In addition road access would need to be considered in the context of highway proposals and circumstances in the area.'

This wording would accord with the Plan's proposed approach to the site in the shopping chapter (Modification 181). A brief justification for the deletion of any reference to a link road is appended, together with the chronology of events and copies of relevant documentation.

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

The Council has been involved in detailed discussions with the County Council (as highway

authority) and the objector. During these discussions a number of alternative schemes were put forward. One of these was the signalisation of the Durrants Hill / London Road junction (TWA15A). This proposal has been included as a Proposed Modification to the Plan. No objections have been received to this new proposal. Advice from the County Council at the Proposed Modification stage was that the preferred solution incorporated both this signalisation and the completion of the link road through the Homebase site. However, following further research conducted by highway consultants working on behalf of the County Council, this advice has been changed and specific reference to the link road is no longer considered appropriate.

As a consequence of this change in approach, amendments are required to Proposed Modifications 445, 432 and 449.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend Proposed Modification 425 as follows:-

~~'This may create new job opportunities and enable key route proposals to be implemented: i.e. the environment of the river corridor and a new footpath link. In addition road access would need to be considered in the context of highway proposals and circumstances in the area. ; that would allow for the consideration of a link through the site as an option. A road is being constructed from Durrants Hill Road through Proposal Site TWA8A, and it could connect through, though this is not a firm proposal in the Plan.~~

Modification Number: 428

Representation No: M 237

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of Polciy TWA5 on General Employment Areas in Two Waters and Apsley.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 429

Representation No: M 238

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the amendment of the boundary of the Gade Valley GEA to exclude existing retail warehouses.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 239

Commenter: G.B Kent G.B Kent and Sons Ltd

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The Council have in considering the Inspector's Report, erroneously interpreted the report in a rigid fashion and ignored the Inspector's comments set out in paragraph 17.17.5 of the report as follows:-

"The objection site is the only premises of any significant size within the Gade Valley GEA that is in employment use. I conclude in the subsection above that the GEA designation is inappropriate because of the preponderance of retail uses, and recommend that it be deleted. The existence of the Kent factory does not change my view, and the 0.5ha site is too small to be designated a GEA on its own. If my recommendation is accepted, therefore, the objection site will not be subject to any designation in the Plan."

The Inspector recommends the deletion of the General Employment Area zoning as the site area of 0.5ha is too small to be designated a GEA on its own and he also recommended the GEA designation is inappropriate because of preponderance of retail usage.

At the time of making the original objection the future plans of G. B. Kent & Sons Ltd. had not at that stage been advanced.

They are now more actively pursuing a local relocation option and in this context it is likely that a proposal for the total redevelopment of the site may be advanced within 12 months culminating in the submission of a comprehensive planning application for redevelopment.

In the light of the circumstances addressed above, we consider that it would be inappropriate for the Kent site to be zoned specifically as a General Employment Area and require the Council to conform to the Inspector's recommendation that the site should be left without specific zoning.

Response:

Delete Proposed Modification and replace with Further Modification.

Since the Public Local Inquiry in 2000 / 2001 a number of changes have occurred on this site and the adjoining site which suggest that they may come forward for redevelopment within the plan period.

The Council is anxious to see the site brought forward in a comprehensive manner that enables the most efficient and effective use of land. It is therefore appropriate that any redevelopment scheme is comprehensive in its approach. A redevelopment scheme should therefore also consider the adjoining land occupied by Wickes and the former Homebase unit, which are designated as a major out of centre retail location in the Proposed Modifications. It is proposed that the London Road General Employment Area is deleted from Policy 31 and the land not made subject to any specific designation in the Plan. This accords Inspector's Report recommendation 17.17.23.

The best method of exploring the development potential of this larger site is considered to be through the production of a Development Brief and a reference should be added to the Plan.

Consequential amendments will be required to the Proposals Map, the text of the Two Waters and Apsley inset and Policy 41 – Shopping Development Outside Existing Centres.

Proposed Further Modifications:

Delete Proposed Modification. Replace with the following Further Modifications:-

Proposals Map:

Amend Proposed Modification 429 as indicated on Map 107 and amend the key.

Policy 41:

Amend Modification 181 relating to Homebase and Wickes, London Road as follows:-

'Bulky, non-food goods. Whilst it is acceptable for the Homebase store to remain, alternative development for the same use, office or residential purposes would be permissible. Whilst a mix of uses will be encouraged, any expansion in the existing non-food retailing floorspace would need to be justified in terms of retail policy (particularly Policies 40 and 41). In these circumstances, access

affecting the site would be carefully considered in relation to the development on the adjoining site (TWA8A), British Paper Company, land at Mill Street and rear of London Road and highway proposals and circumstances in the vicinity. Improve footpath links (Proposal TWA21 in the Schedule of Two Waters and Apsley Inset Proposals Sites). Riverside enhancement (ref Policy TWA2 in Two Waters and Apsley Inset). Any development proposal should examine the potential of the adjoining Kents Brushes site. Development Brief required.

Two Waters & Apsley Inset:

Amend the final sentence of the 3rd paragraph of Proposed Modification 425 as follows:-

'In addition road access would need to be considered in the context of highway proposals and circumstances in the area: that would allow for the consideration of a link road through the site as an option. A road is being constructed from Durrants Hill Road through Proposal Site TWA8A, and it could connect through, though this is not a firm proposal in the plan. An area consisting of Kents Brushes, the Shell petrol filling station and adjacent offices are unallocated for a specific use in the Plan. Whilst existing uses can remain on the site, future development proposals will be judged against the other policies in the Plan. The site can be considered together with the adjoining site in any comprehensive redevelopment of the wider area.'

