



# **CORE STRATEGY REPORT OF CONSULTATION**

## **Panel and Community Reports on the Emerging Core Strategy (May – September 2009)**

### **Volume 4 Annex B**

**Includes:**

- **Reports from the Citizens' Panel and Gypsy and Traveller Community**

First published: July 2011

Edited: March 2011

Reprinted: October 2011

This publication is **Annex B to Volume 4 of the Report of Consultation on the Core Strategy**. If you would like this information in your own language, or you would like to contact the Council about any other issue, please call 01442 867212.

If you would like this information in another format, such as large print or audio tape, please call 01442 228660 or for Minicom only 01442 867877.

本刊物是核心策畧諮詢報告的第四卷—

附件B。你如欲獲得此資訊的中文版，或有任何其他事宜欲聯絡地方政府，請

致電01442 867212。

閣下如欲以其他形式獲得此資料，例如大字版或錄音帶，請致電01442 228660

或聾人電話01442 867877。

یہ اشاعت مرکزی لائحہ عملی پر مشاورتی رپورٹ کی جلد 4- اینیکس B ہے۔ اگر آپ یہ معلومات اپنی زبان میں چاہتے ہیں، یا کونسل سے کسی اور مسئلے کے بارے میں رابطہ کرنا چاہتے ہیں، تو براۓ مہربانی 01442 867212 پر فون کریں۔

اگر آپ یہ معلومات کسی اور شکل میں چاہتے ہیں جیسے بڑی چھپائی یا آڈیو ٹیپ تو براۓ مہربانی فون کریں 01442 228660 یا صرف منی کام کے لئے 01442 867877۔

આ પ્રકાશન કેન્દ્રિય વ્યુહરચના વિશેનો મસલત અહેવાલ ગ્રંથ ૪ – પરિશિષ્ટ બી છે. જો આ માહિતી તમારે તમારી પોતાની ભાષામાં મેળવવી હોય તો અથવા તો બીજા કોઈ પણ મુદ્દા વિશે તમારે કાઉન્સિલનો સંપર્ક કરવો હોય તો, મહેરબાની કરી 01442 867212 ઉપર સંપર્ક કરો.

જો આ માહિતી તમારે બીજા આકારમાં, જેમ કે મોટી છાપ, અથવા ધ્વનિ ટેપ (ઓડિયો ટેપ) માં મેળવવી હોય તો, મહેરબાની કરી 01442 228660 ઉપર સંપર્ક કરો અથવા ફક્ત મીનીકોમ માટે 01442 867877 ઉપર ફોન કરો.

## Report of Consultation

The Core Strategy for Dacorum Borough has been prepared taking account of Government policy and regulation, technical evidence and consultation. Consultation has spanned seven years, from 2005 to June 2011. This report explains the consultation: i.e.

- the means of publicity used;
- the nature of the consultation;
- the main responses elicited;
- the main issues raised; and
- how they have been taken into account.

It also explains how the actual consultation relates to the Council's policy on consultation and engagement, the Statement of Community Involvement.

The report is presented in seven volumes:

**Volume 1:** Emerging Issues and Options (June 2005 - July 2006)

- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses from the organisations consulted

**Volume 2:** Growth at Hemel Hempstead and Other Stakeholder Consultation (July 2006 –April 2009)

**Volume 3:** Stakeholder Workshops (September 2008 – January 2009)

- *Annex A* contains reports on each workshop

**Volume 4:** Emerging Core Strategy (May - September 2009)

- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses to the general public consultation
- *Annex B* contains reports from the Citizens' Panel and Gypsy and Traveller community

**Volume 5:** Writing the Core Strategy - from Working Draft to Consultation Draft (June – September 2010)

**Volume 6:** Consultation Draft Core Strategy (November 2010 – June 2011)

- *Annex A* contains a summary of responses to the general public consultation and reports from the Citizens' Panel and Town Centre Workshop. It also includes changes made to the Draft Core Strategy.

**Volume 7:** Overview

**This is Annex B to Volume 4.**



# CONTENTS

<b>PART 1: GYPSY AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITY</b>	<b>1</b>
Emerging Core Strategy and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan	
Issues and Options Gypsy and Traveller Consultation: visiontwentyone	<b>3</b>
<b>PART 2: CITIZENS' PANEL</b>	<b>13</b>
1. Report of Berkhamsted Citizens' Panel	<b>15</b>
2. Report of Hemel Hempstead Citizens' Panel	<b>31</b>
3. Full Responses from the Citizen's Panel	<b>51</b>
- Berkhamsted	<b>51</b>
- Bovingdon	<b>75</b>
- Hemel Hempstead	<b>91</b>
- Kings Langley	<b>145</b>
- Markyate	<b>155</b>
- Tring	<b>165</b>
- Countryside	<b>183</b>



# **PART 1:**

## **GYPSY AND TRAVELLER COMMUNITY**



## 3.0 CONSULTATION FINDINGS

### 3.1 Emerging Core Strategy

This section reviews the key findings of the consultation on the draft policy 'Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers' set out in the Emerging Core Strategy. It will examine views on the various criteria contained in the policy. Interviewees considered each criteria in turn and were asked if they agreed or disagreed with the criteria.

#### 3.1.1 Overall Approach

- (a) "The Council intends to deliver the number of pitches needed in the borough in a co-ordinated way, which allows for natural growth."

The intention to deliver the new pitches in the borough in a co-ordinated way received overwhelming support from interviewees with all twenty-one participants agreeing that this is the correct approach to take. One respondent noted that delivering places to live in a co-ordinated way is the same approach that is taken to the provision of housing.

- (b) "The Council intends to locate, design and secure the management of all Gypsy and Traveller sites in accordance with the following key principles:
- (i) equity – i.e. fairness to both the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community;
  - (ii) integration of the two communities – i.e. acceptance, social cohesion and a wider, shared sense of place and community;
  - (iii) sustainability – i.e. proximity to services, social inclusion, protection and heritage and important environmental features and conservation of natural resources."

The principles above (b i-iii) were supported by all the interviewees (21 interviewees). It was noted in the previous consultation undertaken by Vision Twentyone (December 2008) that there was a lack of understanding between the settled and Gypsy and Traveller communities, so these principles may help to increase this. The lack of communication between the two communities was again highlighted as an issue with interviewees noting that they felt 'people don't mix', as was the potential issues with different people residing on sites.

One respondent felt that the Council should also consider fairness to all Gypsies when allocated places on sites, citing the differences between different sections of the Gypsy and Traveller community. The provision of a specific site for the elderly (similar to sheltered housing for the settled community) was suggested.

Although the principles of equity and integration were supported, there was also a concern from a small number of interviewees that to achieve this, new

Gypsy and Traveller Consultation:  
Emerging Core Strategy and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan: Issues and Options

sites and the settled community should maintain a reasonable gap. As in the December 2008 consultation, Long Marston was noted as an example of the appropriate distance between a settled community and a site for the Gypsy and Traveller community, and an example of how a site can work well. If sites were provided too close to existing communities, it was felt that this could potentially reduce integration and understanding between communities.

*"People don't mix because of a lack of understanding between people."*

*"The sites should be about half a mile away from the houses as we have our own culture and our own way of life."*

*"The sites shouldn't be too close to housing, needs a buffer."*

*"We get on very well with the village near here, they involve us with any fetes or anything going on."*

A key question was raised by one of the participants, related to the deliverability of integration and equity. Whilst they agreed with the statement to locate, design and secure the management of all Gypsy and Traveller sites in this way, they wanted to know how this would be achieved. It was felt that to enable an informed response, more detail about how these principles would be achieved is needed.

*"How would they improve understanding and make this work?"*

All respondents were keen to see the provision of sites close to services, reducing the time and distance to travel. Again some respondents noted that whilst it is preferable to be located close to services, a gap or buffer should be maintained between a Gypsy and Traveller site and the housing of a settled community.

It is noted that whilst some of the respondents had strong preferences to be close to services, mentioning specific facilities such as schools and shops, there were very few comments relating to any other of the sustainability measures referred to in the key principles, such as reducing the demand on water and energy.

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| (c) | "The Council intends to collaborate with other agencies, such as the County Council, Police and community support groups, and site owners/managers to assist the assimilation of residents on new sites with the settled community nearby." |
|-----|---|

All respondents (21 interviewees) were in agreement that collaborating with other agencies could possibly help with the assimilation of residents on new sites with the settled community and may assist with relationships between those residing on sites. One respondent noted that people do often require extra help and made specific reference to members of the Gypsy and Traveller community having low literacy levels. As previous with the other key principles, one of the interviewees wanted more information about what help they would provide and how this would work/be achieved.

*"Help is needed to make sure that those already on the site 'get on'."*

*"That would be good as some people like people to help them and a lot of us can't read and write."*

*"That's very very important because of all the problems on the site with other families and intimidation – new people who move on to the sites and people who are on the sites with kids that cannot behave themselves and parents that cannot teach their kids manners; causes arguments between families. If there was someone in between like a liaison officer or someone from the council it would help."*

- (d) "The Council intends to seek Government funding to support the provision of new sites."

The majority of respondents (20 of 21 interviewees) agreed that Dacorum Borough Council should seek Government funding to support the provision of new sites for Gypsies and Travellers. One respondent was unsure, noting that they would want to find out where the money for that funding was coming from.

- (e) "The Council intends to give priority to the provision of pitches on sites which are as strategic housing sites or are defined in the Site Allocations DPD – whilst it is possible for other proposals to come forward, they will be judged on the basis of the need for that additional provision and the other principles in this policy."

Whilst all the respondents agreed that the provision of future accommodation for the Gypsy and Traveller community should take place in a co-ordinated and planned way through the Site Allocations DPD (see response to (a) above), there were mixed feelings as to whether new pitches should be provided either through or as part of major housing sites, with a significant number (13 of 21 interviewees) disagreeing with the statement.

Overall interviewees felt that in theory, this could be a solution to the problem of finding sites to provide the required new pitches, with both communities moving in at the same time and possibly encouraging integration between the two communities.

*"Think Gypsies and settled community would get on and integrate as it would all be built at the same time."*

*"There wouldn't be a problem with devaluation if they were built at the same time."*

However, the majority of interviewees disagreed with the statement (13 of 21 interviewees). On further consideration they felt that there were a number of factors that would prevent the practice of pitch provision as part of major housing developments being successful. The reasons for this focused on the relationship between the two communities, and included:

- The probability of the settled community wanting to purchase a house adjacent to a Gypsy and Traveller site
- The ability to provide a reasonable buffer between the housing and the site
- A concern that when the communities change so will the relationship between the two communities. Where a new site may work initially changes in resident dynamics over time may lead to problems.

*"People won't buy house near a gypsy site."*

*"It's only a few people that cause problems but then we all get the blame for it."*

*"Travellers are better spaced out so they don't get in arguments with people in the villages."*

*"That's not the way – it won't work as they'd be too close."*

*"Don't think people would go for it. Both communities would have to get on."*

*What about after a while when people have moved on?"*

*"The travellers should have a say how they design the sites. It's a bad idea putting too many travellers on the one site; big housing sites never work. It's a very bad idea putting a traveller's site next to a housing site for the settled community."*

### 3.1.2 The planning of new pitches

- (a) "New sites will be distributed in a dispersed pattern around settlements in the Borough."

All the respondents (21 interviewees) agreed that new sites should be spread out across Dacorum. This re-affirms the findings of the Site Allocations Consultation (December 2008) in which many of the residents interviewed stated that they would not like to see a new site too close to them. The outcomes of the previous consultation highlighted a number of reasons for this, including a fear of crime from the Gypsy and Traveller community of a new group of people coming into an area close to them when they have a good relationship with the settled community.

- (b) "New sites will be located close to facilities and with landscaping or physical features incorporated to provide an appropriate setting and relationship to existing residential areas (as defined in the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991 – 2011)."

Interviewees (21 interviewees) agreed that new sites should be located close to facilities and incorporate landscaping. There were stronger feelings for a sites proximity to shops than the importance of landscaping, with nearly all the additional comments relating to the statement confirming a high level of support for being near to services such as doctors, schools, and shops. With one respondent noting that they would not like to see sites provided *"in the middle of nowhere"* and another stating that *'landscaping'* should not include the very high banks that you often see around Gypsy and Traveller sites.

*"It would be nice to have trees and hedges etc."*

*"Slip End was a beautiful site but they were jealous so cut the trees down and smashed it all up."*

*"It'd be nice to have a little bit of garden at the back of your own place, fenced in."*

*"Housing should be near to everything - shouldn't be in the middle of nowhere."*

(c) "New sites will be of varying sizes, not normally exceeding a site capacity of 15 pitches."
---

There were mixed opinions on site size with 15 of the respondents agreeing that sites not exceeding 15 pitches in size would be appropriate. The remaining 6 respondents felt that sites smaller than this would be preferable.

*"That's an okay size. There needs to be space."*

*"That's a good size; if you get the right people in it would be lovely."*

Re-affirming the outcomes of the December 2008 consultation, the majority of those respondents agreeing that a site of 15 is appropriate, predominantly resided on a site that is far larger than 15 pitches. As such a site this size would feel small in comparison to their current living arrangements. Those citing that they would like to see smaller sites of between 6 and 10 pitches tended to live on a much smaller site, which they felt was the optimum size for a new site. The reasons for a preference for smaller sites again mirrored the outcomes of the previous consultation (December 2008), with interviewees noting that smaller sites were easier to manage and would provide the best arrangement for a single family.

*"Six to eight is the best size, easier to manage; you can get just one family on the site."*

*"Big sites just don't work; we've seen that in Ireland. It's very important to have big plots but that are all the same size so that there aren't arguments between families."*

*"Sites should definitely be less than 15 pitches."*

Gypsy and Traveller Consultation:  
Emerging Core Strategy and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan: Issues and Options

*"15 is too big, small sites are better. The most you'd want would be six to eight, a full family might take over a whole site but people get on better."*

*"That's miles too big – six pitches is plenty"*

*"15 is more than enough – that should be halved."*

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (d) | "New sites will be planned to allow for part occupancy initially, allowing subsequent growth to full site capacity." |
|-----|--|

Interviewees were mixed in their support for this statement with 15 of the 21 respondents agreeing that allowing room for sites to grow to full capacity at a later date was a positive move providing that this could be managed. It was felt that the provision of pitches in this way would allow for family growth to be accommodated and avoid young people having to find a new site when they grow up and get married.

*"That's a good idea, there needs to be space for growth in the community."*

*"That's a good idea to accommodate future growth but not too big."*

*"That's a good idea as family growth is a problem."*

Interviewees not in support of future pitch provision in this way (6 interviewees) raised a number of concerns relating to the practicalities of how this process would be managed. Interviewees were keen to be provided with more detail on how the Council would prevent the site being at full capacity too soon without permission and if additional land was adjacent to a site to allow for growth, how the Council would prevent this from becoming an area at the mercy of fly-tipping.

*"Providing that they had the land and did not build the bays until they were needed; need to be managed."*

*"There are no sites that accommodate for older people even though it's the younger people who up and leave and the older people who have nowhere to go."*

*"Creates friction as different generations don't want the same things."*

*"That wouldn't work, it would end up like a big rubbish tip."*

*"It would ruin the site to keep adding pitches."*

*"Would be better to have bigger pitches and bigger sheds."*

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (e) | "New sites will be designed with an open frontage similar to other forms of housing and to high standards using Government advice in 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites – Good Practice Guide (May 2008)." |
|-----|--|

There was a degree of support (11 interviewees) for sites to be designed so that they are open to the road with a public frontage, with private space being provided to the side and rear. Respondents agreeing with this statement felt that this would make sites less hidden and may reduce some of the barriers between communities.

*"That would be very nice because a lot of people don't know we exist in here."*

*"Should be all open and not banked in."*

*"The sites [should] run along the road, more like houses."*

The other 10 interviewees were split between being unsure of the proposal (4) and disagreeing (6), noting a preference for more traditional site design. Two considerations were highlighted by interviewees as reasons for their holding this opinion:

- Road safety issues – particularly for children and animals
- Loss of privacy.

*"It wouldn't work because of all the traffic on the road – there would be confusion coming off the road into a gateway for a pitch."*

*"There should be one point of access onto the site or like a ring so that there is one way into the site and then one way out."*

*"Shouldn't have direct access to each pitch off the road."*

*"If you have it like houses there would be a problem of lorries backing out into the road and children and dogs are always going to be running up and down the road."*

*"Like to have own space and privacy."*

*"What traveller wants people to see in?"*

*"Better like this site, closed in."*

*"Not too open – safety of children. They need areas to play."*

<p>"For any new transit pitches, the key considerations will, in addition, be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• achieving good access to the M1 or A41 main roads; and</li> <li>• minimising potential disturbance to adjoining occupiers.</li> </ul>
--

The majority of interviewees (14 interviewees) agreed with the key considerations for new transit pitches identified in the draft policy. One respondent added that any new transit pitches should not be located near to permanent Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Gypsy and Traveller Consultation:  
Emerging Core Strategy and East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan: Issues and Options

*"It needs to be just off the road."*

*"If they made them in different towns they could easily travel from town to town, every 15-20 miles."*

*"Can be a nuisance."*

Those that were unsure (4 interviewees) or disagreed (3 interviewees) with the statement did so because they were undecided whether transit pitches should be provided at all and raised concerns over them being located so close to main transport routes. It was felt that transit pitches would, due to the transient nature of residents and increased vehicle movements, always cause a degree of disturbance.

*"It's too dangerous near to main roads."*

*"There needs to be a gap so there aren't as many complaints, especially with those coming and going."*

*"They don't want access to a main roads, it will encourage more thieves."*

*"Most transit sites that I know have been closed down – one in Bedford, one in Wales. They're quite hard to manage as there are people of all nationalities showing up. They should be satisfied to have a transit site anywhere."*

## 4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The core findings of the face-to-face interviews undertaken can be found below:

### 4.1 Emerging Core Strategy

- New pitches in the Borough should be delivered in a co-ordinated and planned way as set out in the Emerging Core Strategy.
- The key principles of encouraging equity, integration and sustainability should be delivered through the location, design and management of all Gypsy and Traveller sites. The current lack of communication between the two communities is a barrier to achieving the key principles and greater levels of understanding between them.
- Whilst a greater level of interaction is advocated, there was a strong preference expressed for a buffer to remain between the residential areas of the two communities.
- New sites should be spread out across the Borough and located close to services and facilities such as schools, doctors and shops reducing the need to travel whilst maintaining a reasonable gap between sites for Gypsies and Travellers and housing for the settled community.
- Collaborating with other agencies may help the integration of residents on new sites with existing communities close by, however more information is required as to how this would work in practice.
- Dacorum Borough Council should seek Government funding to support the provision of new sites for Gypsies and Travellers.
- Further consideration should be given to the possibility of providing pitches through major housing sites. Whilst it may be a good idea in theory, a number of factors have been highlighted that would prevent this practice being successful.
- New sites should be landscaped in such a way that does not ghettoise the occupants, through the use of banking and other materials that would not be appropriate to use in new housing developments.
- New sites that do not exceed 15 pitches in size remains a popular view. Further consideration should be given to providing smaller sites of around 6 to 10 pitches, as the smaller the site the easier they are to manage and integrate with the existing settled community. This is providing that a reasonable separation distance is maintained between the two communities.

- Whilst there is a need to and support for the concept of providing sites that can accommodate natural growth at a later date, more needs to be done to establish how this would work in practice so that the sites are not overdeveloped prematurely or suffer neglect.
- If sites are to be provided with open frontages similar to that seen in housing developments fears and concerns relating to road safety and lack of privacy need to be overcome.
- Although there was not overwhelming support for the provision of transit pitches, the key considerations of achieving good access to main roads and minimising potential disturbance to adjoining occupiers are supported.

#### **4.2 East Hemel Hempstead Area Action Plan Issues and Options**

- A large number of respondents were unsure or did not feel that the Three Cherry Trees Lane site should remain in its current form. The site has a number of problems and a poor reputation which are compounded by its large size. Whilst there were a limited number of interviewees who want the site to remain in its current form, the reasons for this relate to a desire to reside with family members and remain in the Hemel area; all issues are resolvable with further consultation once an option has been agreed.
- There is support for making the site at Three Cherry Trees Lane smaller. A site half the size would be easier to manage, however, more information is required as to where people would be relocated to and how the decision would be made as to who would remain on the current site and who would be relocated.
- There is support to relocate the entire Three Cherry Trees Lane site in smaller component parts across Dacorum. This would remove the stigma and reputation that the existing site and its residents have and result in a number of smaller sites that would be easier to manage. Further investigation is needed on the practicalities of this option in addition to consultation with residents if this were to happen; particularly as some have noted a preference to stay in the Hemel area.
- The land adjacent to Spencer's Park should remain as employment land if the Three Cherry Trees Lane site is to remain in its current location and form. Although a number of suggestions were made for landscaping and buffering, it was felt that the potential problems from having a Gypsy and Traveller site in such close proximity to a housing development could not be overcome to a satisfactory level.

## **PART 2:**

## **CITIZENS' PANEL**



- 1. Report of Berkhamsted Citizens' Panel**



# Emerging Core Strategy Berkhamsted Report

---

Research Study Conducted for Dacorum Borough Council

September 2009





**Opinion Research Services** The Strand, Swansea SA1 1AF

**Jonathan Young**

Michael Davies

enquiries **01792 535300** · [info@ors.org.uk](mailto:info@ors.org.uk) · [www.ors.org.uk](http://www.ors.org.uk)

© Copyright **September 2009**

## Contents

---

<b><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></b> .....	<b>20</b>
<u>The Survey</u> .....	20
<u>Methodology</u> .....	20
<u>Interpretation of the Data</u> .....	21
<u>Publication of Data</u> .....	21
<b><u>Chapter 2: Key Findings</u></b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b><u>Chapter 3: Results</u></b> .....	<b>23</b>

# Chapter 1: Introduction

## The Survey

- 1.1 Opinion Research Services (ORS) was commissioned by Dacorum Borough Council to undertake a survey. The Council wished to examine residents' views on the Emerging Core Strategy paper.
- 1.2 Panellists were provided with a questionnaire, an information booklet and a covering letter explaining the purpose of the survey.

## Methodology

- 1.3 The survey was distributed to all of the panellists from the Berkhamsted area.
- 1.4 The following tables show the profiles of the respondents to the survey. Please note that the figures may not sum to 100% due to slight rounding errors:

Figure 1  
Gender, by all respondents

Gender – All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
Male	46	56%
Female	36	44%
Not Known	0	-

Figure 2  
Age, by all respondents

Age – All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
18 to 24	9	11%
25 to 39	17	21%
40 to 64	44	54%
65 and over	12	15%
Not known	0	-

Figure 3  
Ethnic Origin, by all respondents

Ethnic Origin All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
White	77	96%

Mixed	1	1%
Asian or Asian British	2	3%
Black or Black British	0	0%
Chinese or Other ethnic group	0	0%
Not known	2	-

### Interpretation of the Data

- <sup>1.5</sup> Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of “don’t know” categories, or multiple answers. Throughout the volume an asterisk (\*) denotes any value less than half a per cent.

### Acknowledgements

- <sup>1.6</sup> ORS would like to thank Claire McKnight, Sara Hamilton and Richard Blackburn for their help and assistance in developing the project. We would also like to thank the 82 people who took part in the survey, without whose valuable input the research would not have been possible.

### Publication of Data

- <sup>1.7</sup> As with all our studies, findings from this survey are subject to our Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any press release or publication of the findings of this survey requires the advance approval of ORS. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation


## Chapter 2: Key Findings

- 2.1 The vast majority of respondents (83%) stated that they agree with the vision for Berkhamsted.
- 2.2 Just under two thirds stated that they think there are additional issues they think the Council should be considering.
- 2.3 The majority of further key issues centred on infrastructure and parking issues
- 2.4 Just over half of respondents (55%) stated that they agree with the level of growth described in the main document.
- 2.5 Of those that didn't agree reservations were most likely to centre around worries over the area losing its character and the poor infrastructure.
- 2.6 Over three quarters of panellists (79%) agree that the Council should rule out the locations set out in table 2.
- 2.7 Respondents were most likely to choose option 4 as their preferred option for Greenfield development (27%).
- 2.8 The vast majority of panellists agreed with the approach to 'looking after the environment' as laid out in the main document.
- 2.9 Over half of respondents (56%) think the Council should be more flexible in its approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt.
- 2.10 Of those who stated that they don't think this, the most popular response was that the Green Belt should be protected:
- 2.11 An overwhelming majority of panellists (95%) agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment use.
- 2.12 91% think the British Film Institute should be allowed to expand on its site.
- 2.13 Less than half of respondents (45%) think that if the site was to be expanded it should consolidate development in one area of the site.
- 2.14 Just under three quarters of panellists (72%) don't think that the site should be linked to possible Greenfield Development.
- 2.15 The majority of respondents (61%) think the Council should support the completion of the New Road/Springfield Road link.
- 2.16 Of those that disagree the most common reasons centred around the development not being justified or it being unnecessary.
- 2.17 The vast majority of respondents (84%) think the potential for new cycle routes in the town should continue to be investigated.
- 2.18 Less than half of respondents had other concerns or comments surrounding the Spatial Strategy for Berkhamsted.

## Chapter 3: Results

- 3.1 The vast majority of respondents (83%) stated that they agree with the vision for Berkhamsted.

Figure 4  
Do you agree with the vision for Berkhamsted? By all respondents



- 3.2 Just under two thirds stated that they think there are additional issues they think the Council should be considering.

Figure 5  
Are there any additional key issues you think we should be considering? By all respondents



- 3.3 The majority of further key issues centred on infrastructure and parking issues:

*'Sufficient roads to accommodate new housing development...'*

*'Adequate provision for parking, traffic flow and local infrastructure...'*

*'Maintenance of the existing infrastructure...'*

*'Car parking for both residents and visitors.'*

*‘Car parking is obviously an increasing problem.’*

- 3.4 Just over half of respondents (55%) stated that they agree with the level of growth described in the main document.

Figure 6

Do you agree with the level of growth described in the main document? By all respondents



- 3.5 Of those that didn't agree reservations were most likely to centre around worries over the area losing its character and the poor infrastructure.

*‘20% growth of a market town will inevitably result in the town losing its distinct character and the infrastructure is hopefully inadequate’*


*‘Maintaining the character of a historic market town. Inadequate infrastructure.’*

*‘Level of growth described is too high to maintain the character of the town...’*

- 3.6 Over three quarters of panellists (79%) agree that the Council should rule out the locations set out in table 2.


Figure 7

Do you agree that we should rule out the locations set out in Table 2 (page 11 of the main document)? By all respondents




<sup>3.7</sup> Respondents were most likely to choose option 4 as their preferred option for Greenfield development (27%). They were least likely to choose option 1 (16%). 13% stated that they have no preference.

Figure 8  
Looking at Table 3 which is your preferred option for Greenfield development? By all respondents.



<sup>3.8</sup> The vast majority of panellists agreed with the approach to ‘looking after the environment’ as laid out in the main document.

Figure 9  
Do you agree with the approach to 'looking after the environment' of Berkhamsted outline in the main document? By all respondents



3.9 Over half of respondents (56%) think the Council should be more flexible in its approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt.

Figure 10  
Do you think the Council should be more flexible in its approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt? By all respondents




3.10 Of those who stated that they don't think this, the most popular response was that the Green Belt should be protected:

- 'Green Belt designation is there for a reason'*
- 'Green Belt is for us to enjoy, not look at buildings and yet more cars'*
- 'Green Belt must be protected'*
- 'Green Belt should be protected.'*

3.11 An overwhelming majority of panellists (95%) agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment use.

Figure 11


Do you agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment uses? By all respondents



<sup>3.12</sup> 91% think the British Film Institute should be allowed to expand on its site.

Figure 12

Should the British Film Institute be allowed to expand on its site? By all respondents



<sup>3.13</sup> Less than half of respondents (45%) think that if the site was to be expanded it should consolidate development in one area of the site.

Figure 13


If the site is expanded do you think it should consolidate development in one area of the site? By all respondents



- 3.14 Just under three quarters of panellists (72%) don't think that the site should be linked to possible Greenfield Development.

Figure 14

If the site is expanded should it be linked to possible Greenfield Development (i.e. Option 3 on page 13)? By all respondents



- 3.15 The majority of respondents (61%) think the Council should support the completion of the New Road/Springfield Road link.

Figure 15

Do you think we should continue to support the completion of the New Road/Springfield Road link? By all respondents



<sup>3.16</sup> Of those that disagree the most common reasons centred around the development not being justified or it being unnecessary.

*'Case not proven and damage not justified'*

*'Need remains unproven.'*

*'Not priority for the whole area.'*


*'Not necessary.'*

*'Not really a priority.'*

- <sup>3.17</sup> The vast majority of respondents (84%) think the potential for new cycle routes in the town should continue to be investigated.

Figure 16

Do you think the potential for new cycle routes in the town should continue to be investigated? By all respondents



- <sup>3.18</sup> Less than half of respondents had other concerns or comments surrounding the Spatial Strategy for Berkhamsted.

## **2. Report of Hemel Hempstead Citizens' Panel**



# Emerging Core Strategy Hemel Hempstead Survey

---

Research Study Conducted for Dacorum Borough Council

September 2009



**Opinion Research Services** The Strand, Swansea SA1 1AF

**Jonathan Young**

Michael Davies

enquiries **01792 535300** · [info@ors.org.uk](mailto:info@ors.org.uk) · [www.ors.org.uk](http://www.ors.org.uk)

© Copyright **September 2009**

## Contents

---

<b><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></b> .....	<b>36</b>
<u>The Survey</u> .....	36
<u>Methodology</u> .....	36
<u>Interpretation of the Data</u> .....	37
<u>Publication of Data</u> .....	37
<b><u>Chapter 2: Key Findings</u></b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b><u>Chapter 3: Results</u></b> .....	<b>40</b>

## Chapter 4: Introduction

### The Survey

- 4.1 Opinion Research Services (ORS) was commissioned by Dacorum Borough Council to undertake a survey. The Council wished to examine residents' views on the Emerging Core Strategy paper.
- 4.2 Panellists were provided with a questionnaire, an information booklet and a covering letter explaining the purpose of the survey.

