



Barton Way Allotments



Charity Dog Show (2016) in Stones Orchard

CROXLEY GREEN NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2016-2031

CONSULTATION STATEMENT [v01F]

[revised 03 Dec 2016]

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1 CONTEXT	5
1.1 REQUIREMENTS	5
1.2 COMMUNITY PLAN	6
1.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.....	7
1.4 MODES OF CONSULTATION	7
2 PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION.....	9
2.1 DESIGNATION OF THE AREA	9
2.2 DEVELOPING THE PLAN.....	10
2.3 INAUGURAL OPEN PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING	12
2.4 THE POLICIES AND ASPIRATIONS	12
2.5 A SUBSTANTIAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES.....	13
2.6 FINAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES FOR CONSULTATION	14
3 FORMAL CONSULTATION.....	17
3.1 FINAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES.....	17
3.2 CONSULTEES	17
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	19
4.1 RESPONDENTS.....	19
4.2 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS	20
4.3 CATEGORISING COMMENTS RECEIVED	20
4.4 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM THE INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL REVIEWER.....	21
4.5 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.....	22
4.6 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS	23
4.7 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM LOCAL ORGANISATIONS	23
4.8 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS.....	24
ANNEX A – EXAMPLE OF CONSULTATION LETTER	25
ANNEX B – LISTS OF CONSULTEES & RESPONDENTS	26
CONSULTEES	26
RESPONDENTS	29
ANNEX C Reconciliation of Comments on Final Consultation Draft 02.02.2016	30
Contents list, preface and summary	30
General points (applying to whole document)	30

Section 1 – Context	49
Section 2 – About Croxley Green	51
Section 3 - Objectives, Policies and Aims.....	55
Section 4 - Designation of Character Areas	56
Section 5 - The Development Management Policies	62
Section 6 - Specific Project Action Plans and Other Opportunities	92
Appendix A – Statistical context	102
Appendix B – Character Areas	103
Appendix C – Extension Guidelines.....	117
Appendix D – The “Village” Centre	118
Appendix E – Trees & Hedges	122
Appendix F – Transport & Roads	122

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is the consultation statement required by Regulation 15 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as part of the plan proposal submitted by Croxley Green Parish Council in support of the proposed Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan.

It:

- (a) Contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Croxley Green Neighbourhood Development Plan;
- (b) Explains how they were consulted;
- (c) Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
- (d) Lists how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Croxley Green Neighbourhood Development Plan.

1 CONTEXT

1.1 REQUIREMENTS

1.1.1 Regulation 15 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires that:

“Where a qualifying body submits a plan proposal to the local planning authority, it must include:

(b) a consultation statement”

“In this regulation “consultation statement” means a document which —

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;*
- (b) explains how they were consulted;*
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and*
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.”*

1.1.2 This document is that consultation statement required by law as part of the plan proposal submitted by Croxley Green Parish Council in support of the proposed Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan.

1.1.3 Regulation 14 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires that:

Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must—

- (a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area—*
 - (i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;*
 - (ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;*
 - (iii) details of how to make representations; and*
 - (iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;*
- (b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and*
- (c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.”*

1.1.4 This document summarises the history of the development of the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan following the survey for the proposed Croxley Green Community Plan and the arrangements for pre-submission publicity and consultation required by law.

1.2 COMMUNITY PLAN

1.2.1 In preparation for a Community Plan, in 2012, the Croxley Green Residents Association and the Croxley Green Parish Council surveyed residents' views under seven themes:

- Environment & Green Spaces (13 questions)
- Built environment – Planning, Housing & Sustainability (9 questions)
- Transport & Road Safety (17 questions)
- Health (4 questions)
- Leisure, Recreation & local facilities (16 questions)
- Business and Commerce (2 questions)
- Safe Society (7 questions)

1.2.2 One further question asked residents to identify their top five priorities from a list of twenty two separate topics. The five top priorities (with the percentages of those listing them) were:

- Protecting & maintaining our open spaces & woodlands (83%)
- Green Belt protection (80%)
- Improved road surfaces (50%)
- Improved pavements (28%)
- Protecting and maintaining our built environment (23%)

1.2.3 About 5,000 paper survey forms were delivered to households in Croxley Green. Just less than 1,400 responses were received of which about half were completed on-line using a commercial survey package that limited respondents to one response per computer. The rest were on the paper forms (one per household) and their responses were entered into a database by a dedicated team of volunteers. There was no way to check whether there was duplication between the paper survey forms and the on line responses, or whether those completing the survey were expressing an individual opinion, or the collective views of the household. Expressed as a percentage of the number of forms delivered, the response was about 28%. Expressed as a percentage of the number of registered voters in the Parish (just over 10,000) the response was about 14%. The results, which were published in June 2013, represent the detailed views of a substantial minority of residents.

1.2.4 A final question asked for constructive comments and although a few people criticised the length of the survey but completed it, others said it was a great idea and welcomed it. There were about 4,500 comments to be considered. The major topics were about housing, building a new school, parking, concerns about overdevelopment and the need to protect the green spaces. Some people who filled in the paper survey gave opinions and comments on questions where there was no white box and these have been captured as well. They ranged from adding that the green spaces refresh our spirits to the emptying of litter bins.

1.2.5 The Parish Council's Planning & Development Committee report at the Annual Parish Council meeting in April 2013 included an extensive item about the Community Plan, concluding with a brief statement by the chair of the P&D Committee about a Neighbourhood Plan:

“The next stage is to produce an analysis of the responses and to use the evidence gained to develop a strategic and pro-active approach to our planning and to developing a Neighbourhood Plan.”

1.2.6 The results of the Community Plan survey were summarised and reported in the Parish Newsletter (the Parish Pump) in Autumn/Winter 2013 which was delivered free to all homes in Croxley Green.

1.2.7 The initial analysis of the results of the Community Plan survey was published in June 2013, a copy of the report was delivered to every household within the Parish, and it has been available on line at the Parish Council website¹ since it was published.

1.3 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

1.3.1 The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations were published In 2012 (before the Community Plan was completed) and, with the support of the Residents Association, the Parish Council decided² at the Council Meeting on 31 October 2013 to develop a Neighbourhood Plan to take forward the views expressed by local residents in the Community Plan survey.

1.3.2 It was resolved:

- That the Clerk formally writes to TRDC to request that the area for our Neighbourhood Plan to be the whole Parish area of CGPC
- That the P&D Committee is delegated by Council to progress to completion the Neighbourhood Plan with any necessary establishment of working parties and to report regularly to Council on progress

1.4 MODES OF CONSULTATION

1.4.1 The Parish Council communicates with and consults local residents through a number of channels:

1. The Parish Council organises the Annual Parish Meeting (as required by law)
2. The Parish Council meets regularly (Council meetings monthly, planning & development committee meetings bi-monthly), meetings are open to the public and notice of the meetings, agenda, papers and minutes are all published on the Council’s website
3. The Parish Council posts notices in the Croxley Green Library and the notice board outside the Council Offices
4. The Parish Council Offices are open and staffed Monday to Friday from (at least) 10:00 to 15:00 (normally the full working day)
5. Parish Councillors attend Local Area Forums (organised by County and District Council Councillors on a regular biannual basis)
6. Parish Councillors attend (by invitation) bi-monthly meetings of the Croxley Green Residents Association Committee

¹ [Download CCP Survey The Results June 13 \(297kb\)](#)

² CC1280/13 Neighbourhood Plan

7. The Parish Council's website includes a wide range of information about the Council's activities as well as wider information about matters of concern or interest to local residents and businesses
8. The Parish Council produces an occasional newsletter (house magazine) the Parish Pump which is delivered to all homes within the Parish
9. A commercial company (MyNews³) produces a monthly magazine (MyCroxleyNews) which includes a regular column by the Chairman of the Parish Council ("In the chair with Chris Mitchell")

1.4.2 All these different modes of communication have been used at different times to communicate information, stimulate discussion and solicit comments from local residents and businesses about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan, in addition to more specific consultation activities and events.

³ MyNews, John Dickinson Enterprise Centre, Stationers Place, London Road, Apsley, Hertfordshire, HP3 9QU

2 PRELIMINARY CONSULTATION

2.1 DESIGNATION OF THE AREA

- 2.1.1 Following the extensive consultation in preparation for a Community Plan (described in section 1.2 above) the Parish Council decided⁴ at the Council Meeting on 31 October 2013 to develop a Neighbourhood Plan to take forward the views expressed by local residents in the Community Plan survey.
- 2.1.2 To start the Neighbourhood Plan process Croxley Green Parish Council applied⁵ to Three Rivers District Council (TRDC) for designation of Croxley Green as a Neighbourhood Area in accordance with Part 2, Paragraph 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 in order that the Parish Council can produce a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.1.3 The application, the process leading up to it and to develop a Neighbourhood Plan, and the implications for Croxley Green were summarised in an extensive article by the Chairman in MyCroxleyNews⁶. Local residents were invited to assist in the process in that article and the following month's article⁷.
- 2.1.4 The public consultation by TRDC on the application for designation of a Neighbourhood Area by Croxley Green Parish Council ran from 29 November 2013 to 10 January 2014 and the area, shown on the map below⁸, was designated by TRDC on 27 January 2014. The designation⁹ was reported by the Chairman in MyCroxley News¹⁰.

⁴ CC1280/13 Neighbourhood Plan

⁵ Letter 964-570 8th November 2013

⁶ Issue 88 (Dec 2013)

⁷ Issue 89 (Jan 2014)

⁸ [Download Croxley Green Designated Area Map 27 Jan 14 \(978kb\)](#)

⁹ [Download Designation Notification 31 Jan 14 \(102kb\)](#)

¹⁰ Issue 90 (Feb 2014)



Croxley Green Neighbourhood Area - designated 27.01.14

© Crown Copyright and database rights (2012) Ordnance Survey 100018686

Key

 Croxley Green Neighbourhood Area.