Modification Number: 432

Representation No: M 240

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the deletion of reference to Proposal Site TWA9.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 241

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the new text concerning the creation of a link road. It is considered that this text is superfluous and should be deleted. There is no evidence from either the Borough Council or the County Council that the link road is the best solution for solving the highways issues in the area. All highway solutions should be considered if redevelopment of the site comes forward in the Plan period. In the absence of any convincing case for the link road, the Plan should not pre-determine which solution might be the most appropriate in the future. This would accord with the Plan's proposed approach to the site in the shopping chapter (Modification 181).

Response:

Delete Proposed Modification.

The Council has been involved in detailed discussions with the County Council (as highway authority) and the objector. During these discussions a number of alternative schemes were put forward. One of these was the signalisation of the Durrants Hill / London Road junction (TWA15A). This proposal has been included as a Proposed Modification to the Plan. No objections have been received to this new proposal. Advice from the County Council at the Proposed Modification stage was that the preferred solution incorporated both this signalisation and the completion of the link road through the Homebase site. However, following further research conducted by highway consultants working on behalf of the County Council, this advice has been changed and specific reference to the link road is no longer considered appropriate.

As a consequence of this change in approach, amendments are required to Proposed Modifications 449, 445 and 425.

Proposed Further Modification:

Delete the following paragraph from Proposed Modification 432.

~~Development is planned to enable a link road to be built from Durrants Hill Road to the edge of the former Homebase. This will allow the closure of the Durrants Hill Road / Mill Street junction, the creation of a slightly larger pedestrian friendly area outside the community centre, alterations to White Lion Street and new 'rear' servicing. Access to and/or through the former Homebase site will be considered if the site is brought forward for redevelopment. The link road was initially planned with the closure of the Durrants Hill Road / London Road junction. However, upon reconsideration the County Council, as local highway authority, has decided that signalisation of the junction is a better approach, with more beneficial impact on traffic conditions in London Road than the original plan.~~

Modification Number: 433

Representation No: M 242

Committer: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the new paragraph on out of centre retailing in Two Waters and Apsley.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 434

Representation No: M 243

Committer: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the inclusion of a reference to the proposal for signalisation of the Durrants Hill Road/London Road junction.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 440

Representation No: M 840

Committer: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 244

Commenter: Evelyn Adamson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 245

Commenter: Mr. James Adamson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 246

Commenter: Marjory Alexander
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 247

Commenter: Mr. Robert Alexander
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 248

Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 249

Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 250

Commenter: Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 251

Commenter: Mrs. J.M Baldwin

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 252

Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Barnett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 253

Commenter: R Beckett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 254

Commenter: D Bowers

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 255

Commenter: Mr. S Blundell

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 256

Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 257

Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 258

Commenter: E.L Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 259

Commenter: Laurence Bodiam

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 260

Commenter: Mr. John Bosworthick

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 261

Commenter: Mrs. Julie Bosworthick

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 262

Commenter: Mr. Paul Bowness

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 263

Commenter: Ms. Denise Bradley

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 264

Commenter: Mr. Stephen Bradley

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the

Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 265

Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Mr B.G.&Mrs S.F Brittain

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 266

Commenter: Mr. Brian Burgess

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 267

Commenter: Mrs. J.D Burgess

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 268

Commenter: Mrs. Diane Carlin

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 269

Commenter: Mr. David Carrington

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:

M 270

Commenter:

Miss Sally Carter

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:

M 271

Commenter:

Mr. Ray Chamberlain

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:

M 272

Commenter:

Animilla Clark

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:

M 273

Commenter:

Mr. Paul Clark

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No:

M 274

Commenter:

Ms. Helen Clarke

Obj/Sup:

Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 275
Commenter: Mr. M Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 276
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 277
Commenter: Juliette Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 278
Commenter: Ngaire Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 279
Commenter: Rebecca Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the

Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 280
Commenter: Mr. Richard Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 281
Commenter: Mr. Michael Collman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 282
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 283
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Cunningham
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 284
Commenter: Miss P.M Daniels
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 285
Commenter: Ms. Linda Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 286
Commenter: Mr. Paul Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 287
Commenter: Denise Dickinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 288
Commenter: Ms. Amanda Dorsett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 289
Commenter: Mr. John Dowling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 290
Commenter: Mr. Jack Duell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 291
Commenter: Ms. Christine Evans
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 292
Commenter: Ms. Liz Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 293
Commenter: Mr. Mark Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 294
Commenter: Mr. Ian Fisher
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 295
Commenter: Debra Fox
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 296
Commenter: Jill Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 297
Commenter: Mr. Peter Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 298
Commenter: Mrs. N Garner
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 299
Commenter: Mrs. Josephine Gilbert
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 300
Commenter: Jennifer Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 301
Commenter: Mr. Mark Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 302
Commenter: Mr. Richard Green
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 303
Commenter: Mr. Martin Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 304
Commenter: Mrs. Shani Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 305
Commenter: Miss Alexandra Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 306
Commenter: Mrs. Barbara Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 307
Commenter: Mr. Edward Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 308
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 309
Commenter: Mr. David Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 310
Commenter: Miss Alison Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 311
Commenter: Mrs. B Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 312
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 313
Commenter: Mrs. N.E Hancocks
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 314
Commenter: Judith Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 315
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 316
Commenter: Mr. Peter Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 317
Commenter: Susan Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 318
Commenter: Miss S Hazell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 319
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 320
Commenter: Mr. Ralph Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 321
Commenter: D Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 322
Commenter: L Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 323
Commenter: Christina Hill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 324
Commenter: Mrs. ME Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 325
Commenter: Mr. R Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 326
Commenter: Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 327
Commenter: Mr. David Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 328
Commenter: Rona Howard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 329
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 330
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 331
Commenter: Brooke Hunt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 332
Commenter: Mrs. Janet Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 333
Commenter: Mr. J Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 334
Commenter: Deborah Johnstone
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 335
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 336
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 337
Commenter: Joan Kempzell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 338
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 339
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 340
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 341
Commenter: T Langley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 342
Commenter: Mr. John Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 343
Commenter: Kathleen Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 344
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 345
Commenter: Mr. Lloyd Leadbeater
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 346
Commenter: Diana Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 347
Commenter: Mr. William Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 348
Commenter: June Linsley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 349
Commenter: Mr. R Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 350
Commenter: Mrs. V Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 351
Commenter: Mr. Mark Mayhew
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 352
Commenter: Mrs. Deborah McKinlay
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 353
Commenter: Mr. Peter Mison
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 354
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. R.J Monk
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 355
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 356
Commenter: J O'Connor
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 357
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Daniel&Thelma O'Mahony
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 358
Commenter: Mr. Anthony Parisi
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 359
Commenter: Mr. Brian Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 360
Commenter: Mrs. E.E Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 361
Commenter: Mr. J.E Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 362
Commenter: Miss Sejal Pau
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 363
Commenter: Vivien Plummer
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 364
Commenter: A.G Powell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 365
Commenter: Mr. N.B Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 366
Commenter: Mrs. S.C Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 367
Commenter: Mrs. Hazel Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 368
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 369
Commenter: Mrs. Emma Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 370
Commenter: Mr. Martin Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 371
Commenter: Janet Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 372
Commenter: Mr. Keith Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 373
Commenter: Mr. D Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 374
Commenter: Mrs. L Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 375
Commenter: Mr. David Russell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 376
Commenter: Miss Violet Saunders
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 377
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 378
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 379
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 380
Commenter: Mr. Andrew Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 381
Commenter: Ms. Kate Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 382
Commenter: Millie Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 383
Commenter: Mr. Daniel Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 384
Commenter: Mr. David Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 385
Commenter: Jennifer Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 386
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Stacey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 387
Commenter: Mr. Aaron Stormont
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 388
Commenter: Mr. Richard Swaby
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 389
Commenter: Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 390
Commenter: Mohanlal Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 391
Commenter: Mr. Minesh Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 392
Commenter: Mrs. H Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 393
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 394
Commenter: Mr. M Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 395
Commenter: Teresa Turton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 396
Commenter: Mr. S Valentine
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 397
Commenter: Mrs. Ann Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 398
Commenter: Mr. Dennis Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 399
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 400
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 401
Commenter: Sarah Watson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 402
Commenter: Mrs. V.E Welsh
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 403
Commenter: Joyce White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 404
Commenter: Mr. Pete White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 405
Commenter: Mr. David Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 406
Commenter: June Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 407
Commenter: Christine Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 408
Commenter: Mr. Peter Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 409
Commenter: Mr. Michael Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 410
Commenter: Mrs. Theresa Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 411
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 412
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 413
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 414
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 415
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 416
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 417
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 418
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 834
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Ian and Emma Burrows
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 441

Representation No: M 419

Commenter: Ms. Sylvia Ackling English Heritage

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the clearer guidance on archaeological requirements.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Representation No: M 420

Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 421

Commenter: Evelyn Adamson

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 422

Commenter: Mr. James Adamson

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 423

Commenter: Marjory Alexander

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 424

Commenter: Mr. Robert Alexander
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 425

Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 426

Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 427

Commenter: Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 428

Commenter: Mrs. J.M Baldwin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 429

Commenter: Mr. G Barnett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 430

Commenter: Mrs. Barnett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 431

Commenter: D Bowers

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 432

Commenter: Holly Beckett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 433

Commenter: R Beckett

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 434

Commenter: Mr. M.E Bess

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 435

Commenter: Mr. S Blundell

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 436

Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 437

Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 438

Commenter: E.L Bocker

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 439

Commenter: Laurence Bodiam

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 440

Commenter: Mr. John Bosworthick

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 441

Commenter: Mrs. Julie Bosworthick

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 442

Commenter: Mr. Paul Bowness

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 443

Commenter: Ms. Denise Bradley

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 444

Commenter: Mr. Stephen Bradley

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the

Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 445

Commenter: Diane Bremner

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 446

Commenter: Mr. Stuart Bremner

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 447

Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Mr B.G.&Mrs S.F Brittain

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 448

Commenter: Mr. Brian Burgess

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 449

Commenter: Mrs. J.D Burgess

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 450

Commenter: Mrs. Emma Burrows

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 451

Commenter: Mr. Ian Burrows

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 452

Commenter: Mrs. Diane Carlin

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 453

Commenter: Mr. David Carrington

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 454

Commenter: Miss Sally Carter

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 455
Commenter: Mr. Ray Chamberlain
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 456
Commenter: Animilla Clark
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 457
Commenter: Mr. Paul Clark
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 458
Commenter: Ms. Helen Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 459
Commenter: Mr. M Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the

Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 460
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 461
Commenter: Juliette Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 462
Commenter: Ngaire Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 463
Commenter: Rebecca Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 464
Commenter: Mr. Richard Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 465
Commenter: Mr. Michael Collman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 466
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 467
Commenter: Miss P.M Daniels
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 468
Commenter: Ms. Linda Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 469
Commenter: Mr. Paul Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 470
Commenter: Mr. Brian Dennis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 471
Commenter: Denise Dickinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 472
Commenter: Ms. Amanda Dorsett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 473
Commenter: Mr. John Dowling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 474
Commenter: Mr. Jack Duell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 475
Commenter: Ms. Christine Evans
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 476
Commenter: Ms. Liz Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 477
Commenter: Mr. Mark Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 478
Commenter: Mr. Ian Fisher
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 479
Commenter: Debra Fox
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 480
Commenter: Mr. Peter Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 481
Commenter: Jill Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 482
Commenter: Mrs. N Garner
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 483
Commenter: Mrs. Josephine Gilbert
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 484
Commenter: Jennifer Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 485
Commenter: Mr. Mark Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 486
Commenter: Mr. Richard Green
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 487
Commenter: Mr. Martin Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 488
Commenter: Mrs. Shani Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 489
Commenter: Miss Alexandra Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 490
Commenter: Mrs. Barbara Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 491
Commenter: Mr. Edward Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 492
Commenter: Mr. David Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 493
Commenter: Miss Alison Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 494
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 495
Commenter: Mrs. N.E Hancocks
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 496
Commenter: Judith Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 497
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 498
Commenter: Mr. Peter Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 499
Commenter: Susan Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 500
Commenter: Miss S Hazell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 501
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 502
Commenter: Mr. Ralph Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 503
Commenter: D Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 504
Commenter: L Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 505
Commenter: Christina Hill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 506
Commenter: Mrs. ME Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 507
Commenter: Mr. R Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 508
Commenter: Mr. David Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 509
Commenter: Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 510
Commenter: Rona Howard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 511
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 512
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 513
Commenter: Brooke Hunt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 514
Commenter: Mrs. Janet Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 515
Commenter: Mr. J Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 516
Commenter: Evelyn Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 517
Commenter: Mr. David Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 518
Commenter: Kathryn Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 519
Commenter: Margaret Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 520
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 521
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 522
Commenter: Joan Kempzell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 523
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 524
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 525
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 526
Commenter: T Langley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 527
Commenter: Mr. John Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 528
Commenter: Kathleen Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 529
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 530
Commenter: Diana Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 531
Commenter: Mr. William Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 532
Commenter: June Linsley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 533
Commenter: Mrs. V Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 534
Commenter: Mr. Mark Mayhew
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 535
Commenter: Mrs. Deborah McKinlay
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 536
Commenter: Mr. Peter Mison
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 537
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. R.J Monk
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 538
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 539
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 540
Commenter: J O'Connor
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 541
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Daniel&Thelma O'Mahony
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 542
Commenter: Mr. Brian Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 543
Commenter: Miss Sejal Pau
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 544
Commenter: Ms. Carole Phillips
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 545
Commenter: Mr. Michael Phillips
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 546
Commenter: Vivien Plummer
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 547
Commenter: Mr. N.B Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 548
Commenter: Mrs. S.C Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 549
Commenter: Mrs. Hazel Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 550
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 551
Commenter: Mrs. Emma Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 552
Commenter: Mr. Martin Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 553
Commenter: Janet Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 554
Commenter: Mr. Keith Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 555
Commenter: Mr. D Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 556
Commenter: Mrs. L Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 557
Commenter: Mr. David Russell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 558
Commenter: Miss Violet Saunders
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 559
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 560
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 561
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 562
Commenter: Mr. Andrew Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 563
Commenter: Ms. Kate Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 564
Commenter: Millie Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 565
Commenter: Mr. Daniel Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 566
Commenter: Mr. David Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 567
Commenter: Jennifer Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 568
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Stacey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 569
Commenter: Mr. Aaron Stormont
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 570
Commenter: Mr. Richard Swaby
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 571
Commenter: Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 572
Commenter: Mr. Minesh Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 573
Commenter: Mohanlal Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 574
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 575
Commenter: Mrs. H Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 576
Commenter: Mr. M Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 577
Commenter: Teresa Turton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 578
Commenter: Mr. S Valentine
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 579
Commenter: Mrs. Ann Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 580
Commenter: Mr. Dennis Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 581
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 582
Commenter: Sarah Watson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 583
Commenter: Mrs. V.E Welsh
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 584
Commenter: Mr. Tony Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 585
Commenter: Amanda Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 586
Commenter: Joyce White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 587
Commenter: Mr. Pete White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 588
Commenter: Mr. David Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 589
Commenter: June Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 590
Commenter: Christine Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 591
Commenter: Christine Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 592
Commenter: Mr. Peter Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 593
Commenter: Mr. Michael Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 594
Commenter: Mrs. Theresa Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 595
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 596
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 597
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 598
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 599
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 600
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 601
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 602
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 832
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 833
Commenter: Mr. R Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 445

Representation No: M 603

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the proposed wording in respect of the option of a link between Durrants Hill Road and London Road / Weymouth Street junction. It is proposed that the text is altered to only refer to firm, committed transportation proposals rather than any schemes that are only at the 'option' stage. The suggested wording is as follows:

'Development must be planned so as to enable and not prevent key highway improvements coming forward: the closure of the Durrants Hill Road / Mill Street junction; the widening of Durrants Hill Road / London Road junction (Proposal TWA15A).'

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

The Council has been involved in detailed discussions with the County Council (as highway authority) and the objector. During these discussions a number of alternative schemes were put forward. One of these was the signalisation of the Durrants Hill / London Road junction (TWA15A). This proposal has been included as a Proposed Modification to the Plan. No objections have been received to this new proposal. Advice from the County Council at the Proposed Modification stage was that the preferred solution incorporated both this signalisation and the completion of the link road through the Homebase site. However, following further research conducted by highway consultants working on behalf of the County Council, this advice has been changed and specific reference to the link road is no longer considered appropriate.