### Methodology

- 4.3 The survey was distributed to all of the panellists from the Hemel Hempstead area.
- 4.4 The following tables show the profiles of the respondents to the survey. Please note that the figures may not sum to 100% due to slight rounding errors:

Figure 17  
Gender, by all respondents

Gender – All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
Male	88	45%
Female	106	55%
Not Known	0	-

Figure 18  
Age, by all respondents

Age – All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
18 to 24	25	13%
25 to 39	61	32%
40 to 64	77	40%
65 and over	29	15%
Not known	2	-

Figure 19  
Ethnic Origin, by all respondents

Ethnic Origin All Respondents	Number of cases	Valid %
White	177	93%
Mixed	2	1%
Asian or Asian British	5	3%
Black or Black British	4	2%
Chinese or Other ethnic group	2	1%
Not known	4	-

### **Interpretation of the Data**

- <sup>4.5</sup> Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of “don’t know” categories, or multiple answers. Throughout the volume an asterisk (\*) denotes any value less than half a per cent.

### **Acknowledgements**

- <sup>4.6</sup> ORS would like to thank Claire McKnight, Sara Hamilton and Richard Blackburn for their help and assistance in developing the project. We would also like to thank the 194 people who took part in the survey, without whose valuable input the research would not have been possible.

### **Publication of Data**

- <sup>4.7</sup> As with all our studies, findings from this survey are subject to our Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any press release or publication of the findings of this survey requires the advance approval of ORS. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy or misrepresentation.

## Chapter 5: Key Findings

---

- 5.1 Over three quarters of respondents (77%) agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead.
- 5.2 Of those who don't, the most likely reservation relates to the town's infrastructure.
- 5.3 Just under two thirds of panellists (63%) think that there are additional issues the Council should be considering.
- 5.4 Respondents were most likely to identify providing Hemel Hempstead with better hospital facilities/an A & E service.
- 5.5 79% agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead town centre.
- 5.6 A further 79% agree with all of the spatial principles in Policy X.
- 5.7 Respondents were most likely to agree with 'part (iv)' in the main document (94%).
- 5.8 Just under two thirds stated they agree with all of Policy Y.
- 5.9 Those who don't agree reservation again lay with moving the hospital away from the town centre
- 5.10 The vast majority of panellists agree with the aims for the Waterhouse Square Zone.
- 5.11 A further 88% agree with the aims for the Old Town zone.
- 5.12 Just over half agree with the aims for the Hospital Zone.
- 5.13 The majority of those who stated that they don't agree commented that they think the hospital needs to stay in the town:
- 5.14 84% of respondents agree with the aims for the Marlowes zone.
- 5.15 The vast majority of panellists (88%) agree with the aims for the Marlowes shopping zone.
- 5.16 The majority of respondents (61%) think the Council should support the completion of the New Road/Springfield Road link.
- 5.17 Around half of respondents (51%) think that other things should be incorporated into the 'looking after the environment' theme for Hemel Hempstead.
- 5.18 Suggestions include cycle paths and not building on green belt land
- 5.19 Over three quarters of respondents stated that they support a viable town stadium complex.
- 5.20 Less than half of panellists think other things should be incorporated in to the 'social and personal welfare' theme for Hemel Hempstead.
- 5.21 Over three quarters of respondents (78%) think that Jarman Fields should be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation.
- 5.22 Over three quarters of respondents (78%) think that Jarman Fields should be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation.

<sup>5.23</sup> Under half of Panellists (47%) stated that they have other concerns or comments regarding the Spatial Strategy for Hemel Hempstead.

## Chapter 6: Results

- 6.1 Over three quarters of respondents (77%) agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead.

Figure 20  
Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead? By all respondents



- 6.2 Of those who don't, the most likely reservation relates to the town's infrastructure. Comments include:

*'6,500 + new dwellings are far too much for the poor infrastructure...'*

*'Better transport links between new estates and the industrial estates. This is still poor and prevents people from getting to work'*

*'I am concerned that the town infrastructure...will not be able to cope with the level of growth planned'*

- 6.3 Just under two thirds of panellists (63%) think that there are additional issues the Council should be considering.

Figure 21  
Are there any additional major issues you think we should be considering? By all respondents



- 6.4 Respondents were most likely to identify providing Hemel Hempstead with better hospital facilities/an A & E service. For example:

*'An A & E is vital for the town's hospital'*

*'Bring back a hospital with full services.'*

*'Consultant led 24 hour general and A & E hospital facilities to meet the needs of an increasing population both young and old...'*

*'Hemel Hempstead must have a proper hospital, Watford is a disaster'*


*'Hospital facilities are not adequate and will become less adequate...A & E services must be re-established locally before any increase...Watford A & E is already over stretched and not easily altered quickly. Hospital facilities must be considered first before accommodation, cultural etc...'*

*'Location of full hospital facilities. Not transfer to Watford or Luton'*

- 6.5 79% agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead town centre.


Figure 22

Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead town centre? By all respondents




6.6 A further 79% agree with all of the spatial principles in Policy X.

Figure 23  
Do you agree with all of the spatial principles in Policy X? By all respondents



6.7 Respondents were most likely to agree with 'part (iv)' in the main document (94%).

Figure 8



Do you agree with the following in the main document... ? By all respondents

6.8 Just under two thirds stated they agree with all of Policy Y.

Figure 24  
Do you agree with all of Policy Y? By all respondents



6.9 Of those who don't agree reservation again lay with moving the hospital away from the town centre:

*'Existing hospital is accessible and in the town centre. It should not move.'*

*'Hospital has had so much money spent on it, why close it and build a new one over at Maylands.'*


*'Hospital services should be in town centre.'*

*'It is essential to keep hospital services in town centre for ease of use for people who have to use public transport.'*

*'The replacement 'hospital' should not be on Maylands.'*


6.10 The vast majority of panellists agree with the aims for the Waterhouse Square Zone

Figure 25  
Do you agree with the aims for the Waterhouse Square Zone? By all respondents



6.11 A further 88% agree with the aims for the Old Town zone.

Figure 26  
Do you agree with the aims for the Old Town zone? By all respondents



6.12 Just over half agree with the aims for the Hospital Zone.

Figure 27  
Do you agree with the aims for the Hospital zone? By all



- 6.13 The majority of those who stated that they don't agree commented that they think the hospital needs to stay in the town:

*'A town this size needs a fully operational hospital. Millions of pounds have been spent on it over the years. It will be criminal to pull it down.'*

*'A waste of money. I thought some parts of the hospital were fairly new. Why knock them down to re-site them.'*


*'Consider a central hospital complex, very important not moved to out of town centre.'*

*'...keep the hospital on site. Don't build elsewhere.'*

*'Keep hospital central'*


- 6.14 84% of respondents agree with the aims for the Marlowes zone.

Figure 28  
Do you agree with the aims for the Marlowes zone? By all respondents




- 6.15 The vast majority of panellists (88%) agree with the aims for the Marlowes shopping zone.

Figure 29  
Do you agree with the aims for the Marlowes shopping zone? By all respondents



<sup>6.16</sup> The majority of respondents (61%) think the Council should support the completion of the New Road/Springfield Road link.

Figure 30  
Do you agree with the aims for the Plough zone? By all respondents



<sup>6.17</sup> Around half of respondents (51%) think that other things should be incorporated into the 'looking after the environment' theme for Hemel Hempstead.

Figure 31

Is there anything else you think should be incorporated into the 'looking after the environment' theme for Hemel Hempstead? By all respondents



6.18 Suggestions include cycle paths and not building on green belt land:

*'Cycle paths alongside footpaths throughout the town.'*

*'Cycle paths like Stevenage New Town.'*

*'Do not build on Green Belt land.'*

*'No building on Green Belt land at all costs.'*

6.19 Over three quarters of respondents stated that they support a viable town stadium complex.

Figure 17

Do you support a viable town stadium complex? By all respondents



6.20 Less than half of panellists think other things should be incorporated in to the 'social and personal welfare' theme for Hemel Hempstead.

Figure 18

Is there anything else that should be incorporated in to the 'Social and personal welfare' theme for Hemel Hempstead? By all respondents



- 6.21 Over three quarters of respondents (78%) think that Jarman Fields should be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation.


Figure 19

Should Jarman Fields be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation? By all respondents



- 6.22 Over three quarters of respondents (78%) think that Jarman Fields should be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation.

Figure 20  
The Spatial Strategy themes for Hemel Hempstead to 2031 are presented in Section 5. Overall, do you support this approach? By all respondents



6.23 Under half of Panellists (47%) stated that they have other concerns or comments regarding the Spatial Strategy for Hemel Hempstead.

Figure 21  
Do you have any other concern or comments regarding the Spatial Strategy for Hemel Hempstead? By all respondents





**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**BERKHAMSTED**



**Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision for Berkhamsted?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	67	82%	67	83%
No	No	14	17%	14	17%
NAN	Not Answered	1	1%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A1TX - If no, what should be different?**

- Berkhamsted cannot sustain similar levels of new housing as in the recent past. There have been several large high density developments and we cannot cope with anymore.
- But there is not enough land to achieve this. In particular housing development cannot continue at rate of recent past without losing gardens/increasing densities as all the brownfield land has now been used.
- Due to the scale of the map it is impossible to locate the gridded section of development for side Street development, and hence make assessment on this. Also the impact of 4 storey development on the high Street or in town area is hard to assess unless specific areas for such developments are suggested.
- I do not believe there should be any further housing development until the existing developments are finalised and the infrastructure catches up.
- I would like to see mention of other facilities besides education. E.g. doctors surgeries, youth work activities, older peoples day centre etc.
- It would mean huge over development for Berkhamsted.
- Option 1 land off New Road, there should definitely be no development here. New Road is already a nightmare morning and evening with traffic coming down across the common too close to the wood (the beeches) which is already being ruined. Essentially no access from Springfield Road. I am in a small group of houses but access would be so badly limited.
- The actual developments suggested in the strategy have not, and are not being followed. So many works in statement do address the actual action requirement.
- The assumption that Berkhamsted can keep on growing and still maintain its character. This is rubbish it is just turning into a large housing estate which is made more difficult due to the valley producing a long thin estate with very poor road access.
- The present Green Belt must be retained. New build must be in keeping with the existing town, no to four storey buildings.
- The statements "new development will be high quality, sustainable and ..." and "affordable housing" are contradicting. Assumptions regarding local employment are over stated and this will need to be addressed otherwise social issues may ensue.
- There should be no more housing, without more infrastructure, especially schools.

- This town centre is already significantly over populated. The recent developments such as Stag Lane and Waitrose are awful. Until a plan can be produced to sustainably develop Berkhamsted efforts should be made to reduce the population.
- Vague, pc phrases lack specificity. It could be applied to many towns the size of Berkhamsted.
- We cannot accommodate new housing at similar level as in the past as we cannot expand beyond the present limits of the town due to the AONB and Green Belt. A little or no room left for more open space. No more services should be lost and those lost already should be returned.

#### Q. A2 - Are there any additional key issues you think we should be considering?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	50	61%	50	62%
No	No	31	38%	31	38%
NAN	Not Answered	1	1%	-	-
Total		82	100%	81	100%

#### Q. A2TX - If yes, please list...

- 1. The need to provide sufficient water supply for the further growth as Dacorum is a net importer of water. 2. Sufficient roads to accommodate new housing developments, particularly in the area of Durrants Lane on Shooterway.
- 2.0 --> vision should be the positive promotion of the canal, not simply protect , which is a negative, also more on sustainability.
- A firm commitment not to have any large supermarket / superstore.
- Additional parking is essential.
- Adequate provision for parking, traffic flow and local infrastructure such as sports facilities and leisure facilities.
- All the nice side roads (or most of them) from the station outward are filled with parked cars and disposal bins. The road sweeper can't access Station Road, George St. Or Ellesmere to name but a few. A very difficult situation!
- As mentioned, an intended four storey development in the next 20+ years in the town centre is an issue. Modern development since the sixties has almost ruined the very centre (Tesco's, Boots, Waterstones).
- As well as ensuring that the environment is protected, extra attention should be given to reducing carbon emissions.
- Better use of local authority housing stock. Why are some council property houses boarded up? These can be seen from the high Street on the left by sports centre.
- Car parking for both residents and visitors. I do not think we could cope with an influx of tourists. Note should be taken of the topography of the town with regards to drainage and overlooking.

- Car parking is obviously an increasing problem (especially all day parking for people taking the train to work). This impacts increasingly on those living in proximity to the station (proximity which probably now extends to 1/4 mile). Extension of parking by the station (proposed upper deck) should be a priority and double yellow band areas need to be extended on all roads within 1/4 mile including gravel path.
- Care should be taken that planning permissions for houses on hand that should be maintained for farming or nature preserves, less infilling.
- Controlling development on school sites. There has been too much building on the Kings Road 'campus' in recent years.
- Correct imbalance of flats to houses, far too many flats at present.
- Demographics and the ageing population, what impact will this have on future development in the town!
- Enhance and build on leisure areas, walks etc along canal. Improved car parking or reduce new housing development.
- Ensure new housing is matched by additional doctors surgeries, dental surgeries, schools, swimming pools, tennis courts. I am not sure all these are covered by the phrase 'community facilities' but they should be listed explicitly.
- Focus on leisure such as cycle networks and access to countryside.
- I do not believe there should be any further housing development until the existing developments are finished and the infrastructure catches up. Availability of hospital (Hemel). Northchurch needs traffic relief and calming measures asap.
- I would like to see more police on the 'beat'.
- Maintaining the character of a historic market town inadequate infrastructure, facilities, schools, doctors, dentists, care for the elderly. Traffic congestion, road safety for pedestrians / cyclists and destruction of good fertile farmland and Green Belt.
- Maintenance of the existing infrastructure, public transport links both within the town and long distance (75 km and over), particularly northwards.
- More activities and places for young people to go, the Swan is not enough. Also, increase the number of opportunities to socialise for the elderly. Don't build on Shootersway anymore, the area is known for spacious housing, keep it that way!
- More trees/green in new development e.g. Robertson Road (welcome site) has nice buildings but is a barren treeless waste. With some good large trees (plane, oak, beech) it could take on the attractive character of a London square. I fear for the rural aspect of London Road when Bank Mill is developed.
- No further encroachment on amenity and arable land surrounding the town.
- No reference to the role of the churches which still have a significant impact on the life of the town, e.g. in promoting 'fair trade', they should be included.
- Not sure if affordable housing would attract certain changes to demographic of Berkhamsted. Do not want Berkhamsted spoilt.
- Not to allow large housing gardens to be split up to provide a number of smaller units.
- Over population in the south east. Berkhamsted has already been ruined as a pleasant place to live. The main issue must be to reduce the population of Berkhamsted.

- Planning ambitions are mostly about residential accommodation. Encouragement of local employment and services on offer, small units for rent would be an advantage.
- Primary school places for additional housing, especially change of sunny gate Lane location up hill and larger, leaving existing lower site for flatter elderly housing, nearer buses and shops.
- Prioritisation is needed to achieve your vision. Traffic to an enhanced Berkhamsted must be dealt with e.g. the highways department must safely improve burgeoning rat runs and use the by pass to control peak flow where possible.
- Providing more bridge paths.
- Provision for vulnerable groups, e.g. elderly, physically or mentally impaired.
- Provision of protection for trees, whether they are within the town (roadside), in shrub lines, in gardens or surrounding or within local school grounds.
- Provision of public transport. Up keep of road surfaces with the potential increase in traffic.
- Quality of road surfaces.
- Road use/parking. Future local energy generation/ use etc. Provisions for local food production/growth and markets. Value of gardens and informal open spaces. (all of the above except parking) to make a proper 'transition town'.
- Schools: playing fields are better for children and people need green areas e.g. grass.
- Special consideration should be given to enabling small private business to flourish. Too many 'chain' businesses, no good!
- Specific healthcare issues, distance from hospital, A&E and other care. Enough ambulances? - more local healthcare. More traffic on A41 = dangerous and busy.
- Status of local infrastructure, roads, sewage and schools are inadequate as it is and needs to be addressed.
- Stop killing Berkhamsted by squeezing even more houses in. The town centre can't cope with any more cars due to poor road access and complete lack of proper parking.
- The design of any developments needs to be in keeping with the town, and our community. The high Street especially should be used for the community, local businesses and the market. Pedestrian access and cycling into town should be encouraged enabling young families and elderly to access local services and to enjoy amenities without traffic noise.
- The effect of the proposed changes will have upon access and upon services generally, their ability to provide the necessary quality required. The need to provide more parking facilities that will be needed to accommodate the greater use of the town centre. The inevitable need for increased policing / warden especially at night.
- The loss of greenbelt land and the need to protect wildlife areas (noted that there are few).
- The town is badly supplied with community facilities, the old town hall and city centre are uncomfortable and badly designed. A well designed centre is essential for arts and cultural use.
- What about non renewable energy generation to facilitate increased use? Use of canal / river, wind power or efficient digester for gas generation at sewerage works for example.

- What arrangements will be made for ongoing monitoring of actual performance and the vision.
- You should be considering life in the area instead of just marking out sites for development that aren't as yet crammed full.
- Young people should be encouraged to take a more active role within the community.

#### Q. A3 - Do you agree with the level of growth described in the main document?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	45	55%	45	55%
No	No	37	45%	37	45%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A3TX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- 20% growth of a market town will inevitably result in the town losing the distinct character and the infrastructure is hopefully inadequate.
- Although growth is needed, no Green Belt land should be used. Growth for growths sake needs to be treated carefully.
- Appalling congestion in Berkhamsted and north church, narrow high Streets and car parking and bicycle traffic. Growth target excessive. The proposed in filling will create a high density 'area' with inadequate 'space'.
- Berkhamsted cannot take this growth without improvements to roads and parking.
- Berkhamsted feels overcrowded yet Tring and surrounding areas feel under populated, shops are closing etc. Development should focus on these dying areas.
- Having lived in area all my 70 + years, I hate to see the way things are going, but I didn't think we have much choice, unfortunately it's the same everywhere.
- I am not convinced the town can sustain this growth.
- I do not believe there should be any further housing development until the current development is finished and the infrastructure catches up.
- I don't understand the logic behind your statement that 750 homes would maintain the existing population. Surely, any additional homes would increase the population : 750 homes would seem adequate to me.
- I fear for the threat to Green Belt land and to Berkhamsted's distinctive character.
- I would not like levels of growth that impact on the Green Belt. I think this starts us down a slippery slope and will eventually completely change the nature of the town.
- It should be the lowest figure in the list I.e. 750 as a top maximum number. This town is way too crowded as it is, and all development of new homes should ideally stop.
- It sounds a lot. Also don't understand why +50 new homes are needed to maintain existing populations.
- It would entail over development.

- Level of growth described is too high to maintain the character of the town. School capacity is already too low, so why try to increase the population?
- Maintaining the character of a historic market town inadequate infrastructure, facilities, schools, doctors, dentists, care for the elderly. Traffic congestion, road safety for pedestrians / cyclists and destruction of good fertile farmland and Green Belt.
- Many new build homes in Berkhamsted are sitting about unsold. Either they are too highly priced or undesirable? Will affordable homes have the same fate? Establish need before wasting money just because of developer pressure.
- Northchurch is a small town, the schools are already full. The roads are not wide enough for yet more traffic. Town and common are already being spoiled with too much use. Instead of being a comfortable little town it is being gradually ruined. I would say there is no room for more people and more facilities.
- Planned growth appears to be out of scale with current size of town centre.
- Recent serious issues with car parking and school places indicate that the council should be much more conservative in its growth plans going forward.
- Schools, car parks, roads, drains, sports facilities are all already stretched beyond capacity and that capacity cannot be increased.
- Seems a lot of development, maybe too much.
- The additional level of growth suggested does not take into account the unsatisfactory growth that has recently occurred in the town on account of the large number of flats (apartment development) that has already increased the number of units supplied without consideration for the extra congestion this is causing and the additional pressure on services, car parking etc.
- The arbitrary level of growth suggested presents problems because there is insufficient land. The number of homes should be reduced.
- The assumption that Berkhamsted can keep on growing and still maintain its character. This is rubbish it is just turning into a large housing estate which is made more difficult due to the valley producing a long thin estate with very poor road access. Stop killing Berkhamsted by squeezing even more houses in. The town centre can't cope with any more cars due to poor road access and complete lack of proper parking, plus, the character of Berkhamsted is being lost. More development will make this worse and less likely to be a true transition town i.e. sustainable living as there is not enough open spaces already, and all the gardens are being developed. I also don't believe the infrastructure will be improved to cope due to cost.
- The level of growth planned is crazy. Building more housing will only attract more people and make a bad situation worse.
- The proposed level is still a 50% increase. The town is already at saturation point without changing its character and where would these dwellings be built? Also road, water and drain infrastructure etc couldn't accommodate this increase.
- The rate of growth is too high. I don't think town infrastructure can accommodate this without exacerbating the issues (services, congestion, parking).
- The town is busy enough and traffic doesn't flow very well though the town.
- There is already too much pressure on infrastructure. Would there be enough doctors for example.

- There is simply no room and not enough schools and services already.
- Unfortunately having lived in the town for 6 years, we have noticed a slow and steady decline in quality of life we enjoyed here. In the future, much more will need to be done to improve access to schools, doctors, dentists and general services to meet the increase and changes in social economic population needs of the population being introduced into Berkhamsted and I don't think that these plans recognised these needs or will meet the population target needs.
- Will schools be able to cope?
- With the credit crunch and presumed net emigration the need for extra housing may be reduced.
- Would like growth to be up to 1200, not too much. I like the use of sites like Egerton.

**Q. A4 - Do you agree that we should rule out the locations set out in Table 2 (page 11 of the main document)?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	65	79%	65	79%
No	No	17	21%	17	21%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Agree with all, except: could have small development on the edge of Ashlyn's school site. Would help school and not be detrimental of by hill top road : also releasing some land for BFI use only would be beneficial if it keeps BFI in town.
- All areas should be considered and development kept in keeping with established norms for each area. This will mitigate resentment and protest.
- Bark mill Lane and Ashlyns area would maintain integrity of town.
- Basically because all these locations offer more scope for housing development than these in table 3. I would especially not rule out the land to the south of bank mill Lane. This would take any housing no nearer to Bourne End than the existing hall park estate and I do not feel any of the other 'cons' listed are particularly significant.
- Don't have strong feelings but think the first two options sound okay.
- I think that land south of upper hall park should be used. This would avoid an already congested Berkhamsted.
- Ivy house Lane area, homes would seem less squashed in.
- Land south of bank mill Lane is ok to develop as currently semi derelict otherwise agree no development on these sites.
- Option 4 looks possible. Access to town and schools is still good, and it wouldn't impact on the town centre itself.

- Realistically the a41 is a blot on the landscape and any development near it can only detract from it. Whether a person would want to live near it is a different issue, the houses need to be built and the noise from the a41 is heard across the valley at Ashridge. If any developments were to happen then the council should be looking to put them in areas where previous construction has also happened rather than pushing them to the fringes. If this means concentrating the development along the A41- Shooterway path, then they have to.
- Rule out south Northchurch - this exits to the main road which at peak times is already full.
- Silly way to put this question! Some yes, some no. Have marked your boxes 1 - 4 top to bottom, 1/ no, 2/ no, 3/ yes, 4/ no, 5/ no, 6/yes.
- Some of these locations could accommodate low density housing.
- South north church etc. Why not the area between pea Lane and Howberling House adjacent to the b4251.
- The land south of bank mill Lane is closer to the town centre than hall park. The area is scruffy and is the entrance to the town.
- The land south of bank mill Lane is no further from town centre than many houses around there. Careful design would minimise usual impact and preserve the Bulbourne.
- The reason for rejection are contradictory and inconsistent as they could apply to almost all the sites under consideration.

**Q. A5 - Looking at Table 3 (page 12) which is your preferred option for Greenfield development?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	12	15%	12	16%
2	Option 2	18	22%	18	23%
3	Option 3	16	20%	16	21%
4	Option 4	21	26%	21	27%
5	No preference	10	12%	10	13%
NAN	Not Answered	5	6%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - Please explain why...**

- 1. This is an established residential area. 2. The dwellings would not be very visible from other side of valley. 3. Area is already served by route 353 buses to Chesham and slough. 4. Site is on the town side of Aslyns school buildings.
- Adjacent to hilltop estate, Ashley school setting has never really been made full use of.
- Agree/align opinions with pros + cons expressed more with this option than alternatives.
- Avoids town centre congestion. Helps expansion of BFI which I think is important.

- Because developments could help fund new school facilities and there is some scope for reducing Ashlyns grounds.
- Best access to roads and schools.
- Clear boundaries and close to amenities, school and small basic shops. Will enhance local community.
- Close enough to town centre to make walking into town possible, close to all schools.
- Close to less congested entry/exit roads.
- Close to schools and will help with school facilities.
- Close to schools. Could help new school facilities.
- Closer to residential development. Other option further away also broke the buffer between / too close to the a41.
- Currently low density area. One hit so single loss of Green Belt.
- Despite affecting Ashlyns school, others are too far from the town centre and affect land which could set harmful precedents.
- Difficult to assess as your map has no road names on it, and I don't know where some of these sites are.
- Good relationship to existing development.
- Good road (Kings Road) to middle of town and direct to station. Seems more space to offer to each house built.
- Good sized site. Like the idea. It will encourage use of facilities at that end of town.
- Green field should be protected for the sake of the environment.
- I agree with the 'pros' in the table.
- I consider option 2 to be the most suitable for green field development. Access onto hilltop should not cause too much of a problem. Hopefully it would not be necessary to clear all the trees along hilltop.
- I favour supporting BFI.
- I feel that any development should be for the maximum number of dwellings hence the majority of the town would not be affected.
- I object to this leading question. There should be no greenfield development.
- I think development close to the town centre already seems at maximum level and this development would seem to have the space to accommodate the growth required.
- I think it will have the least impact on the nature of the town. Shootersway is incredibly busy in the morning during rush hour. The bend onto Kings Road is dangerous and increasing the number of cars would increase the risk of accidents.
- If some development is inevitable then all but option 2 would be acceptable. Option 2 is unacceptable due to loss of school playing fields.
- If this area is developed sensitively it could enhance the canal, there are several areas along the canal where the corridor for wildlife has been improved, with a buffer zone between housing and the natural environment. Nb. Option 3 would be my second choice if one were needed.
- It is the only site of sufficient size and has better access potential.
- Keep Berkhamsted as it is.
- Keeping the Green Belt policy and keep a flexible approach or people get very unhappy.

- Larger plot, conjoined with current building line.
- Least disadvantage to people i.e. schools also depends on what type of housing.
- Least visible, good access to public highways. Best of a bad choice.
- Least worst option.
- Link with BFI site.
- Located within existing housing area, less impact on less developed parts of town.
- More scope.
- Natural extension to housing area.
- Near a school and greenfield. Good access.
- Near schools, key strategic housing site and new open space. Reasonable access to town centre and its amenities.
- No green field development.
- None are suitable for the reasons expressed. We really must oppose any further expansion of Berkhamsted and encourage maintenance of existing buildings.
- None of the areas should be developed. Just read all the 'cons' comments.
- None of the options are big enough. 2 / 3 are best limited to the town facilities currently. More brown site options should be sought.
- Not option 1. Already crowded and lots of traffic. Option 2 loses playing fields. Option 4 with key site, can provide infrastructure for both and local shops.
- Offers more space and least visual impact.
- Only if it can help to secure the New Road/Springfield Road link which is badly needed. Option 4, of course provides the most dwellings.
- Option 1 is already very busy. Narrow road certainly no entrance from Springfield Road. For some of us (e.g. on Northchurch common) it is already very difficult at peak times.
- Option 1 won't feel like the town is growing. Option 3 and 4 would be my second choice due to feel of area.
- Option 2 already suffers from poor access and heavy traffic. Options 3 and 4 are preferable as the shooters way area has already been ruined by over development.
- Option three or four would be too expensive and houses would be large. Option two, loss of school playing fields and loss of trees.
- Pros and cons are fairly evenly balanced across all 4 sites. Incidentally, I believe the position shown for option 3 on the map is in correct as it is shown bordering Kingshill Way, not Shootersway.
- Proximity of schools. Access to Shootersway.
- Retention and expansion of BFI site.
- Seems a good use of existing space. Also nearer town centre and railway, not on a hill would suit less mobile people. Near to open space.
- Seems the one with the least disadvantages. The Northchurch site would be very damaging, New Road is already so busy.
- Site is convenient to centre of town and schools. Ashlyns might benefit from funds for new facilities but it is difficult to visualise how much space 50 dwellings would take.
- Smaller unit of development.
- Strengthen g. Belt boundary. Sale proceeds can fund school improvements. (paragraph 1.10).

- Support the expansion of the BFI. Direct access for all without impacting the town centre.
- Supports the BFI. This is an asset to the town and should be supported, development can be phased with others to increase housing and I have no objection to development of housing towards a41. Very near schools and is this good for traffic and children.
- The best defined site with good access, though not close to town centre and amenities, the least worst alternative.
- The fact that it has immediate access onto shooters way and it is close to schools and achieves the capacity required.
- The New Road/ Springfield link has been expected for many years and might complete the outer loop around Berkhamsted thereby taking pressure off north church and Berkhamsted high Streets.
- This is the least bad option! This adds housing to a heavily housed area which is the best thing to do. Shooters way will not sustain any further usage as it is at breaking point. Similarly the canal area cannot sustain any further ruination of its banks.
- Will have the least impact on the town. I do not see why being close to the A41 is an issue. This is land not used for anything else.
- Within town envelope helps Ashlyns financially. Why are some sites 'too small', prefer smaller developments. If unappealing to developers then not try a different model - e.g. local authority or self-build? Might get something less bland.
- Wouldn't appear to have as much impact on the wider environment as other options and has the advantage of potentially supporting and retaining facilities on BFI site.