Scale: 1:15,000

Croxley Green Neighbourhood Area designated 27 January 2014

2.2 DEVELOPING THE PLAN

- 2.2.1 The Chairman used his column in MyCroxley News¹¹ in March 2014 to invite readers to take a look at the Abbots Langley Transition Town Association website¹² and let the Council know whether transition to a less carbon dependent future should be in the Neighbourhood Plan. There were no specific responses.
- 2.2.2 Progress on developing the Neighbourhood Plan was reported¹³ at Council on 27 March 2014. Cllrs were reminded that the Community Plan questionnaire results had been delivered to every household and it was hoped that a presentation could be made at the forthcoming Annual Parish Meeting. The narratives for the various sections of the Community Plan were currently being worked on. The information would eventually feed into the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.2.3 At the Annual Parish Meeting on 24 April 2014 the Chairman reported¹⁴ the public consultation by Three Rivers District Council and consequent approval that we can go ahead with a Neighbourhood Plan for the whole of Croxley Green. It would probably follow the format of the Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan and he had made enquiries to see whether there might be some funding to help us to the next stage.

¹¹ Issue 91 (Mar 2014)

¹² <http://altta.org.uk/>

¹³ CC1333/14 Community Plan / Neighbourhood Plan / Village Centre Update

¹⁴ AP77/14 Chairman's Report

- 2.2.4 At the same meeting the Chair of the Planning & Development Committee explained that a Neighbourhood Plan would be a major task as it must be aligned to district and national planning policies and structures. This would be the major P&D project for the forthcoming year.
- 2.2.5 The Chairman reported the discussion at the Annual Parish Meeting in his MyCroxley News column¹⁵ in May 2014 and again invited local residents to assist in the process.
- 2.2.6 The Parish Council met with TRDC planning officers in May 2104.
- 2.2.7 The Chair reported progress¹⁶ at the P&D committee meeting on 4 June 2014. Two meetings had been held in the last week to further both Community and Neighbourhood Plans and the Village Centre project. The meeting with TRDC officers was very constructive but there was little doubt that external professional planning help would be required to progress the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.2.8 The Chair reported¹⁷ progress at the Council meeting on 26 June 2014. The Chairman and Cllr Jordan (Chair of the P&D committee) had recently met with Claire May, Principal Planning Officer TRDC, to discuss the next steps in progressing the Neighbourhood Plan. As the Neighbourhood Plan is a planning document, external professional help will be needed to ensure that the correct and appropriate wording is used within the document which would become part of the statutory development plan for the area.
- 2.2.9 Progress on the development of a Neighbourhood Plan was reported to all residents in the Parish Pump issued in Spring / Summer 2014. The Chairman's letter described the current position and again invited local residents to assist in the process. The Parish Pump included the Chairman's Report and P&D Committee Report from the Annual Parish Meeting.
- 2.2.10 In August the Chairman reported in MyCroxley News¹⁸ that he Council had submitted a bid for funding to help take the Neighbourhood Plan to the next stage and hoped to hear by the end of August.
- 2.2.11 Chambers, Goodwin Partners was appointed to provide professional advice in August 2014.
- 2.2.12 In the September edition of MyCroxley News¹⁹ the Chairman reported that the Parish council had secured a grant to help take the Neighbourhood Plan forward. The Council expected to produce a draft plan, for consultation, by the end of the year. This would then be scrutinised by TRDC and then by an inspector. Finally there would be a referendum to ratify the plan and then it would become a statutory plan for Croxley Green. The Chairman again invited local residents to assist in the process, and went on to explain the Neighbourhood Plan in more detail.

¹⁵ MyCroxley News Issue 93

¹⁶ PD2310/14 Neighbourhood and Community Plan

¹⁷ CC1359/14 Neighbourhood and Community Plan

¹⁸ MyCroxley News Issue 96

¹⁹ MyCroxley News Issue 97

- 2.2.13 The Chair reported²⁰ progress at the Council meeting on 26 June 2014. The Council had obtained a Grant of £5,800 from the “Supporting Communities in Neighbourhood Planning” Programme to obtain external professional expertise in planning to assist in developing the Neighbourhood Plan. The Council had retained the services of Peter Goodwin of Chambers, Goodwin and Partners.
- 2.2.14 In the October edition of MyCroxley News²¹ the Chairman reported the award of the grant and the engagement of a professional to advise the Council and explained the importance of a Neighbourhood Plan for the future development of Croxley Green.

2.3 INAUGURAL OPEN PUBLIC CONSULTATION MEETING

- 2.3.1 At the Planning & Development committee meeting on 05 November 2014 the Chair reported²² that the Community Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan were being taken forward in parallel and that a public meeting would be held on the 12 November 2014 to seek views and opinions from residents regarding Neighbourhood Plan issues.
- 2.3.2 An Inaugural Open Meeting for the Neighbourhood Plan was held in the Croxley Green Community Centre on 14 November 2014 to discuss the Parish’s aspirations for a new Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.3.3 The Chairman commented in the November edition of MyCroxley News²³ that readers should have seen a leaflet to advertise a public meeting about the Neighbourhood Plan. In developing the plan, the Council felt the main thrust should be to “future proof” and protect Croxley Green. The article described the proposed approach extensively and in some detail. He invited anyone who had missed the meeting to send their comments to the Council’s offices by e-mail.
- 2.3.4 The Council’s working party met on 17 November 2014 to review progress on developing the Neighbourhood Plan following discussion at the Inaugural Open Meeting.
- 2.3.5 In the December edition of MyCroxley News²⁴ the Chairman thanked everyone who came to the Neighbourhood Plan meeting in November. There was a great turnout and everyone got into the spirit of the evening and many good ideas came up. He also thanked those who had responded to last month’s column.

2.4 THE POLICIES AND ASPIRATIONS

- 2.4.1 The Parish Council’s architect/planner met TRDC planning officers on 28 March to discuss the proposed approach to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.4.2 There was extensive coverage of the Neighbourhood Plan in the Spring/Summer 2015 edition²⁵ of the Parish Pump. The Chairman’s opening statement included the message that

²⁰ CC1390/14 Projects updates 2014 – 15

²¹ MyCroxley News Issue 98

²² PD2403/14 Community and Neighbourhood Plans

²³ MyCroxley News Issue 99

²⁴ MyCroxley News Issue 100

²⁵ Finalised for publication 19th March 2015

the Neighbourhood Plan was the most important long term project the Parish Council was undertaking and drew attention to the articles following. It included three pages of articles describing the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan Progress and setting out the draft policies and aspirations in detail.

- 2.4.3 In the April edition²⁶ of MyCroxley News the Chairman drew attention to the Parish Pump published in March that set out a draft Neighbourhood Plan for consideration by the Community. There would be a presentation of the draft plan at the Annual Parish Meeting on the 30 April in the Village Hall at the Community Centre off the Barton Way car park. He invited readers to come to the meeting as it was a great chance for the Council to get their feedback and for them to get an update on our work generally.
- 2.4.4 At the Annual Parish Meeting on 30 April 2015 the Chairman Cllr Mitchell and Peter Goodwin gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Neighbourhood Plan followed by discussion with those present.
- 2.4.5 In the June edition²⁷ of MyCroxley News the Chairman reported that there had been a very positive Annual Parish meeting, with many residents turning up. The Council had also had a further meeting²⁸ with TRDC and had feedback from them. The Council aimed to have a draft plan ready in early July for further consultation.
- 2.4.6 The annual Croxley Revels took place on the Green on 20 June 2015 at which the Parish Council mounted a stand including exhibition boards with a ten poster display explaining the Plan in more detail and inviting comment on: Character & Conservation Areas and Heritage & Community Assets; Retail and Commerce; Housing; Croxley Green Village Centre; Transport; Environment. A single page flyer was handed out explaining the Neighbourhood Plan and inviting views and opinions. Copies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan including Sections 1(Background) to 4 (Policies) dated 2 June 15 and the draft Appendices (latest version June 15) were available for people to consult and were given to those interested to read them. The draft Plan was discussed with visitors and questions were answered.

2.5 A SUBSTANTIAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES

- 2.5.1 Following a number of working party meetings a substantial draft of the proposed Plan and the Appendices was completed in July 2015.
- 2.5.2 In the July edition²⁹ of MyCroxley News the Chairman reported that the Neighbourhood Plan was taking shape. An up-to-date version was on the Parish Council website, it was still in development and consultation, he invited readers to e-mail any views they would like considered.
- 2.5.3 The proposed Plan was discussed at a meeting with Thrive Homes on 01 Sept 2015 including an overview of the Plan, the specific sections relevant to Thrive Homes, comments from Thrive Homes, how Thrive Homes and the Parish Council could best work together, and any

²⁶ MyCroxley News Issue 104

²⁷ MyCroxley News Issue 106

²⁸ 28 April 2015

²⁹ MyCroxley News Issue 107

further suggestions from Thrive Homes for inclusion in the Plan. Following the meeting Thrive Homes sent a detailed response: *“As an important stakeholder, Thrive is very keen to be involved in the consultation process – I look forward to receiving details of the public consultation in due course.”* The response included detailed comments under the headings: General; Statistics; New Housing; and Development Opportunities.