As a consequence of this, amendments are required to Proposed Modifications 425, 432 and 449.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend Proposed Modification 445. Second paragraph of the planning requirements to read:-

'Development must be planned so as to enable and not prevent key highway improvements coming forward: the closure of Durrants Hill Road / Mill Street junction; the widening of Durrants Hill Road (ref. Proposal TWA15A); and signalisation of the Durrants Hill Road / London Road junction (Proposal TWA15A) ~~and a new road through the site to enable the option of a link between Durrants Hill Road and the London Road / Weymouth Street junction.'~~

Modification Number: 449

Representation No: M 604

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Objection to the proposed inclusion of reference to a link between Durrants Hill Road and London Road / Weymouth Street junction. We propose that the text is altered to only refer to firm, committed transportation proposals rather than any schemes that are only at the 'option' stage. The suggested wording is as follows:

'Development must be planned to secure key highway improvements: the closure of the Durrants Hill Road / Mill Street junction; the widening of Durants Hill Road / London Road junction (proposal TWA15A)

Response:

Amend Proposed Modification.

The Council has been involved in detailed discussions with the County Council (as highway authority) and the objector. During these discussions a number of alternative schemes were put forward. One of these was the signalisation of the Durrants Hill / London Road junction (TWA15A). This proposal has been included as a Proposed Modification to the Plan. No objections have been received to this new proposal. Advice from the County Council at the Proposed Modification stage was that the preferred solution incorporated both this signalisation and the completion of the link road through the Homebase site. However, following further research conducted by highway consultants working on behalf of the County Council, this advice has been changed and specific reference to the link road is no longer considered appropriate.

As a consequence of this change in approach, amendments are required to Proposed Modifications 445, 432 and 425.

Proposed Further Modification:

Amend Proposed Modification 449 as follows:-

'Development must be planned to secure key highway improvements: the closure of the Durrants Hill Road / Mill Street junction; the widening of Durrants Hill Road (ref: Proposal TWA15); and signalisation of the Durrants Hill Road / London Road junction (Proposal TWA15A) ~~and a new road through the site to enable the option of a link between Durrants Hill Road and the London Road / Weymouth Street junction.~~

Modification Number: 453

Representation No: M 605

Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support is given for the new transport proposal site TWA15A relating to the signalisation of the Durrants Hill Road / London Road junction in the Inset Proposals Schedule.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Modification Number: 454