**Q. A6 - Do you agree with the approach to 'Looking after the environment' of Berkhamsted outlined in the main document?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	72	88%	72	88%
No	No	10	12%	10	12%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Although I agree, I think you could go a lot further in your long term plan by highlighting the importance of the canal to the younger generation in the area (by education) and therefore preventing the rubbish and distraction of the habitat of the wildlife throughout the years.
- Berkhamsted does not need/want any more homes, it is far too overcrowded as it is. The valley has been ruined by the sprawling mass of housing already.

- Broadly agree but the following should be included, (1) an additional important view at the entrance and surrounding Ashlyns School - scenic and historic. (2) Open Space around Ashlyns School should be protected, much used for sport, important for wildlife including migratory birds (redwings, fieldfares), contains historic buildings and trees.
- Compiled by persons with ethereal tendencies not combined with pragmatic approaches that required by those who actually live in Berkhamsted. A lot of hot and fine words but little substance or understanding of the need, views, or requirements of those living in the town or in / near the sites being discussed.
- I do not believe there should be housing on the Egerton Rotherhay School site. Durrants Lane is too narrow to accommodate an increase in traffic.
- I think the town will lose its character if it grows too big.
- Insufficient attention and emphasis on providing and increasing open spaces and sports grounds.
- It is inadequate. The areas of Green Belt that have been released should be reinstated. Only a limited amount of brown field development should be considered.
- Not the increase in south Northchurch. Rule out all option 1. New Road is already overused putting school children at risk.
- The scale of the proposal developments will have a major negative impact on farmland, wildlife and will cause both vehicular and light pollution.

**Q. A7 - Do you think the Council should be more flexible in it's approach to new development on school sites in the Green Belt?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	44	54%	44	56%
No	No	35	43%	35	44%
NAN	Not Answered	3	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7TX - If no, give your reasons why...**

- Can't really follow this question. My view is that the only expansion of schools should be in the state sector, if the fee paying sector feel constrained they can move.
- Depends on what you mean by 'flexible' be more specific in your questions.
- Development of a new school on an existing site is likely to increase traffic and activity. In time this would threaten the Green Belt.
- Find the information provided on this subject confusing and difficult to understand and evaluate. However, I take it that new development on school sides in the Green Belt essentially involves infilling and encroachment on the Green Belt and should be discouraged.
- Green Belt designation is there for a reason.
- Green Belt is for us to enjoy , not look at buildings and yet more cars.
- Green Belt must be protected.

- Green Belt should be protected.
- I think no, based on the limited interpretation I have.
- If by 'flexible' it is meant new development easier to begin on Green Belt. Green Belt should be avoided as long as other options remain.
- If school sites are decreased then in time another area for them to go will be required. It's vital not to lose the character of Berkhamsted, as that's what makes it such an appealing town.
- If the council starts to accept building on Green Belt land this will result in a reduction of outdoor leisure space. It is extremely important that schools keep their green spaces for sport, they are open land and important for informal and formal recreation. Only in exceptional cases should Green Belt be released for development.
- In particular, school playing fields should be preserved and put to greater use as intended for school PE activities.
- It is vitally important that we keep games areas available for children to play, take part in sport and explore nature.
- It's important to keep our Green Belt, preserve it as a valuable space to enjoy and wildlife to live.
- Need to maintain Green Belt to keep character of town and restrict growth.
- New school buildings only.
- No new sites.
- Not sufficient data to answer questions. How much more flexibility is available and what does it imply? Impossible to answer this question, lack of facts, what options?
- Once the school fields disappear, children will be less inclined to exercise and this will lead to further social problems in the locality. You can't put a value on a child's health.
- Releasing school fields for housing contradicts the basic premises of the 'vision of Berkhamsted'.
- Risks setting an unwelcome precedent.
- School playing fields should on no account be reduced. They are an important part of school life.
- School sites and grounds should be retained at all costs.
- Schools need their sport fields.
- Seems pointless putting housing on school sites which will then need more educational facilities. Open space is open space and must be preserved.
- Sounds alright if they stick to the script on page 17/18.
- The Green Belt should be protected, use the school on Egerton Rothesay site?
- The Green Belt should be protected.
- The inflated numbers of home presents other problem such as school places.
- The quality of existing services should come before changes that invite growth. A lot more thought needs to be given to the long term needs of existing residents and the town character.
- There is only one possible site but that is needed because of demand for school places.
- There should be no development on school sites other than to change sporting activities for children.

- These sites should be protected for the health of our children and of the environment.

**Q. A8 - Do you agree that the existing employment areas should be safeguarded for employment uses?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	78	95%	78	95%
No	No	4	5%	4	5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Any current or future redundant sites and could be re - classified for housing.
- I believe Hemel and surrounding areas are the key high volume employment areas.
- If employment opportunities were reduced then maybe more people would leave the area.
- One answer can not apply to all circumstances.

**Q. A9A - Should the British Film Institute be allowed to expand on its site?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	75	91%	75	91%
No	No	7	9%	7	9%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9ATX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Because of fire hazard.
- It is in the Green Belt area.
- It is within the Green Belt.
- No adequate reasons are advanced for such expansion. They are a drain on public finances and should move their operations to a purpose built site elsewhere.
- Not at the expense of Green Belt land, if expansion can be achieved within existing built up area then that would be reasonable.
- Not onto Green Belt land, more development within the built up area of the site would be acceptable. Development option 3 may be acceptable need detail N.B. I am a BFI employee, based at Berkhamsted.
- Site is already very visible from by pass a41.

**Q. A9B - If the site is expanded do you think it should consolidate development in one area of the site?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	34	41%	34	45%
No	No	41	50%	41	55%
NAN	Not Answered	7	9%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9BTX - If yes, then please give your reasons...**

- Better map needed please!
- BFI is local asset which may continue to provide some local employment.
- Development on this site will be largely out of sight.
- Development over Green Belt expansion if possible to retain Green Belt security and not set precedents, despite importance of BFI.
- Development should be as close as possible to other buildings so that green land is kept as large as possible and not broken up.
- Don't know enough to comment.
- Don't know.
- Encourages redevelopment of existing site alongside expansion into space within existing curtilage.
- Environmental reasons and to limit possibility of further encroachment.
- Expand within existing footprint.
- I do not know the geography of the site but development in on defined area seems sensible.
- If the BFI uses more of it's land for business activities then it should definitely consolidate within one area of the site, ideally nearest the a41 as this then keeps a tract of land between the local road and the business activities. Keep residential areas away from the BFI as far as possible.
- In order not to 'squander' the area of the site and to leave space for further development in future by the BFI.
- It's better to have all the building in one area, mainly because of heavy lorries and the holes in the roads etc.
- Keep development under control.
- Less impact on the area.
- Minimise the size of the Green Belt area used.
- More efficient use of space.
- Not at the expense of Green Belt land, if expansion can be achieved within existing built up area then that would be reasonable.
- Not sure of the question. What do you mean?
- Reduced the impact on the environment (Green Belt).
- So that Green Belt land is left untouched, as much as is possible.

- This is a one off in GB and if for a special purpose.
- This would leave some open space (but building height must be reasonable, no skyscrapers, please).
- To maintain the character of the town. To prevent excessive traffic build up in the areas.
- To not use Green Belt land.
- Whilst it make sense to expand the facility, the site should not be enlarged. Might be better to move the facility completely.
- Within reason a compact expansion of this activity would have less visual impact.

**Q. A9C - If the site is expanded should it be linked to possible Greenfield Development (I.e. Option 3 on page 13)?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	21	26%	21	28%
No	No	55	67%	55	72%
NAN	Not Answered	6	7%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9CTX - If yes, then please give your reasons...**

- Avoids town centre congestion. Helps expansion of BFI which I think is important.
- Could be phased with other land, one has to be careful of gypsies, as long as they know where they stand.
- Development on this site will be largely out of sight.
- Don't know.
- If option 3 development takes place I see no reason why expansion of the BFI site should not be linked with it.
- If option 3 is decided upon it would seem sensible to take the opportunity to expand the BFI site at the same time.
- If the expansion depends on being linked to the green field development, then it should be.
- If the use of green field development is kept to a minimum.
- Kill 2 birds with 1 stone!
- Logical consequences of 9a and 9b.
- Permit attractive buildings screened by real trees.
- Possibly need more detail, but this would make sense in many ways.
- Seems to me that one proposition will effect the other, not able to be mare in isolation.
- Site on main 'a' road suitable for expansion.
- The area is lucky to have the BFI, and if we don't it will relocate. Jobs will be lost and the local economy will suffer. The houses need to be built, surely it is best to try to improve their facilities, build houses, and keep jobs. Only a little greenfield dvpt.
- Why not allow both and get all work on the area carried out at the same time?

- Wouldn't appear to have as much impact on the wider environment as other options and has the advantage of potentially supporting and retaining facilities on BFI site.

#### Q. A10 - Do you think we should continue to support the completion of New Road / Springfield Road link?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	48	59%	48	61%
No	No	31	38%	31	39%
NAN	Not Answered	3	4%	-	-
Total		82	100%	79	100%

#### Q. A10TX - If no, please give your reasons...

- Case not proven and damage not justified.
- Costly, substantial works with a negative impact on wildlife and very little benefit.
- Definitely no - option 1 land off New Road. There should definitely be no development here. New Road is already a nightmare morning and evening with traffic coming down across the common too close to the wood (the beeches) which is already being ruined. Essentially no access from Springfield Road. I am in a small group of houses but access would be so badly limited.
- Due to the topography (differing levels), it is difficult to envisage such a junction being anything other than dangerous.
- For the reasons stated, is it really required, will impact local wildlife and there is insufficient funding.
- I do not think New Road is a suitable width to take extra traffic and access onto the main road can be difficult at times already.
- I live on this estate (for 6 years) and the speed of the cars on Springfield Road is ridiculous (40-50 mph). Joining up to New Road would sooner or later result in a child being killed as they walk to school at St. Marys or Bridgewater School. If you did this 'speed humps' and 'cameras' would need to be installed when the new houses are finished, the traffic will only be worse than now and I am not sure they would like it at all.
- If this road is too expensive, best to ditch it now, not tear the countryside up and it takes forever and the costs go up and up.
- It is clearly impractical, will create severe traffic congestion and ruin a big residential area.
- It would become a rat run.
- It would divert traffic through a major residential area which is contrary to current policy and thinking. Current arrangements do not cause any significant problems. The idea is 35 + years old and predates the bypass.
- It's not vital to complete, would unnecessarily disturb the wildlife.
- More loss of land.
- More roads encourage us to drive more. Could we run a school bus to keep our use down for travel to school?

- Need remains unproven.
- Not fully aware of the proposed link and feel upset at more green space / field / woodland being torn up/apart for yet more tarmac.
- Not high priority for the whole area.
- Not if it has impact on wildlife.
- Not necessary.
- Not really a priority.
- On the basis of any of the optional developments proposed, all completion of this link will achieve is to create a rat run from New Road to the A4251 at Gossoms End to the detriment of local residents on the Chiltern Park estate.
- Springfield Road / children park estate does not need in increase in traffic, dangerous and noisy as the area is mainly young families. The exit onto New Road is too narrow / dangerous.
- The area is already clogged with traffic.
- There has already been too much encroachment of wildlife sites nearby.
- There is already too much traffic congestion and the proposal would provide no benefit.
- This road would be difficult if given much more traffic especially with school so near.
- Traffic should be encouraged to stick to the principle road. This would turn a residential area in to area with substantial traffic flow.
- We should funnel traffic along existing roads and not go and create new major road links like this. Creating this link would ruin this housing area.
- Will encourage additional traffic along Bridgewater Road. This should not be seen as a major traffic route.
- Will simply encourage demands for further subsequent encroachment.
- Without traffic calming, Springfield Road would become very dangerous, people already drive very fast. Link to New Road would also be very dangerous because of the bends in the road.

**Q. A11 - Do you think the potential for new cycle routes in the town should continue to be investigated?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	69	84%	69	84%
No	No	13	16%	13	16%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A11TX - If no, please give your reasons...**

- Cycle routes are largely dangerous for both cyclist and motorists and should generally be discouraged, particularly in places like Berkhamsted with narrow roads and a great deal of congestion.
- Cyclists are in a minority. More effort should be made to provide affordable adequate car parking.

- Don't deem it as influential an issue as traffic/parking/congestion. Cycle routes could affect the other three and complicate an already vehicle saturated town centre and through road.
- I was not aware of cycle routes other than road / canal and feel these are sufficient.
- Impractical given topography and narrow capacity of existing roads / paths.
- Most roads are not wide enough to incorporate cycle routes.
- Priority should be given to road maintenance not policing minority activities when should use existing roads.
- The steep valley sides mean that only the east/ west route along A4251 Road or canal towpath are well used. All other hilly routes are unpopular. Where could any other route go?
- The town being mainly hills is not conducive to safe cycling.
- The volume of traffic doesn't warrant it, also, we don't want to create a 'London cycle culture' whereby bicycles become a danger to pedestrians.
- There is very little flat areas so Berkhamsted is on the hills (valley sides) therefore little use to the majority of residents.
- Too dangerous.

#### Q. A12 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the Spatial Strategy for Berkhamsted?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	35	43%	35	45%
No	No	43	52%	43	55%
NAN	Not Answered	4	5%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A12TX - If yes, please list...

- (1) it does not mention the proportion of the population which commutes, they speculate if this will continue to grow and the potential effects. (2) vague vision. (3) too many unspecific assumptions. (4) no apparent awareness of the pressure and infrastructure which population increase will bring. Shopping and parking space will be inadequate, yet no space has been put aside for new community shopping and parking facilities in new housing project. (5) social and cultural space and facilities already lacking now and will be seriously lacking with the proposed changes. I am afraid their proposals are vague, ill thought out, inadequate.
- 1. Pedestrians should be encouraged. 2. Police station should be resisted and present civic centre made into enhanced attractive building with more social functions such as cab and stroke club venue using part of council yard at rear of premises and providing access via Clarence Road to some additional parking.
- 5d)(ii) Water Lane/High St developments should go three plus stories down for car parking as in London squares. This would create a pleasant pedestrian square rather than an eyesore 'car-parking square'.

- Berkhamsted and Northchurch, I feel, are small rural sites and should be left alone. There are places on the outskirts but inside Berkhamsted and particularly in Northchurch there should be no further development.
- Berkhamsted FC site is poorly located and could be redeveloped, moving the playing facility to edge of town.
- Concerned to see that a second supermarket will be built. Waitrose has already killed off local shops.
- Desperate need for more town centre parking, particularly for people working. It is intolerable to have to move your car to a different car park when you are working all day. There should be a permit system for all day parking for local businesses.
- Development should not be too dense away from the town centre. We must preserve the attractiveness of the town for future generations.
- Do we need such a growth.
- Don't try to build up every green space and back garden.
- Further to answer A10 above, there is little or no comment in write up addressing the need for at least one more unrestricted crossing of canal/ railway as part of the development of Berkhamsted. Such a crossing would affect the public transport pattern which could then affect locations of new housing sites.
- Healthcare for increased number of people, in fact, for existing people. Adult education opportunities. More car parking needed in town centre. Housing should include 4 bedroom properties for growing families, not just entry level affordable housing.
- I believe this is rail roading greenfield development which is not needed and not wanted and entirely unethical and inappropriate.
- I have serious concerns as to the capacity of the present infrastructure to cope with the anticipated residential growth planned. I.e. the sewers, schools, parking, poor roads. All of these are problems now.
- Is a new supermarket necessary? Development is a good idea, space behind Tesco's is an unattractive waste of town centre open space but clearly this is a Tesco funded strategy to compete with successful Waitrose development. Worrying to envisage Berkhamsted as a pleasant high Street masking the 'battle of the supermarkets' behind the historic buildings and locally run businesses. A bit soulless and degrading to any individual character Berkhamsted should be desperate to retain the future, surely?
- It is very good expanding the boundaries but there are many times when all these residents will bring their cars into the town, behind Tesco's for instances is mostly full from 8 am onwards.
- It looks like a lot of thought has gone into the spatial strategy but when does Berkhamsted become big enough? The valley makes infrastructure improvements very difficult, all of which are overloaded now.
- Let's be honest. We can only fit so many people in one space.
- Maintenance of local employment.
- My concern is the reality of the statement and sustained commitment to it's maintenance.

- Need to recognise importance of gardens. Don't agree with four storey aspirations for the town centre, it is too high (there are already some four storey now, but it already looks too big and bulky, more is wrong). Please redevelop the 20th century buildings on south side of High St from Oxfam to Tesco (inclusive) they are hideous. Have a lovely beautiful design/aspiration for 2031. More attention to design quality, this makes a huge difference to acceptance of a development or not and not let it be so commercially developed land.
- Permit parking: try again (most do not need 2 cars), put yellow lines at junctions / corners, so people don't park opposite them (as you are taught in the highway code). Ensure cycle routes / facilities are improved in town and at the station so people have an alternative to using their cars. If bus routes were improved or cheaper than perhaps the reliance wouldn't be on the car so much. Work with rail and bus companies to provide a community service and to meet environment targets.
- Public transport links and service levels not being addressed.
- Sites do not seem to be identified for more than about 1 third, and are half of the dwellings (1,200) needed.
- Speed of growth, aspects are not economically sustainable.
- Table 1 key principles for peripheral zones states that they should have low density housing. The suggestion of high density housing abutting Coppins Close contradicts this key principle.
- Take great care as people get very unhappy of change in their area and don't enjoy too many people and racing cars etc.
- That the main topics, such as say 'congestion' car parking services etc are given publicity and the residents made aware of the public opinion on such matters. The results are not just filed away so that it can be said that the public have consulted on such and such matter. That greater thought should be given as to how questions are in many cases a simple 'yes' or 'no' is meaningless.
- The number of new homes appears to be excessive therefore generating problems to solve.
- The physical area of the town should not increase as the infrastructure would not support larger scale usage.
- The state of existing roads are dreadful with many potholes, especially on roads leading to the sports centre. There is a risk to cyclists on many roads and this needs rectifying.
- The whole town has suffered from a lack of planning and over development for the past thirty years. Corrective action should be taken before any further development is considered.

- There is so little green space within the town that to expand its boundaries would remove central dwellers further away from the countryside. The density must not be further increased. Buildings are becoming too close to each other. Health and safety seems to be abandoned. Berkhamsted is contained by the canal and the a41 bypass and therefore is restricted in exits and entries to the town. This causes much traffic congestion that can only get worse with more housing. Lack of space for parking is another problem which would be made worse with development on the outskirts of Berkhamsted. (residents coming to the centre to shop, or going out of the town thus diminishing facilities) it may be regrettable but a quart cannot be put in a pint pot.
- Traffic congestion / parking is controlled (particularly around gravel path).
- Traffic trying to leave town is either trapped by traffic lights or uses ill equipped residential roads. I would like to see traffic flows re-examined. There appears to be a half hearted (at most) approach to keeping traffic flowing.
- With more building the speed limit on roads should be carefully thought through, especially approaching the town e/w, w/e.

**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**BOVINGDON**



**Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision for Bovingdon ?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	19	73%	19	79%
No	No	5	19%	5	21%
NAN	Not Answered	2	8%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A1TX - If no, what do you think should be different?**

- Agree in part, but it is a contradiction in terms to imagine new housing development can create new open space. The use of the term affordable housing is also a concern as it implies lower quality housing attracting maybe the wrong residents for a village culture.
- I agree with most of the vision for Bovingdon except regarding housing development. There are no building plots left in Bovingdon which is now at capacity.
- Key issues, access on foot and bicycle is o.k.
- School would be unable to meet increased demand from further housing. Excellent to tackle traffic congestion, but need more provision for other residents living on high Street. Maintaining Green Belt is key to character of village - further development threatens this.
- There should be a definite programme for the redevelopment of the old fire station and village hall.
- Traffic congestion and parking are acceptable with current level of population. I would hate to see any proposal and metered arrangements changing the character of the high Street.

**Q. A2 - Do you think there are any additional major issues we should be considering?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	13	50%	13	59%
No	No	9	35%	9	41%
NAN	Not Answered	4	15%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

- Any expansion must take account of the infrastructure to support it. Schooling, medical, services, utilities etc. This wasn't done 30 years ago with the increased housing and prison.
- Bovingdon desperately needs a car park for people using the shops. The village school is not big enough to cope with the increase in children that the additional housing will bring. Why was the fire station closed?
- Ethos and character of village.
- Future use of the airfield.
- Nature walk, heritage walk around area.
- Need better parks for children. Need 'High Street' road improvements including designated parking areas, cycle paths and railings to protect pedestrians.
- No obvious route into secondary education for children of Bovingdon, often problems in gaining place at preferred schools and lack of transport links to allocated schools.
- Protection against building on Green Belt land. Retain a green division between Bovingdon and Hemel Hempstead.
- Schools, speed limits, parking restrictions, airfield events.
- Spread the development over all 4 options equally.
- The proposal for gypsy encampments must be resolved first.
- The threat to the village from the Tesco proposal.
- You have mentioned support for the school but if you build more, you need to look at secondary schools as this is already an issue.

#### Q. A3 - Do you agree with the level of growth set out in the main document?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	20	77%	20	80%
No	No	5	19%	5	20%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A3TX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- A reduction in population in Bovingdon is not a bad thing, the character of the village needs to be retained.
- I do not believe the population will reduce. People are living longer and to keep the village 'vibrant' young people will need to occupy the new homes.
- Infrastructure will not cope with this level of growth e.g. schools, traffic, public transport and will be detrimental to character of village and local wildlife.
- It is generally felt the village is at or above capacity, reducing population is preferred.
- The use of 'affordable' (current government seem obsessed by this term) is a concern. We should not build on green field land.

#### Q. A4 - Which is your preferred option for Greenfield Development?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	5	19%	5	19%
2	Option 2	3	12%	3	12%
3	Option 3	4	15%	4	15%
4	Option 4	12	46%	12	46%
5	No preference	2	8%	2	8%
Total		26	100%	26	100%

#### Q. A4TX - Please explain your reasons...

- a - it will have access onto a main road. b - limit the amount of traffic going into the village. c - with appropriate design housing improve entrance to village.
- Accessibility to the village centre.
- All options are important 'green' areas and should not be built on.
- Away from prison, good road access, most space.
- Cause least through traffic. Best pedestrian access to High Street.
- Continuation of development from the airfield / prison prior / existing development means less disruption to land use, major improvements to area / becomes inclusive to village.
- Good road access - on three sides of site without only using Chesham Road / Box Lane, which will also contain the development and prevent further spread, sandwiched between moody estates and brickworks it is an isolated patch of 'countryside'. Wildlife corridors do not have to be eliminated by new developments.
- Good road access, largest site, least damage to wildlife and biodiversity, keeps village to compact area, safe access possible to village centre.
- Good scope for housing in less important area of countryside, while improving airfield. Access to village by new crossing.
- I like the idea that it is the largest of the 4 options and it has good road access.
- I strongly oppose option 1, this is an ancient farm that must be protected / preserved including land.
- It is the option with the least impact on the existing inhabitants of Bovingdon close to the village.
- Land is not in hands of its landowners, saves time, plenty space. People do not walk to shops. Room for a council estate (cheap house) (a new Hyde Meadows).
- Largest option so should be able to have more open space.
- Largest zone so reasonable spacing of houses, etc.
- Not as important part of local wildlife, not overcrowding existing developments / village, good road access. Not affect existing landowners as much.
- Not restricted by size, can accommodate housing and open space. Will have less impact and disruption on existing village life.
- Option 4 has the best access to a main road and is on poor agricultural land. Option 3 is on good agricultural land and options 1 and 2 would increase congestion in the village.

- See pros in ECS document.
- Significant pros and insignificant cons. Hedgerows and wildlife habitat can be safeguarded by planning conditions.
- The better option in a very difficult situation.
- The land is not beautiful and it would cause least worry to existing villagers.
- The site has the least value environmentally of the four options and, so long as there is no impact either way between the prison and the proposed development, this would tidy up a somewhat scruffy area. Care would need to be taken to ensure surface water drainage did not impact on the nearby estate.
- This option represents the least potential damage to the countryside. The land is often considered wasteland and seems to be popular with travellers which inevitably causes problems, development here may deter this.

**Q. A5 - Do you think a key emphasis of the Spatial Strategy should be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Bovingdon ?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	26	100%	26	100%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - If no, then please give your reasons why...**

\*\*\* THIS QUESTION RECEIVED NO RESPONSES \*\*\*\*

**Q. A6 - Do you agree that affordable housing should be provided with future housing developments?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	23	88%	23	92%
No	No	2	8%	2	8%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - If no, then please give your reasons why...**

- There is already a lot of council and ex council housing in the centre of the village.
- We already have a good proportion of 'affordable' housing - we know only too well the impact said housing has on our village and therefore do not need more.

**Q. A7 - Do you think additional open space should be sought for the village with new housing developments?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	22	85%	22	88%
No	No	3	12%	3	12%

NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A7TX - If no, then please give your reasons why...

- Abundant open space surrounding the village already.
- This would mean building in already 'green' areas.
- Without new developments we already have an adequate level of open space.

#### Q. A8A - Do you agree that the prison should remain a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	25	96%	25	100%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A8ATX - If no, then please give your reasons why...

- I would prefer the prison was not there.

#### Q. A8B - Do you agree that the Bovingdon Brickworks should remain a Major Development Site in the Green Belt?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	26	100%	26	100%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A8BTX - If no, then please give your reasons why...

\*\*\* THIS QUESTION RECEIVED NO RESPONSES \*\*\*\*

#### Q. A9A - Do you think a small supermarket would be better located in the centre of the village?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	11	42%	11	42%
No	No	15	58%	15	58%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A9ATX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- Bovingdon does not need a supermarket. Our local shops are adequate. Specialist shops are welcome but not a Tesco.
- Difficult to site, create traffic congestion, sufficient parking will be needed.

- Enhanced parking problems, commercially damaging to existing retail businesses, no obvious need.
- I don't think Bovingdon needs a supermarket, it will kill the local shops.
- If a small supermarket is allowed in the village it will kill off at least three existing trading shops.
- No need for a supermarket, which would destroy the present grouping of shops and services.
- No need for new supermarket, current shops perfectly adequate and dispersed throughout village for easy accessibility for all parts of village.
- Seems to work fine where it is, but like the next idea as good road access.
- There is already a small supermarket in the centre of the village (actually there are two, so we don't need any more).
- This would direct too much traffic down the already congested high Street, there is no obvious potential location for a supermarket in the village centre, besides the location of the ex jaguar garage is hardly a long way from the village centre.
- We already have a good co-op and Costcutter and an excellent range of local shops, no to Tesco or other.
- We already have two, one at either end, which is sufficient for a village this size.
- We do not need a small supermarket.
- We do not need a supermarket.
- We have all the shops we need in the village, they will not thrive if another supermarket is opened.

**Q. A9B - Do you think a small supermarket would be better located at the ex-Jaguar garage site?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	3	12%	3	12%
No	No	23	88%	23	88%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9BTX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Car access / deliveries would add to difficulties already existing at junction of High Street / B405. It would take trade away from assorted shops in High Street (newsagent / co-op / takeaways / butchers etc). Limited parking = overspill and queuing elsewhere - Warner's End shops an example.
- Do not even think about it. It will kill the village no, no, no!
- Existing shops support each other and local suppliers. Tesco do not and will not and won't care about the village which will die.
- I don't think Bovingdon needs a supermarket, it will kill the local shops.
- If a small supermarket is allowed in the village it will kill off at least three existing trading shops. Plus the problems of more heavy HGV in the village and the decimation of village shop life.

- Impact on local businesses and shopping hours would bring extra people to the village causing nuisance.
- It would be very detrimental to our existing shops. Furthermore, it would cause more traffic difficulties.
- It would kill off other businesses, (Tesco).
- It would significantly reduce trade for existing shops in the heart of the village. We do not need additional shops, it would increase traffic.
- It would threaten the survival of the High Street as the focus of village activity and community and threaten the success of the village. Also dangerous so close to the roundabouts and crossing.
- Make the site a much needed car park instead and put double yellow lines down the High Street.
- No need for a supermarket, which would destroy the present grouping of shops and services.
- No need for new supermarket, current shops perfectly adequate and dispersed throughout village for easy accessibility for all parts of village.
- Parking problems, commercially damaging to existing businesses in the High Street, no obvious need.
- Site best for end of village 'off road parking'.
- The roads aren't wide enough to cope with more traffic and the village does not want 3 supermarkets. The 2 we have are sufficient.
- This corner / junction is very busy and cars will stop causing congestion. Also it is not needed with enough grocery provision already in the High Street. Use the land for development of low cost housing, yes!
- This is a busy road junction and there is a danger, because of proposed limited parking on the site, that congestion would be even worse than at present, especially on Saturdays.
- This is part of a 'gateway' into the village. A building designed to blend in should be on this site. Ideal for 'starter' homes for local young people.
- Traffic congestion at roundabout.
- Traffic is already congested at the top of village, we do not need another supermarket in village.
- We do not need a small supermarket.
- We do not need a supermarket.

**Q. A10 - Do you think there are any other ways of improving the economic prosperity of Bovingdon ?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	11	42%	11	48%
No	No	12	46%	12	52%
NAN	Not Answered	3	12%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A10TX - If yes, please give your reasons why...**

- Ambivalent.
- Better parking facilities.
- By allowing limited commercial development at and near the brickworks land.
- Develop the brickworks as nature / adventure / picnic park. Allow prison capacity to increase with perimeter.
- Do not let Tesco kill the village. The prosperity of Bovingdon relies on the present situation.
- Don't know.
- Encourage one of the farms to provide their own produce or farm shop.
- If a suitable location could be found, perhaps a small number of starter industrial units could be built.
- If you are going to build more houses you will need more shops.
- Improve the bus service so more accessible for people to visit local shops, services, amenities. Keep the high Street as chief trading area, encourage diversity of shops, trades, services. Encourage people to use public transport.
- More parking, even a little distance to walk.
- The paving of the High Street, the same as in Tring, with parking areas at the side of the road would slow traffic and allow people to stop to use the shops. By taking just 3ft of grassed areas in High Street would allow parking while keeping traffic moving.
- Use the site at the top of village for retirement accommodation. There is very little in Bovingdon and we definitely do not need a supermarket on this site.