- 2.5.4 Local businesses were invited to a meeting at the Community Centre on 9 September 2015. The invitation letter explained that the Council had had a number of public meetings about the Plan over the last two years, and now had a draft to share with the business sector. They were invited to come and join the Council for a short presentation followed by an open discussion.
- 2.5.5 The proposed Plan was discussed at a meeting with Hightown on 10 Sept 2015 followed by a tour of potential development sites within Croxley Green.
- 2.5.6 A revised draft was sent to TRDC on 15 September 2015 and discussed extensively and in detail at a meeting with the Principal Planning Officer on 29 September 2015. TRDC offered to pay for an independent professional review of the plan and policies, once the next stage of drafting and revision was complete to be carried out in parallel with the Parish Council’s informal consultation with interested parties.
- 2.5.7 Following the meeting TRDC planning officers sent more detailed comments by e-mail including (in summary): Leisure and Community Facilities; Development Opportunities; Aims (which might be better expressed as policies) and Appendices (consider reformatting these sections to help justify the policy requirements).
- 2.5.8 A consultation meeting was held with Croxley Green Baptist Church on 15 September 2015. Following the meeting the minister wrote: *“Thanks again for your visit and I hope that we at Croxley Green Baptist – as with all the faith communities of Croxley – and other community groups and the councils can make a continued positive contribution to the life of Croxley Green.”* He questioned the use of the term “future proofing” and suggested “sustainable community” and “flourishing” as alternatives.
- 2.5.9 It was reported³⁰ at the Council meeting on 24 September that good progress had been made on the Neighbourhood Plan and a draft had been sent to TRDC in anticipation of a meeting with. A more detailed report³¹ on progress was discussed.
- 2.5.7 A consultation meeting was held with TfL representatives on 23 November 2015 to discuss possible enhancement of development proposals for Croxley station timber yard / car park site. (A follow up meeting was held with TfL representatives on 04 March 2016.)

2.6 FINAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES FOR CONSULTATION

- 2.6.1 Following these consultations extensive modifications were made to the draft Plan and Appendices. Progress was reported³² at the P&D committee meeting on 7 October 2015.

³⁰ Paper CC1519/15 Projects / Budget Items 2015-16

³¹ Paper CC1521/15 Neighbourhood Plan and Community Plan Update

- 2.6.2 The Chairman wrote³³ in November in MyCroxleyNews that the new (replacement) website would include a consultation section³⁴ and one of the first items the Parish would consult on would be the final consultation draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.6.3 Progress was reported at the Council meeting on 26 November 2015. The Chairman reported³⁵ that considerable work had gone into developing the Neighbourhood Plan and he thanked the Cllrs who had been working on it. He reported that it was intended to have a final consultation draft ready within the next three to six months, after which it would be presented to TRDC, and then be independently reviewed by an inspector leading to a referendum for acceptance.
- 2.6.4 The Chairman wrote³⁶ in MyCroxleyNews in January that the Council would soon be uploading the final draft consultation of the Neighbourhood Plan onto the Council website. He invited feedback on it, using the consultation section to respond.
- 2.6.5 On 20 January 2016 progress was reported³⁷ to the P&D committee. The Council Chairman introduced the item and explained the background to the development of the Neighbourhood Plan following the Localism Act in 2011. A final draft consultation document would be presented at the next Council meeting for comment before external consultation.
- 2.6.6 The revised Plan³⁸ and Appendices³⁹ were presented for review by the Parish Council on 28 January 2016. It was resolved⁴⁰: that, subject to the necessary amendments and the production of an Executive Summary, the Neighbourhood Plan and Appendices were released for consultation.
- 2.6.7 In February the Chairman reported⁴¹ in MyCroxleyNews that the Council had ratified the Neighbourhood Plan for external consultation. Readers would be able to see it online soon on the consultation section of the Parish website. He invited comments on the plan.
- 2.6.8 At the Parish Council meeting in February, under matters arising⁴², it was reported that no comments had been received about the Neighbourhood Plan from the website to date.
- 2.6.9 The Chairman wrote⁴³ in March 2016 in MyCroxleyNews that copies of the Neighbourhood Plan⁴⁴ and the Appendices⁴⁵ were available for comment on the internet or from the Parish Clerk. He encouraged residents to comment.

³² Paper PD 2607/15 Neighbourhood Plan update Progress report to P&D

³³ MyCroxley News Issue 110

³⁴ <http://croxleygreen-pc.gov.uk/index.php/council/public-consultation>

³⁵ Paper CC1545/15 Projects and Working Group Update

³⁶ MyCroxley News Issue 112

³⁷ Paper PD2672/16 Neighbourhood Plan

³⁸ PLAN: Final Consultation Draft 16.01.16

³⁹ APPENDICES: Final Consultation Draft at 16.01.16

⁴⁰ Paper CC1569/16 Neighbourhood Plan

⁴¹ MyCroxley News Issue 113

⁴² Paper CC1577/16 Matters Arising

⁴³ MyCroxley News Issue 114

⁴⁴ PLAN: Final Consultation Draft 02.02.16

⁴⁵ APPENDICES: Final Consultation Draft at 02.02.16

2.6.10 The Chairman stressed⁴⁶ the importance of the Neighbourhood Plan in his column in MyCroxleyNews in April 2016. There would be more information and discussion at the Annual Parish Meeting in April.

2.6.11 At the Annual Parish Meeting on 28 April 2016 the Chairman gave a detailed PowerPoint slide presentation⁴⁷ on progress of the Neighbourhood Plan (a copy of the slides was attached to the minutes of the meeting).

⁴⁶ MyCroxley News Issue 115

⁴⁷ AP95/16 To receive an update on the Croxley Green Community Plan and Neighbourhood Plan.

3 FORMAL CONSULTATION

3.1 FINAL DRAFT PLAN AND APPENDICES

- 3.1.1 The version of the Plan⁴⁸ and the Appendices⁴⁹ that had been finalised on 2 February 2016 was used for the consultation; as two separate MS Word files on the website and printed and bound in a single paper document.
- 3.1.2 The Parish Pump newsletter issued in May 2016 (spring/summer 2016) included several references to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.1.3 The Chairman's report referred to the Neighbourhood Plan "Final Consultation Draft" which was available on website and as hard copy in the library. If residents wanted a hard copy they were advised to contact the Parish office. The report also raised and answered a number of specific questions that had come up in discussion at meetings (FAQ).
- 3.1.4 There was an article on the proposed Neighbourhood Plan explaining where we were in the process, what would happen next and how it might affect residents and businesses in Croxley Green.
- 3.1.5 The Parish Chairman's note in MyCroxleyNews⁵⁰ for June 2016 included a request to respond to the consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan, even if it was just to say you agree and support it. It would be best to email comments via the Parish Council's website. The consultation would close on the 12 August.
- 3.1.6 The Parish Council set up and manned a stand at the Croxley Revels on 18 June 2016. This included an extensive display explaining the Neighbourhood Plan and offering printed copies to read and respond. The proposed Plan was discussed with visitors at Revels and their questions were answered.

3.2 CONSULTEES

- 3.2.1 On 28 June 2016 a consultation letter⁵¹ (example at Annex A) was posted to nearly 90 local organisations and other interested parties listed in Annex B. Representatives of the following Groups were consulted:

- Schools
- Churches
- Health
- Minority Groups
- Societies
- Councils
- Councillors
- Public Houses

⁴⁸ PLAN: Final Consultation Draft 02.02.16

⁴⁹ APPENDICES: Final Consultation Draft at 02.02.16

⁵⁰ MyCroxley News Issue 117

⁵¹ Reference 577-570

- Allotment Associations
- Residents' Associations
- Other stakeholders

- 3.2.3 Responses were requested by Friday 19 August but, in response to comments from some consultees about the consultation being during the school holiday period, the period was subsequently extended to 9th September.
- 3.2.5 The Chairman attended the Local Area Forum on 13 July, presented the plan and offered printed copies to read and respond. The Plan was discussed with residents and their questions were answered.
- 3.2.6 The Parish Chairman's note in MyCroxleyNews⁵² for August 2016 reminded readers that the draft Neighbourhood Plan was out for comment. The deadline for comments had been extended to 9 September. There was a display explaining the Plan in the Library. Copies of the Plan were available from the Library or from the Parish offices.
- 3.2.7 There was an unmanned exhibition display board at Croxley Library for several weeks during July and August with copies of the Plan to take away and read and a paper slip to respond with comments.

⁵² MyCroxley News Issue 117

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

4.1 RESPONDENTS

- 4.1.1 Written responses were received from twelve organisations and seven individual respondents (listed at the end of Annex A). The Parish Council is grateful to all the organisations mentioned and the individuals for the care with which they scrutinised the draft Plan and Appendices and the thoughtfulness of their responses and comments.
- 4.1.2 Because it had not been made clear in the consultation letter that responses would be published, those from individual residents have not been identified separately in the detailed table in Annex C to avoid giving offence. They are simply noted as “Resident”.
- 4.1.3 Responses on behalf of organisations have been attributed to those organisations although, when reviewing the comments, it has been apparent that those responding on behalf of local organisations have a much wider knowledge of Croxley Green and have commented most helpfully on a wider range of topics than those directly relevant to their organisations.
- 4.1.4 Responses on behalf of national or regional organisations have reflected their particular duties and responsibilities. These have been most helpful in identifying wider issues that the Council needed to address.
- 4.1.5 The Planning Officers at TRDC offered particular assistance in reviewing the draft Plan and Appendices. At an early stage TRDC offered to engage an independent professional to review and comment on the Plan. Through the Planning Officers Society Enterprises Ltd they engaged Stephen Tapper (Planning) Ltd to review the Plan. TRDC requested an objective opinion as to whether the Plan, as currently presented, was likely to be fit for purpose as a development plan document.
- 4.1.6 More precisely, they required confirmation that:
1. *the plan would meet the basic conditions;*
 2. *the policies do not conflict with the NPPF and Local Plan policies; and*
 3. *the policies would be useable as part of the development plan (for example by being realistic and not too restrictive in the control of development).*
- 4.1.7 In response to the consultation TRDC provided the report from Stephen Tapper (Planning) Ltd together with helpful advice on the process to be followed in finalising the plan for submission for the next round of public consultation and guidance on the documents required.
- 4.1.8 The report from Stephen Tapper (Planning) Ltd has been useful guidance on shaping and sharpening the Plan and the Council is grateful to TRDC for commissioning the report, and to Stephen Tapper (Planning) Ltd for a thorough and thoughtful review, as well as helpful advice and guidance.