Representation No: M 606

Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the

Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 835
Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 607
Commenter: Mrs. Diane Carlin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 608
Commenter: Evelyn Adamson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 609
Commenter: Mr. James Adamson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 610
Commenter: Marjory Alexander
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 611
Commenter: Mr. Robert Alexander
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 612
Commenter: Mr. Brian Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 613
Commenter: Mrs. Patricia Ayling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 614
Commenter: Mrs. J.M Baldwin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 615
Commenter: Ms. Elizabeth Baldwin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 616
Commenter: D Bowers
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 617
Commenter: Mrs. Barnett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 618
Commenter: Mr. G Barnett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 619
Commenter: Holly Beckett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 620
Commenter: R Beckett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 621
Commenter: Mr. S Blundell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 622
Commenter: Ms. Alexandra Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 623
Commenter: Ernst - Jurgen Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 624
Commenter: E.L Bocker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 625
Commenter: Laurence Bodiam
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 626
Commenter: Mr. John Bosworthick
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 627
Commenter: Mrs. Julie Bosworthick
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 628
Commenter: Mr. Paul Bowness
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 629
Commenter: Ms. Denise Bradley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 630
Commenter: Mr. Stephen Bradley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 631
Commenter: Diane Bremner
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 632
Commenter: Mr. Stuart Bremner
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 633
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Mr B.G.&Mrs S.F Brittain
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 634
Commenter: C.R Buckell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 635
Commenter: Mrs. C Buckell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 636
Commenter: Mr. Brian Burgess
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 637
Commenter: Mrs. J.D Burgess
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 638
Commenter: Mrs. Eileen Burnell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 639
Commenter: Mr. Ronald Burnell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 640
Commenter: Mrs. Emma Burrows
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 641
Commenter: Mr. Ian Burrows
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 642
Commenter: Mr. David Carrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 643
Commenter: Miss Sally Carter
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 644
Commenter: Mr. Ray Chamberlain
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 645
Commenter: Animilla Clark
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 646
Commenter: Mr. Paul Clark
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 647
Commenter: Ms. Helen Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 648
Commenter: Mr. M Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 649
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Clarke
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 650
Commenter: Juliette Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 651
Commenter: Ngaire Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 652
Commenter: Rebecca Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 653
Commenter: Mr. Richard Cockerill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 654
Commenter: Mr. Michael Collman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 655
Commenter: Mr. Pete Cull
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 656
Commenter: Miss P.M Daniels
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 657
Commenter: Ms. Linda Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 658
Commenter: Mr. Paul Davis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 659
Commenter: Mr. Brian Dennis
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 660
Commenter: Denise Dickinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 661
Commenter: Ms. Amanda Dorsett
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 662
Commenter: Mr. John Dowling
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 663
Commenter: Mr. Jack Duell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 664
Commenter: Ms. Christine Evans
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 665
Commenter: Ms. Liz Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 666
Commenter: Mr. Mark Fey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 667
Commenter: Debra Fox
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 668
Commenter: Jill Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 669
Commenter: Mr. Peter Galvin
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 670
Commenter: Mrs. N Garner
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 671
Commenter: Mrs. Josephine Gilbert
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 672
Commenter: Jennifer Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 673
Commenter: Mr. Mark Gower
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 674
Commenter: Mr. Richard Green
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 675
Commenter: Mr. Martin Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 676
Commenter: Mrs. Shani Greeves
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 677
Commenter: Miss Alexandra Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 678
Commenter: Mrs. Barbara Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 679
Commenter: Mr. Edward Groutage
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 680
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 681
Commenter: Mr. David Gurr
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 682
Commenter: Miss Alison Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 683
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Hall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 684
Commenter: Mrs. N.E Hancocks
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 685
Commenter: Judith Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 686
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Hardcastle
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 687
Commenter: Mr. Peter Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 688
Commenter: Susan Harrington
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 689
Commenter: Miss S Hazell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 690
Commenter: Mrs. Melanie Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 691
Commenter: Mr. Ralph Henley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 692
Commenter: D Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 693
Commenter: L Hepwood
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 694
Commenter: Christina Hill
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 695
Commenter: Mrs. ME Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 696
Commenter: Mr. R Holland
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 697
Commenter: Mr. Stephen Holmes
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 698
Commenter: Mr. David Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 699
Commenter: Mrs. Kerry Hopkinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 700
Commenter: Rona Howard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 701
Commenter: Ms. Viviane Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 702
Commenter: W.J Howarth
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 703
Commenter: Brooke Hunt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 704
Commenter: Mrs. Janet Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 705
Commenter: Mr. J Izzard
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 706
Commenter: Deborah Johnstone
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 707
Commenter: Mr. David Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 708
Commenter: Kathryn Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 709
Commenter: Margaret Jury
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 710
Commenter: Mr. Andy Keen
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 711
Commenter: Mr. J.R.B Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 712
Commenter: Mrs. M.E. Keeton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 713
Commenter: Joan Kempzell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 714
Commenter: Mr. Anthony King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 715
Commenter: Ms. Katrina King
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 716
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Konstandi
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 717
Commenter: T Langley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 718
Commenter: Mr. John Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 719
Commenter: Kathleen Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 720
Commenter: Mr. Timothy Lazenbatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 721
Commenter: Diana Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 722
Commenter: Mr. William Leeden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 723
Commenter: Mr. Lloyd Leadbeater
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 724
Commenter: June Linsley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 725
Commenter: Mr. Robin Linsley
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 726
Commenter: Mr. R Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 727
Commenter: Mrs. V Lock
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 728
Commenter: Mr. Adam MacDonnell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 729
Commenter: Mr. Mark Mayhew
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 730
Commenter: Mrs. Deborah McKinlay
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 731
Commenter: Mr. Peter Mison
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 732
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. R.J Monk
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 733
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 734
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 735
Commenter: K Myatt
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 736
Commenter: J O'Connor
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 737
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Daniel&Thelma O'Mahony
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 738
Commenter: Mr. Brian Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 739
Commenter: Mrs. E.E Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 740
Commenter: Mr. J.E Parker
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 741
Commenter: Miss Sejal Pau
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 742
Commenter: Ms. Carole Phillips
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 743
Commenter: Mr. Michael Phillips
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 744
Commenter: Vivien Plummer
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 745
Commenter: Mr. N.B Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 746
Commenter: Mrs. S.C Prowse
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 747
Commenter: Mr. Cliff Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 748
Commenter: Mrs. Diane Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 749
Commenter: Mr. Peter Randall
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 750
Commenter: Mrs. Emma Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 751
Commenter: Mr. Martin Richards
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 752
Commenter: Janet Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 753
Commenter: Mr. Keith Richmond
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 754
Commenter: Mr. D Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 755
Commenter: Mrs. L Robinson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 756
Commenter: Mr. David Russell
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 757
Commenter: Miss Violet Saunders
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 758
Commenter: Florence Scott
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 759
Commenter: Mr. James Scott
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 760
Commenter: Mrs. Beverley Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 761
Commenter: Mr. Nicholas Schramm
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 762
Commenter: Barbara Sear
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 763
Commenter: Mr. Andrew Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 764
Commenter: Ms. Kate Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 765
Commenter: Millie Shaw
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 766
Commenter: Mr. Alan Shearman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 767
Commenter: Mr. N.G Skeates
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 768
Commenter: Mr. Daniel Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 769
Commenter: Mr. David Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 770
Commenter: Jennifer Smith
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 771
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Stacey
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 772
Commenter: Mr. Aaron Stormont
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 773
Commenter: Mr. Richard Swaby
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 774
Commenter: Mrs. Jaswanti Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 775
Commenter: Mohanlal Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 776
Commenter: Mr. Minesh Thakkar
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 777
Commenter: Mrs. Heather Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 778
Commenter: Mrs. H Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 779
Commenter: Mr. M Toms
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 780
Commenter: Mr. Denis Turton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 781
Commenter: Mr. S Valentine
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 782
Commenter: Mrs. Ann Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 783
Commenter: Mr. Dennis Venables
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 784
Commenter: Ms. Andrea Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 785
Commenter: Mr. Peter Vincent Jones
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 786
Commenter: Sarah Watson
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 787
Commenter: Mrs. V.E Welsh
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 788
Commenter: Amanda Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 789
Commenter: Mr. Tony Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 790
Commenter: Amanda Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 791
Commenter: Mr. Tony Wharfe
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 792
Commenter: Joyce White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 793
Commenter: Mr. Pete White
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 794
Commenter: Mr. David Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 795
Commenter: June Wiggins
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 796
Commenter: Christine Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 797
Commenter: Mr. Peter Williams
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 798
Commenter: Mr. Michael Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 799
Commenter: Mrs. Theresa Wilton
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 800
Commenter: Helen Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 801
Commenter: Mr. John Wolfenden
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 802
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Carole and John Wright
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 455

Representation No: M 837
Commenter: J.S. Bloor Ltd & Apsley Develop Ltd
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 803
Commenter: Mr. Andy Keen
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 804
Commenter: Mr. & Mrs. Peter/Christine Moore
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 805
Commenter: Mr. Alan Shearman
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 806
Commenter: Mr. N.G Skeates
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Representation No: M 807
Commenter: Mrs. V.E Welsh
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Response:

Refer to 'Summary of Duly-Made Representations to Development at the Manor Estate and the Council's Suggested Response' (Annex 1).