**Q. A11A - Through which option in the main document do you think we should try and tackle congestion on the High Street?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	9	35%	9	35%
2	Option 2	9	35%	9	35%
3	Neither of these options	8	31%	8	31%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A11BTX - Please give your reasons...**

- (The paving of the High Street, the same as in Tring, with parking areas at the side of the road would slow traffic and allow people to stop to use the shops. By taking just 3ft of grassed areas in High Street would allow parking while keeping traffic moving.) - formal parking in front of shops should be included.
- Blocking on Street parking as proposed in option two would only cause frustration amongst drivers and thus deter people from driving to the village and encourage them to go elsewhere.
- Combination of both best - also people could perhaps park on car parking marked in High Street / roads off the High Street.

- Despite the congestion, the balance of convenience in relation to access to facilities, and peace and quiet in adjacent residential streets, is best served by continuing the present arrangements.
- If you choose option 2 all the side roads are going to be very congested and people are going to have a job to park and this could affect the shops.
- It is the better option.
- Lack of space to make option 1 a realistic option, unless Jaguar garage can be used.
- Less disruption, less costly. Option 1 high risk with no guaranteed success.
- Makes parking more formalised, may encourage more people to walk. Make the area in old dean by the play area a one way system. By ensuring one way traffic this moves traffic away from the High Street easier.
- More readily achievable.
- More spaces are needed. It is hard to drive between all the cars so car parks should help this.
- Neither would actually improve parking / access.
- Neither would work, there is not enough space for the cars that want to park.
- Option 2 may result in less people stopping in the village. The surrounding roads (especially Old Dean) are already used as on-Street parking. But I cannot envisage where the car parks would be unless the pubs outside opening hours or part of the Jaguar site could be used.
- School parking would ease congestion. Would not affect parking for those residents who live on High Street.
- The lesser of two evils.
- The present parking works reasonably well. 'If it ain't broke don't fix it'.
- There are several areas where parking could be arranged in front of shops and the old fire station, village hall.
- This may help in the refusal of the proposed Tesco development. It is accepted that parking is a problem, with Tesco in the village it would be disastrous.
- This requires a more organised system but it would need to be policed as some parking around the High Street and particularly the corner of Hyde Lane is just plain stupid.
- To relieve on road parking congestion.
- Use the Jaguar site.
- Walking on the pavement - the High Street can be quite dangerous, especially at school times. I feel this option might improve it.

**Q. A11C - Can you think of any other way of tackling congestion on the High Street?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	13	50%	13	50%
No	No	13	50%	13	50%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A11CTX - If yes, please give your reasons why...**

- Better buses, public transport would deter people using cars to go into the village centre, all new buildings, houses to have adequate parking space and condition of planning permission. Keep using school car park at weekends, possibly extend this.
- Delivery vehicles deliver to shops before 8:00 and after 6:00! Get children to walk to school!
- Ensure parking is only allowed on one side of the road at a time, 20 mph speed limit in the High Street.
- Go for option 1 as well.
- Land behind the dentists and solicitors could become formal parking with specific bays retained for staff (public parking is already allowed evening and weekends behind the solicitors).
- Old fire station for the other off road parking.
- Providing school car park for parents picking / dropping kids to / from school.
- Restricted parking along some sections of the High Street (double yellow lines).
- Some yellow lines at the top of High Street would help. It would also make wider pavements possible.
- Speed humps. The High Street is not a race track and drivers should be dissuaded from using it as a rat run.
- The safety could be enhanced by making the High Street a 20mph zone.
- Use the Jaguar garage site. Let Tesco build on the airfield in exchange.

**Q. A12 - Do you think affordable housing should be given greater priority over open space / leisure space?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	7	27%	7	29%
No	No	17	65%	17	71%
NAN	Not Answered	2	8%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A12TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Affordable housing is low cost housing, the developer should assess his own risks. Although with a maximum of 150 new dwellings perhaps 25 should be 'low cost' but good standard.
- Already there is insufficient leisure space for the population, creating more housing first will exacerbate this lack. It would be better to provide leisure space for the current residents first rather than attracting more people to live in the village who will then have limited leisure space.
- At this stage there should be no presumption one way or the other. If one of the smaller sites for development was chosen, for example, would that preclude development (or at least part) of one of the other sites as a public open space, sympathetic to the preservation of the natural environment at that site and maybe its enhancement.
- Bovingdon needs its open spaces to remain a village.
- Choose 'option 4' and we can have all three.
- Everyone needs open space for a good quality of life, space must not be compromised. Children need to be able to run around.
- I question the need for more 'affordable' housing in Bovingdon. I simply do not accept the analysis trends.
- It should be given equal weighting, we need a quality environment for all. If younger families move in, children need space and for the future, for all people to be healthy, they need leisure space.
- Leisure facilities for young people, current issues exist in village with not enough opportunities in village for young people.
- Our village is over congested and really can't handle too many more inhabiting it, more housing means more cars, more traffic.
- Over leisure space, yes. Over open space, no.
- Problems with youth already a problem, this should be resolved before increasing population.
- The more housing means more people and everyone must have some open space / leisure space available. In London at the moment the housing development is coupled with open spaces.
- This is a loaded question. All developers promise open space and sport facilities in their proposals but experience in 90% of cases it does not materialise. Get the contract tied up so that it does.
- We all need leisure space, an area to relax. Bovingdon has reached capacity.
- We all need room to breathe - open space / leisure space provides that, there needs to be a balance for mental wellbeing as well as physical wellbeing.
- We need open space more than affordable housing.

**Q. A13 - The spatial strategy for Bovingdon in 2031 is presented in Section 5 of the accompanying document. Overall do you support this strategy?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	22	85%	22	88%
No	No	3	12%	3	12%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-

	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>
--	--------------	-----------	-------------	-----------	-------------

#### Q. A13TX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- Bovingdon cannot take additional growth. The school is oversubscribed, the drains cannot cope now and the roads are disintegrating with the current volume of traffic.
- Not all of it, no mention of prioritising protection of wildlife / Green Belt areas.
- The strategy is generally okay but the continued emphasis on affordable housing is a real issue.

#### Q. A14 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Bovingdon ?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	9	35%	9	41%
No	No	13	50%	13	59%
NAN	Not Answered	4	15%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A14TX - If yes, please give your reasons why...

- Attempts to site Gypsies around village madness, destroy character of village. Resources taken by outsiders / non locals.
- Ensure people do not live 'on top of one another', allow spaces / parking and air movement around any future development. What may help is a more frequent bus service to Hemel and Watford. Once an hour is not good enough to encourage people to use public transport. The bus services also cross over each other i.e. Tiger Line and 52 follow each other and only take half the passengers each. This cannot be sensible.
- Liked the idea of sheltered / suitable housing for the elderly as there is an increasing number of older people in the village.
- Little consideration has been given to correct current problems before adding more. Why not consider Flamsted or Chipperfield instead.
- Only as stated. I attend the planning meeting of the Tesco development and was appalled at the planning office (on the project) who threatened the committee with libel. Not acceptable for a professional employee of the council.
- The essence of Bovingdon is that it is a village not a small market town therefore no supermarkets and 'out of village' developments. Use the existing main roads, do not create the need for more. Keep the good agricultural land and develop the airfield instead.
- The future of Bovingdon is inevitably entwined with that of the airfield. Most 'temporary' activities do not meet the criteria in the strategy and I feel that a 'so far but no further' element should be included, especially as this is Green Belt land. Option 4 for the development in the village helps. Perhaps indoor and outdoor facilities for sport could be developed for use by the village and the prison.

- The increase in traffic through the village and Box Lane.
- The most important consideration is parking. Given easy parking it should generate more use of the shops, post office, library. If you can't park people will just go elsewhere.
- The proposals for gypsy encampments seem to be ignored. Much will depend on that decision.
- The Tesco threat in my opinion should not be underestimated. They will deny it, but they would say that wouldn't they.



**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**HEMEL HEMPSTEAD**



#### Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	148	76%	148	77%
No	No	45	23%	45	23%
NAN	Not Answered	1	1%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A1TX - If no, what else do you think should be different?

- 6,500+ new dwells are far too much for the poor infrastructure and certainly no Green Belt inclusion.
- 6500 dwellings over 25 year period equals only 260p / year, not enough to cover people marrying and having families. Private development exceeding this amount monthly already. Young people being driven away from it as the affordable housing available or private rental charges too expensive. Not enough sporting facilities and existing one is too expensive now 8:00 for mother and baby at swimming pool.
- Although I agree in general, this section makes no mention of decreasing dependence on the private car or if improving pedestrian and cycle facilities. These are only mentioned in relation to the centre but should be considered as town wide issues. The reference here to public transport only refers to Maylands, the centre and rail station, but this too must be considered a town wide issue.
- Better transport links between new estates and the industrial estates. This is still poor and prevents people from getting to work.
- Concentrate on maintaining current facilities as it appears that DBC have insufficient funds/ manpower to provide residents with a satisfactory service as it is.
- Do not waste any money on cycle ways. This is a very hilly town, people do not cycle. Remember the wasted money on the cycle way between Marlowes and lawn lane? Never saw a cycle using it!
- Hospital facilities are not adequate and will become less adequate, still when population increases. A + E services must be re established locally before any increase. Housing if undertaking, Watford A + E is already over stretched and not easily altered quickly.
- Housing growth needs maximising at say 10,000. Maylands business park development also needs limitation. It is already swamped by car traffic during rush hours.

- Housing within Dacorum - other towns/ areas should absorb some of the new housing. The percentage increase in Hemel since 1950 has been for in excess of towns such as Berkhamsted and Tring. Can I see comparison chart of % increases of the past 60 years.
- Huge areas of northern England are depopulated and dying, why always the insane push to cram more people into the over populated south east.
- I am concerned that the town infrastructure (even including the planned improvements) will not be able to cope with the level of growth planned.
- I do not understand how building a minimum of 6500 dwellings will provide a better quality of life. There is no room for them.
- I don't feel any adjustments have been made in light of the 'credit crunch'.
- I have concerns with the proposed public transport links to Maylands business park. Historically at the time of the beeching cuts to rail infrastructure, we were told by H.M. government that public transport would be improved to cover closed rail lines, it did not happen. Recently the park and ride service from Gadebridge park to town was discontinued?? Meaning a reduction in customer service.
- I think a concentration on improving quality of the town rather than growing number of dwellings. Agree with business and leisure facilities improvement.
- I think a new covered bus station will just become the next blot on the landscape like Luton or Slough bus stations currently are- Watford manages without one.
- I think there should be better appreciation of the location and countryside (greenbelt) surroundings and include in the statement 'whilst maintaining Hemel Hempstead's natural areas of beauty and conservation'.
- If the county council don't repair the roads properly and DBC don't maintain road verges the rest is a waste of time, Hemel will be a lot better if you just do the simple stuff.
- It does not include a modern hospital facility.
- Jarman Park retail regeneration, must not compete with town centre retail in any way.
- Maylands development of housing and commercial development, plus a possible health (hospital) facility will intensify traffic and greatly add to the heavy traffic flows within town and through from St. Albans and M1, detracting from existing facilities.
- Mostly agree but need better bus service on Sundays.
- No - I have lived here since 1935 and too many alterations have been attempted all of which have ruined this little 'market town'.
- Plans for Maylands business park should include a heliport. This would increase international appeal, provide a facility for police and medical services. If new hospital is based in Maylands it would cut transfer time between Hemel and Watford.
- Reduce the ambitions concept.

- Schools are very important, often talking about 6500 dwellings. I strongly believe that 'villages' should not merge into each other with housing.
- Some of the proposals are good but with an expanding community, the road network will need to be improved.
- Sort out bad behaved residents/ families and get pride and care back into Hemel Hempstead. There is no respect.
- Taking forward the 1947 motto as the motif is outdated and grandiose as the current economic down turn clearly shows. Modest, prudent improvements for the benefit of all should be the aim.
- The Hemel hospital should not be moved.
- The number of additional new dwellings being planned (minimum 6,500) is I believe too high to be sustained by the planned infrastructure. For the town.
- The plan contains many good points. Fundamentally the borough should be seeking a realignment of boundary with St. Albans to bring the boundary in alignment with m1.
- The term delivers a minimum of 6500 new dwellings fills me with horror. For 6500, read 50,000, at the drop of a hat. The remainder is fine.
- The town needs to develop more up market image to attract more middle and high earning families. Some developments should be less dense and provide to only above. I.e. no affordable housing.
- The transport system needs a radical overhaul not to criticise the staff who are extremely polite and courteous, but the transport itself. The buses are like something out of 'heartbeat'. Are there any plans for a reopening for what used to be Woolworths?
- The vision for Hemel has been over looked but we are too far down the line to alter it I.e. Kodak building what an eye sore.
- The vision is pointless without the necessary infrastructure! To build 6,500 new dwellings having closed most public loo's is irresponsible! There is no costing for the vision!
- The vision should not be based on population figures based on the 2001 census which is nearly 10 years out of date. I.e. 1:11 the last 'last neighbourhood' was Woodhall Farm - development at Apsley appears not to have been included in the figure.
- There is no mention of health care facilities (local) or schools and youth clubs / community centres for new residents.
- There needs to be more emphasis on activities or pastimes for the growing population. Without this there will always be a view of it being boring in a comparison with St. Albans and Watford.
- Vision for Hemel Hempstead is that hospital is close, many schools are closed. So vision for Hemel is closure.
- We should have our own a + e department, especially if the town is to grow more than ever, apart from that it's ok.
- What is there is excellent but there should also be explicit mention of ready access to education, health, personal care and welfare service provision.

- You have not mentioned the civic centre - it needs to be moved out into Maylands. This would ensure best use is made of town centre.

#### Q. A2 - Are there any additional major issues we should be considering?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	119	61%	119	63%
No	No	71	37%	71	37%
NAN	Not Answered	4	2%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A2TX - If yes, please list...

- 'Healthier' as an objective and the means to attain it. The road network and growth of car usage.
- (1) a green park space in Maylands industrial estate with seating for workers to enjoy. (2) a proper children's library dedicated to provide a range of suitable activities.
- (1) hospital issue. (2) before Maylands business park is expanded. Efforts should be encouraged to let existing empty premises (possibly by reducing rent / rates). (3) I do not agree with residential housing being built near the business park because of proximity to Buncefield. (4) I think there should be strict controls on the amount of fuel stored at Buncefield.
- 1 - library. 2 - only brief experience to multicultural faith facilities. Are these definitely in plan ?
- 1) parking for residents and visitors has not been adequately considered. (2) the level of traffic through the area (not necessarily in and out of it) and the effect on the conditions of the roads and quality of life of those living adjacent to them. (e.g. health and safety).
- 1) quality of life for existing residents.
- 1. Hemel needs a unique selling points/identity when compared with Watford - St. Albans. 2. Develop water-based resources, e.g. boating lake.
- A decent hospital with a + e services.
- A hospital that is fully operational to cope with the extra homes and families, should be a top priority.
- A hospital, a better police station. No more closure of schools.
- A public place with simple car parking.
- Additional housing needs better hospital facilities (a + e) and school provision. Not closing hospital and schools.
- An A&E is vital for the towns hospital.

- Are there enough schools, doctors surgery, dentist, etc. For all the new people moving to Hemel? There are always problems getting children into the school of choice now.
- Before the expansion of Maylands, Buncefield needs to be considered carefully - how safe is it. How to recruit new businesses. Why do we need new schools when we have just shut many? Improve areas first then see what needs to be done.
- Better roads and highway maintenance, better health facilities policing.
- Bring all schools in Hemel up to an outstanding level. Many schools are very good while others could be better.
- Bring back a hospital with full services.
- Cleaning up the place and putting pleasant things into empty shop windows, which are a complete eyesore at present.
- Completely abandon any new development in Apsley mill and manor estate until the road infrastructure is considerably improved. Traffic congestion in the area is unacceptable.
- Consultant led 24 hour general and A&E hospital facilities to meet the needs of an increasing population both young and old. Not necessary in town centre.
- Cut out all cheap (one pound) shops.
- Do not burn bridges for a return of a full on hospital (just look at the additional housing being planned).
- Existing housing potential should be maximised and included in the overall growth figures. Renewable generation technologies should only be implemented if H.H. wants them.
- Facilities 11-18 other than sport or music, ask them to stop yobs.
- Faster and quicker transport links, as a bus journey from Woodhall Farm to the town station takes approx 45 minutes.
- Greater provision of 'green' transport options, realistic cycle ways, low emission buses for town centre routes and parking for electric vehicles and charging points.
- Green areas for new developments. Quality of road surfaces.
- Hemel Hempstead must have a proper hospital, Watford is a disaster.
- HH is becoming a town of apartments. Much talk of new shops but not enough variety with many retail outlets closing because of high rentals. Town is boring - some units never opened in riverside area, over provision of restaurants/coffee shops. Need furniture, carpet and general electrical suppliers locally. Not everyone can get to retail business parks. Debenhams do not provide these facilities unlike previous department store.
- Hospital facilities and youth services - visions are not enough. Road networks and more local police / ambulance and fire services.

- Hospital facilities are not adequate and will become less adequate, still when population increases. A + E services must be re established locally before any increase. Housing if undertaking, Watford a + e is already over stretched and not easily altered quickly. Hospital facilities must be considered first before accommodation, cultural etc.
- How are you going to attract high earners to support high quality shops? Open up the town, instead of making it more congested, by demolishing the side of Marlowes alongside Waterhouse Street. Widening Waterhouse Street to become part of Marlowes , leave the Green Belt alone.
- How can you justify all this improvement without mentioning the urgent need for keeping a hospital for such a large populated town, it needs to be top of the agenda.
- I feel that it is important that a town the size of Hemel and growing - should have a hospital. It is ridiculous that the ill and their relatives should have to travel to Watford.
- I have no pride in Hemel Hempstead, if I could afford it I would move tomorrow sort the roads, paths, litter etc. Out!
- I would like to see more facilities in Gadebridge Park, better toilets are a must. A better park for the children and a much needed cafe serving lunches, sandwiches and hot and cold drinks etc.
- If H.H. is to be a 'key centre' more emphasis is needed on attracting people from a wider catchment area for shopping/entertainment etc.
- If the town population increases an A&E department should be included at Hemel hospital as well as a maternity unit.
- Impact of aging population (and associated areas) of Hemel Hempstead on this vision.
- Improved habitat for flora and fauna.
- Improving areas for motorbike access and parking facilities.
- In the planning of new homes, infrastructure very important. New community hospital planned, no A&E, no operations! Watford only for all major decisions. Not happy, special houses suggested.
- In view of the increase in homes in the future I believe we should have the A&E department re-established when the new hospital is built. (definitely not based at Watford).
- Introducing better quality retails to Hemel Hempstead and providing better and more affordable parking for shoppers. Marlowes Riverside too expensive for short and long stay.
- Is the hospital big enough to cope with new development? Will have enough resources such as water supply.
- It all sounds good but where is the money coming from? It needs more than words to put this all in place and I seriously doubt it will take place.
- It does not include a modern hospital facility.
- Jarman Park should have an environmental enhancement. And not compete with town centre redevelopment.

- Keeping the final vision of Hemel clean, tidy, safe, civilised and to provide better health care in the borough.
- Location of full hospital facilities. Not transfer to Watford or Luton.
- Location of Hemel Hempstead station. Two waters is closer to the majority of the town and the proposed bus station than the present site. (although moving it would be very expensive). Links between Bennetts End / Leverstock Green and Apsley station. Apsley is closer to both than Hemel Hempstead, but the road layout is unhelpful.
- Make sure, schooling, policing and adequate health / hospital facilities in place and leisure facilities.
- More houses. We require a hospital with A&E.
- More provision for the elderly care, transport. Do we need more retail space in the town centre when we cannot fill what we already have.
- Much more emphasis on high quality leisure facilities. Return of a community oriented college service and establishment. An effective park and ride scheme like oxford.
- New A&E hospital! This is vital being so close to the M1 and M2 as well as Hemel Hempstead being a large industrial area, not to mention, housing expansion! Do it!
- New local hospital, it is a disgrace that A&E has moved to a hospital hemmed in on all sides - madness !!
- No mention of attracting quality retailers to the town, top drawer employers, plus noted restaurants.
- Not having an 'a' and 'e' centre is a cause for concern. Also hopefully transport facilities will be put in place to the business park. They are not very viable at the present time, red a hospital being re-sited there.
- Over development of urban e.g. 'in filling' on any available piece of land. Rural areas should be developed also, who appropriate.
- Overcrowding, traffic congestion. Do you know of the social experiments conducted on rats?
- Parking and traffic flow.
- Perhaps a crematorium could be considered.
- Policing and safety. Green spaces to include a variety of play grounds for children. Improved cycling opportunities.
- Protect and enhance existing green space and wildlife, deficit of 6 hectares leisure space.
- Public services, I.e. police and hospital, fire, road repairs, condition and congestion.
- Public transport with hospital provision being used in Luton (LDH) and Harpenden (Bupa) should the poor (and in the case of Harpenden, non-existent) bus links be improved. Not everyone has a car and parking isn't good in either area.
- Quality of the roads (potholes) etc. Parking alone Water House St. What about a red line zone like London. What about litter.

- Reinstatement of A&E with all these new houses. What about safety, schools. i.e. the infrastructure.
- Reinstating A&E services in Hemel Hempstead on the Maylands business park or the town centre.
- Replacement college or equivalent centre for territory and continuing post school education and training.
- Roads and access to motorways are already congested, side roads have become 'rat runs' at peak times.
- Safer communities, drinking culture effects Hemel. Speed in Hemel (cars) as well as congestion (already mentioned). Up keep of areas, all well and good developing new areas but these require regular up keep to keep looking good and litter problem along main roads in Hemel.
- Schools, hospital, A&E, jobs, town centre, half of the Marlowes is boarded up.
- See above the infrastructure concerns. I am concerned that the town infrastructure (even including the planned improvements) will not be able to cope with the level of growth planned.
- Social housing ethnic mix Gypsies and Travellers. Social housing - communities, improvement of existing areas. Increase within limitations, better facilities for children, schools, play areas, green space, security. Gypsies and Travellers - extreme care in location of new sites with agreement from residents strong feeling in Grovehill/Piccotts End against too close to Cherry Trees.
- Social housing. Far more will be needed. Health services are totally inadequate. Re-open tourist information centre in the town centre. Could do with more seats near entertainment stand.
- State of roads, patchwork effect looks messy and uncared for. Needs total re-tarmac, e.g. HP3 9AU.
- The added noise, disruption antisocial behaviour and resultant increase in crime and unhappiness.
- The cheapest cardboard and tile housing needs demolishing and rebuilt stronger with modern techniques and energy saving devices.
- The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and antisocial behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues.
- The existing house owners that were affected have still not resolved their problem after Buncefield disaster. Reduce traffic along Leighton Buzzard Road and the Plough roundabout.
- The hospital should be a full hospital for the size of town Hemel Hempstead will become.
- The hospital situation, we need an A&E department.
- The loss of further education facilities in the town centre. The loss of medical services from the town centre. The overdevelopment of housing in the town centre from loss of college and hospital facilities.

- The new town development of 1947 was based around industry Maylands Ave was factories. The housing was to house factory workers. Do we have the right sort of populous to fulfill modern needs? Dacorum college was built to provide this key piece of education. The whole area and populous must grow together.
- The south east is likely to become warmer and drier over in the next few years. What provision is been made for the additional water and sewerage requirements of the proposed development.
- The transport issue is very weak and is not integrated. Dedicated cycle provision needed for the whole town to support 2/3 of school children to cycle to school, half travel to Maylands, half travel to Marlowes. Car, public transport, cycle, pedestrian routes needed for whole town, not bits and pieces.
- There is no mention of water, gas, electricity and sewerage schemes to accommodate the new buildings.
- Too many houses, already. Too many unsuitable shops. Too much mimicry of U.S.A.! The town is becoming characterless and these plans do not help retain Hemel Hempstead's originality.
- Town stadium - doubtful. How much is the athletics block used (near Tesco) public transport will only be used if it is at very low cost. Cars used otherwise - if parking is a cost issue then people travel to 'best' shopping centre e.g. Watford. Car parking is a major issue. Town centre needs adequate i.e. more cheap, short stay parking. High density housing increasing problem. Aim should be to lower housing density, if that means Green Belt usage then it should be done.
- Traffic free cycle and foot paths.
- Transportation - from north end of Old Town to riverside is a very long walk. Especially for the elderly. Maybe a mobility centre in old. Too expensive moving sidewalk an ideal solution.
- Travelling people sites, refugees living in Hemel.
- Under passes Maylands roundabout to M1.
- University: this town should aim for a first class university, that will provide high class engineers, scientists / medical staff.
- Using the brown field site at Lucas would help greatly by not using the greenbelt sites.
- Waste incinerator. Although it would arouse opposition it would cut landfill and reduce road journeys.
- We live in Adeyfield, they shut the toilet down in the square. Why was this? Old people want to go shopping and we need the toilet frequently. Please put them back! Can we have a bus from Adeyfield to Apsley , direct.
- We need swift action rather than words on replacement of major entertainment centre to take up the void left by loss of pavilion.
- We should have our own A&E department, especially if the town is to grow more than ever, apart from that it's ok.

- What about people who can't afford to buy, are there any new council or housing association housing going to be available.
- When planning new residential development, business leisure in town centre - I feel there are already too many flats, family homes and gardens encourage a settled population. Leisure plans are limited by most of the shopping area being shut off in the evening.
- Where does the space for all the new dwellings come from?
- Whether there is any need to further shops in the town, given the number currently empty and the new areas in the 'Kodak development. How to encourage small, independent, shops and control major predatory operators. How to ensure money spent in the town stays in the town.
- Why not a medical centre in the Marlowes itself? After all it is the hub of Hemel Hempstead, it would be a hub for social integration with maybe a cafe or restaurant.
- With an ageing population, there should be more provision of safe retirement communities.
- With the growth of H.H. a fully opened 24/7 and staffed police station will be required. Not one that closes at night. Space for a 'professional' football club.
- Yes, more affordable housing and more scenes for kids and the youths.

#### Q. A3 - Do you agree with the vision for Hemel Hempstead town centre?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	148	76%	148	79%
No	No	40	21%	40	21%
NAN	Not Answered	6	3%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A3TX - If no, what do you think should be different?

- 1. No new housing with in the town centre. 2. No vehicular access for private cars to be allowed. 3. Shops etc should embrace the river gape. 4. Parkland, cycle paths, foot paths should replace the collage area and throughout the whole scheme, Plough roundabout to Old Town.
- A real effort to create a distinctive centre, there are far too many shops e.g. that represent chains. We need specialists in the main town as well as the Old Town.
- After change to railway is vague and must reduce reliance on taxi service to buses and clear signage and regular bus runs. Time table security even free buses to trains. 1 am - 1 pm.
- Any housing in the town centre should be restricted to apartments/flats with parking. Houses should not be in the town centre.

- Architecture should be in keeping with tradition i.e. no glass, multi storage complexes.
- Attracting and keeping shops (including more big chains) to make people shop in Hemel rather than Watford.
- Business rates and rental are far too high to attract major retailers.
- College should be retained. Medical services should be retained. Money should not be wasted on cycle tracks.
- Didn't need a town stadium. We already have a sport centre and Jarman athletics track.
- Do we need more shops to become charity shops and shops? The proposal Pavilion replacement should be totally sound proof.
- Don't know, but lots more public toilets and benches in town!
- Existing layout acceptable if properly maintained. Large frontal area of civic centre could be used for expansion. Old pavilion site could be used for original purpose. Old market square could be used for new bus station - with hopefully decent toilets. (recent poll showed HH as worst in country). Too much money wasted knocking things down then doing exactly the same things. D. College does not wish to relocate. Very boring.
- Hospital facilities must be considered first before accommodation, cultural etc.
- I believe the plan is unrealistic regarding the expectation that there will be less use of private cars. Needs of disabled do not appear to have been considered. I do not agree with setting up of a multicultural centres as it is divisive concept alien to integration of minorities.
- I think the hospital should be relocated to the industrial area and flats built on land. Better use of space for both. (easier access for hospital as well).
- It should also be the natural location, and therefore designed to accommodate services which are not provided at neighbourhood level, but which people of all kinds throughout the town and its hinterland expect to have access to. The town centre is the only location that is accessible from all parts of the town by a single bus journey.
- Knock it down and start again.
- Marlowes should be buses only no cars or taxis. This would reflect the increase in needs for the elderly.
- More car parking, only then will there be an argument for extra 'shopping facilities'. Multi cultural centre leads to segregation not integration.
- More employment in the town centre and better shops. There are many shops.
- No. Leave things as they are. We do not want more buildings.
- Not enough specifics. The town centre at night is a place only for the young. There is too much emphasis on the pub culture, I see nothing outlined to address this. There needs to be though on how to encourage all ages into the town centre into the evening - this will give more balance and the town centre will feel safer.