4.2 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS

- 4.2.1 A tabular approach has been used to list the specific comments in sequence against the draft plan and appendices with a separate heading for each Section of the Plan and each Appendix. Under each section the comments are numbered in sequence, the page number in the original document, Plan⁵³ or Appendix⁵⁴, is recorded, the respondent is identified with the comment, there is a response to the comment and the proposed resolution of the matter raised.
- 4.2.2 This provides a complete record of the actions taken to respond to comments, even where there has been a significant restructuring of the Plan or alteration of the policies and aims in response to comments received.
- 4.2.3 The minor comments that were simply correcting points of fact or pointing out typographical errors have been removed from the abbreviated list of comments In Annex C.

4.3 CATEGORISING COMMENTS RECEIVED

- 4.3.1 The overall response was very supportive and the Council is very grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read the plan and appendices so carefully and respond so thoughtfully. All the comments have been most helpful in improving the Plan.
- 4.3.2 Many of the comments received were simply correcting points of fact or typographical errors.
- 4.3.3 Some were helpful guidance from knowledgeable organisations which have been most helpful in improving the Plan.
- 4.3.4 Some were heartfelt comments from residents (and residents' organisations) about their concerns for the future of Croxley Green. These lend weight to the overall approach in the Plan and have been most helpful in shaping and refining the Plan to try to meet the aspirations of residents within the planning context established by National Planning Policy Guidance and the TRDC Local Development Framework (the Local Plan).
- 4.3.5 Some were comments from interested parties advancing particular points of view. These have not always reflected the wider consensus. They have been very carefully considered and the response to the individual comments explains why they have either only been partly reflected in the Plan, or have been set aside.
- 4.3.6 The comments from Stephen Tapper (Planning) Ltd are technical recommendations from a professional standpoint and have helped address some of the wider issues raised by other respondents.

⁵³ PLAN: Final Consultation Draft 02.02.16

⁵⁴ APPENDICES: Final Consultation Draft at 02.02.16

4.4 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM THE INDEPENDENT PROFESSIONAL REVIEWER

- 4.4.1 The comments from the independent professional reviewer raised the most significant issues for consideration and there has been extensive restructuring of the Plan and detailed amendment of the policies and text.
- 4.4.2 The policies have been refined in the light of the existing development management policies in the Three Rivers Local Plan Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMD)⁵⁵ adopted 23 July 2013.
- 4.4.3 The policies and aims in section 5 have been re-arranged to reflect the overarching principle of sustainable development. Sustainable development in the context of a tightly defined developed area, surrounded by Green Belt protected countryside, and including open spaces protected by designation (in the SALDD) and by other legislation including village greens and allotment land. With very few opportunities for future development without extensive demolition of existing residential properties and reconstruction. And in the context of the historic development of Croxley Green into a mainly residential suburb with a rather limited range of housing for a population with increasingly diverse needs.
- 4.4.4 Section 6 has been extended to include specific policies relating to the development sites proposed in the Three Rivers Local Plan Site Allocations Local Development Document (SALDD)⁵⁶. In particular, the Killingdown Farm site, the Croxley Station Yard redevelopment site and the proposed Croxley Danes Secondary School site. These amendments, suggested by the independent reviewer, address some of the more serious concerns expressed by local residents' representative groups and individual residents.
- 4.4.5 In some cases aims have been restated as policies, in other places policies have been divided and abbreviated or rewritten for greater clarity and precision, accepting the suggestions and advice from the independent reviewer and building on them to improve the presentation.
- 4.4.6 Many of the aims in the proposed Plan reflect the history of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan from the proposed Community Plan and refer to matters relating to sustaining land use in a developed community rather than simply land use development or re-development. However they reflect the concerns and aspirations of the residents, were widely supported in the preliminary consultation stage, and have not been opposed in the formal consultation. They complement and expand upon the specific development policies.
- 4.4.7 The relevant comments from the independent reviewer's report (dated April 2016) and Appendix 1 (Croxley Green NP- policy & implementation table review) have been itemised in Annex C with a response from the Parish Council and the proposed resolution of each comment. The other guidance and advice from the independent reviewer has been reviewed carefully and incorporated in the revised Plan and Appendices where appropriate.

⁵⁵ [Development Management Policies \(pdf\)](#)

⁵⁶ [Site Allocations LDD \(Adopted 25 November 2014\) \(pdf\)](#)

4.5 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES

4.5.1 **Transport for London (Commercial Development)** responded in detail on 9 September 2016. Their comments represented the views of officers in Transport for London Commercial Property Development Team (**TfL Property**) in its capacity as a significant landowner and did not form part of the TfL corporate response (provided separately).

4.5.2 The comments were under four headings:

- 4. Designation of Character Areas
- 5.2 New housing standards
- 6.2 Croxley Station
- 6.3 Other Development Opportunities.

4.5.3 The comments under 4 relate to the proposed site of the Croxley Danes School, referred to in the SALDD document as Site S(b) Croxley Green - land north east of Baldwins Lane for secondary education provision. The constraints on the site include Green Belt designation, Central River Valleys Landscape Area and a proposed cycle route on southern boundary.

4.5.3 **TfL Property** expressed the view that, in the event that the site is not developed for such a use (either fully or partly), it could be developed for alternative uses, particularly housing. Having considered this suggestion carefully the Parish Council remains of the view that the removal of Green Belt designation over the southern part of the site for a new secondary school was regrettable, whilst acknowledging the need for additional educational provision and strongly resists the suggestion that the site is suitable for alternative development. The new policy PRO2 is proposed to ensure that the rest of the site remains within the Green belt and that the development of a new school respects the acknowledged importance of the site in the landscape as providing a buffer between the developed areas of west Watford and Croxley Green.

4.5.4 **TfL Property** comments under 5.2 relate to the need for specific housing provision within Croxley Green, now expressed in a number of separate policies in 5.2 under “sustainability”. Having considered the suggestion carefully, the Parish Council remains of the opinion that a mix of housing provision would best address the need to maintain a sustainable community. The extensively revised policies HO1, HO2, HO3 and HO4 are proposed to ensure that future provision meets the very specific needs in Croxley Green and not simply the wider market for larger, executive style, homes.

4.5.5 **TfL Property** comments under 6.2 relate to the development potential of the highly accessible site at Croxley Station comprising the former goods yard, currently partly used as a station car park, and partly for TfL operational purposes (the site of a former timber yard). The site has been allocated in the SALDD document as H(13) Croxley Station Car Park and Timber Yard with a proposed dwelling capacity of 25 and comments that the development may include retail store with residential above. Having considered the comments carefully, the Parish Council remains of the view that there is perhaps greater potential in the site than has been identified in the SALDD. Policy PRO has been revised to ensure that the future development of the site addresses the needs of the community in a sustainable way without

compromising the commercial viability of future development, and recognises the significant landscape value of the tree screen around the site on the boundary with the Watford Road.

- 4.5.6 The Council welcomes **TfL Property**'s comments on other development opportunities (6.3).
- 4.5.6 In addition to the response above the detailed comments from TfL (Property) are included in Annex C with the Council's comments and the proposed reconciliation.

4.6 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

- 4.6.1 **Transport for London (Planning)** responded on behalf of TfL's transport planning, project delivery, operations and infrastructure interests. These extensive comments are included in Annex C and were generally concordant with the overall approach of the Neighbourhood Plan. Some of the specific points have been incorporated in the text of the Plan, others in the text of the Appendices and the policies and aims have been adjusted to ensure the comments are adequately reflected in the revised Plan.
- 4.6.2 The **Environment Agency** responded enclosing guidance on Neighbourhood Plan prepared jointly by English Heritage, the Environment Agency, the Forestry Commission and Natural England as well as specific guidance on flood risk and water resources. Flood risk and water resources are already covered in some detail in the Three Rivers Local Plan in the DMD (Policy DM8: Flood Risk and Water Resources) and these comments have been reflected by a brief reference to the DMD. The other guidance has been considered carefully in reviewing and revising the Plan and Appendices and minor amendments have been made as detailed in Annex B.
- 4.6.3 **Hertfordshire Constabulary** provided some brief comments on aspects of crime and security. These have been included in Annex C and taken into account in modifying the proposed Plan.
- 4.6.5 **Hertfordshire County Council** made specific comments relating to the use of OS copyright in maps in the Plan and Appendices. The appropriate copyright statements have been included in the revised Plan and Appendices.

4.7 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM LOCAL ORGANISATIONS

- 4.7.1 **Croxley Green Residents Association (CGRA)** was deeply involved in the preparation of the proposed Community Plan. Their comments are very supportive of the overall aspirations and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan as well as many of the detailed objectives, policies and aims. Their extensive comments are included in Annex C and most have been taken into account in clarifying, correcting and strengthening the revised Plan. In some cases it has not been possible to incorporate all the suggestions. The reasons for this and the proposed resolution are included in Annex C.
- 4.7.2 **Windmill Drive Residents Association (WDRA)** made a number of very specific points, both about their area of Croxley Green and the wider issues affecting the Parish. Overall they were very supportive of the proposed approach of the plan. Where they raised issues of

concern about the Plan and the Appendices these have been addressed, as detailed in Annex C.

4.7.3 **Three Rivers Museum (Trust)** made a number of detailed points about specific parts of Croxley Green. These have been included in Annex C, together with comments and the proposed resolution in the revised Plan and Appendices.

4.7.4 **The Sea Cadets** and the **Croxley Hall Woods Allotment Association** also made some specific points which have been included in Annex C.

4.7.5 The Parish Council is grateful to all the organisations mentioned above for the care and thoughtfulness with which their comments were prepared, reflecting their extensive local knowledge and experience.

4.8 RESPONDING TO COMMENTS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

4.8.1 Seven **individuals** commented on the plan (one kindly provided two sets of extensive comments). Their comments ranged from identifying specific mistakes and typing errors to profound reflections on the future of Croxley Green as a sustainable community and the challenges it faces. Almost all were supportive or very supportive of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. There is a detailed response to specific comments in Annex C.

4.8.3 The Parish Council is grateful to all the seven residents for their careful reading of the Plan and the Appendices and their thoughtful and constructive comments which reflect their commitment to the future of Croxley Green, as well as their extensive local knowledge and experience.