Modification Number: 469

Representation No: M 808
Commenter: Prudential Assurance Company Ltd.
Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Support for the revisions to TWA Diagram 6, in particular the deletion of reference to the Homebase/Wickes site as TWA9, deletion of reference to a link road across the site and for insertion of permissible uses for the site if it comes forward for redevelopment.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 1

**Major Developed Sites in the Green
Belt & Infill Areas**

Modification Number: 476

Representation No: M 809

Committer: Mr. B McKay Bovingdon Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Re: Bovingdon Prison

Support for the infill area shown in Map 2 but objection to the much larger area shown in Map 26, which includes the prison playing fields. The Map 26 designation would give the opportunity for the playing fields to be developed for housing or other commercial use.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The inclusion of the playing fields as part of the Major Developed Site is logical and appropriate, as it ensures that all land within the prison site is covered. PPG2 makes clear that such sites should include the present extent of the development. Identification of the playing fields does not imply that they can be built on. The nature and scale of any future redevelopment is very tightly controlled through criteria (a) to (i) of Policy 3A.

See also response to Proposed Modification 51.

Representation No: M 810

Committer: Mr. B McKay Bovingdon Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Re: Bovingdon Brickworks

Objection to the designation of the Bovingdon Brickworks site as an infill area suitable for redevelopment on the following because; further sub-division of the site leading to more unsightly developments in a Green Belt area; the intensification of uses leading to an increase in traffic on a straight stretch of road used as a rat run; uses which are detrimental to the amenity of the Green Belt, are in an unsuitable location, and pose an environmental threat such as shown by the appeal to allow concrete crushing.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE:

This objection has been considered under both Modifications 476 and 53, as the objection relates to the both the issue of infill and the extent of the Major Developed Site itself.

See response to modification 53 (M74).

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 2

Sustainability Checklist

Modification Number: 477

Representation No: M 811

Commenter: Dr. Nick Michael Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

All applications should require the submission of a sustainability statement.

Householder and telecommunications planning applications may have significant effects on nature conservation, including legally protected species including bats, badgers other protected mammals and great crested newts. An application relating to a single dwelling can have greater impacts on wildlife than one for multiple dwellings.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The Council does not consider it either practical or reasonable to require all householder and telecommunications planning applications to include a full sustainability statement. The impact of new development upon protected species is already adequately controlled through the application of Policy 103 (incorporating Proposed Modifications). In addition, PPG9: Nature Conservation is clear that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration in dealing with development proposals. The Government's approach (PPG8: Telecommunications, August 2001) is to facilitate new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. Pre-application discussions should include English Nature.

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 3

Layout and Design of Residential Areas

Modification Number: 478

Representation No: M 812

Commenter: Beechwood Homes Ltd

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The Inspector made it clear in his report that the maintenance of minimum garden depth and privacy distances was contrary to PPG3 in its attempt to avoid regimented and bland development. However he did not specifically recommend that the council delete the minimum distance requirements but he did say that if they were to be retained, the council should at the very least provide examples of the type of situations in which variations from the standards are likely to be acceptable.

It is noted that the council has attempted to achieve this. But we would like to state that as residential developers, in our experience, adhering rigidly to specific distance standards and garden depths can detrimentally affect the raising of density levels and thus prejudice the objective of making best use of urban land.

It is considered that provided the distance standards and layout of the scheme provides functional space that is usable and does not unduly impinge on privacy then such schemes should be allowed. In essence we support the views of the Inspector and feel that the gardens and amenity space standard and the privacy standard should be made more flexible than currently proposed.

Particularly onerous is the requirement that all gardens should be compatible with those of the

surrounding area; and that the private communal amenity area be provided to the rear of the building at least equal to the footprint of the building for two storey developments and increasing with building height and should not include drying areas. The council should delete these particular references.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Recommendation 20.4.9 of the Inspector's Report states that examples should be provided of situations where variations in amenity standards are likely to be acceptable. These examples have been included as part of Proposed Modification 478 and offer a wide range of opportunities for variation in the standards. It is clear from the new wording that the standards are intended to be applied flexibly. The objector gives no indication as to how an even greater level of flexibility could be satisfactorily built into these standards. It is not the Council's intention to apply these standards in a rigid manner and it is satisfied that they allow for sufficient flexibility.

The Council does not accept the criticism that applying these standards would be detrimental to the aim of making best use of urban land. Simply achieving high densities does not meet the objectives of PPG3: Housing. PPG3 also seeks to encourage high quality design that respects immediate neighbouring buildings and the wider environment. Therefore it is important to link the effective use of urban land with creating a quality environment. Ensuring that new schemes take account the pattern of surrounding development, particularly the nature of existing amenity space is a legitimate and essential part of this process. This, together with opportunities for variations is considered to be a reasonable approach to take when assessing new development.

The issue of amenity space provision for dwellings in multiple occupancy was not discussed at the Public Local Inquiry and therefore not subject to Modifications. The objector's comments relating to this aspect of the Plan are therefore not considered duly made.

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 5

Car Parking Standards

Modification Number: 480

Representation No: M 813

Commenter: Ms. Jennifer Bissmire Markyate Parish Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The National guideline suggests 1.75 parking spaces per property, Herts County Council recommend 1.5 per property.

The Parish Council feels that due to taking away public transport and in particular school transport, cars are an essential part of village life.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

NOTE: This representation has been considered as an objection to Proposed Modification 480 (Parking Provision), rather than to Decision 497 as specified by the Parish Council.