- Once again the civic centre has been slipped in. Put the Civic Centre in Maylands.
- Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- People will not use the entire length of the 'new' Marlowes. Properties are already empty and we don't want more 'charity shops'.
- Pull it all down and start again. Dreary buildings, Dacorum college co courses is a farce.
- Question the need for more shops. In the current economic climate there are many empty shops and this may be a permanent trend. What we need is more traders.
- Re-site the 'market' with permanent covered status.
- Riverside shopping and the Old Town are too far apart - physically and culturally they should be separate identities - not linked and some days it will rain !
- The blot on the town centre landscape is bank chambers buses and large vehicles are always having to queue behind drivers trying to park in bank chambers.
- The council has closed most of the services, which is affecting the local community.
- The replacement of the pavilion should be tackled with the utmost urgency as the cultural life of the town is very poorly provided.
- The town centre has no cultural 'heart', no theatre or music venues apart from the Old Town hall and some pubs. Hemel desperately needs culturally enlivening as well as enlivening the local shopping area. Otherwise I agree with much of the plans.
- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- The urban park must not just be another 'Jarmans Park', one is enough. A stadium for Hemel Hempstead town football club and retail park is required.
- There is no costing for the vision, so it's inconceivable that the council will have enough money as it cannot even maintain current services. The vision is unaffordable!
- Totally ignores the need of a fully up and running hospital for the expected growing population.
- Water house square is now a long way from the main shops. Hemel centre has become a long, one street, strip and needs broadening out somehow. It is a long way from Debenhams to the civic centre!
- Waterhouse so no point in building further shopping facilities when we have never filled the new mall and riverside shops.
- With a proposed population of 100,000, how can your plan not include an up to date hospital including A&E.
- You should put more thought into what type of shops you let out to.

#### Q. A4A - Do you agree with all of the spatial principles in Policy X?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	150	77%	150	79%
No	No	39	20%	39	21%
NAN	Not Answered	5	3%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A4ATX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- (These questions are too difficult). The report is written in complicated language.
- A clear pass route to cycle uses is essential through the whole town centre to Berkhamsted.
- Already too much high density dwelling.
- Don't understand half of what you are saying so how can I agree.
- First things first.
- Focus - must include availability and access to a proper hospital, not 'bits and pieces' in odd corners of the borough!
- Forget leisure, hotel and arts. Have them at the edges of town.
- I am fed up of supporting idle, non working disrespectful lay-about. Look after my needs!
- I can't agree with all the principles.
- Integrated transport - the 67% of commuters into Maylands rely on their cars to carry samples/goods etc. They can't and won't use bikes or public transport as it's too costly and time consuming or inconvenient.
- Is 'public art' necessary in the current economic climate?
- It is unrealistic to think that people will use their cars less. Better to find ways to accommodate the inevitable increase in car use.
- Love the joining of zones and walks.
- Manor Estate has poor road links. Residential plans for inner zone project a dormer/ commuter role - not a settled community.
- No place to go.
- Nobody could agree with all the principles. I couldn't find policy x.
- Not sure if all of them are actually needed.
- One hotel is sufficient (how often is it fully booked?).
- Part (ii) bullet 3. - pointham. (iii) we are a 'car society'. Pedestrian of Marlow's killed it. Compare Berkhamsted - busy, thriving, live. (iv) riverside walk - pointham e.g. poor maintenance of water garden (green) makes it unsuitable.
- People will want a car if they are buying a large amount of shopping and to generate trade the centre needs to bring people from out of Hemel in. A combined parking and public transport policy is required.

- Principles are pie in the sky. We need facts to comment on.
- Pt (iii). The scheme seems not to serve people who are less agile, but not sufficiently mobility impaired for disabled parking (so they would go to e.g. Watford).
- Reasons for providing more shopping areas are not clear. Waterhouse square development.
- Reduce reliance of private motor car. Unfortunately people (lazy? Will drive rather than walk / public transport). Will use private cars, restricting use will make centre inaccessible and they will go to Watford.... Need more car parks (long term stay). And set down areas allowing to pick up shopping.
- Residential development - depends on type of building and how many! Kodak building is already an eyesore on approach to town.
- The current 'new' town centre is cold, impersonal and lacks character.
- The Kodak building and accompanying housing and shops will dominate any walkway between hiath park and Gadebridge park. If present development carried out as promised should be more than adequate without more revised work. Already pleasant walkway from riverside area via waterway gardens. Volume of use would make this impractical.
- The people have not been consulted properly.
- The principles are meaningless without the necessary funding! It's like saying 'hands up who wants a gold watch?'.
- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- There is insufficient information as to the nature and location of the town square.
- There should be a cinema, theatre and enlarged library in Marlowes.
- Too grandiose and exorbitantly expensive. So much could be improved for more economically by the efficient maintenance and supervision of existing facilities.
- Town centre plan needs to provide council with development control of new buildings to conform with the vision.
- What about community shops (I.e. Adeyfield square, Bennetts end etc).
- You have ignored library facilities, college and community services, high quality arts and gallery possibilities and welfare services.

#### Q. A4BA - Do you agree with the following in the main document? Part (I)

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	159	82%	159	88%
No	No	21	11%	21	12%
NAN	Not Answered	14	7%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4BB - Do you agree with the following in the main document? Part (ii)**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	163	84%	163	92%
No	No	14	7%	14	8%
NAN	Not Answered	17	9%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4BC - Do you agree with the following in the main document? Part (iii)**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	150	77%	150	85%
No	No	27	14%	27	15%
NAN	Not Answered	17	9%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4BD - Do you agree with the following in the main document? Part (iv)**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	165	85%	165	94%
No	No	11	6%	11	6%
NAN	Not Answered	18	9%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4BTX - If no, please give your reasons why, specifying which part you are referring to.**

- (iii) rightly or wrongly people (including me) will want to use their cars and be able to park. (iv) more dog (poo) bins around, there aren't nearly enough!
- 1 - everything does not have to be in one place. 2 - this is just contradictory nonsense! 3 - people will never opt for anything other than private cars, cycle schemes will not work as the town is too hilly.
- 1) no mention of provision of public (civic and other services).
- Arts, shops etc should be available throughout DBC.
- As a regular user of Gadebridge Park, I believe this should be enhanced with perhaps additional services - proper clean toilets, cafe, waterplay - these are the reasons people go to St. Albans.

- Bus services are never comprehensive so trying to reduce car use is not going to work. Use of bicycles would be nice but too many cars on the road. Please no 'modern' buildings!
- First things first.
- Forget leisure, hotel and arts. Have them at the edges of town.
- Gobbledegook.
- Hospital is not included and should in any long-term plan for an expanded town otherwise I agree with the vision.
- I am not confident that the distinct identity of each character zone can be achieved, while joining up the different zones. There should be a subtle theme running throughout the town.
- I believe that if possible by law that the number of disabled parking spaces should be reduced. This is because too many are always empty while other drivers struggle to find spaces and resort to illegal parking. If cycle routes are to be improved more bike racks need to be installed.
- I cannot decide which parts of the doc. You mean. P. 20-21, p. 23, p.28, p.29, p.30-32?
- I drive a car and this sounds like disruption on the way to town, having to drive miles a round just to park.
- I feel there is not enough activities for babies, toddlers and teenagers. I feel there should be something to cater for all ages.
- I really do not see the need for this (part ii).
- I see no need to reduce the reliance on private on motor cars. They remain the most convenient way of getting from a to b.
- li) as previously believed unrealistic and disabled not considered. (iii) no consideration appears to have been given to transport aspects of more housing / health facilities in the Apsley area which is already a traffic nightmare.
- li) gobbledegook! lii) don't agree with freezing out cause. Should be achieved by carrot not stick.
- Integrated transport. Difficult one. Try and relieve congestion magic roundabout. High level of flyover taking traffic directly from dual carriageway St. Albany's hill over roundabout to A41.
- It is unrealistic to think that people will use their cars less. Better to find ways to accommodate the inevitable increase in car use.
- It sounds like a waste of money and not enough detail given to understand properties. Current views and green spaces are not maintained and they will become litter bins.
- No more high density dwelling.
- No more residential development. No facts - just waffle. Have you seen covered bus stations? Appalling, frightening! Waffle - just give us the facts.
- Not clear what this relates to?

- Once and for all accept that in a town like Hemel Hempstead 90% of all transport will be car based. This is sustainable and there is nothing wrong with it. Motorist bashing may suit certain political agendas, but it is a sure way to kill a town centre.
- Part (I) retail business has such a high failure rate, hence, we need to analyse why? What help can we give to accord success to retail.
- Part (I) should make explicit mention of the knock of service I have referred to under a1, a2 and a3. (generically of course for brevity).
- Part (ii) bullet 3. - pointham. (iii) we are a 'car' society. Pedestrian of Marlow's killed it. Compare Berkhamsted - busy, thriving, live. (iv) riverside walk - pointham e.g. poor maintenance of water garden (green) makes it unsuitable.
- Part (iv) agree with riverside link- but no need for art and fancy designs. Clear signage and obvious links is all that is required.
- Part 1. Housing - no. Part 2. No mention of greenery. Part 3. Water house street should not be a through fare for cars. Part 4. No to vehicles again.
- Part 1. I find it difficult to see where the space is to enable this amount of redevelopment. Part iv. Water always reverts to its natural route. Take care.
- Part 1: risk of providing too many shops. Part 2: good, but not historical aspect to sense of place. Part 3 :integrated transport provision looks good but needs to be part of extensive town provision.
- Pessimistic.
- Pt (iii). The scheme seems not to serve people who are less agile, but not sufficiently mobility impaired for disabled parking (so they would go to e.g. Watford).
- Public safety must be given priority.
- Reduce reliance of private motor car. Unfortunately people (lazy? Will drive rather than walk / public transport). Will use private cars, restricting use will make centre inaccessible and they will go to Watford.... Need more car parks (long term stay) and set down areas allowing to pick up shopping.
- The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and anti social behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues.
- The Kodak building and accompanying housing and shops will dominate any walkway between hiath park and Gadebridge park. If present development carried out as promised should be more than adequate without more revised work. Already pleasant walkway from riverside area via waterway gardens. Volume of use would make this impractical.
- The Old Town is lovely and integrating it risks losing its charm. (people will want a car if they are buying a large amount of shopping and to generate trade the centre needs to bring people from out of Hemel in. A combined parking and public transport policy is required).
- The passage of 'through' traffic from Leighton Buzzard Road, needs to have less roundabouts. They want to bypass Hemel Hempstead, not get clogged in it.

- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- There must be sufficient parking otherwise people will shop in other town centres.
- There should be an additional bullet in (iv) in that the centre must be designed to facilitate policing. There is a danger of an area such as this becoming violent at times. (e.g. the evening often people have been drinking).
- Unable to identify part (1) etc. In spatial strategy.
- We appreciate the dustbin men. They are very nice people and we recycle everything.
- We definitely need the hospital and the emergency department. The other thing is to clean up the back of where the area where, the restaurants and old shops that have closed down.
- We require more private car parks in Hemel Hempstead, not less.
- You are never going to stop people driving into the town centre as it is convenient so you should try and accommodate cars. Busses are too infrequent and expensive to be a true alternative to using a car.

#### Q. A5A - Do you agree with all of Policy Y?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	120	62%	120	65%
No	No	65	34%	65	35%
NAN	Not Answered	9	5%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A5ATX - If no, please give reasons why...

- Re-providing the civic offices. There is nothing wrong with the building. No mention of the police station.
- A growing town the size of Hemel Hempstead should enjoy the facilities of a general hospital which should include an A&E department. Not face continual downgrading etc.
- All this was negotiated at least 20 years ago. Why bother putting out this questionnaire.
- Civic offices do not open weekends they are closed every night, could allow bigger 'pavilion' and more amenities. If the civic offices were moved to Maylands.
- Completely abandon any new development in Apsley Mill and Manor Estate until the road infrastructure is considerably improved. Traffic congestion in the area is unacceptable.
- Concerns about moving local community hospital away from town centre to Maylands business park - ease of accessibility / distance.

- Do not regenerate the town centre, pull it all down and start again. Get decent shops in.
- Does it really take over 20 years to implements some of these developments?
- East / west cycle links will be too steep the River Gade dries out occasionally St. Mary's church is where it is - you can't improve it without knocking historical buildings down.
- Economics and social regeneration and new homes must be considered carefully and planned so that you do not over load the existing residential and commercial surroundings to look cluttered, untidy and worse. Not thought out clearly.
- Existing hospital is accessible and in the town centre. It should not move. Scattering hospital related services around the town will place an impossible burden on Dacorum to provide the same level of transport infrastructure as present. - yes, but with the addition that the scheme should look at covering the pedestrian areas (with technology similar O2 arena).
- First things first.
- Health services, preferable in the form of a hill hospital should be retained in the town centre.
- Hospital has had so much money spent on it, why close it and build a new one over at Maylands?
- Hospital services should be in town centre. See a5d. We should have hospital service in or near town centre. Apsley and Maylands, both need good transport. We should have our own hospital in Hemel with full services.
- Hospital should remain.
- Hospital zone, the hospital should be a full hospital for the size of town Hemel Hempstead will become. I have concerns about the surgery going to Apsley . Traffic in that part of the town is dreadful.
- How can we comment when there are no plans made available? The graphic gives no detail.
- I agree with all except the health provision.
- I can only agree with some of it e.g. houses.
- I do not think the hospital should be down-sized.
- I have serious concerns about what is happening to the hospital. What facilities does a local community hospital have? This is a key issue to provide adequate hospital and health facilities. To even suggest they may be moved to Maylands business park puts them even more remote from some members of the community. This is more important than all the other changes being suggested.
- I think it is ridiculous that the hospital will not be in the town.
- I think that the health services should be retained in the centre of the town to make them easily accessible to all the neighbourhoods.
- I think that whatever hospital facilities we are left with, they should be located in the present site which seems to be more accessible for more people.
- I would wish to see a full hospital facility being retained in the hospital zone.

- 1) hospital zone - essential for residential community hospital retained and health centre surgery in the zone. 2) proposed figure for residential housing too large against proposals for leisure / social development. 3) Plough zone, already conflict with increased traffic and housing development.
- It is essential to keep hospital services in town centre for ease of use for people who have to use public transport, no good being able to get a bus to town centre and then another one to Maylands bus park.
- More 'houses' mean high density - undesirable. If the centre is to thrive it has to be easy to get in and out (cars). E.g. the market died because it became inaccessible.
- New civic offices not required. How many homes are planned? This is a river valley where flooding could occur.
- No new homes on hospital grounds.
- Open space - not really necessary - will create bad focus (groups of people). River Gade should be left as it is.
- Open space, on principal seems fine but town lacks a theatre / concert venue. I feel this should be considered rather than an 'open space' which would be in use for only part of the year and often daytime.
- Pessimistic.
- Proposed timescale too long. Priority should be given to regeneration of Marlowes shopping zone- 2021 is 22 years away!
- Save cost of re-siting hospital. Keep in original site. Why close? False economy, buildings already exist.
- See below re Old Town no integration necessary! (leave it as it is - old, quaint and original).
- Taking forward the 1947 motto as the motif is outdated and grandiose as the current economic down turn clearly shows. Modest, prudent improvements for the benefit of all should be the aim. The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and antisocial behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues. Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- The hospital area should be used for medical care since most of the areas have been taken else where, and yet we are continuing to increase the population.
- The new hospital should include all services including an A&E especially as it is so near m1 and m25. Also serves large community.
- The Old Town area will continue to be separated from the main retail area by civic buildings. No positive statement about the provision of public transport serving the area.

- The original Marlow's zone is, by virtue of the number of listed buildings and thus limited scope for redevelopment, too small to be considered as a separate zone. It should be divided between the hospital zone and the water house zone.
- The replacement 'hospital' should not be on Maylands!
- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- The Watergardens could be a world class garden. It is very neglected. It needs to be considered as a whole, plus new development as far as Gadebridge Park.
- There is no money! Putting forward grandiose plans (however attractive) when even the current level of services cannot be maintained is irresponsible.
- There should be an unqualified affirmation of the council's concern that such hospital facilities are to remain in Hemel must be located in the hospital zone. (including the minor injuries unit and the excellent recently provided open access GP service. (mainly for reasons of access mentioned under a3).
- Time scale again totally unacceptable.
- Too vague - I just can't get the picture somehow. Policy seems to suggest, yet more rebuilding. Hemel will never have a settled permanent feel if it is always being changed.
- Unhappy about the use of our hospital site, we should have a good hospital within easy reach of our Dacorum population.
- Until the parking in the street and shop rents are addressed, businesses won't or can't survive in the Old Town.
- Vista of St. Mary's church has always been good - why interfere? Existing Rivergate area pleasant for family outings. If properly maintained, water flow / weeds cleared could be even more so. Old market square is never used to capacity, better to be incorporated into better bus station. Most traders / event organisers already complain of high rental charges.
- We have not been consulted about the water house zone, yet it is proceeding. Meanwhile the BDC has no money for basic needs (I requested a litter bin and dog faeces bin, but was told there is no money!).
- What is the nature and design of the new oasis centre?
- What policy, nothing follows up.
- When you open up areas like Gadebridge park, you end up with glass, litter, dogs muck and intimidation where you can not walk at night.
- Where is the police station going to be sited? There has been no mention of it. I agree with the aims overall other than the lack of a police station.
- With the anticipated population expansion. H.H. must have its own hospital providing a full range of medical services. Urgent care facilities will not be sufficient.
- You have not considered improved transport links.

#### Q. A5B - Do you agree with the aims for the Waterhouse Square zone?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	162	84%	162	85%
No	No	28	14%	28	15%
NAN	Not Answered	4	2%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A5BTX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- 1 - do we need a town centre civic office block? Would a 'one shop office' with other activities out of the centre be more suitable? 2 - what provision is to be made for a police station.
- Aiming for too much from space available. Already too high density and therefore short term.
- Civic offices do not open weekends they are closed every night, could allow bigger 'pavilion' and more amenities. If the civic offices were moved to Maylands.
- Does 're providing' the civic offices mean you are going to demolish the civic centre? Probably one of the more attractive buildings in Hemel. The Gade and Water Gardens will be difficult as all the shops back onto it. The present town centre lies well south of w. Square. So it will be difficult to make the square a hub.
- East / west cycle links will be too steep the River Gade dries out occasionally St. Mary's church is where it is - you can't improve it without knocking historical buildings down.
- First things first.
- Housing again. Water House Square, will it be green? Built in a pleasing style?
- I fear that the public square will include yet another pointless sculpture that everyone ignore except for the vandals.
- I feel the performing arts venue is years overdue, this was promised to Hemel Hempstead years ago.
- If by 'public square' you mean an open area where nothing happens then I think this is a mistake. I don't see any mention of a street market and this should be catered for and held in the square. The strip format of the current market down Marlowes is characterless and lacking atmosphere. Learn from the continent.
- It has all been spoiled.

- New civic offices not required. How many homes are planned? This is a river valley where flooding could occur.
- Not entirely, very big and bold but does all of it need improving? Yes - arts venue, we need this.
- Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- Open space, on principal seems fine, but town lacks a theatre / concert venue. I feel this should be considered rather than an 'open space' which would be in use for only part of the year and often daytime.
- Open spaces are used for groups - can be unsightly and intimidating.
- Pessimistic.
- The current civic offices are fine - we need the other cultural facilities now, 2021 is a long wait. Start with the performing art venue.
- The suggested position of the bus station will further insolate the northern end of town. Does a bus station enhance the water gardens (river gate) ?
- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- The Water Gardens could be a world class garden. It is very neglected. It needs to be considered as a whole, plus new development as far as Gadebridge Park.
- There is no money! Putting forward grandiose plans (however attractive) when even the current level of services cannot be maintained is irresponsible.
- Type of housing not specified. Presume blocks of flats. If so the council needs to develop policies that will lead occupiers to live in harmony.
- Vista of St Mary's church has always been good - why interfere? Existing River Gade area pleasant for family outings. If properly maintained, water flow / weeds cleared could be even more so. Old market square is never used to capacity, better to be incorporated into better bus station. Most traders / event organisers already complain of high rental charges.
- We have sufficient open space (Gadebridge Park) nearby and the water gardens. The council offices and library are still in good condition, so why replace them? 'Green' area by library is not used.
- Why waste the space of the square, build on it.

#### Q. A5C - Do you agree with the aims for the Old Town zone?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	168	87%	168	88%
No	No	24	12%	24	12%
NAN	Not Answered	2	1%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5CTX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Better car parking facilities for on street parking needed.
- First things first.
- Leave it as it is - old, quaint and original.
- Leave the Old Town alone. Everything has been tried leave history to generate itself.
- Must be pedestrianised and a walking link established with tunnels or overhead bridges, or timed crossings.
- North / south pedestrian links would be too long to be useful. Make the old high street one - way traffic.
- Old Town integration unlikely due to poor access and retail outlet. This area neglected when Marlowes created and never recovered. Creation of cycle links and pedestrian links not going to make any difference. Very few people use existing links to Gadebridge Park from there. Frequent traffic congestion. Old market deserted.
- Old Town zone is in need of some modernisation development. Businesses are isolated and do not make a profit.
- Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- Pedestrians and cyclists do not mix!
- Proposal is not sufficiently proactive. 'As new development opportunities arise....' = reactive policy.
- Should be one way and no parking at any time on one side. Limited, say 2 hours on the other side.
- Suggest that this zone should have even more historical character. Found a site for Dacorum museum? Interpretation boards, guided walks.
- The Old Town is already isolated from the centre of activities. The new bus station will isolate it even further. Improved pedestrian/ cycle links - oh no, not more waste of money. Face up to it, we know it's politically correct, but people do not, and will not cycle.
- The Old Town is out on a limb. Quote: - develop when opportunities arise. South end of Gadebridge Park should be developed to bridge the gap between the new and old.
- The Old Town needs to be completely separated from new building and development. Some parts of Hemel will lose their charm if upgraded.
- The Old Town seems only to take a walk down memory lane.
- Too vague. Old Town would be much better if it were a one way street with on street parking. I am sure the businesses would benefit. This is the most valuable asset to Hemel since I have lived here (25 years) it seems to have been badly sidelined.
- Unless someone makes a better job of integration I feel the Old Town is a dead duck.

- Unrealistic. Nobody needs to go to the Old Town. Specialist shops come and go parking cost deter. Housing development beyond the top of Old Town would give it a natural constituency.
- Until the parking in the street and the shop rents are addressed, businesses won't and can't survive in the Old Town.
- What is there is excellent, but a commitment to restoration of frequent access by bus should be added.
- You have not considered improved transport links.

#### **Q. A5D - Do you agree with the aims for the Hospital zone?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	103	53%	103	54%
No	No	88	45%	88	46%
NAN	Not Answered	3	2%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### **Q. A5DTX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- A growing town the size of Hemel Hempstead should enjoy the facilities of a general hospital which should include an A&E department. Not face continual downgrading etc.
- A hospital should not be halfway up a hill. An ageing population would not appreciate it.
- A new zone for hospital must be allocated or we will always have a minor hospital and a grand new facility should be at Lucas Aerospace site to facilitate, St. Albans, Hemel and north Watford.
- A town (largest in Herts.) With out a hospital 82000 and growing population! Plus outlying areas such as Berkhamsted and Tring.
- A town this size needs a fully operational hospital, millions of pounds have been spent on it over the years. It will be criminal to pull it down.
- A town this size requires a full scale hospital - A&E, surgical, maternity. The land is there, the town centre sitting is excellent, the hospital must remain where it is now. We do not want 'bits and pieces at Maylands, Apsley , Watford!
- A waste of money. I thought some parts of the hospital were fairly new, why knock them down to re-site them. I still believe if the town is going to grow we need our hospital back.
- A&E should be re-instated and hospital should remain until new one built.
- Access - this area is nicknamed 'cardiac hill'. It is a very steep, cycle access will be challenging.

- Anxieties regarding whether there is a long term plan to remove Hemel's health facilities. Watford is inadequate, to inaccessible.
- Apsley already has congested roads and parking is a nightmare most of the time!
- Because the size of the town, we need a hospital centrally placed.
- Best central place for hospital site already exists. Ground bought by residents to enhance facilities not to have them sold for developments. Present hospital serves over 80,000 people in H.H. alone without other Dacorum towns. People would prefer to keep hospital than selling land for housing. Maylands park should be kept industrial Apsley area completely unsuitable especially with traffic. No need for cycle access.
- Completely abandon any new development in Apsley mill and manor estate until the road infrastructure is considerably improved. Traffic congestion in the area is unacceptable.
- Concerns about moving local community hospital away from town centre to Maylands business park - ease of accessibility / distance.
- Consider a central hospital complex, very important not moved to out of town area.
- Cycle access?? It is on a steep hill, unrealistic.
- Demolish existing hospital buildings and develop a new hospital on site (there is unused land by paradise); improve road access. Apsley is already congested by shops and business offices.
- Difficult to comment without commitment of NHS Maylands would be grossly inconvenient for most of the town.
- Essential community hospital and health centre, GP surgery maintained in centre, moving to Maylands conflicts with sustainability concepts and transport policies.
- Every effort must be made to retain hospital services in the town centre. How do we get to Maylands - in our cycles perhaps? Another opportunity for cycle tracks.
- Everything has been decided well before this paper was printed. The fight for the hospital is documented in our history books. Keep the hospital on sight. Don't build elsewhere.
- Excess spending projected if there is to be a new hospital. Many of the present buildings have only gone up in the last 25 years! Paradise Fields above the hospital, behind Walnut Close and Turtles Hill is an area full of biodiversity and interest to those who know and would be much better as an open nature park.
- Existing hospital is accessible and in the town centre. It should not move. Scattering hospital related services around the town will place an impossible burden on Dacorum to provide the same level of transport infrastructure as present.

- For reasons explained earlier, a town of this size needs an adequate hospital. This land earmarked for hospital use should not be used for residential housing.
- Greater information required on plans for health care provision.
- Have you ever tried to get to Watford hospital when there is a football match on?
- Health services, preferable in the form of a hill hospital should be retained in the town centre.
- Health should be retained in this central area and not relocated to one corner at the extremes.
- Hemel Hempstead needs its own major hospital not a super surgery excuse for a hospital, forget homes on this site concentrate on expansion of hospital, Watford even with expansion will not be able to cope.
- Hospital facilities must be maintained here, at the middle of the town where it's equally easy for everyone to access them, not moved to the dead area of Maylands.
- Hospital facilities to be maintained.
- Hospital is important for the local community and I don't see that been developed in these plans.
- Hospital is needed with all services.
- Hospital should not be closed. And definitely re-sited to Maylands.
- Hospital should remain.
- Hospital zone, the hospital should be a full hospital for the size of town Hemel Hempstead will become. I have concerns about the surgery going to Apsley. Traffic in that part of the town is dreadful.
- How many people will die on route to Watford before it is realised that a modern fully equipped hospital is the number 1 priority for a town the size of Hemel Hempstead.
- I agree with all except the health provision. Quite simply health provision is inadequate for a town of this size.
- I do not think the hospital should be down-sized.
- I think that the health services should be retained in the centre of the town to make them easily accessible to all the neighbourhoods.
- I would wish to see a full hospital facility being retained in the hospital zone.
- I'm not against the hospital moving to Maylands as at present the hospital is all over the place, but there should be an A&E.
- Inadequate facilities.
- It is essential to keep hospital services in town centre for ease of use for people who have to use public transport, no good being able to get a bus to town centre and then another one to Maylands bus park.
- It is not clear what is being provided.
- Keep hospital central.
- Lesson from the closure of St. Albans city hospital must be learned. Land sold and tiny houses built, not social or council houses.

- My real feeling is that hospital facilities need to be retained in the centre - it is not workable to outpost facilities to Maylands/Breakerspear.
- Need a bus service as hill is too steep for OAPS/ disabled.
- No new homes, it is a nice area. Leave it this way.
- Not all users of the surgery live in the town. Many from outlying villages so London road not suitable site.
- Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored). The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and antisocial behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues.
- Only agree if proper transport links are supplied from all the local neighbourhood areas.
- Open space will be too hilly. Why this persistent promotion of cycling, have you not noticed that Hemel is hilly and few people cycle.
- Pedestrians and cyclists do not mix!
- Please note there is now no Hemel hospital! The remaining health care should be based where the hospital used to be based where the hospital used to be.
- Putting a hospital near to Buncefield is a crazy idea! It is easy and accessible for everyone to get to town at the moment. But is not easy to get to Maylands.
- Reasons already given, it doesn't give us an A&E department.
- Redevelop by all means: but retain a new small but efficient A&E unit here! It's a big issue with people of Hemel, we need it!
- Save cost of re-siting hospital. Keep in original site. Why close? False economy, buildings already exist.
- Some measure of health facility should be retained in the town centre.
- The clear first priority for this town should be continued location of those hospital facilities that its pct is able to locate in Hemel at all here in the hospital zone. Relocation to Maylands.
- The hospital (even in its sadly reduced state) should be central. Maylands is not (without a car). This would be a better place for clubs etc, than Jarman's Field.
- The hospital in some form should be kept open. Space is not the highest priority.
- The hospital land should remain as services for the community. If houses are built we will not be offering the medical care for the expanding population.
- The hospital should stay where it is. It needs to be central and in the town not on the outskirts of town.
- The hospital would be best placed where it is. There would be enough housing in the town area as is.
- The new hospital should include all services including an A&E especially as it is so near M1 and M25. Also serves large community.

- This area should be a hospital only, to serve the entire community plus the expected expansion.
- To remove service from Hemel hospital was a disgrace. Leave Lincoln House Surgery alone.
- Unhappy about the use of our hospital site, we should have a good hospital within easy reach of our Dacorum population.
- We need a hospital to cope with the increasing population with all facilities.
- We should have a cottage hospital as most of your OAP's can't always get to out side Hemel for treatment.
- We should have hospital service in or near town centre. Apsley and Maylands, both need good transport we should have our own hospital in Hemel with full services.
- We should still have a proper hospital.
- We urgently need an A&E department at Hemel hospital. In an emergency an ambulance in rush hour can take up to 40 minutes to go from Watford to Hemel and back.
- We want a hospital near the town centre not on the Maylands area.
- We want our hospital back.
- Where on London road is a surgery to be sited? Traffic issues in Apsley are difficult now without adding more traffic.
- Why are the facilities being split? (Maylands - Apsley) perhaps two surgeries should be implemented to ease travel problems. Access. Pedestrian/cycle locals may walk.
- Why did you get the hospital facilities go to Watford, it is wrong (82,074 people).
- Why do you need a park, cycle access, pedestrian walkways? It's cheaper to repair pavements leading to the hospital, if you're ill why would you want to take your bike to the hospital. Also there is already a great doctors surgery in the area.
- Why have shut the hospital in Hemel. We need this service.
- Why not build the new community hospital where it is on the flat on the college site and rebuild the college in hill field road, which fit young students can easily cope with.
- With the anticipated population expansion. H.H. must have its own hospital providing a full range of medical services. Urgent care facilities will not be sufficient.
- With the population of Hemel Hempstead rising every year the hospital must be kept in town centre. How are old and frail people going to get to Maylands business park.
- Without an A&E.
- Would not include residential in this area.