ANNEX A – EXAMPLE OF CONSULTATION LETTER

David Allison
Clerk to the Council



Our Ref: 577 - 570

Your Ref:

The Council Offices
Community Way
Croxley Green, Rickmansworth
Hertfordshire WD3 3SU

Tel: 01923 710250
Fax: 01923 896425
Email: croxleypc@btconnect.com

28 June 2016

Thrive Homes
Building 3
Hatters Lane
Watford
Hertfordshire
WD18 8YG

To Whom It May Concern,

The Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan Project Group has now completed the draft Neighbourhood Plan and we want to get your views to ensure we are on the right track and that you agree with the strategy we have developed on your behalf. Please find the enclosed hard copy of the plan, and it can be downloaded or accessed at <http://www.croxleygreen-pc.gov.uk/index.php/council/public-consultation>. If you would like a further hard copy, please contact us on 01923 710250.

This is your draft Neighbourhood Plan!

It has been drawn up using the views you have given us during all the consultations which have been held during 2014 – 2016. We now need your comments before it goes on to its next stage, which will be conducted by Three Rivers District Council.

It's very important that you take the time to read the draft Plan and give us your views, as these will add strength to the proposals. If you disagree with anything, we need to know so that we can take this into account and make amendments where appropriate. If you support the plan, please tell us. This will help move the plan forward in the next stage

YOUR opinions are valuable – it's YOUR community and village. please let us know what you think.

If you have any comments, please email us or send a letter letting us know your views. Remember the Plan can be accessed online at the above address and comments can be submitted electronically too.

Your comments should be returned or submitted before the consultation period expires on **Friday 19 August 2016.**

Thank you in advance for your time and for supporting the Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Mitchell'.

Chris Mitchell (Chairman) – Neighbourhood Planning Project Group

'Keeping Croxley Special'

ANNEX B – LISTS OF CONSULTEES & RESPONDENTS

CONSULTEES

Local Schools:	Harvey Road Primary School
	Little Green Junior School
	Malvern Way Infant and Nursery School
	Yorke Mead Primary School
	Rickmansworth School
	St Joan of Arc Catholic School
Local Churches:	All Saints' Church
	Croxley Green Baptist Church
	Croxley Green Methodist Church
	Explore Church
	St Bede's RC Church
	St Oswalds Church
Health service providers:	New Road Surgery
	Baldwins Lane Surgery
	Croxley Physiotherapy and Sports Injury Clinic
	Better by Barton
	Backs to Basics
	New Road Dental Practice
	Chartwell Dental Clinic
	Croxley Dental Clinic
	Devine Feet Ltd
	Danita Canning Chiropodist
	D & J Brower Optician
Minority Groups	The Sunnyside Club
	Age UK Hertfordshire
	Croxley Green Children's Centre
	Home-Start Watford & Three Rivers
	Rickmansworth Foodbank
	New Hope
	West Herts and borders LGBT Christian Fellowship
Associations and societies:	Campaign to Protect Rural England

	Hertfordshire Association of Parish and Town Councils
	The Open Spaces Society
	Community Development Action (CDA) Herts
Councils:	Three Rivers District Council
	Watford Borough Council
	London Borough of Hillingdon
	Hertfordshire County Council
	Abbots Langley Parish Council
	Chorleywood Parish Council
	Sarratt Parish Council
	Watford Rural Parish Council
Elected representatives:	Member of Parliament, South West Hertfordshire: David Gauke, MP
	Hertfordshire County Council & Three Rivers District Council: Cllr Steve Drury
	Three Rivers District Council: Cllr Rupert Barnes
	Cllr Phil Brading
	Cllr Peter Getkahn
	Cllr Chris Lloyd
	Cllr Alison Wall
Public Houses:	The Artichoke
	The Coach and Horses
	The Fox and Hounds
	The Harvester
	The Red House
	The Sportsman
Allotment Associations:	Barton Way Allotment Association
	Croxley Hall Woods Allotment Association
	Frankland Road Allotment Association
	Lavrock Lane Allotment Association
Residents' Associations:	Copthorne Road Society
	Croxley Green Residents' Association
	Little Green Residents' Association

	Windmill Drive Residents' Association
	Upper New Road Residents' Association
Other stakeholders:	Canal & River Trust
	Countryside Access Officer, Hertfordshire County Council
	Croxley Bowls Club
	Croxley Green Community Centre
	Croxley Guild of Sport
	Croxley Tennis Club
	East of England Ambulance Headquarters
	English Heritage
	Environment Agency
	Freight Transport Association
	Friends of Croxley Common Moor
	Head of Libraries, Culture and Learning, Hertfordshire County Council
	Hertfordshire Constabulary Headquarters
	Hertfordshire Fire and Rescue Service
	Hertfordshire & Middlesex Wildlife Trust
	Killingdown Farm
	Natural England
	Rickmansworth Waterways Trust
	Royal British Legion
	Three Rivers Museum
	Thrive Homes
	Transport for London
	Watford and West Herts Chamber of Commerce

RESPONDENTS

Organisations (comments attributed):

- Croxley Green Residents' Association (CGRA), 04 September 2016
- Croxley Hall Woods Allotment Association(CHWAA), 17 April 2016
- Environment Agency (EA) , 02 August 2016 (enclosing joint guidance from English Heritage, Environment Agency, Forestry Commission and Natural England)
- Harvey Road School, 01 July 2016
- Hertfordshire Constabulary (HC), **date** August 2016
- Hertfordshire County Council (HCC), 19 July 2016
- Sea Cadets, 08 August 2016
- Three Rivers District Council (POSE, independent assessor's report), 23 September 2016
- Three Rivers Museum (TRM), 22 August 2016
- Transport for London (Transport Planning) TfL(TP), 07 September 2016
- Transport for London (Property) TfL (Property), 09 September 2016
- Windmill Drive Residents Association (WDRA), 14 August 2016

Residents (comments not attributed individually):

- Danny Austin, 04 August 2016
- June Emerson, 31 July 2016
- Frances Gannon, 21 August 2016
- David Luddington, 02 February 2016 and 14 July 2016
- Ross Humphries, 30 March 2016
- Janet Tublin, 13 July 2016
- Keith Westcott, 06 September 2016

ANNEX C Reconciliation of Comments on Final Consultation Draft 02.02.2016

This does not include minor comments, such as factual errors or typographical mistakes, or comments about the process (not the plan itself)

Contents list, preface and summary

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
		NONE		

General points (applying to whole document)

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
2		<p>POSE report:1.2</p> <p>In accordance with Regulation, TRDC have supported the Parish Council in the preparation of the Plan. They now require an objective opinion as to whether the Plan, as currently presented, is likely to be fit for purpose as a development plan document. More precisely, they require confirmation that:</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Matter for the 'basic conditions' statement</p>	<p>No specific amendment to Plan required</p>
6		<p>POSE report:1.3</p> <p>The following adopted development plan documents are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TRDC Core Strategy 2011 • Development Management Policies LDD 2013 • Site Allocations LDD 2014 	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
8		POSE report:3.1 At Examination, in order to allow a neighbourhood plan to progress to referendum the Examiner is required to confirm whether or not it has been prepared in such a way that it meets the “basic conditions” set out in the primary legislation, regulations and summarised in National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), para.65.	Noted	No specific amendment required Parish Council to prepare a Basic Conditions Statement having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
9		A Basic Conditions Statement should be prepared by the Parish Council setting out the reasons why it considers the Plan meets the basic conditions. The Council has not prepared a statement to date and so the following review has been based on a reading of the Plan itself. The review takes into account advice in NPPG, para. 069 onwards.	Noted	[ditto]
10		POSE report: 3.2 Condition (a): the Plan has been prepared having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State.	Noted	[ditto]
11		POSE report: 3.3 A neighbourhood plan or Order must not constrain the delivery of important national policy objectives. NPPF para.16 says <i>“neighbourhood plans or Orders should support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development...plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan.”</i>	Noted	[ditto]
12		More specifically paragraph 184 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that <i>“neighbourhood plans and Orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.”</i>	Noted	Basic Conditions Statement to show that NP meets policy objectives in para 184 quoted

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
14		For the most part the Plan policies are either consistent (status green) or will be if amended as suggested (status amber). A small number are red status and may have to be dropped from the Plan or dealt with quite differently.	Noted Each comment will be considered individually	No specific amendment required
15		POSE report: 3.5 In regard to the NPPF's golden thread of a presumption in favour of sustainable development it would be helpful if the Plan had an overarching policy confirming the local commitment to sustainable development, which would provide context for policies and aims regarding design constraints and bringing forward new sites.	Noted	New section 5.2 addresses the issues of sustainability Point reinforced elsewhere in the Plan (and Appendices, where appropriate)
16		POSE report: 3.6 It is considered that with some amendment the Plan will meet condition (a).	Noted Particular amendments will be considered individually	No specific amendment required Particular amendments will be considered individually
17		POSE report: 3.7 Condition (b) <i>listed buildings</i> relates to Orders and is not relevant to the Croxley Green NP.	Noted	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement
18		POSE report: 3.8 Condition (c) <i>conservation areas</i> relates to Orders and is not relevant to the Croxley Green NP.	Noted	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement
19		POSE report: 3.9 Condition (d) <i>the making of the neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</i>	Noted	Describe how this is covered in the 'basic conditions' statement