The County Council recommends an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across each local authority area. This guidance accords with government advice in PPG3: Housing (revised) and PPG13: Transport.

The Borough Council accepts that residents in more rural parts of the Borough are likely to be more dependent upon private cars than those who live in the larger towns. These differences are taken into account through the 'Accessibility Zones' work undertaken by the Council. This

establishes a two-tier approach to residential parking requirements and allows, where appropriate, for a higher standard in less accessible locations. The large villages (including Markyate) are identified as areas where normal maximum car parking standards apply. This approach, and the standards themselves, are consistent with those applied by other authorities within Hertfordshire.

Representation No: M 814
Commenter: WH Morrison Supermarkets PLC
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The proposed maximum car parking standard is too restrictive and inconsistent with PPG13 and when considered together with the Council's zonal approach to car parking restraint will result in an under-provision of car parking spaces at food stores/hypermarket development, making them unviable. This will discourage the provision of such facilities in town centres, contrary to the aims and objectives of PPG6.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The objections relate to two aspects of Appendix 5: Parking Standards, the standard for food superstores over 2500sqm and the application of the accessibility zone approach, both of which would reduce parking provision.

The parking standards set out in the Proposed Modifications document were supported by the Inquiry Inspector (Recommendation 20.7.15). In reality there is little difference between the maximum standard in Annex D of PPG13: Transport and that in the Plan 14 and 15sqm respectively). Furthermore, paragraph 53 of PPG13 makes clear that where appropriate local planning authorities may adopt more rigorous standards. This contributes towards the aim of reducing car dependence.

The standards accord with those adopted by Hertfordshire County Council in December 2000 as supplementary planning guidance to Policy 25 of the Structure Plan. It would be inappropriate for the Borough Council to amend any aspect of these standards, as a uniform approach is applied across Hertfordshire, so as not to disadvantage one location or type of development over another. The need for a uniform approach to parking provision was supported by the Inquiry Inspector (paragraph 20.7.4 in his Report).

Whilst PPG6: Town Centres and Retail Development encourages retail development that supports vital and viable centres, this is one of many related objectives that need to be considered in the Local Plan. Certainly, PPG6 seeks greater flexibility in the form of such development, including the amount of car parking (para 1.12). This should be tailored to meet local circumstances. PPG6 is keen to promote parking that serves the centre as a whole, rather than the needs of the development alone (para 2.31), and that parking at foodstores in central locations should reflect the level of accessibility of that centre (3.15).

Whilst it is accepted that parking under-provision is as unacceptable as over-provision, the Council's zone-based approach provides the scope to avoid both. The Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car parking Standards was adopted by the Council as supplementary planning guidance (SPG) on 24th July 2002 and stems from Policy 25 of the Hertfordshire Structure Plan.

With regard to town centres, shared provision should be explored through a Transport Assessment, assisted by the Council's Parking Management Plan and/or data on the existing usage of town centre public car parks. This approach is consistent with government advice contained in PPG13. The Council will be guided by this advice when assessing relevant planning applications. However, each case must be judged on its own individual circumstances, rather than applying a higher parking standard for all food superstores, or exempting them from the Accessibility Zone approach.

Representation No: M 815

Commenter: WH Morrison Supermarkets PLC
Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

The proposed cycle parking standards for food superstores are too high and will result in an over-provision of spaces.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The parking standards set out in the Proposed Modifications document were supported by the Inquiry Inspector (Recommendation 20.7.15).

The standards accord with those adopted by Hertfordshire County Council in December 2000 as supplementary planning guidance to Policy 25 of the Structure Plan. It would be inappropriate for the Borough Council to amend these standards. A uniform approach should be applied across Hertfordshire, so as not to disadvantage one location over another. The need for a uniform approach to parking provision was supported by the Inquiry Inspector.

The Council does not agree with the Objector's view that these standards are unduly onerous and will result in the inefficient use of land. The cycle parking standards were derived from surveys of actual demand and followed a comparison with practice in adjacent authorities.

Encouraging both shoppers and employees to cycle has an important role to play in achieving sustainable development. Guidance produced by the Hertfordshire Technical Chief Officers Association (2001) states that Green Travel Plans would be required in connection with planning applications for all new food retail units above 1,000 sqm. This reflects government advice in PPG13: Transport. Green Travel Plans would be expected to look at measures to reduce the demand for travel and to encourage the use of non-car modes. Furthermore, a key objective of PPG6: Town Centres and Retail Development is to promote the accessibility of new retail development by a choice of means of transport rather than just by car.

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 7

Small-scale House extensions

Modification Number: 482

Representation No: M 816

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Support

Representation:

Welcomes the guidance relating to Small Scale Extensions.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

Plan Ref:
APPENDIX 9

Article 4 Direction Areas

Modification Number: 484

Representation No: M 817

Commenter: Mr. Colin Westwood Berkhamsted Town Council

Obj/Sup: Objection

Representation:

Berkhamsted Town Council has pressed to have its Conservation Areas (or parts) designated for this for some years.

Response:

Retain Proposed Modification.

The list contained in Appendix 9 reflects the existing designations set out in the Deposit Draft Local Plan, (incorporating Proposed Modifications), rather than a commitment to a specific review.

Conservation Areas are already accorded considerable protection under Policy 116 and listed buildings further protection under Policy 115. However, Policy B2 of the Berkhamsted Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Policy Statement identifies priority areas where Article 4 Directions should be investigated. Such work is programmed under the Council's Conservation Strategy, depending on budgetary constraints.