#### Q. A5E - Do you agree with the aims for the Marlowes zone?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	156	80%	156	84%
No	No	29	15%	29	16%
NAN	Not Answered	9	5%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A5ETX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- Apart from the listed buildings, this area is a hotchpotch of developments of questionable quality and requires major radical re-development.
- Because the shopping precinct is closed at night (after 6 pm) making it social regenerated will be a problem. Several pubs and other enterprises have failed, with Marlowes pedestrianised in the south there seem to be good links already.
- Could cost council tax payers money!
- Create stronger historical sense in this zone. Interpretation boards etc.
- Depends what happens with the college site, which is not mentioned at all, a very significant gap. Nothing can work without integrating this major stretch of Marlowes.
- Do not agree with losing another car park.
- Economic and social regeneration. Putting more housing in and removing car and commercial areas deter people from visiting or working. If you want professional services etc you must provide parking facilities for these professionals.
- Hospital first.
- I don't think that more housing should be sighted in the town centre.
- Knock it down and start again.
- Lack of theatre / concert venue versus an open space. I feel Hemel needs a venue. The cinema is out of town and there is nothing to draw people into town now.
- Losing car parking facilities, of which they're already insufficient.
- Marlowes is alright as it is now.
- Marlowes zone lets the town down, visitors must be horrified.
- More houses!
- No mention of new large supermarket in the area. Current facilities limited.
- No more housing in this area!
- No residential development.

- Once the Kodak / image project is complete, this will be a densely populated area of small homes. This area is not suitable for family sized homes.
- Pedestrians and cyclists do not mix!
- Pull it all down and start again. Regeneration is a waste of money.
- Stores in the Marlowes should be value for money. Stores which are too up market don't flourish.
- The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and antisocial behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues. Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- The town centre should be reserved for non - housing uses.
- The whole focus of the paper is high density housing. e.g. flats / apartments by plough roundabout. This is wrong.
- Too many proposed shops, will there be room for all the extra cars when the extra dwellings are built.
- Very hard to understand what this plan is all about.
- We need car parks.

#### Q. A5F - Do you agree with the aims for the Marlowes shopping zone?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	166	86%	166	88%
No	No	22	11%	22	12%
NAN	Not Answered	6	3%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A5FTX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- Allow market forces to direct development.
- Attract vitality to the heart of the town day and night. Only thing you will attract is drunks.
- Could cost council tax payers money!
- Ensure vehicles are kept out of so-called pedestrian zone. All new shops have rear delivery access.
- Knock it down and start again.
- Need a taxi rank facility at riverside end, maybe in bus lane or Waterhouse Street.
- Need to ensure Waterhouse Street, outside Waterhouse zone is included and redeveloped as very run down.

- Need to include a cycle route to the area. Prevent cycling in pedestrian only areas.
- No mention of new large supermarket in the area. Current facilities limited.
- No vision - concrete bad, greenery good.
- Pull it all down and start again. Regeneration is a waste of money.
- Streetscape design for the town centre, whatever does this mean, where is the town centre?
- The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and anti social behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues. Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- The Marlowes shopping zone must be protected from out of town centre competition other than neighbourhoods.
- The town centre is getting better and seems more popular especially with the market and should be left now.
- The town centre will remain cold, impersonal and will lack character.
- Time scale again, totally unacceptable.
- Time scale too long. More significant redevelopment required to enhance town centre.
- Too many proposed shops.
- Too many units are left empty for far too long. I believe the rents need to be reduced or at least tiered raising depending how long a business has been established. If we can get more long term business it will be a dramatic improvement on the aesthetic aspect of the town.
- What shopping centre it needs a complete overhaul.
- Why have you shut the hospital in Hemel? We need this service.
- Yes, but with the addition that the scheme should look at covering the pedestrian areas (with technology similar O2 arena).

#### Q. A5G - Do you agree with the aims for the Plough zone?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	172	89%	172	91%
No	No	18	9%	18	9%
NAN	Not Answered	4	2%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5GTX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Also need to make provision for cycles and similar forms of transport, electric bikes, single occupant vehicles. Off road route to the station.
- By using the excuse of pedestrian links, the council have made the driving more dangerous e.g. Kodak building site by putting traffic lights, the queues are longer and longer.
- Can't see what you can change, some policies are in practice already.
- Could cost council tax payers money!
- Get some sort of by pass for the plough roundabout (or over pass).
- Hospital first.
- How do we integrate Kodak tamer retail and commercial development into town centre.
- I think it is too busy, too over crowded and if the Kodak building is remaining that colour, an eye sore!
- Insufficient information to understand what is planned. Surely the 'view corridor' shown has been compromised by current development.
- Keep pedestrians away from the plough roundabout as much as possible and take into account that the roundabout works well as it is and is the only thing most people know about Hemel. Now they now longer send their films to Kodak for processing.
- No comment, where is it?
- Plough roundabout needs redevelopment. Pedestrian gateway is a problem. Tunnels are threatening and undesirable. A bridge is needed. Not pedestrian crossings.
- Proposals vague, the existing arrangements are quite suitable if they were properly maintained, monitored and policed.
- Should also include enhancing cycle access which is very poor at present.
- The cycle route have a huge part to play if made wide for buggy child trailer safety at junctions / most important.
- There is no point improving pedestrian access if you don't provide enough car parking spaces.
- Totally vague! How? What are the proposals?
- Why change this when it is ok now.

**Q. A6 - Is there anything else that you think should be incorporated into the 'looking after the environment' theme for Hemel Hempstead?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	95	49%	95	51%
No	No	91	47%	91	49%

NAN	Not Answered	8	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A6TX - If yes, please list...

- 'Health and safety' needs to be incorporated into sorting out the park river - dangerous grounds. Improve the River Gade in Gadebridge Park. It is disgusting. Never before has it got into the state it is now. If the Water Gardens are going to improve then start the improving at Gadebridge Park. It has gone from a river to a stream - large puddles - to a mess.
- A ban on any high size buildings or structure should be implemented in order to maintain sensitivity to existing key views.
- A complete facelift and brightening up.
- A lot more could be done to enhance the GUC and to improve it for leisure purposes.
- A maintenance strategy.
- Adding green to urban redevelopment (like Riverside) as tired areas and main roads smartened up, add vegetation. Green corridors. Will look more like green town.
- Adequate hospital facilities.
- All not some developments must be zero carbon buildings.
- Ambience, ethos, heritage and pride are 4 words missing. Why not a museum? That might encourage a feeling of value and permanence for Hemel. Not much is being done to encourage the market either.
- An interest in wildlife should be promoted for all ages.
- As many as possible - green open spaces should be left as they are for people to walk on and children to play and run on.
- Better bus service for Adeyfield.
- Better litter picking/ moving and hedge trimming. To save electricity could pedestrian crossing lights be turned off until someone presses the button and maybe off at nights.
- Building designs that are efficient in water usage.
- By relocating hospital out side of town centre it will allow more area for housing. Less need for cars as all amenities would be local. Cheaper land outside of town can be used for hospital.
- Cycle paths alongside footpaths throughout the town.
- Cycle paths like Stevenage new town.
- Dedicated cycle lanes and adequate parking sites dedicated to cyclist.
- Development of Boxmoor Trust facilities.
- Do not build on Green Belt land. How about a golf course behind Piccotts End? Work on pride in Hemel Hempstead, bring it up market like St. Albans and Berkhamsted.
- Electric vehicles.

- Emission of 'green house gases' due to existing / future traffic levels and other causes.
- Ensure that buildings both in look and design have a 'lasting' quality. Decent architecture not the latest fad. We don't want to be doing this again in 40 years time.
- Ensure that there is access for the elderly and disabled with adequate parking centrally together with efficient and reliable public transport. Ensure that the river Gade grassed area is free of Canada geese, because they are an environmental hazard and no one can use the grassed areas.
- Establishment of site for touring caravans, the existing site in Breakspear Way is well below present day standards.
- Gadebridge Park should be opened up to look like St. Albans Park. Lake etc. To encourage wildlife and a walking area.
- Get more traffic to by pass the town centre (make more dual carriage ways) by pass/ over pass Plough roundabout.
- Greater emphasis on policy.
- Green spaces, shade trees, seats and public toilets.
- Greening of town must be retained, but closure of public toilets has led to soiling of areas of town and this must be dealt with, preferably by opening the toilets again.
- If built the community hospital in Maylands Park needs a fully staffed 24/7 a + e department. To cope with the rise in population.
- Important to the plans for the urban park and two waters gateway is that the box moor trust be persuaded to return to green space, the factory site on trust land between the new road from the A41 and two waters road south of the GUC.
- Improve public transport links, town centre to rail station. Improve car parking / park and ride.
- Improve the state of Gade River through Gadebridge Park.
- Improved traffic flow to avoid queues and therefore lower emissions.
- Include green gateway from west (i.e. Boxmoor, Station Road, St. Johns, in para ii and para v).
- Increase some green areas and keep streets clean.
- Increased segregation of rubbish for recycling, reduced packaging.
- Less 'tall' buildings, more car parking spaces and better public transport.
- Less traffic, cleaner town.
- Make sure the bins are emptied, dogs don't crap on the footpaths, green play areas etc. Get the drinkers out of the parks.
- More car parks. Free car parks. More local buses covering all areas of the town.
- More dog (poo) bins!
- More flower beds and trees put in place to reduce the concrete theme of the town.

- More green areas rather than all concrete. Especially in town centre, Marlowes areas.
- More seats in places controlled by the Boxmoor Trust.
- More stress on reducing/ controlling car use. Inclusion of shared car/ pedestrian road use. Bicycle pool scheme (Paris white bikes).
- More waste place. Seating.
- Much more attention to public toilet facilities and services, current provision is wholly inadequate. Concern in the plan for DDA.
- New building will need to generate their own power, be as green as possible. Roof gardens, use recycled materials.
- No building on Green Belt land at all costs.
- Not building another permanent Travellers site.
- Not enough use of the water areas is made. Any other town would put restaurants along the water gardens to make best use. We have a car park and a rose garden,
- Only allow 'electric' taxis within the Marlowes area - the amount of pollution with engines ticking over is unacceptable.
- Overcrowding insufficient thought given to traffic congestion.
- Perhaps a small recess unit, independent from other units, could be placed control to Marlowes to cope with heart attack and strokes.
- Plenty of colourful plants are required to give the town the same spirit and encourage wild life. We once had this - but it was cut for economy.
- Provision for extra water supplies is essential.
- Rebuilding train networks between neighbouring estates and the town centre / train station maybe using the old Nicky Line. Environmentally and logistically this would improve the town.
- Redesign, transfer or update how the towns rubbish dump works. i.e. more environmentally friendly containers, purpose built buildings to house compactors to deal with household and commercial waste. Why is this not on the plans??
- Reduce traffic by introducing some form of congestion charge or toll for town centre access.
- Reducing congestion in the town centre. Affordable car parks not too far from town centre.
- Refrain from using green areas for development use existing out of date or little used brown sights where possible.
- Relocation of information centre is not a good idea. Should be located in the town centre.
- Retain all grass areas, no development on these.
- Safer streets for walkers.
- Security wardens day and night who patrol and are visible.
- Small food shops in all neighbourhood area e.g. Old Town where elderly and infirm have to go miles for basic shopping.

- Space for recreation such as dog walking and wildlife corridors are a great idea for enhancing the environment.
- The land near the leisure world should be used for housing or leisure. It has stood dormant too long! (and looks scruffy).
- The proposed park at two waters is peripheral to the town and cannot therefore be described as 'urban'. A new park should be within the urban neighbours.
- The provision of a 'ranger' service to supervise and monitor public spaces such as playgrounds and open spaces. The provision of public conveniences, currently a disgrace e.g. the bricking up of the ware end and other facilities is civil vandalism.
- The quality of the air breathed by those living alongside the heavily (soon to be more heavily) congested roads has not been considered.
- There is some evidence that the sewage works along the bullbourne are feeding too many nutrients into the water course upsetting the natural balance and hence wildlife.
- There should be a policy statement that all Boxmoor Trust grazing land is to be kept as such. It is rare for wild meadows and grazing land to be accessible to the public and this must be protected. On figure 3.2 it appears that the proposed urban park will take some existing Boxmoor Trust grazing land.
- This has probably already been addressed. It is a daily walker from Boxmoor to the town centre, it is an unpleasant walk from heath park.
- Tighter control on litter dropping, defacing walls, especially underpasses required.
- To make pet owners to pickup their dog mess and don't let them do it where they like.
- Upgrade play equipment in parks Watford has done this, it is important for quality of life in the area.
- We have no ponds in Hemel. Running water has different wildlife. The area next to the river, opposite the car park in Gadebridge Park could be developed into pond area, it already floods in winter and would need little work to improve, a great feature for the park!
- What is the nature of Buncefield?
- Why make life hard for old folks? In the park in Adeyfield please put the benches back. We are old folks and need to rest. What have we done to you? Thanks.
- Wild life protection, schemes involving planned centre of learning and volunteering. Meeting points with toilets and washing facilities.
- Yes rail station being isolated from, town centre needs better parking or free parking.
- You must look after our local rivers nearer to their sources or you are just wasting our money. The two rivers were once well maintained not just tinkered with!

- You need to look at a traffic census at the amount of vehicles in and around your main trunk roads at peak times.

#### Q. A7 - Do you support a viable town stadium complex?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	148	76%	148	80%
No	No	38	20%	38	20%
NAN	Not Answered	8	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A7TX - If no, please give your reasons...

- A stadium too close to A414 and M1 will only increase traffic congestion in this very busy area. Peak times see traffic there already at a standstill. Better location closer to Gardenbridge Park.
- Already got me and an athletics track and facilities commensurate with Hemel Hempstead sporting achievements these do nothing any way, reduce the aspirations of individuals to greater sporting achievements.
- Already have facilities in the towns and schools.
- Develop the existing sporting facilities of sport space units. This reducing unnecessary expenditure.
- Enhance the current facilities at the sports centre first.
- Focus on development of town centre is key.
- Hemel Hempstead would have no use for a stadium complex.
- Hospital priority.
- I am not sure. Feel it is too ambitious yet.
- I do not believe demand would warrant the costs on the loss of valuable land that may be needed for hospital as a later date. No space in town so would need cars to access, bad for environment and more space required for parking.
- I don't see it as a good use of money. Improve existing leisure facilities instead.
- I don't see it as a priority, given there are no major teams here (look what happened to the basketball team). What is needed more than this is a replacement for the pavilion: a multi -use building for concerts, school activities, lectures, markets, weddings...
- I think it is a good idea but a good location would be Jarmans Park.
- I think the area around Jarman Fields could be expanded with all sports activities centred there.
- In principle or with it provided exact use is identified before it is built.

- It is unlikely to add usefully to what we have already at St. Albans hill and will only generate more traffic in our overloaded roads.
- It would serve too few people. Already a sports complex.
- It's nonsense! Would cost money we haven't got and there is simply no demand or justification for it.
- Maybe.
- More road congestion. More car parking will be needed. Might be detrimental to the vision of town central.
- Need more facts, what would stadium provide use for? We already have athletics track, many football pitches and performing arts venue. What areas are lacking? Would it make a good return if just modest.
- No call now far such facility since the pavilion disappeared.
- No. We need a new pavilion first.
- Not cost affective. Athletics track is seldom used.
- Not necessary - see previous comments. Not economically viable. Don't need a town stadium. We already have a sport centre and Jarman athletics track.
- Not necessary for a town of Hemel's size. Is better to use funds to restore cultural life to Hemel Hempstead.
- Not sure - more information required.
- Not sure because how well used are the football ground and the two rugby fields?
- Not unless it is demonstrated to be a financially viable undertaking.
- Only if it is not too expensive to use these facilities.
- Should be a commercial operation.
- The access to stadiums near by have good transport links. How much would it be used.
- The plan states the town centre, but then in paragraph 5:2 (vi) states this would be close to A414 and M10 which is not the town centre. Town centre stadium would be good, but not stuck out of town.
- The town needs a new hospital more.
- This is already catered for at Jarmans Field.
- Unsure.
- We already have a athletics venue and a sport centre as well as the snow centre, I do not foresee that the use that would be derived from a stadium would justify the cost.
- We already have an athletic stadium.
- We already have one in leisure land.
- We can't support what we have.
- Why do we need a stadium? We have enough facilities.
- Why have a modest stadium? Have a decent sized stadium to put Hemel on the map.

**Q. A8 - Is there anything else that should be incorporated into the 'Social and personal welfare' theme for Hemel Hempstead?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	82	42%	82	47%
No	No	93	48%	93	53%
NAN	Not Answered	19	10%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8TX - If yes, please list...**

- 1) reiterate 'local hospital ugc and gp services are developed in town centre' delete Maylands business park. 2) include museum, art gallery in para (v) arts venue!
- A big hall with plenty of car parking space.
- A bigger and better public library.
- A college that educates locals for the east of England biggest business park, visa versa.
- A GP service in Leverstock Green. The original practice moved to Lincoln House (now to Apsley?).
- A hostel for Hemel Hempstead and social misfits.
- A ring - fenced budget is essential.
- All neighbourhood retail spaces must be kept alive and prosperous for the need of all ages.
- As before, ensure all groups are catered for to reduce them travelling out of Hemel and teen drinking needs to be addressed in the borough.
- Availability of opportunities for exercise e.g. child and adult 'playgrounds' with suitable robust equipment - free.
- Before any further development is allowed there should be a considerable road improvement scheme and an upgrade of the whole infrastructure.
- Better leisure facilities and public playing fields rather than a stadium. Sport space has inadequate parking and is difficult to get to during rush hour. Have a sports centre in Highfield/Grovehill area.
- Better seating for the elderly and infirm.
- Cheap / free youth facilities.
- Closing and consolidating small churches into a purpose built spiritual needs centre in Maylands business park. With ample parking to free up road around them.
- Community facilities for homeless.

- Community services for young people should be provided in all neighbourhoods, provision for young people lags behind provision for elderly people and children.
- Considering the ageing population, there should be provision for their needs, ease of access, disabled access, toilets, higher use of buses.
- Cycle lanes.
- Day care provision of the elderly does not need to be in the town centre. A variety of playgrounds for young children, through to teens. Policing.
- Decide urgently to either use Marlowes or Maylands for health centre / hospital.
- Development of central community facilities in Waterhouse Square must not be at the expense of the local neighbourhood facilities such as cultural or religious meeting places. These must be retained.
- Do not close the schools so no new ones need to be build.
- Ensure enough capacity for good school places in Hemel so as not to get into problems as currently exist in Berkhamsted.
- Ensure pedestrianised areas incorporate facilities for the elderly/wheelchair users.
- Ensure that there are adequate school places for all children coming to live in Hemel. Sadly schools have already been closed unnecessarily!!
- Extra community facilities for disabled. Jarman Park is fairly small, but there are no facilities for asperger's and autistic men and women. And now with 1:60 people being diagnosed and only 15% in employment, community planning will need to accommodate these individuals.
- Facilities for teenagers.
- Full hospital that (maternity ward) A&E but that will never happen! Because the council will, don't care about that.
- Give your pensioners who have no social life a bingo hall and don't have to go out of town to enjoy themselves.
- GP surgery and senior school for Leverstock Green.
- Helping single people and first time buyers to get their own property. This is something that needs to be addressed.
- I am not sure what a 'multi cultural' centre is?
- I don't see it as a priority, given there are no major teams here (look what happened to the basketball team). What is needed more than this is a replacement for the pavilion: a multi -use building for concerts, school activities, lectures, markets, weddings...
- I would like to see a secure dog park incorporated. I am sure there are people out there who would like to have a place where their dogs can play with other dogs without the fear of them running away.
- If more housing is being built we need a hospital with full services including A&E.
- Improved feeling of safety, e.g. more police on foot patrols as people will be more inclined to walk.

- Improved town centre security.
- Improvements in quality of health care and schools before more housing.  
Need more facilities to keep teenagers off the streets.
- Improving Astley Cooper School.
- Indoor soft play / parks undercover, picnic areas.
- Look after the normal law abiding people like me.
- More activities. Promotion of Green Belt, parks, conservation areas, farming, cycle routes.
- More assistance should be given to the development of existing sports facilities such as the, rugby, tennis, football and cricket clubs.
- More children's centres and playgroups for ages 1-4 years.
- More help for the aged.
- More social places.
- More structures like the skateboarding in Gadebridge Park. The youngsters love it and it keeps them off the streets.
- More toilets for old folks and people in town. Don't rely on shops, pubs, public toilets, please.
- More youth activities to help train and develop our youngsters to keep them off the streets.
- Much more thought to be given to facilities and parking for disabled people.
- NHS dentists a must. Availability of doctors surgery.
- Night club type venues should not be close to private dwellings, put them in the industrial area.
- No more flats around the town centre. Small family housing please.
- Not having an 'a' and 'e' centre is a cause for concern. Also hopefully transport facilities will be put in place to the business park. They are not very viable at the present time and a hospital being re-sited there.
- Our involvement, if any with the Olympics in 2012. We are only 25 miles and 30 minutes from London.
- Parks should have a warden patrol provision to report mis-use and vandalism. Blocks of flats should be child - friendly and designed to eliminate antisocial behaviour.
- Performing arts centre and multi cultural centre could be in the same building or on same site.
- Plans are going to involve a lot of car parking. Is there land available for this? Is it what we want?
- Police - give out police a lovely new building that they and the town can be proud of and you will, in return get an efficient police in our town!
- Provision of youth activities close to neighbourhood centre.
- Public toilet now! The gardens flowers must be maintained, improved if possible. The evolved garden in Gadebridge Park looks lovely at the moment.
- Quality provision for the arts, libraries and college community services.
- Retain hospital. Keep all schools open.

- Review of action that needs to be taken to deter cyclists from dashing through Marlowes (pedestrian access only). It is apparent that decorum district council does nothing to deter such happenings.
- Safe areas for dog walking - away from roads.
- Schools. We have just closed schools and now you quote provision of new schools to accommodate growth in the town. This town has been growing since 1947.
- Something for the teenagers to use to keep them off the street give them something to be proud of.
- Sufficient public toilet facilities with a permanent cleaner.
- The core strategy recognises that the town is expanding. The hospital footprint should be retained to provide for this (I.e. A&E and full services).
- The performing arts venue should be built with a proscenium arch so that it can act as a theatre.
- The public toilets system is a disgrace and is a must for the health of the town.
- To make sure Hemel does not become a place where any or every available space of land has houses or flats on them as public houses pulled down and houses and flats put on the land.
- Transport to and from Watford hospital!
- Try and alter the mind set of local people. There are a lot of dull, un imaginative people in Hemel. They need motivation to change.
- We need good facilities for an aging population.
- We should adopt an integrated approach to facilities for the elderly so that sheltered housing and care homes are close to each other so that loss of community is minimised when a person moves from one to another, as is likely to be a necessity for many.
- Where possible the onus should be on pedestrianisation or cycling facilities.
- Would it be possible to develop a spur from the canal to provide river craft access to the town, to provide tourist and service facilities to bring additional inward economic thrust.
- Yes investigate with the town centre is so dead late evening looking at bus service part of problem.

**Q. A9 - Should Jarmen Fields be redesignated as an out-of-centre retail and leisure designation?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	149	77%	149	78%
No	No	43	22%	43	22%
NAN	Not Answered	2	1%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- 'Yes, but' rather than a blanket 'no'. The existing nightclub already causes noise problems (especially Friday/Saturday) to the surrounding residential area. This should be in the town centre.
- (1) it has out lived its usefulness. (2) the retail and leisure must not be adjacent, for obvious inability to police adequately. (3) a proper stadium should incorporate some of the leisure facilities.
- As above, by all means keep it as a retail park and cinema but not for a night club there are too many homes within walking distance. Disturbed by noisy yobs leaving already.
- As long as you don't touch the athletics track.
- Because it is too far away for people with no transport. Buses do not run late for those wanting evening leisure.
- Concern over impact on town centre and sustainability and growth of town centre businesses if develop out of town centre.
- Designation irrelevant.
- Everything needs to work as one-place/one-team to move forward, not competition between split areas.
- Further redevelopment would conflict with proposals for redevelopment and increase of retail provision in town centre (Marlowes) etc.
- Goes against the town centre being at the centre of the town and transport (location and access) appears to ignore this area.
- I don't understand the significance of this. Further retail at Jarmans field would be in competition with the town centre retail, which is very close by. Jarmans Field urgently needs developing, but not with retail what would compete with the town centre.
- I think it's alright as it is. It is quite popular and easy to get to.
- I think the residents already have enough problems from these. We could do with one over the other side (I mean Homebase etc). I have to travel right across town for a light bulb!
- Insufficient access routes for increased traffic flow. A nuisance to the local neighbourhood.
- It is certainly an out of centre retail centre now. As a leisure centre it is almost a 'no go area' for all but the young.
- It should be cleaned up, the park is a disgrace. Further out of centre retail development should be stopped because it has already taken life from the town centre.
- It will take trade from the town centre! Leave it as a leisure complex.
- It would be a good site for the new hospital (on the waste ground not bring used at present) could also be used as a park and ride base, the Jarman centre should be pulled down and a better designed complex built.

- It would take the shoppers away from the town centre which is already suffering with empty shops.
- It's good how it is.
- Leisure - yes. Retail - no. Unless retail at Apsley is removed the town centre currently struggles and there is poor food provision.
- Leisure only, no more retail premises.
- More retail units will adversely impact on Leverstock Green and Bennett's End shops, Tesco's has done this!
- No more retail there.
- Out of town retail centres have been showed to have a detrimental effect in town centres.
- Road congestion will increase and retail units will take business out of the town centre and reduce retail business further.
- Surely already is!
- The leisure centre should be moved from a residential area to Mayland business park and turn Jarman's Park into a retail area.
- The more development there is out of town centre the more the centre will die. Efforts should be focused here, as in London and so many other cities on reversing the drift to the periphery that spells doom for cities.
- The retail use of this area has already damaged the town centre and neighbourhood shopping. It would be foolish and encourage any further shopping expansion at Jarman Fields.
- The town centre needs all the help from retail units.
- There are enough out of town retail places.
- There is little or no public transport to this area, this should be a first priority.
- There is no point - a new label makes no difference to what is there. The Jarman Fields area though needs tidying up and finishing off. It has never been finished even to the original plans.
- Too many shops and already plenty which are empty.
- Too close to the town centre.
- Traffic congestion.
- Unless better access in and out of the area is improved even now long traffic queues are forming at busy times to get out onto the dual carriageway.
- We have enough out of town shopping.
- We have got enough shops already.
- What are the benefits / disadvantages to this clarification? Is it just a label? I cannot judge due to lack of information.
- Why should it?
- Would become a dangerous area at night.

**Q. A10 - The Spatial Strategy themes for Hemel Hempstead to 2031 are presented in Section 5. Overall, do you support this approach?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	167	86%	167	89%
No	No	20	10%	20	11%
NAN	Not Answered	7	4%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A10TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- 6500 dwellings over 25 year period equals only 260p / year, not enough to cover people marrying and having families. Private development exceeding this amount monthly already. Young people being driven away from it as the affordable housing available or private rental charges too expensive. Not enough sporting facilities and existing one is too expensive now 8:00 for mother and baby at swimming pool.
- Concentrate on improving quality rather than quantity, especially with environmental issues.
- Everything on the wrong track.
- I don't know.
- I don't think that half of the things are necessary. A case of trying to keep everyone happy and not getting any satisfaction.
- I have explained many times in this question.
- I only agree with some parts of it.
- Impossible to support vague ideas, no substance, mostly waffle.
- Inadequate attention to health priorities.
- More proposals are unfunded and not deliverable.
- None of these themes address the need for an integrated transport policy.
- Not enough information to support it. No mention of making high St. One way.
- Not until a lot of other issues are sorted out as I have pointed out elsewhere.
- Plus electric powered (rechargeable) vehicles, small buses, council vehicles, P.O. vans.
- Road improvements too little, too late.
- Spend money on basics not ideals.

- Taking forward the 1947 motto as the motif is outdated and grandiose as the current economic down turn clearly shows. Modest, prudent improvements for the benefit of all should be the aim. The emphasis on high density housing, additional business and leisure activities in many areas is wrong, encouraging crime and antisocial behaviour. Also no regard is paid to the additional traffic and pollution issues. Once again too grandiose and unnecessary except for the provision of a decent bus station. (the existing one could be economically improved if decently maintained and monitored).
- The Leighton Buzzard Road in the town needs major improvement to reduce congestion. Public transport to Maylands is needed to reduce car usage.
- Too ambitious.

**Q. A11 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the Spatial Strategy for Hemel Hempstead?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	87	45%	87	47%
No	No	100	52%	100	53%
NAN	Not Answered	7	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A11TX - If yes, please state below...**

- 1. There need to be better access to the M1 from the magic roundabout out.
- 2. There is a need for a bus to the train station from the heath lane area - this is a 20-25 minutes walk, but no bus available. More commuters could use the station if there was a bus service.
- A wider public information and consultation should be represented in the various public halls for further comment.
- A414 and a4147 need specific cycle / pedestrian paths. Personal experience say they are already dangerous.
- Additional housing should not be on Green Belt land. There is enough brown field land available.
- Address the issue of litter, include more litter bins (sealed) in new developments. More education in schools - on the spot fines.
- All the grass is being built on and street parking is now in house gardens.
- All the nice people will leave Hemel Hempstead.
- Basically a good idea but have concerns I.e. so much housing. There will be a need for better infrastructure. Also, if you send more surveys could they be in plain English please!
- Cambridge park toilet is also shut. Old people need the toilets, everyone does. Please help! My appreciation. Good luck and have a nice day!