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
20		POSE report: 3.10 The Plan must contribute to improvements in environmental, economic and social conditions and consideration must be given to how any potential adverse effects arising from the proposals may be prevented, reduced or offset by mitigation measures.	Noted	No specific amendment required
21		It is very unlikely that anything in the Plan would have such an effect on the environment that an environmental assessment would be required and there is no legal requirement for a neighbourhood plan to have a sustainability appraisal.	Noted	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement
22		However, the Parish Council may find this a useful approach for demonstrating how Plan meets this condition, the more so if the Council follows advice hereunder regarding the desirability of taking a stronger policy position on future development sites and opportunities such as the Croxley Station development.	Noted This suggests the need for a sustainability appraisal (an additional task)	Sustainability appraisal within the "basic conditions" statement
23		POSE report: 3.11 Again, an overarching policy confirming the local commitment to sustainable development would be helpful. Otherwise, the majority of the policies and aims in the draft Plan do address the various facets of sustainable development and there should be little difficulty in meeting this basic condition.	Noted	New section 5.2 addresses the issues of sustainability Point reinforced elsewhere in the Plan (and Appendices, where appropriate)
24		POSE report: 3.12 Condition (e) <i>the making of the neighbourhood must be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area.</i>	Noted Plan has been prepared in general conformity with the strategic policies	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
25		POSE report: 3.13 Columns two and three of the table in Appendix 1 indicate which policies in the Core Strategy and the Development Management LDD are relevant to each policy and aim in the Neighbourhood Plan. Not all such policies of the LPA are strategic.	Noted	No specific amendment required Particular amendments will be considered individually
26		Where there is inconsistency there are recommendations in the final column for changes to the Neighbourhood Plan policies and aims that will address the inconsistencies. If appropriate changes are made to the Neighbourhood Plan it will be likely to meet the requirements of this condition.	Noted Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually	No specific amendment required Particular amendments will be considered individually
27		POSE report: 3.14 <i>Condition (f) the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</i>	Noted	No specific amendment required
28		POSE report: 3.15 None of the policies and aims in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan would be likely to breach any of the seven European Directives incorporated into U.K. law and listed in para. 078 of the NPPG as being of possible relevance to neighbourhood planning.	Noted with thanks	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement
29		POSE report: 3.16 <i>Condition (g) the making of the neighbourhood plan does not breach any other prescribed conditions and matters in relation to the plan.</i>	Noted	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
30		<p>POSE report: 3.17</p> <p>The NPPG at para. 079 refers to matters required to be considered under Regulations 32 and 33 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (relating to the conservation of habitats and species and EIA development) in addition to those above which are in the primary legislation.</p> <p>It is considered that neither will be breached by this Draft Neighbourhood Plan as it stands.</p>	Noted with thanks	Include this point in the 'basic conditions' statement
31		<p>POSE report: 3.18</p> <p>It is therefore concluded that with some amendment to the policies and aims of the Neighbourhood Plan it will meet the basic conditions.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>Particular amendments will be considered individually</p>
32		<p>POSE report: 4.1</p> <p>Appendix 1 of this Report is a Policy & Implementation Review Table which indicates how each of the policies and aims of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan relates to policies in the NPPF, the TRDC Core Strategy and the Development Management LDD.</p> <p>The degree of compliance is indicated by a RAG rating and where there are inconsistencies the implications are commented on in the Implementation column with suggestions for improvement in red text.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>Particular amendments will be considered individually</p>
33		<p>We would highlight here the following matters for consideration by the Parish and District Councils.</p>	Noted with thanks	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
34		<p>POSE report: 4.4 (b)</p> <p>A number of the policies are poorly expressed. Some of them are too wordy to be easily and quickly understood by those that need to use them in the development management process. There are sometimes statements that are more in the nature of an objective of the policy or a justification that would sit better in the supporting text, leaving the policy itself as a clear set of requirements.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>Policies have been reconsidered and amended to address this point</p>
35		<p>It is not always achievable, but generally, less is more in policy writing. Clarity of purpose and clarity as to what a developer must do to satisfy the policy, without ambiguity, is essential if objectives are to be met and costly appeals avoided. Appendix 3 lists the characteristics of good planning policies in a little more detail.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Accept the general principles of clarity and brevity</p>	<p>Appendix 3 has been studied carefully and the guidance applied</p>
36		<p>POSE report: 4.5 (c)</p> <p>Some objectives are more likely to be achieved if the policies take a different approach to the problem. There are some conventions in planning policy writing that may be helpful in securing objectives. For example, rather than a policy that simply says no to a particular change of use it may be better to say that the change will be unacceptable unless a set of criteria can be met. Such reasonableness and flexibility in a policy is less likely to finish up at appeal than a simple “no.”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Accept the general principles of reasonableness and flexibility</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>Policies have been reconsidered and amended to address this point</p>
37		<p>POSE report: 4.6 (d)</p> <p>By adding policies that support the concepts of sustainable development and lifetime neighbourhoods it will be possible to strengthen certain policy areas such as housing mix and design. As an example, Appendix 2 shows how control over gated development proposals may be handled more effectively.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Accept the helpful advice in general, and the specific points about gated communities</p>	<p>Appendix 2 has been studied carefully and policies will be reconsidered to achieve the proposed approach</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
38		<p>POSE report: 5.1</p> <p>The affection of the Neighbourhood Plan Team for their Parish; their enthusiasm to protect it from change that might adversely affect the community’s enjoyment of it; and their concern to protect the welfare of local residents and businesses is clear to see and underscores the value of the neighbourhood planning process.</p> <p>There is no argument in this review with the general sentiments of the Plan, but we have highlighted where the Plan could be strengthened.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>Particular amendments will be considered individually</p>
39	p.7	<p>POSE report: 5.2</p> <p>A stated purpose of the Plan is to actively plan for new sympathetic development whilst protecting those parts of the Parish that are important to its character and function. A Plan is wanted that will ‘future-proof’ Croxley Green (para. 2.2 above). Yet policies give greater priority it seems to the preservation of character across the Parish than to the careful control of known development opportunities. Those are generally relegated to aims that are likely to be of limited effect.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This reflects the tension between the community’s desire to protect and enhance the character of the parish and the lack of suitable land for development or redevelopment without fundamentally changing the character or appearance of the existing development.</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>Particular amendments will be considered individually</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
40	p.51	<p>This is the case in respect of both residential developments coming forward in which the community has no particular interest other than in securing good design, such as the Metropolitan Line extension surplus land, and those such as the Croxley Station development and the creation of a village centre where the community has a considerable stake in the outcomes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This suggests an opportunity to influence the development of the three key sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed new secondary school • The Croxley station land • Killingdown Farm estate 	<p>Plan and appendices have been revised to achieve the proposed approach</p>
41		<p>POSE report: 5.3</p> <p>The Parish Council should not be deterred from policy making in these areas simply because it does not have the statutory powers of TRDC and the Highway Authority and it requires their support to achieve community objectives. The aims should be converted to policies that set out clear requirements.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Where there are specific suggestions for amendments these will be considered individually.</p>	<p>Plan and appendices have been revised to achieve the proposed approach</p>
42		<p>Where there is uncertainty as to exactly what is required on a site in terms of the balance of land uses, and where there is uncertainty regarding viability, a policy may require the preparation of a master plan or planning brief prior to the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>This should compel the landowner, the LPA and the Highway Authority to be engaged with the Parish Council and sign up to a programme of such work and to consider any funding requirements.</p> <p>It may be a simple matter of resources and that an adjustment to timing and the apportionment of funding responsibilities will secure their commitment.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>A policy to require a master plan or planning brief that addresses the key concerns of the Community.</p> <p>Which are.....</p>	<p>The allocations have been added to the proposals in chapter 6 Sections 6.2, 6.3 & 6.4</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
43		<p>POSE report: 5.4</p> <p>Conferring a higher priority in the Plan to the control of development itself is not to give lower priority to the conservation of local character and improvements to the design of new buildings and extensions. The thorough Character Area assessments provide a firm basis for that.</p>	Noted with thanks	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>Particular amendments will be considered individually</p>
44		<p>The Character Area assessments identify some excellent examples of streets and individual buildings that have largely retained their original character and careful and detailed design control by reference to a design guide may be justified.</p> <p>However, expectations should not be raised too high in other less distinctive areas where a degree of latitude is normally exercised.</p>	Noted with thanks	Plan and appendices have been revised to achieve the proposed approach.
45		<p>Para. 60 of the NPPF says</p> <p><i>“Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>These may be useful words of guidance to be incorporated in the Plan and Appendices</p>	Plan and appendices have been revised to achieve the proposed approach.