- Children's leisure / play parks are outdated and of poor quality and should be a bigger focus for renewal. Including Boxmoor and Gadebridge.
- Concerns no mention of Travellers site which have been mentioned before.
- Congestion at peak times is very bad in Hemel, not just the roads mentioned. It takes half hour to get to borders of Hemel any way tried. Speeding on non camera roads a problem.
- Cost and inconvenience to alter things.
- Don't let Hemel Hempstead become another town with all the major stores making it another regimented town centre.
- Ensure wooded areas are maintained. Don't sprawl the town into the surrounding countryside.
- Excellent ideas, but in the current economic climate. I wonder where the finance will come from. DBC seems to struggle to provide current services, this would mean for more expense for them.
- Fine detail but inadequate consideration of priorities.
- Funding for all the peripheral requirements: roads, transport, schools, supporting infrastructure.
- Great idea but think funding may be an issue together with drive / commitment to take this forward.
- Have already voiced these, along with major part of town population. Develop yes - reduce - no! Hospital please.
- Hemel has lost its cinema pavilion and its full facility hospital culture and health are important factors in a society and should be a priority requirement.
- Hemel has lost two large employers in the area; Kodak and a large portion of the hospital. I lack confidence that employers can be enticed to the area. More importantly, that a variety of jobs created will be of a mixed skill base and will have a salary high enough to support a mortgage to live locally.
- Hemel Hempstead has the opportunity to be a great town, but was far better 25 years ago. Town is boring, dirty and paving stones already being replaced in newest Riverside area. Young people going to Watford for better variety of shops and entertainment. Housing prospects bad - granddaughter on list for 8 years and never had an offer of a flat, yet born here as were her parents.
- Hemel needs saving now not in 10 or 20 years time. We need a large central meeting hall now.
- Housing! In principle, I admire what the council is trying to do. I think you have lots to do!
- I am unhappy with cramming more houses into already over - crowded areas in town. Building in the less attractive parts at the countryside should be considered instead.
- I do not have any confidence that there has been enough forethought to this whole business.
- I fear that there is no vision of Hemel Hempstead as a beautiful place. The Marlowes centre lacks it. G. Jellicoe original ideas down graded, not to mention the dream of a garden city (Ebenezer Howard).

- I question whether the authors of this paper understand the reality of life in Hemel Hempstead. Extra retail opportunities in the centre? Look at the rate of what shops close (and I don't mean during recession) restaurants and cafe do not survive. Pedestrian and cycle links. People use cars - our society depends on them.
- I think something should be considered about the ugly building at Jarmen Park as it is an eye sore and the cinema moved back to Hemel town with maybe a bowling alley.
- Improve services, roads, policing, tidiness. Needs attention to detail.
- In essence this underscores the comments made at 8, full use of water features, water gardens, river walkway, canal usage. (would it be possible to develop a spur from the canal to provide river craft access to the town, to provide tourist and service facilities to bring additional inward economic thrust).
- In implementing this generally excellently formulated strategy, with its implication of increased density of built development (partly in order to retain and enhance, even extend, green space) much will depend on moderating use of it in all its aspects. The challenge this represents maybe underestimated in section 5.4.
- Increased noise distribution. Too far from shops. Not enough medical services. That it will become rougher. Transport and parking.
- Infrastructure concerns i.e. whether the infrastructure can cope with the additional burden.
- It all sounds good but where is the money coming from? It needs more than words to put this all in place and I seriously doubt it will take place.
- It should be noted that local wards are not up to the standard required in the overall vision for an improved Hemel Hempstead.
- Jobs for existing Hemel citizens and the new future ones should be for them, not for outsider commuters!
- Just hope that these plans have been thought through and that with other developments in the past these will remain.
- Lack of immediate hospital facilities. Also have misgivings on the building of houses flats etc in town centre.
- Maylands Avenue must be dual carriageway the M1 - Hemel by pass must be redesigned as non - stop.
- Much depends on the fulfillment of s.4. e.g. - proper bus connections with trains to town centre (compare Guildford - there is frequent free shuttle bus from the station to and around the town centre which attracts shoppers etc from the other areas of surrey).
- My main concern is the number of additional dwellings that are being planned for Hemel Hempstead.
- My main concern is traffic management. New homes are to be put into areas with inadequate parking and will exacerbate this problem.
- No caram oaks of light centre or multicultural faith centre.

- Not sure how this will encourage visitors to come to the town.
- Not until a lot of other issues are sorted out as I have pointed out elsewhere.
- Nothing but sadness and sorrow.
- Omission of St. Johns church as major landmark on entry to town on 'fig 3.2 and fig 4'. Boxmoor Trust land not mentioned.
- Plans for expansion at Maylands (Buncefield) and Apsley (traffic) appear to ignore the reality of the current (probably future) problems. Many of the propositions / assumptions are not under local control.
- Private car use in the town centre is a problem. Extra dwellings will add to the problem. We must look at more 'park and ride' or similar scheme to prevent absolute grid lock.
- Provide social housing as important. The town is going to need this. It can't keep up with the waiting list in present times.
- Public toilets! The present lack is an appalling disgrace.
- Reduce fast food and cheap retail shops.
- Regular park and ride should be reintroduced from Gadebridge Park into town centre and from train station to shops and college.
- So many, I don't think you are (DBC) is interested of my concerns or views.
- Sorry you lost me after question A4, much too complicated.
- Take a leaf out of Milton Keynes development. Put in the infrastructure first.
- The bulk of new dwellings are flats. Particularly for council and housing association occupiers the need is for family two and three bedroom homes, even if this means incursion into the Green Belt.
- The consequences of this strategy extend well into the future. Designs should recognise that newer transport technologies may well become viable and allow for incorporation of these at a later date. e.g. 'personal rapid transit'. In the meanwhile, if we are serious about reducing dependence on the private car. Public transport provision must be an integral part of the strategy and not an extra added on.
- The hospital must be moved to Maylands.
- The number of empty buildings and spaces in Maylands for many years gives concern for growth in these areas.
- The only thing that will get built will be a new town hall. The money will dry up after that and nothing else will happen unless financed privately.
- The town will be a disaster if we do not get the hospital we need. No young families will settle here. I know I wouldn't if there was not an A&E and maternity unit.
- There is a good emphasis on car road use, but little mention of improved bus routes / affordable traffic transport. Potential exits for a 'drive through' network around Hemel.
- There is no mention of emergency services, fire / police / paramedics. Where will they be sited.
- This is too much hot air, Hemel county council to deliver roads, third world country have better roads.

- Time scales- appreciate budgets needed but focus on regeneration in 2009 not 30 years later!
- To save electricity, could pedestrian crossing lights be turned off until someone presses the button and maybe off at nights.
- Too little attention has been paid to the impact of housing growth upon community needs. The concomitant effect of increased car usage.
- Traffic congestion such as lights on buzzard road and magic roundabout.
- Traffic, at present, there are problems with parking and movement during morning and afternoon rush hours and Saturday in town centre.
- We are becoming a ghost town.
- We need a proper hospital and care centres for all.
- What about the area next to the Plough zone? i.e. Lawn Lane. Will this be classed as a local centre in its own right? Is it part of the Hemel 2020 vision - if so, it is not clearly recorded in the strategy.
- What happens when the River Gade dries up in hot summers like it has done in the past, it will be just a dried up mud patch.
- When leaving the m1 to A414 the area first seen is an eyesore and should be a priority and urgent. It's a poor advert for Hemel. Also, Kodak Tower is awful.
- Who will be paying for all this development? The council are having to make cuts every year because they have no money.
- Why do all these plans take so long?
- Why?!
- Wildlife should be more prominent in the spatial strategy with centres for learning the subject, in relation to public usage.
- With all these development for Hemel Hempstead town centre, are there any provisions to have supermarkets in the new developments so that people can do all their shopping in one visit to the town centre?
- With more new housing that is being considered in section 5.2 (i) needs serious consideration as more people buying houses means more strain on local roads. Spaces, resources and facilities you are proposing overall, see how the residents cope first before building more homes!! (don't run until you learn how to walk !).
- With the increasing population over this period I feel we are rejecting health and safety issues, reduced hospital facilities. Already Watford General cannot cope with the increase in demand.
- Worry about lack of open spaces and natural resources as well as infrastructure.
- You have an area where a prison stands, why not build a hospital. There is enough ground going to waste for the last 40 years.



**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**KINGS LANGLEY**



**Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision for Kings Langley?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	7	78%	7	78%
No	No	2	22%	2	22%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A1TX - If no, what do you think should be different?**

- By providing extra housing the local schools (junior and senior) are already stretched. Extra schooling needs to be provided as well.
- Kings Langley is now over-built with the Ovaltine development and Spooley Lock which has put too much traffic on roads such as Water Lane, Church Lane, Waterside, The Nap and Rectory Lane. Only single houses should be built in future - we don't want or need any more developments.

**Q. A2 - Are there any additional major issues we should be considering?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	67%
No	No	3	33%	3	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A2TX - If yes, please list...**

- Climate change & global warming = low carbon economy.
- If you increase the amount of houses and the influx of people you need more medical centres and more schools and more industry.
- Need to ensure infrastructure continues to support the local community - I.e. viable schools, doctors surgeries, library within the village.
- Road layout, parking. Extra capacity at doctors.
- The extra cars causing problems around the area where West Herts College has been allowed to open a site. Traffic using waterside since the Ovaltine site was developed has led to damage (by vibration and pollution) to the listed building known as the Old Red Lion.
- To bring retirement flats and bungalows into the 21st century as many pensioners will have fridges, fridge-freezers, washing machines and some washing up machines (especially the studio flats at Harrock Road) they are too small and not fit for the 21st century.

**Q. A3 - Do you agree with this level of growth?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	5	56%	5	56%
No	No	4	44%	4	44%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A3TX - If no, what do you think it should be?**

- Kings Langley is a small village - with a good community spirit - when/if it grows this will be lost.
- No more residential developments should be allowed - the roads around the village can't take any extra traffic.
- There may be other pockets of land within the current built boundaries which could provide additional small scale housing developments.
- What is needed as I said above is modernising what we have got not to build on green belt or farmers fields as they will be needed in the future for food use as food prices will rise if from abroad.

**Q. A3EXT - If no, what do you think it should be? Extra Comments**

- Although need growth there must be green spaces for leisure and walking.

**Q. A4 - Which is your preferred option from the main document?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	4	44%	4	57%
2	Option 2	1	11%	1	14%
3	No preference	2	22%	2	29%
NAN	Not answered	2	22%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4TX - Please give your reasons why...**

- A well defined area. Less visual impairment than option 2. Option 2 spoils the whole feel of the southern element of the village.
- Area can easily be developed into Kings Langley community.
- But still think the removal of unsightly buildings should be removed and homes built on affordable ones.

- Neither - both will be wholly detrimental to the character of the village.
- No - neither should be built.
- Rectory farm is an eyesore from the road and canal.
- The area of option 2 is at the entrance of the Kings Langley village, when you comment M25/A41, provides the identity of this historical village with conserved open spaces.

**Q. A5 - Should a key emphasis of the Spatial Strategy be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Kings Langley?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	8	89%	8	100%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - If no, please give your reasons why?**

\*\*\* THIS QUESTION RECEIVED NO RESPONSES \*\*\*\*

**Q. A6 - Do you agree that the new housing developments should provide a significant level of affordable housing?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	8	89%	8	89%
No	No	1	11%	1	11%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- No more housing, affordable or otherwise should be built. The infrastructure is already at breaking point.

**Q. A6EXT - If no, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments**

- But not on green belt land we must keep farmers' fields for growing food as that in the future for oil and environmental purposes when oil runs out.
- The housing should be offered to the young residents of Kings Langley so they can stay near to family etc.

**Q. A7A - Do you think Sunderland Yard should be retained as a local employment site?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	5	56%	5	62%
No	No	3	33%	3	38%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7ATX - If yes, please give your reasons why...**

- I don't know Sunderland Yard or anything about it.
- Most of the people of Kings Langley have to go outside the area for employment.
- So that they were transferred to the employment area near the Technical College so they are in one place in Home Park Mill and Royal Hunting Lodge area.
- There are so little employment sites within the area.
- Where else would you put the business that is already on the site - local people work on this estate - why make them travel further to work.

**Q. A7B - Do you think Sunderland Yard should be a potential development site for residential development?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	3	33%	3	38%
No	No	5	56%	5	62%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7BTX - If yes, please give your reasons why...**

- It's in a nice spot near the canal also you could build on the playing field opposite in exchange for using the turkey farmer's field for a sports centre.
- Since you don't show Sunderland Yard on the plan, I can't say.
- The area is a mess - housing would tidy it up. Its value as an employment site is minimal.
- To save greenfield development.

### Q. A7BEXT - If yes, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments

- Because we are getting more and more houses but less industries.

### Q. A8A - When future housing development comes forward, we may have to choose between the delivery of affordable housing, towpath improvements, additional outdoor leisure space, or sustainable buildings. Do you think we should prioritise between these objectives?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	7	78%	7	78%
No	No	2	22%	2	22%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Q. A8BA - If so, please use the comments box to rank them in order of your preference (1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable). Affordable housing

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	1	4	44%	4	67%
3	3	1	11%	1	17%
4	4	1	11%	1	17%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
NAS	Not asked	2	22%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Q. A8BB - If so, please use the comments box to rank them in order of your preference (1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable). Towpath improvements

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
2	2	1	11%	1	20%
3	3	2	22%	2	40%
4	4	2	22%	2	40%
NAN	Not answered	2	22%	-	-
NAS	Not asked	2	22%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8BC - If so, please use the comments box to rank them in order of your preference (1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable). Additional outdoor leisure space**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	1	2	22%	2	33%
2	2	2	22%	2	33%
3	3	1	11%	1	17%
4	4	1	11%	1	17%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
NAS	Not asked	2	22%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8BD - If so, please use the comments box to rank them in order of your preference (1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable). Sustainable buildings**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
2	2	3	33%	3	75%
3	3	1	11%	1	25%
NAN	Not answered	3	33%	-	-
NAS	Not asked	2	22%	-	-
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8BEXT - If so, please use the comments box to rank them in order of your preference (1 being most preferable and 4 being least preferable). Extra Comments**

- An infrastructure must be in place first.
- You don't need to sacrifice one for another as I wrote overleaf as there is a field for playing football nearby.

**Q. A9 - The spatial strategy for Kings Langleyto 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall, do you agree with the strategy?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	8	89%	8	89%
No	No	1	11%	1	11%
<b>Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Kings Langley Secondary School is already full to bursting. The problems caused by the school include excessive traffic on the surrounding roads and severe litter problems, more housing in Kings Langley can only make these problems worse.

**Q. A10 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding this spatial strategy for Kings Langley?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	67%
No	No	3	33%	3	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A10TX - If yes, please state...**

- All new affordable housing should be open to young residents of Kings Langley- they should be offered first choice - i.e. how long been residents of Kings Langley, working locally - like the council points system. Why should they be forced to move away and bring people who've never done anything for Kings Langley.
- I feel that as people of my age get to eighty, I am sixty-six, will be different from eighty year olds today. We need larger flats and bungalows as we have washing machines, fridge-freezers for kitchens. We also have computers in sitting rooms also bedrooms for older couples especially bungalows.
- It is essential to the maintenance of the character of the village that it is not allowed to expand beyond the boundaries of the current developed area. Development of the Rectory Lane site and site south of Great Park would ultimately lead to coalescence and loss of village character. It is a telling indictment of the strategy that the title of the booklet refers to 'town'. Kings Langley is a village!
- Just curious that Rucklers Lane does not appear to be considered as part of kings Langley (not on maps).
- School size (junior/senior).
- Too much jargon of the planning niche in the text, whatever is a 'threshold issue'? Plain English, please.



**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**MARKYATE**



**Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision of Markyate?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	67%
No	No	3	33%	3	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A1TX - If no, what do you think should be different?**

- How are shops and services to be increased? You give no solution. This is wishful thinking. Shops only come to business!
- Keep Hicks Road for industry, there are too many problems with flooding (and the whole area is a flood plain) for housing development. Demolish Harts Motors and the takeaway and divert all traffic into Hicks Road and install traffic lights at the A5 junction.
- Relocate the industrial part of Hicks Road. Not many businesses left. Develop site completely.

**Q. A2 - Are there any there any additional key issues you think we should be considering?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	75%
No	No	2	22%	2	25%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A2TX - If yes, please list...**

- Additional shops, housing, businesses etc. Will inevitably attract additional traffic with the potential to increase congestion unless additional access to A5 etc. Is considered. Impact of primary school growth on secondary school places.
- Before any new development the sewerage system must be improved.
- Improved street lighting for some of the roads off the high street (esp. George Street). Increased/more visible local policing.
- Recreational improvements - tennis courts, better equipment in parks.
- See above as well as small development of housing, local shops selling local produce I.e. farmers market, etc. Also Saturday market.
- Traffic in the High St is getting more of a problem if Hicks Rd were improved a one-way High St could be thought about, using the by-pass more.

- Where is there to be new housing? Planning turned down for flats in the disused building on Hicks Road? Employment is going down not up. Leases ended for businesses.

**Q. A3 - Do you support the principle of Hicks Road coming forward for redevelopment to accommodate the majority of the village's future needs?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	7	78%	7	78%
No	No	2	22%	2	22%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A3TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Hicks Road is a flood plain it continually floods when heavy rain falls and if housing is built I question whether tenants would be able to secure insurance cover.
- The current infrastructure would not support more residential dwellings - congestion/parking is already a big problem. Also, the site does not lend itself to housing.

**Q. A3EXT - If no, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments**

- Only if proper consultation with the village (not just a few 'key shareholders' and proper transport through the village.

**Q. A4 - Which is your preferred development option?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	3	33%	3	38%
2	Option 2	3	33%	3	38%
3	No preference	2	22%	2	25%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4TX - Please give your reasons why...**

- All your items under 'pros'. Also would not require use of Green Belt land.
- Building on flood plane is trouble in future.
- Controls growth. Manages viability of use. Less risk to already inadequate infrastructure, less impact on primary school and secondary school limitations.

- Hicks Road is an eyesore well overdue for redevelopment.
- Markyate infrastructure at present does not have the capacity to take on a larger development.
- Not happy with either proposal.
- Reason as above - I do not believe the village can adequately support more housing. Would be detrimental to quality of life.
- Seems to provide more/better options.

**Q. A5 - Do you think a key emphasis of the Spatial Strategy should be to protect and enhance the natural, built and historic environment of Markyate?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	9	100%	9	100%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

\*\*\* THIS QUESTION RECEIVED NO RESPONSES \*\*\*\*

**Q. A6 - Do you agree that affordable housing should be provided with future housing developments?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	5	56%	5	62%
No	No	3	33%	3	38%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Depends on the proportion.
- Keep the housing the same as most of village.
- Not without an improvement in leisure/schools/doctors and shops.
- There needs to be balanced management of housing if exiting from village is to be controlled. Affordable houses may attract initially but may not be sustainable for growing families.

**Q. A6EXT - If no, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments**

- But not Hicks Road.

**Q. A7 - Do you think additional provisions such as open space and other services/facilities should be sought for the village with new housing developments?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	9	100%	9	100%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

\*\*\* THIS QUESTION RECEIVED NO RESPONSES \*\*\*\*

**Q. A8 - Do you support our approach to tackling the challenges faced in the village?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	75%
No	No	2	22%	2	25%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A8TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Because you talk of 'relaxing planning restrictions'. I think they are too relaxed already and will chip away at character of village.
- Dacorum Council are making all these proposals but as on previous occasions, nothing ever happens!

**Q. A8EXT - If no, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments**

But do not see how proposed level of housing development would be adequate to support any additional shops etc. In village.

**Q. A9 - Can you think of any other ways of improving the economic prosperity of Markyate?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	5	56%	5	62%
No	No	3	33%	3	38%
NAN	Not answered	1	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A9TX - If yes, please list your reasons why...**

- By making Markyate and its access points off of the A5 cleaner litter wise and visually more attractive to tempt passing trade into the village.
- Develop the land adjacent to Farrer Top High View and Peggies Field and build the houses and leisure facilities and a supermarket.
- Improve transport to local hubs of employment. Entice small service shops into village (e.g. vet photographer, etc.)
- More encouragement for new shops/restaurants/services in the village. Current facilities are average at best, encouraging people to go outside the village. Demand is there!
- Rural villages like Markyate are extremely important to the quality of life of the people who live there.

**Q. A10 - Do you support our approach to improving the parking and congestion issue in Markyate?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	67%
No	No	3	33%	3	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A10TX - If no, what alternative would you suggest?**

- Assuming that traffic volume will not reduce, there is a strong argument to implement a one-way system on the high street, or traffic slowing. The high street cannot cope with current volumes - this should be recognised and addressed.
- Demolish Harts Motors showroom and the Indian takeaway and open up the junction and divert all traffic to the bypass with traffic lights.

- I think a one way system is needed in the High Street.

#### **Q. A10EXT - If no, what alternative would you suggest? Extra Comments**

- But must be carefully planned to ensure village centre existing businesses are viably retained and parking for households in the High Street is adequately addressed.
- Yes, in theory. In practice, don't think will work unless financial benefit. e.g. free public transport!!

#### **Q. A11 - The spatial strategy for Markyate to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall, do you support the strategy?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	6	67%	6	67%
No	No	3	33%	3	33%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### **Q. A11TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- I can't see any reasoned thought concerning provision of services and facilities. The whole scheme seems to be just a string of politically correct sentences.
- Section 1.9 'the village is deficient in leisure space', this has not been discussed or noted in any part of this questionnaire.
- The focus appears to be concentrated on additional housing without the guarantees of enhancing the village's infrastructure. That is already resourced to support an increasing population. No more building without improving infrastructure first.

#### **Q. A11EXT - If no, please give your reasons why... Extra Comments**

- Yes, generally but do not support the high density housing that seems to be current trend.

#### **Q. A12 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Markyate?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	8	89%	8	89%
No	No	1	11%	1	11%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A12TX - If yes, please list...**

- Concern that being 'last in line' between county boundaries means Markyate is left 'til last or not all included in any improvements mooted or upkeep maintained (e.g. look at large trees overshadowing housing!)
- Do not see how you can reverse the trend of the past 20/30 years of closing shops/losing services etc. Without more significant development than proposed
- I live on Luton Road Markyate. Nowhere is this area even mentioned in this spatial strategy. As we pay tax to the parish council, why aren't we included?
- I strongly agree with the concept of improving the 'gateway' to the village along with Hicks Road. However, in the last 10 years there has been a marked increase in dwellings with no obvious improvement to local services - this trend needs to be addressed.
- Items a and b I agree with. Items c and d I disagree with - please see comments above (a8 and a9).
- Markyate has been continuously neglected by the Dacorum district council and nothing in this strategy fills me with optimism for the future of the village.
- Serious concerns about existing infrastructure to support growth. e.g. Victorian sewer system within floodplain. Transport improvements to Dunstable seem strange with most high street south shops closed down and many services lost. Hemel would be a more appropriate selection.
- Yes one important and our biggest concern with all the talks, meetings, questionnaires will it really happen?!



### **3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**

## **TRING**



### Q. A1 - Do you agree with the vision for Tring?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	33	75%	33	75%
No	No	11	25%	11	25%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Q. A1TX - If no, what do you think should be different?

- Every effort should be made to protect countryside around Tring from building development. Its character as a small market town with such easy access to green fields and hills is a great attraction to visitors. This enhances its economic prosperity.
- I do not think building a load more houses is done to improve the quality of life for residents. I do agree that transport links should be improved.
- I think that market towns and villages should not be expanded. Expansion should only take place in new towns, Hemel and Milton Keynes.
- I think there are enough houses in Tring already. Developing more I believe will crowd the little town of Tring.
- Not just outdoor leisure facilities need to be improved- indoor facilities too. Sportspace is not accessible during the day to adults of any age as the school uses the facilities and we are forced to travel to Berkhamsted sports centre. Expansion of these facilities is vital.
- People choose to live in Tring because it is a small town. It should remain a small town.
- Successful market town? Tring does not have a cattle market anymore, it is becoming a ghost town, the Friday market should be in the High St for a start and all the market area used for free parking, also what about a cinema?
- The essence of a market town has been completely missed, the market is dying, the old livestock market was destroyed by the previous Local Plan, there is little or no relationship between the town and its hinterland which is still agricultural, other than the farmers market. The agricultural aspect must be recognised as part of the vision.
- There should be no change at all, as currently council services are being withdrawn.
- This has been thought up by persons outside Tring and do not understand its charm, simplicity and peacefulness. Most, I believe, do not know where Tring is without looking on a map. Let the people of Tring develop their town, i.e. keep recycling area.  
Tring has a unique quality of being a small market town, so expansion of any kind would start to destroy this status. Only infilling should be considered.

### Q. A2 - Do you agree with this level of growth?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	27	61%	27	63%
No	No	16	36%	16	37%
NAN	Not Answered	1	2%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Q. A2TX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- 600 extra homes on green field land will conflict with the maintenance of existing countryside and existing farm enterprises. The RSS has not identified Tring for such expansion. Such release of the greenbelt would conflict with the aims of sustainable development as described by DBC who state that market towns will remain stable and their size and character protected, with marginal population growth at best.
- Current amenities are not sufficient especially parking.
- Growth will only be successful if infrastructure enhanced as well. Vital to ensure character of town is maintained. Any housing should be no more than 2 storeys high. i.e. no blocks of apartments anywhere. Gardens vital for social harmony and community spirit.
- I do not think we need growth in dwellings / development on greenfield sites. The town is crowded enough and there is plenty of space for 'affordable housing' in Pitstone Green- which needs more mass to justify some retail/ social provision.
- I have not seen any evidence to support the claim that 'a minimum of 465 dwellings would maintain the current level of population'. I do not agree that development should be allowed to 'provide developer contributions'.
- I think there are enough houses in Tring already. Developing more I believe will crowd the little town of Tring.
- If people want to live in a large town there are plenty nearby to choose from. Tring School is big enough and is a good school.
- Infrastructure of roads apart from A41 cannot take more people or vehicles.
- It is excessive. No necessity is proved or definition of natural growth- a high proportion of Tring's population is transient, not settled or intending to settle. Expansion beyond the existing boundaries will change its character adversely.
- No reason has been given as to why the town needs to grow. It seems the right sort of size as it is.
- The level of growth should be restricted to the absolute minimum. It is illogical to state that population level will remain level if new houses are provided- it will attract new people!

- There should be no change at all, as currently council services are being withdrawn.
- To preserve Tring as a small market town we need to minimise development and protect the adjacent Green Belt.
- Tring does not need the extra growth, the schools are practically full, there is hardly any policing, there are empty shops and business units.
- Tring School is at capacity. Nearby hospitals are full or being moved further away. Tring waste and recycling centre being closed. Developer money only goes to Hemel.
- Use of green field sites for building. Irreversible loss of precious green heritage. Loss of Tring's unique character.

**Q. A3 - Are there any additional big issues you think we should be considering?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	21	48%	21	50%
No	No	21	48%	21	50%
NAN	Not Answered	2	5%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A3TX - If yes, please list...**

- Additional pressure on existing infant and junior school facilities.
- Development must allow for sufficient on site parking unless public transport can be greatly increased.
- Expansion in the past, has highlighted problems with the provision of health/ dental care which will need to be addressed.
- Firstly improve/ enhance what we have got. Recycling should be improved. New developer money should always be spent in our area/ not elsewhere.
- Focus on facilities for children between the ages of 12-16 years. This is lacking in town, considerably.
- Health and medical care, i.e. GP / hospital provision. Provision of social outlets for teenagers.
- I feel we should consider the area north east of Tring between Bulbourne Road and station road (Marshcroft Farm) this is on a main road close to the station and would have limited impact on existing dwellings.
- If option 1 is accepted we still need more leisure facilities / space.
- If there has to be any development it should be on the east side closer to Tring station, making it easier for commuters to access trains.

- Keep the recycling area. Improve street lighting. Repair roads and footpaths, clean up the stream in Brook St. Roundabout in Icknield way crossroads with Dundale road and little Tring. Improve exit of Miswell Lane onto Icknield Way. Cut hedgerow and grass verges. Let us be able to take a pride in our environment.
- Parking.
- Pedestrianisation in town centre similar to Aylesbury where some delivery vans still have access.
- Provision of children's and adults playground in inner Tring green spaces. e.g. giant chess board. Adventure playground equipment with safety officer in charge. See Stockwood Park visitors centre.
- Solve the existing issues (school capacity, public transport, roads etc) first before expanding the towns and adding to the problems.
- The character of our society is changing due to the economic collapse and the impact will be felt for more than a decade. Demand will lessen for both goods and services and also housing. The way to maintain Tring's character is to keep it in its current balanced state.
- The cost of road widening cow lane or Icknield Way would be very costly when we have good roadway for Hemel and Milton Keynes.
- The deficit of 9 ha leisure space needs defining. We were told by planners at the Tring consultation that Tring did require more sports facilities. For informal leisure it has Tring Park, Tring Wood, Tring Reservoir and the Canal, etc. Future farming on the edge of the town. Business rates crippling retail and other enterprises. Youth facilities.
- The speed and amount of traffic is too high. Returning Green Belt around Tring.
- To preserve Dunsley Farm which sells locally produced food. This would support Tring in transition philosophy. Tring School is already one of the biggest in Hertfordshire. Is there extra education capacity that will not detract from the high quality of education provided.
- Tring now faces withdrawal of recycling centre, termination of pest control hardly the framework for growth.
- Waste management site retention.
- We do not wish to live in a environment where the result of long term planning could mean Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted, Tring and Aylesbury becoming one concrete jungle.

#### Q. A4 - Which is your preferred option?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	22	50%	22	50%
2	Option 2	17	39%	17	39%

3	No preference	5	11%	5	11%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A4TX - Please give your reasons why...

- Achieves all objectives within defined boundaries and with minimum impact on visual approaches to town.
- As given in table 3.1 (spatial strategy for town of Tring) where reasons for rejecting options are clearly stated.
- Bigger area so just a one off build, nearer Tring School and shops.
- By far the better option to retain the rural feel of the town.
- Careful development of option 2 land will support the sustainable/ prosperous vision. The 'green' at the apex of Station Road/ London Road must be retained.
- Change the look of Tring the least, nearer to Aylesbury, work opportunities in that direction.
- Do not agree with option 2 as it is too large an area in Green Belt.
- Extend employment area near option 1. Easier access for transport- not far from bus routes, could walk or cycle.
- Gives greater flexibility for achieving/ expanding some/ all of the objectives and opportunity for more creative solutions.
- Good access to both the employment area of Icknield Way and access to A41.
- Greater opportunities for development of leisure facilities. Easier access to town centre.
- Greater space and access.
- I would like to see a new secondary school and outdoor sports facilities on this site, maintaining the wildlife site. The old school site can be used for residential development. Option 1 can be useful for commercial use and expansion of the cemetery.
- If option 1 is chosen, it would soon become too restricted, putting pressure to build option 2. Therefore use 2 from the start.
- If there has to be any development it should be on the east side closer to Tring station, making it easier for commuters to access trains.
- It has sufficient capacity to achieve the required minimum level of development, without making a massive difference to the town. Option 2 has far too big an impact.
- It is a contained site within the natural boundaries of Icknield Way/ Aylesbury road and will not alter the character of the town so much as infilling the Dunsley area.
- It is nearer the station and has much more room for flexibility than option 1. More room to design an acceptable solution to maintain character of the green gateway.

- It limits the extent of growth and has less impact on open countryside and wildlife. Option 2 will destroy two existing farms. It will be immediately visible from the AONB and as viewed from the Chiltern Hills. The green corridor of pastoral countryside would be lost here.
- Less capacity is better as we do not have the room to hold 600 extra dwellings.
- Less impact on the town.
- Loss of productive farmland and the character this imparts to the town. Option 1 is too far from amenities and will result in additional car journeys. Option 2 will result in loss of two viable farms.
- Make the new development a showpiece for the visitors to Tring. It is the first impression they get after coming off the A41.
- Minimum level of destruction of Tring and its surrounding neighbourhood.
- More space and will upset less people.
- Option 1 would end up as an isolated development remote from the town. Option 2 is much too big an area.
- Option 2 is currently a farm, a public open space and a cricket club, none of which we should lose. Also option 2 would ruin the 'green gateway' to Tring more.
- Option 2 is too large, spoils the landscape from on the hills.
- Option 2 pending a look at a proper map to see what happens to cricket club and Pound Meadow.
- Option 2 would have severe impact on the Green Belt land sandwiched between the AONB and green gateway and would be detrimental to the view from the A41 as well as destroy farm land/ greenbelt. Option 2 is not an option.
- Option two is too large and would fundamentally change the size and spread of the town and the surrounding areas. Option one is more contained and thus preferable.
- Potential for nearby employment opportunities and extension to cemetery on one site. Option 2 development too large, would complete development to county boundary.
- Provides minimum level of development. Site cannot be used as base for urban 'creep' development.
- Proximity to Tring station and Tring School.
- Smallest of the two options.
- This area is underused and being near to the station would prove a useful place to live for work purposes.
- To have most sports facilities in one place would be ideal. Traffic would not be such a problem. These facilities would be within walking distance from most areas of the existing town.
- We need to return to level of services, which include these now being withdrawn.
- Will keep development contained in a controlled fashion.

- Would retain established character.

**Q. A5 - Should the key built and environmental assets of Tring be protected and enhanced as outlined in paragraphs 1.3 to 1.6?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	41	93%	41	93%
No	No	3	7%	3	7%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - If no, please list your reasons why...**

- In choosing the style of the new housing there are many exciting eco friendly designs which are contemporary and good looking. Why be stuck in the past? If housing were in the grove area, which is relatively new anyway, why would there be a need for faux Tudor and all that fuddy-duddy styling?
- Kept as they are.
- Paragraphs 1.3-1.6 are too restrictive; many of these already receive formal recognition and protection. Tring's unique livestock market was ignored in the last local plan, which identified it for housing and now it is tarmac. All the environmental assets thus require the means to manage them. Why is Dundale now so important when over half was built on. There are many other and better big views.

**Q. A6 - Should Akeman Street employment area include a wider range of uses?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	29	66%	29	69%
No	No	13	30%	13	31%
NAN	Not Answered	2	5%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - If no, please list your reasons why...**

- Current issues of parking need sorting before any increased uses are discussed. Current friction with residents could escalate even further as change of use encourages more cars.
- It needs to keep its current diverse businesses and enhance them.
- It's a built up area of Tring already, making more use of it will lead to overcrowding.

- Logistics!
- Parking.
- Residential use and parking issues.
- Should be kept to small units. Too narrow for large transport- emergency services vehicles.
- The area is over subscribed and should be left as it is.
- The roads are too congested now, if more use was made of this area it would become gridlocked. How emergency vehicles manage at present I don't know. I certainly wouldn't like a heart attack or house fire if I lived in the Tring triangle. Jr Smith should be encouraged to take his lorries up to the Icknield Way industrial site.
- There is inadequate parking in this area for change of use.
- Too tight anyway.
- Use of the area for employment provides jobs of many kinds which are essential for the vitality of the town and the town centre economy and reduce the overall need to travel to work. There is no evidence of the need for any wider range of uses here. Use for housing would erode the character it gives.
- When a wider range of uses are introduced, more traffic will result in an area known for excessive parking and traffic problems.  
Would need to see the options before being able to say.

**Q. A7A - Do you agree that Heygates' Tring Mill should be redesignated to employment use?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	20	45%	20	48%
No	No	22	50%	22	52%
NAN	Not Answered	2	5%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7ATX - If yes, please give your reasons why...**

- Benefits to community of possible provision of recreational facilities, small business enterprises etc. Without expansion of buildings into the countryside.
- Better use should be made of the site for employment uses.
- Having more employment opportunities in Tring will help the prosperity of the town.
- It already fulfils that use, there is no advantage to Tring and it will remain so.
- It already is an employment area. It has the canal and the area which is now the recycling centre, soon to be closed! Housing and industry should be separate due to noise factors and traffic.
- It could have mixed use also.

- It is a key employer in the town. It is not a pretty site, you may as well keep as much industry together as possible.
- It is a suitable area for providing employment in an area with easy access to the A41 via Icknield Way.
- It is an employment area! Mixed use is perhaps more accurate and versatile.
- It is an important business and employer in the town and also maintains an important link to the agricultural heritage of the town.
- It provides employment, much of it blue collar which is in short supply here, being on the edge of town and close to main roads is ideal for the purpose.
- Keygates is a useful employer.
- Local employment opportunities. Keeps heavy delivery lorries to outskirts of town and easy access to bypass via Icknield Way.
- Out of town plenty of space to incorporate parking and lorry use. Most houses close to site are owned by the mill.
- Should be retained for local employment or the core of the market town will be lost forever.
- To discourage land being sold off wholesale or piecemeal for property development.
- To increase employment for Tring residents.
- Utilising an existing facility is always prudent.

**Q. A7B - Do you agree that Heygates' Tring Mill should be redesignated to mixed use?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	21	48%	21	55%
No	No	17	39%	17	45%
NAN	Not Answered	6	14%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7BTX - Please list your reasons...**

- A more appropriate solution for the area.
- Again better use should be made of the existing site.
- Again, new mill is not an industrial village. It has the mill, encourage that to keep going employing our local workers.
- Already being used for mixed use in that area.
- Benefits to community of possible provision of recreational facilities, small business enterprises etc. Without expansion of buildings into the countryside.
- Employment near homes= walk or cycle to work, helping the environment, e.g. college lake, canals, reservoirs etc.
- Housing and employment use.

- I cannot answer this question as you have not explained exactly what is proposed or designated the area affected.
- I see this as a 'halfway' option allowing an increase in employment options but also accommodation.
- If it needs to be changed from the current use we should be as flexible as possible in finding an effective role for it. The current move towards self employment and service provision means that live/ work units will become more popular.
- If it was for mixed uses, would the current residents have to be rehoused to make way for new employment facilities?
- If land / buildings no longer required in its entirety there could be potential for residential or small business development.
- It is best to be flexible about this area as it is currently dependent on a single user for much of its character.
- It is essential to maintain businesses in Tring and cut down on people having to commute to work and to reduce unemployment.
- It should remain as it is.
- It would undermine the sites existing role. Businesses are already closing down in the industrial area, and we need to support successful enterprises where they exist.
- Let's keep all the industry together.
- Not enough resources to support more housing.
- Poor road access, mainly residential area, boundary to the canal needs protecting to contain growth.
- Possible future change.
- The area is already mixed use!
- The canal bridge will have to be rebuilt and the parking problems addressed.
- The existing business could not operate on a smaller site, so the question implies closure and redevelopment. This would be unlikely to provide as many jobs as at present and would entail the loss of a satisfactory, compatible business.
- Traffic already difficult.
- Utilising it to its full potential is crucial.
- We need more affordable housing and employment opportunities that this brownfield site would give us whilst protecting the surrounding greenbelt land.
- Why change what works, fine as it is. Additional employment use is impractical there.
- Would depend on the proposals.

**Q. A8 - Should the market, the auction rooms and the Natural History Museum be protected from redevelopment?**

	<b>All Responses</b>	<b>VALID RESPONSES</b>
--	----------------------	----------------------------

RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	42	95%	42	95%
No	No	2	5%	2	5%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A8TX - If no, please give your reasons why...

- Market yes. Auction rooms no. As long as business is good then I am sure no change will be necessary. But if they move premises or close, redevelopment must be an option. Museum no. New buildings are used anyway!
- The natural history museum should be protected only, the others should be developed as in my answer A1.

#### Q. A9 - Can you think of any other ways of improving the economic prosperity of Tring?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	25	57%	25	64%
No	No	14	32%	14	36%
NAN	Not Answered	5	11%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A9TX - If yes, please list...

- 'Posh' cinema like the REX. We need a decent clothing store. Perhaps have business grants available specifically for Tring residents who have lived in Tring over, e.g. 5 years (or other minimum time span). Get empty shops open- perhaps put a cap on what rent landlords can ask.
- Abolish car parking fees. Better public transport links. Lower business rates.
- Affordable housing and facilities for young teenagers would only enhance the town and its prosperity.
- Better local transport - more buses going in all directions, better provision in the evening. Improved road signage. Financed incentive to new businesses if they start up in Tring.
- Better shops, places for meetings.
- Consider 'Stockwood Park' type development of the inner Tring open space (see Luton model) great all season attraction to all ages. Increases shopping in town. Acquisition by council of any disused or under used farm or other out buildings for small business e.g. Tring brewery.
- Encourage existing and empty shops to full usage and encourage 'a smartening up' of the facades.
- Encourage more shops to open. Develop more small industry.

- Give the town council more of the revenue collected from Tring so that the town can decide what it wants to spend its money on.
- Giving small non-chain shops a helping hand by keeping a free one hour parking and a reduction in rent (why should they pay the same level as Hemel).
- Hold proper consultation meetings to get better attendance instead of the same old faces which do not generate new ideas. These questionnaires should be available in shops etc - utilise the town. Promote the town's heritage, food and cultural activities. Application of business rates seems unfair and unhelpful. Sort car parking or sort public transport out.
- Improved public transport with reliability and frequency. Better range of shops, e.g. there is no shoe shop, a particular problem for young families (there were two in the 70's / 80's).
- Keep rates of shops at a level so as businesses are able to keep trading through tough economic times to encourage businesses to stay in the town.
- Knock the industrial estate down in Akeman Street and build a massive shopping complex with access through Smiths Yard, financed by M&S/ Waitrose/ Sainsbury's.
- Low rent business units/ shops to encourage economic growth. Private landlord rental is too high for most small shops to afford, maybe the local authority could have business units as well as housing.
- Lower rates- bring back the parish council or Tring District Council to run our town.
- Lower rents to fill empty shops. A permanent cover over the market area to encourage a wider use by commercial and private organisations, e.g. exhibitions, craft fairs, trade fairs, markets and cultural events.
- Maintain the character of the town so it continues to attract those who appreciate its special nature and wish to avoid the sprawling mess and congestion of Berkhamsted and the overdevelopment of Aylesbury. Keeping it as a desirable residential environment will encourage investment. Encourage enterprise in small business and stimulate growth with live/ work units in areas such as Akeman Street or, if necessary, Heygates.
- Promote tourism- w/e bus linking station, museum, canal and Aldbury.
- Reduce car park charges to encourage visitors to stay. Will also reduce parking on access road.
- Reduce rates for shops and car parking charges. Reduce rates for Icknield industrial businesses.
- Reduce the cost of shop rates. Build an arcade for low cost shop units. Pedestrianise the High St. But this would mean locating a traffic bypass somehow. Promote trade fairs.
- Remember we are a 'market' town and should use and protect this way of living but be diverse in our choices.
- Scrap car parking charges for first two hours. Regular ferry - buses to and from station, tied in with train timetable.

- Significant reduction in business rates on small shops and factories. Tax on free parking at supermarkets. Not to extend car parking charges.
- Successful market town? Tring does not have a cattle market anymore, it is becoming a ghost town, the Friday market should be in the High St for a start and all the market area used for free parking, also what about a cinema?
- The council should consider the compulsory purchase of empty shop units with a view to letting them out at affordable rents.
- Visitors arriving by train need a more frequent bus service during the day and evening and a local map in the High St.

**Q. A10 - The spatial strategy for Tring to 2031 is presented in Section 5. Overall do you support the strategy?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	39	89%	39	89%
No	No	5	11%	5	11%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A10TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Dunsley Farm should not be changed from a farm. It is all part of Green Belt land.
- It is not ideal for expansion, the station is way out of town, the bypass has to accommodate 90% of motorists to the m25 and other motorways.
- Schools, doctors, infrastructure cannot cope with an expansion. Infilling of zones on the edge of Tring will inevitably lead to 'creeping development'.
- The Council's thinking and reasoning is flawed. A greater emphasis on improving core facilities, such as schools, policing, leisure activities, entertainment.
- Too far into the future. The Council can't look after Tring at present, what chance has Tring got for the future governed by Hertfordshire C.C. or Dacorum.

**Q. A11 - Do you have any other concerns or comments regarding the spatial strategy for Tring?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	24	55%	24	59%
No	No	17	39%	17	41%
NAN	Not Answered	3	7%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A11TX - If yes, please list...

- (The parish church has a tower, not a steeple.) The comment in section 5 (c) (iv) about retail space implies that the council would look favourably on an extension to the London Road supermarket, which would only compound the disastrous effect on the town's existing retailers of its opening. This possibility should be rigorously excluded. There is a direct conflict between the notion of Tring as a transition town and the proposal to build housing on farmed land. There is no means by which it can be ensured that new housing caters solely for the towns needs, e.g. new household formation, or that it will be sufficiently affordable. The experience of the last fifty years is that new housing is overwhelmingly bought by outsiders, who do not work here and drive to their work elsewhere and also that at least 20% of these people will not remain in this area. Therefore to build new housing will simply suck in new people and exacerbate the existing situation.
- Any developer money/ planning gain money from developments in Tring gets taken by Dacorum and spent in a large part in schemes in Hemel. This has to change so that Tring gets the benefits.
- Concern over speeding traffic entering town from Aylesbury. Traffic calming needed at cemetery corner. More public transport would be nice to the rural areas around the town, but expensive to provide. Any development must be low level, no higher than 2 storey.
- Currently you are looking to build about 400 new homes in the town, but over 900 may be necessary. How and when will the decision be made on which figure will be used and how much say do the people of Tring get. You could double the number of new homes built which could be severely detrimental to the town.
- Don't surrender to the current fashion, led from Westminster, to over plan more and more housing. The demand will not be there as the recent growth trends are changing. The places which resist overdevelopment and retain their character will become more and more desirable and thus more cherished.
- Failure to recognise the importance of local farming in contributing to the character and setting of the town. Bring back Tring's tip (recycling centre). Visioning process was poor, option 2 was not even discussed or promoted, so a proper debate could not be had. Tring cannot compete with Aylesbury, Hemel, or Watford so its USP needs to be recognised.
- Gypsy site should go on the Cow Lane site of the existing council farm, close to schools and shops and being as the council owns the land- low cost.
- Housing development needs to be for first time buyers and young families.
- I am concerned that government policy on housing will overload the area and the services will not be increased in proportion.

- I am generally concerned with imposition of government 'targets' interfering with local democracy. It should be up to Tring to decide what development it wants or doesn't want, not Dacorum. Proposals should be kept to the minimum.
- I feel strongly that we should keep Tring a small town. Keep the greenbelt and farmland we have and use the sporting facilities we have more effectively, even if this costs more. We should look to build on existing sites more effectively.
- I have not seen the coherent argument around the need for expanding the development of the town. It is as if expansion is the only option and with a number of variations to vote on. There is no real evidence presented as to why this is the case.
- I think Tring School could be enlarged where it is. Also the sports centre; it would be cheaper, the playing fields are very large after all. What is affordable housing?
- If Tring is going to get bigger we need a full time police force, more spaces at Tring School and our recycling centre should not close.
- Keep Tring as a market town and do not allow overdevelopment.
- Need affordable housing. Improved leisure opportunities for teenagers.
- Please don't ignore the need to improve roads and paths for cyclists- many more of us would cycle on a regular basis if the roads were safer. Please don't move Tring School to the edge of the town.
- Still see no reason why the town has to grow! Bigger is often not better.
- The continued threat of Traveller sites being incorporated into new build areas.
- The police station is mostly closed already, and the influx of people must mean that policing must improve dramatically.
- The suggested development of the Icknield Way site would create problems in the Miswell Lane area. Traffic and people would increase tremendously in miswell lane, a road that has problems now. It is very narrow on the top and congested with parking the rest of the way and the junction onto Western Road is dangerous.
- There is a long list of potential allotment holders waiting for plots in Tring. The increasing interest in growing your own food is well known; this can only benefit the environment and provide healthy recreation.
- Too large. Facilities we have now are being taken away, has any Councillor from Hertford walked down Brook St? Walked to reservoirs? Tried to drive up Albert St? Charles St? King St? Langdon St? Or seen two buses trying to pass in our High Street.
- Tring is basically a commuter town and traffic flow will increase. This has not been addressed.



**3. Full Responses from the Citizens' Panel:**  
**COUNTRYSIDE**



**Q. A1 - Paragraphs 1.15, 1.16 and 1.42 refer to some despoiled areas in the countryside that require improvement. Are there any other areas you wish to draw our attention to?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	2	9%	2	9%
No	No	21	91%	21	91%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A1TX - If yes, please list...**

- Apsley High Street, derelict buildings etc.
- Vacant dump site.

**Q. A2 - Do you agree with the vision for the countryside?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	19	83%	19	86%
No	No	3	13%	3	14%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A2TX - If no, what else do you think should be included?**

- Am not sure how you can deliver as "most" visitors will arrive by bicycle or public transport.
- Gaddesden Row and Wigginton should be protected by conservation orders.
- More accessible recycling stations.
- Woodlands for timber as well as fuel. Visitors will arrive by car, screened car parking areas required.

**Q. A3 - Are there any additional key issues you think we should be considering?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	12	52%	12	55%
No	No	10	43%	10	45%
NAN	Not Answered	1	4%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Q. A3TX - If yes, please list...

- A reduction of new building sites to maintain existing overview.
- Fast foods outlets and associated litter nuisance is an issue in some areas of countryside, e.g. Ashridge, Tring Park and Felden / Bovingdon areas.
- Greater support for agriculture, most fields around Wigginton are either unused or horse fields. The latter are sub divided, therefore visually unattractive, of poor quality and often affecting footpaths because walkers are forced to use the narrow space between two fences.
- If any further building, then build north of boundary (Long Marston) or east, i.e. Markyate.
- Loss of pasture land to residential housing.
- Maintenance and improvements of footpath network.
- Not allowing any further building of residential or business properties in the countryside or any road development.
- Protection of wildlife needs greater publication, children in schools should be taught more about why the wildlife is so important and any destruction of nests, burrows, hides, holts etc is not to be allowed.
- The management of roaming wild animals I.e. minkjacks and pheasants.
- The public transport would need to be increased if people are being expected to use it, e.g. one bus from Tring to Wigginton every 2 hours - and last one at 4:40pm is not a very useful service.
- Traffic calming needed in lanes, e.g. between Chipperfield and Kings Langley, also state of roads is poor.
- Very much related to above comment, environmentally friendly transport measures.

#### Q. A4 - Looking at the main document which, if any, is your preferred option for levels of housing in the countryside?

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
1	Option 1	14	61%	14	61%
2	Option 2	5	22%	5	22%
3	Neither of these options	4	17%	4	17%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A4TX - Please explain your reasons...**

- Any more than this number of dwellings will infringe on the countryside and could involve using Green Belt land. Infilling / change of use should be encouraged to prevent encroachment on such areas.
- Better to enlarge the villages a little than take up huge swathes of farm land around the town.
- Do not have enough information to make a decision on this.
- Fewer houses being built is preferable due to strain on infrastructure - schools, hospitals, roads etc.
- I would question the adequacy of doctors, dentists, school places, shopping, parking, etc if the increase in population is too great.
- It would seem from what you say about maintaining the rural population (567 dwellings) and the anticipated need for more than 1000 dwellings in the villages by 2031 that option 2 is inadequate.
- Limited services would be pushed to the limit (travel) at a higher housing level. Roads would not be able to cope with the higher level of transport, already in disrepair.
- More and more housing will cause villages to lose their character.
- More housing needed for young people.
- New housing should be placed in existing towns, using infill sites and derelict land.
- Option 1 preferable due to our area already over subscribed and populated. Less housing would mean less pressure on our already under pressure services.
- People have stayed here or moved here for the beauty. Relative tranquillity and freedom from the disturbing excesses of urban living. Some changes are inevitable but should be kept to a minimum.
- Protect the villages and surrounding countryside by limiting major housing expansion to the main towns such as Hemel, Watford, Berkhamsted etc. The smaller villages are served by narrow and badly maintained roads, unsuitable for traffic increases.
- The balance between affordable and private housing is better, ditto managing public services.
- The countryside villages have only limited space for new housing. Option 2 would spoil village characters.
- The nearest hospital, Watford general, is 16 miles away. Tring School at Mortimer Hill already caters for the town and surrounding villages.
- This would be more beneficial for schools and local services to keep services such as local shops going.
- Village facilities are closing (pubs, shops, local clubs, etc.) Due to lack of use. Suggest housing of approx twice option 1 would only mean about 4 houses per year per village.

- Wigginton has no shop, post office, surgery etc. Therefore transport is necessary. More social housing will not help, most of the original council houses are now privately owned under the right to buy scheme. Part owned houses (rural housing scheme) have not attracted local buyers. Elderly people wish to leave the village. There is very little employment. Much social housing goes to people living in beech park mobile homes.

**Q. A5 - Do you think the key emphasis of the spatial strategy should be to protect and enhance the built, historic and environmental assets of the countryside?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	22	96%	22	96%
No	No	1	4%	1	4%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A5TX - If no, please give your reasons why...**

- Social, economic and access are equally important.

**Q. A6 - Do you think there is a need for further local job growth in the countryside and its villages?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	14	61%	14	61%
No	No	9	39%	9	39%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A6TX - Please give your reasons why...**

- Any further infiltration would ruin the environment for people who have chosen to live there, especially in their retirement.
- Appropriate employment uses can help sustain life in countryside.
- As Dacorum is already a heavily populated area, employment can be found in the close vicinity.
- Depends how intrusive the introduced businesses would be.
- Environmentally it's better for people to work locally. However new enterprises should be small in scale and not need to 'import' staff. The size of the firms transport needs (aside from cars) should be an issue.
- I am not sure that the infrastructure is in place locally to accommodate wide scale employment uses but small scale agriculture / equestrian and cottage industry should be encouraged.

- If there must be more houses in villages, there must be more local employment or the traffic situations will be even worse. Sympathetic conversions of some redundant buildings could be done. DBC might give priority to this rather than residential barn conversions and holiday cottages.
- It is almost impossible for teenagers in a village to find part time work.
- Local employment reduces commuter traffic and promotes community cohesion and use of local facilities.
- Local jobs would mean hopefully fewer car journeys, however too much heavy building e.g. factories would not be desirable.
- No Green Belt land should be utilised for industry, perhaps some brown field sites could be used.
- So that people don't need to travel.
- The 'plastic factory' moved from London Road, Tring to Icknield Way - now closed down. Rodwells, the soft drink manufacturer moved to a village - now a distribution centre.
- The countryside and its villages are already being spoiled by inappropriate business. We should encourage local craftsmen and specialist workers.
- The decline of farming and other traditional rural professions mean that village inhabitants have to travel to the main towns / London for employment. I would encourage small scale entrepreneurship and diversification to try to limit community and car use in the area.
- The local industries mentioned are slotted unobtrusively into the countryside. I can see no reason why other similar ventures should not be included.
- There is no demand as many people work away in the larger towns and cities or from home.
- To encourage diversification and rural industries.
- To provide more work for more local people.
- To provide work in order to keep the younger generation in the villages and not drive them to the towns. To preserve the families.
- Too much diversity from natural farming / woodland management will destroy characters of village life. Yes, some new housing / businesses are needed, but on a small scale, as suggested, with all the new area not being 'obvious'.

**Q. A7 - Have you any other suggestions as to how the economic prosperity of the countryside can be improved and local services supported?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	13	57%	13	62%
No	No	8	35%	8	38%
NAN	Not Answered	2	9%	-	-
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Q. A7TX - If yes, please list your suggestions below...**

- Better bus services would encourage people to use them, also better cycle tracks.
- Better transport.
- Communities such as Tring and Wilstone are showing strong cohesion and encouragement for small businesses support. This extends from local public houses and tea rooms through to high street shops and restaurants plus the Tring farmers market offers a focal point for this area. This appears to be working exceptionally well for the area and could be introduced elsewhere.
- Conserve what we already have and protect it, don't build on it.
- Council supervised farmers markets. Bicycles lanes on more roads. Encourage supermarkets to buy local produce. Banning heavy lorries from country lanes.
- Council tax relief for local shops.
- Leave well alone (if it ain't broke don't fix it) 'progress for progress sake' at the end of the day is retrospective, let us keep our heritage.
- Local services - restore child welfare clinics, chiropody etc sessions to local village hall.
- More volunteer work to be organised, encourage a pride in local environment, awards for best kept areas.
- Put a stop to closures of local shops and post offices so that the villages become more than just 'dormitories'. These closures force people to use private or public transport for every need.
- Slight relaxation of planning controls. Improved internet speed. Limited financial support for small new employers, perhaps reduced council tax for 2 - 3 years.
- The loss of the village shop is a major concern. Supermarkets should be encouraged to open small shops stocking the basics. New supermarkets should not be allowed unless they support / provide a local shop.
- There needs to be more encouragement to young local residents to stay / work in the areas, as too many leave for 'better' living areas. Therefore small housing / affordable projects would be welcome to achieve this aim.
- Village shops and post offices restored. Regular and reliable public transport needed. Affordable, subsidised local taxi service? Disused farm buildings used for light industry.
- What local services? Do you mean the mobile library?

**Q. A8 - Do you have any other concerns regarding the strategy for the countryside to 2031?**

		All Responses		VALID RESPONSES	
RESPONSE OPTIONS		Count	Total%	Count	Valid%
Yes	Yes	10	43%	10	48%
No	No	11	48%	11	52%
NAN	Not Answered	2	9%	-	-
Total		23	100%	21	100%

**Q. A8TX - If yes, please explain why...**

- Farming hamlets such as Felden and water end are not currently mentioned in the strategy document. This is a gross omission as both of these areas are important to designate the boundaries between the sprawling Hemel Hempstead and the surrounding countryside. Efforts should be made to preserve these important locations. In addition, I have noted that there is not a specific agenda to fight against the lowering of aircraft flight paths over our areas of outstanding natural beauty, this needs to be raised and addressed as part of the spatial strategy.
- I believe that this whole document / strategy is an absolute waste of time / tax payers money. It is merely an exercise to keep unnecessary council people in employment which is why council tax is so high.
- Lack of finance to achieve plan.
- Little Tring is not mentioned, is it town or countryside? Is it a conservation area? The cutting of the verges are I believe put out to outside agencies. Who is actually responsible for ensuring that the cutting is carried out at a time when most suitable for the enhancement of indigenous flora and fauna? With increase of housing planned, it seems a backward step to close the dump (in New Hill). However since it is to close, it would seem an ideal site for a small industrial site. Farmland on the London road, between cow lane and Tesco's should not be built on. I am totally against using working farms for building.
- People do not respond to speed limits, especially concerned about horse traffic in the area.
- The areas around Kings Langley, Chipperfield and Hemel are already so overcrowded and certainly do not need any further growth. Area of Kings Langley and Apsley in particular have grown so much in last 10 years. The infrastructure is already ruining what was in past a beautiful area. No more housing, please. If any housing to be built then Markyate area, or over towards Long Marston areas can still accommodate more growth, thank you.

- The proposed increase in the activities of Luton airport, which coupled with the proposed changes in flight paths and altitudes can only have a detrimental effect on this area.
- There has been in the past non Green Belt land with housing potential that has been sold off to developers. The council should keep it's land and build its own housing, not selling unoccupied land.
- We need to preserve the rural character of the area for the benefit of the children.
- Where bus routes are poorly supported, mini buses would be better, less large vehicles on lanes, less carbon footprints. Where post office / shops have shut and therefore, as in the case of Wigginton, encouragement of post office / mobile shops should be supported, to particularly help elderly residents. Also, more surgeries should have at least one doctor / nurse station in villages such as Wigginton etc. These villages are really cut off from what should be automatic services.
- Your document appears to want to remove horse owners (horsey culture). This is absolutely ludicrous! Local farms all have horses and it is to be encouraged in general!