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
46		<p>POSE report: 6.1</p> <p>The Croxley Green community has put an enormous amount of effort into creating the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting appendices. With suitable amendment the Plan is capable of employing strong and locally nuanced policies that will complement very well those of the District Council.</p> <p>That will ensure new development is sustainable, supports or improves local social infrastructure and complements those elements of local character that are special. The Parish and District Councils will find that the additional time taken to so amend the Plan will be time well spent.</p>	Noted with thanks	No specific amendment required. Particular amendments will be considered individually.
47		Overall: A very comprehensive and detailed piece of work, providing a wealth of information about the area in which we are fortunate enough to live, as well as providing a well-argued framework for guiding future development	Accepted with thanks	No specific amendment required
48		<p>Resident:</p> <p>I feel that in some places, the respective purposes of the Plan Document and the Appendices have become mixed, with some statements in the Plan which might be more at home in the Appendices and vice-versa, and with some straight-forward duplication.</p> <p>I have not attempted to list these, particularly as I recognise some overlap is inevitable, but feel some clean-up would be helpful.</p>	Noted but difficult to respond to a general point	Contents and layout revised following comments from the independent professional reviewer
49		<p>Resident:</p> <p>I'd like to offer my thanks to the Parish Council and especially those members directly involved in this significant and very worthwhile initiative.</p>	Accept with thanks	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
50	p.36	<p>Resident:</p> <p>See comment about new Appendix listing impending developments which may be cause for concern.</p> <p>p.36 Land Use Policies</p> <p>Should there be a short Appendix listing planning proposals causing immediate concern?</p> <p>Croxley Danes School, the risk of housing being ‘imposed’ on part of the site, and the impending traffic management arrangements which are going to be required might be included in such an appendix</p>	Noted	<p>The allocations have been included in section 6 of the Plan with specific policies in each case:</p> <p>6.2 Proposed school site</p> <p>6.3 Killingdown Farm</p> <p>6.4 Croxley Station</p>
51		<p>Harvey Road School</p> <p>First, can I say what a good document you and your team have put together with regards the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan. Its purposes and aims are clear and show a drive towards improving the already well presented Croxley Green that we have.</p>	Accept with thanks	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
52		<p>Environment Agency: Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan for Croxley Green. We aim to reduce flood risk, while protecting and enhancing the water environment. Together with Natural England, English Heritage (now Historic England) and the Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning. This sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into neighbourhood plans. I have attached a copy for your information. Please note that some of the hyperlinks have changed since the advice was published and the advice is now available on Gov.uk</p>	<p>Noted Joint advice document “planning for the environment at the neighbourhood level Topics covered: Improving local heritage within the community Adapting to climate risks and creating open space Reducing flood risk and improving water quality Reducing fuel bills and using local resources wisely Information sources Environmental assessment (SEA & HRA, sustainability assessments and EIA</p>	<p>Check with Three Rivers DC that SEA, HRA, sustainability assessment and EIA are NOT required for CGPC Neighbourhood Plan (Mr Clerk)</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
53		<p>Resident:</p> <p>Aesthetics:</p> <p>Croxley Green is neither a Broadway (Worcs) nor a Godshill (IOW) and many extensions and alterations that may have been previously implemented now seem to offend the aesthetics of the Parish Council.</p> <p>I feel a more pragmatic tone to some of the opinions on detrimental developments, e.g. New Road, Yorke Road etc, may keep on-board some residents who may be affronted by them. In some areas what's done is done and it's 'damage limitation' if necessary.</p> <p>Given five sixths of the households are owner occupiers, approx 4415 of the 5300, most would have improved their properties, in good faith, using the then current designs and/or materials blissfully unaware of falling foul of the future Neighbourhood Plan!</p>	<p>Noted (and agree with the substance)</p> <p>Objective of Neighbourhood Plan is to limit the future damage, not to force residents to modify their existing properties back to some sort of "time capsule" standard.</p> <p>Therefore no specific changes</p>	<p>No specific change required</p>
54		<p>Resident:</p> <p>Trees:</p> <p>Has the Parish Council got a tree fetish! There are some very attractive hanging baskets, flower tubs etc. around the village as well as laid out front gardens without the required tree features. I don't remember too many lost trees along the footpaths of New Road over the last 60 or so years (re Appendix page 31 B.5.3). Granted where trees currently reside in streets and on the Green we should look to manage them but a few 'where appropriate' in the text would lessen the impression that the Parish Council will embark on an offensive to get resident's to plant trees in their front gardens and in 'barren' streets.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The point about trees is that they provide a great deal of "greenery" from a relatively small area of land take, and are visible from a distance.</p> <p>The existing trees provide a great deal of the semi-rural appearance of Croxley Green – they need to be conserved and replaced (and protected using TPO where they are of particular value)</p>	<p>Appendix E has been modified</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
55		Sea Cadets: This is a really good piece of work, in my view, and will be very helpful to the residents' understanding of what the village has in hand.	Accept with thanks	No specific change required
56		Sea Cadets: But apart from these minor points – good work by Wendy and the team! I look forward to the final version.	Accept with thanks	No specific change required
57		WDRA: The basic objectives of the Plan are to be commended although when the final decisions on important projects such as the proposed new school at the bottom of Baldwins Lane are taken, a higher authority overrides any local views and decisions. In the future we suspect this Plan will suffer the same fate.	Noted The Neighbourhood Plan can only ever be one part of the whole panoply of statute and guidance.	new section 6.2 in Part 6 setting out Parish Council views
58		WDRA Maintaining the approach to Croxley Green (Scots Hill) As one approaches Croxley via Scots Hill there is a grass verge between Copthorne Road and the parade of shops. This was a neat grass verge containing spring bulbs and wild flowers. It is now overrun with brambles. The first impression of Croxley when approached from this direction would be greatly enhanced if this was cleared of brambles and maintained appropriately as it was some years ago.	Noted This is not specifically a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan Possibly an issue for the E&A committee to consider further	Mr Clerk to bring comments to the attention of the E&A committee
60		Resident: supports the aims of the neighbourhood plan	Noted	No specific amendment required
61		TRM Firstly may I congratulate and thank all concerned with its production – a massive amount of work very well done.	Accept with thanks	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
62		<p>CGRA</p> <p>You will be aware that the CGRA fully supports the notion of producing a Neighbourhood Plan and we are pleased to see that work undertaken jointly by the Parish Council and the CGRA in completing a Community Plan questionnaire 3 years ago has been utilised in the preparation of this document.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
63		<p>CGRA</p> <p>We approve the format of the document, the overall clarity of presentation and are, generally, in agreement with the content.</p> <p>We understand this is a document that will exist alongside the TRDC Planning Policy documentation and will accentuate local requirements of the community in Croxley Green.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
64		<p>CGRA</p> <p>With this being a forward thinking document we have considered what may happen next by way of planned development and have taken into account key phrases associated with the Plan that include:</p> <p>“local people”</p> <p>“control over the future of the Parish”</p> <p>“sympathetic development” and</p> <p>“protecting character and function”</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
65		<p>CGRA</p> <p>The Policies, Aims and Proposals in the Plan should be locally distinctive are arise from the characteristics of the neighbourhood and aspirations from the Community.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
66		CGRA Specifically the Plan should be used to emphasise the importance of:	Noted	No specific amendment required
67	p.53	CRGA (a) securing the former Durrants School playing field (adjacent to Little Green School) as recreational land that serves a growing community	Noted Requires further amendment	Text amended 5.6.2, 6.2.2, AIM PRO7
68	p.41	CRGA (b) safeguarding and perhaps increasing allotment land and	Noted Requires further amendment	New AIM RO3 “protection of allotments”
69		CGRA (c) ensuring the non-build area of the Horses Field, Baldwins Lane remains as Green Belt, whether as school grounds or general recreational land.	Noted Requires further amendment	Section 6.2 added with specific policies
70	pp. 46 47	CGRA We fear that the character of north Croxley Green, or rather its predominantly “green” aspect, could completely deteriorate by way of a domino effect unless its charm and rural nature is emphasised in this document.	Noted pp 46/47 of the plan Requires further amendment	To be strengthened – A bit more on street trees and an aim, with other parties, to preserve a distinct boundary to the settlement
71		CGRA Equally the document should not fall the document should not fall into the trap of unnecessarily highlighting inappropriate development sites for those who wish to acquire land for future property development, for inclusion in the next round of TRDC Site Allocations Planning. The Plan will be a valuable source of information for prospective developers as well as for local residents.	Noted	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
72		<p>CGRA</p> <p>Having designed a document that includes photographs to illustrate and support key factors I consider the main document should feature more photographs of the adjacent rural area that encircles the urban area (there are many spots where dwellings can be photographed with significant rural backdrop).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>pp 46/47 of the plan</p> <p>Requires further amendment</p>	<p>Include something on the boundary walk and the importance of the district boundary & rural setting</p>
73		<p>CRGA</p> <p>One of the advantages of having the Boundary Walk around the Parish is that it accentuates the feeling of living in a community within a defined green boundary and is so important in making Croxley Green such a sought after community in which to live, work and commute from. The document should make more of this important asset.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Additional paragraph about importance of the green boundary on page 9 (Plan) and page 17 (appendix)</p>	<p>Add Boundary walk to Appendix B</p>
74		<p>CGRA</p> <p>As currently presented the balance of rural / urban photographs do not accurately reflect the Land Use statistical diagram on page 11 where Greenspace accounts for 50% of Croxley Green and the overall look of the document doesn't provide an overall view, for me, of the community in which I live.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Review photos for additional greenery</p>	<p>Additional photos and text to reflect the balance</p>
75		<p>Resident:</p> <p>A comprehensive plan for Croxley, well researched</p>	<p>Accept with thanks</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
76		<p>Resident:</p> <p>A balanced report but Croxley must make its contribution to the housing crisis. We must not be NIMBYs</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But there is a lack of suitable development land within the current Parish Boundary without breaching current planning restraints such as village green, common land, Green Belt, etc. and whilst still providing adequate space for recreation, both formal and informal.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
77		<p>TfL (TP)</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL) on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>As you will know TfL has a direct interest in the area due to the Metropolitan Line Extension as a new transport project as well as other associated development opportunities. I enclose a response prepared by TfL Planning that reflects TfL’s transport planning, project delivery, operations and infrastructure interests. A separate response will be prepared by TfL Property to reflect TfL’s commercial development interests as a landowner of potential development sites.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
78		<p>TfL (Property)</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Transport for London (TfL) on the draft Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The following comments represent the views of officers in Transport for London Commercial Development Property team (TfL Property) in its capacity as a significant landowner and does not form part of the TfL corporate response.</p> <p>Our colleagues in TfL Planning have provided a separate response regarding TfL wise operational and planning / policy matters</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Not part of the TfL corporate response</p>	<p>Parish Council has replied to TfL (Property)</p>

Section 1 – Context

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.7	<p>CGRA: 1.1.2</p> <p>This paragraph refers to an opportunity for people to have control over the future of the Parish etc. and point 1.1.7 refers to our vision for the “village. I wonder if it’s appropriate at this point to make reference to the Parish Council obtaining ownership of land in Croxley Green that is owned by TRDC so as to achieve these aims?</p> <p>It would be a start pointing for a concerted effort by the Parish Council, supported by the local community. The Community Plan survey results demonstrated a high level of local community support for the notion and its evidence gained in such a survey that carries significant weight in the negotiating process.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Land ownership is not a material consideration in planning terms</p> <p>The Parish Council is seeking control over public land by transfer</p> <p>Not relevant to this document</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
3	p.8	<p>HCC Map</p> <p>The map included in the policy document is not marked with the required attribution statement.</p> <p>Because it reproduces OS Licenced Data the map (p8) should show the following attribution statement which includes your PSMA Member Licence number: © Crown copyright and database rights 2016 OS EUL 100043947”</p> <p>Guidelines can be found here: https://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/business-and-government/help-and-support/public-sector/guidance/</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>To be amended (Mr Clerk)</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
4	p.8	CGRA There is a Green Belt map on page 8 but the document doesn't reflect the nature of the Parish or illustrate, as is mentioned in 1.2.5 on page 9, that the top two priorities for local community are protecting and maintaining our open spaces and woodland.	Noted Additional paragraph about importance of the green boundary on page 9 (Plan) and page 17 (appendix)	Plan paragraph 1.2.6: new "High Level Aspiration" added Appendix B.1.4 and sentence added to
5	p.9	CGRA footnote 2 Long Valley Wood and Buddleia Walk was designated a new Village Green in September 2007 (not December 2015). I believe the reference to 2015 is in respect of the registration of certain Rights of Way in and around the new Village Green.	Agreed	Amended
6	p.9	Resident: 1.2.3 (and elsewhere) Don't agree losing its distinctive character. Settlements evolve, is any place distinctive? Slow demographic changes will alter community	Noted Valid point of view, but Neighbourhood Plan seeks to support sympathetic and appropriate development whilst conserving the essential character of Croxley Green	No specific amendment
7	p.10	CGRA Objectives. The final objective includes "...and to enable those engaged in services and working independently in the village" and I consider there is text missing. What are these people to be enabled to do?	Agreed Suggest change "enable" to "support"?	Amended

Section 2 – About Croxley Green

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.11	POSE: 2.7 The Plan includes a fulsome description of the history, character and demographics of Croxley Green, all of which is well presented and very informative (section 2). It should contribute very well to the evidence required in support of policy making.	Noted with thanks	No amendment required
2	p.11	CGRA 2.1.3 Most of the woodland is common land....? As far as I’m aware from my legal dealing with the Village Green Public Enquiry only The Green has “common” rights. Woodland with public access is in the ownership of TRDC, London Underground /TfL, Howarth Homes and other private parties.	Agreed	Amended
3	p.11	Environment Agency 2.1 Natural Environment Flood Zone 2 & 3: Where any development is proposed in areas of flood zone 2 and 3. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 100-102, we recommend the Sequential Test is undertaken when allocating sites to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk. The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). We would have concerns if development is allocated in this high risk flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.	Noted This reads like “boilerplate” text (and not applicable to the majority of Croxley Green which is built above the flood plains) but we probably need to include some minimum guidance on flood risk procedures and areas within Croxley Green – perhaps a paragraph?	Sentence added to 2.1.2 referring to zones 2-3 with footnote referring to establishing whether a proposed development is a flood risk. In addition, the Environment Agency’s advice is quoted in full in Appendix B Paragraph B.10.6 and footnote references added in Section B.2 and B.13

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
4	p.11	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>It is important that your Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with these sites can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward.</p> <p>The Local Authority will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from surface water flood risk (including groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. The Surface Water Management Plan will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.</p>	Noted	This advice quoted in full in Appendix Paragraph B.10.6
5	p.11	<p>Environment Agency</p> <p>2.1 Natural Environment</p> <p>Watercourses</p> <p>The River Gade, Colne & Chess runs adjacent to/ through the neighbourhood plan area. Developments within or adjacent to these watercourses should not cause further deterioration under the Water Framework Directive and should seek to improve the water quality based on the recommendations of the Thames River Basin Management Plan.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>We probably need to include some minimum guidance on water quality management within Croxley Green – perhaps a paragraph?</p>	Brief text on water quality inserted in paragraph 2.1.2
6	p.12	<p>CGRA</p> <p>2.1.4</p> <p>Common Moor is famous for its unusual flora and <i>fauna</i></p>	Agreed	Amended
7	p.13	<p>Resident:</p> <p>figure caption</p> <p>“Yorke Road School now converted to 5 houses”</p> <p>should be 4 dwellings</p>	Agreed	Amended

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
8	p.13	CGRA The caption for the Yorke Road School photo - “now converted to 4 houses.....”.	Agreed	Amended
9	p.14	Resident: 2.4.1 State the population e.g. ‘...the 2011 Census, the population of Croxley Green was 12562. This increased by....’ This is stated in Appendix 5 but is appropriate here.	Agreed	Amended
10	p.15	CGRA 2.3.4 refers to New Road comprising the “Village Centre”. Whilst I concur with this description, TRDC does not. Its Site Allocation Local Dev. Document (SALDD) November 2014 lists Croxley Green (Watford Road) as our local Retail Centre. I think there’s a need for the Parish Council to align with TRDC Core Strategy Policy CP7 whilst ensuring that our local Retail Centre and Village Centre are one and the same – New Road. I consider that this point, in a nutshell, highlights just why a Neighbourhood Plan is needed and just how a higher local authority can document a perception that is not in keeping with local knowledge of the area.	Noted Site Allocation Local Dev. Document (SALDD) November 2014 lists Croxley Green (Watford Road) and New Road as our local Retail Centre. Neighbourhood Plan will complement and update the SALDD document	Added text in para 2.3.4 clarifying differences between the two “local retail centres” with cross reference to Appendix D
11		Resident: p.19 2.6.6 “employment is also provided also in retail premises....	Agreed	Amended

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
12	p.20	<p>Harvey Road School</p> <p>2.7 Vehicle ownership, etc.</p> <p>The reason for my email is that I thought you might like to know Chris Lloyd (District Councillor) has successfully managed to gather together a team of people ranging from local police officers to Headteachers and governors to review what can be done to reduce the real and perceived risk young people currently face by the level of traffic in the area.</p> <p>Although this does not alter your plan this action group are reviewing an area covered by it and for that reason the outcomes of this group may be of interest to you and your team.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>As stated, does not alter the plan</p>	<p>Include concerns about traffic generation from development of proposed new Croxley Danes school in section 6</p>
13	p.20	<p>Resident</p> <p>2.7.1</p> <p>Mention the number of public car parking spaces available in Croxley maybe split by time restricted and unrestricted.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This information is not readily available, and will change over the Plan period</p> <p>Also TRDC intends to carry out a parking study. Depending on the progress of the study, might be possible to make further amendments</p>	<p>No specific amendment</p>
14	p.21	<p>Resident</p> <p>2.7.5</p> <p>restricted bus services also affect those without a car especially the elderly who may feel ‘trapped in the village’.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amended</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
15	p.21	TfL (TP) 2.6.7 (sic) TfL welcomes the references to the Metropolitan Line Extension (formerly Croxley Rail Link) project. In section 2.6.7 the opening date needs to be amended to read that the extension is expected to open in late 2020 rather than 2018.	Agreed Amend paragraph number to 2.7.4 Amend date to 2020	Amended

Section 3 - Objectives, Policies and Aims

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.10 p.24	POSE report: 4.2 (a) The Plan uses the term “aims” in two different ways: firstly, in the widely understood sense of a high level aspiration from which a set of objectives will flow (described in para. 2.6 above). Secondly, it is stated by the Parish Council, as a non-planning policy (described in para. 2.8 above).	Noted This approach is based on the adopted Chalfont St Peter Neighbourhood Plan Accept that there could be some confusion between the high level aspirations and the non-planning policies.	Terms amended Explained in 3.1.1
2	p.10 p.24	However, the use of the term is made more confusing by the fact that a number of these detailed aims do in fact refer to land use planning matters. This ambiguity should be removed by reserving the term for the well understood meaning of a high level aspiration and finding a different expression for non-planning statements of encouragement or intent. This will improve the fit between policies in the Plan and the NPPF and TRDC development plan policies. Clarification in the use of the term “aims” will also improve the legibility of the Plan as a whole.	Noted A different term will be found High level aspiration on page 10 Land use planning policies Non-planning related aims As per adopted Chalfont St Peter plan	Terms amended Explained in 3.1.1

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
3	p.10 p.24	POSE report: 4.3 The Aims in the NP are a difficulty – as presented, they have the appearance of policies but are not and should be dropped from the NP or included within the supporting text as matters for action elsewhere, such as advice in a design guide. Alternatively, and with sufficient evidence, some may be elevated to policy.	Noted Those that may be adopted as policies will be promoted as such. Those that cannot will be rephrased appropriately	Policies and Aims reconsidered and amended

Section 4 - Designation of Character Areas

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.25	POSE report Section 4.0 of the Plan describes how the Parish has been divided into 8 urban and 4 rural “Character Areas”. These are described in full in Appendix B of the Plan, which is a body of careful and well-illustrated work that should provide useful evidence in support of some of the policies and provide general assistance to those involved in the preparation and determination of planning applications.	Noted with thanks	No specific amendment required
2	p.25	Resident Map a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area	Agreed Map to be amended	Map being amendment

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
3	p.25 et seq	CGRA Designation of Character Areas. I'm firmly of the opinion that The Green and Scots Hill (Area 2) should be designated as separate areas. The Green is the most distinctive area of Croxley Green and, in the absence of a definition, it is a rural area. I would also consider adding Stones Orchard to title of the Area 2 description.	Noted The Green itself is most certainly rural, but the adjacent developments are suburban in nature. The Conservation Area includes the adjacent properties, the Character Area extends the scope somewhat without detracting from the Conservation Area status	Add Stones Orchard to title Add Windmill Estate to title
4	p.25 et seq	CGRA If Area 2 is to remain intact I consider a greater distinction should be made between the rural character of The Green and the rest of Area 2.	Noted Remains as one area but explain the differences between the conservation area and the character area in the Appendix	Revise appendix (KAG)
5	p.25 et seq	CGRA Finally on this point, The Green is iconic, our significant landmark, and there should be more photos (including a good aerial photo) showing the entirety of The Green, its openness and how well maintained it is (courtesy of the Parish Council).	Noted with thanks Would need an up to date good quality aerial photograph	Mr Clerk to search for suitable source / provider at reasonable cost
6	p.25 et seq	TfL (Property) et seq. Character areas TfL Property supports the exclusion of the Baldwin's Lane site from the Rural Character Area of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted But unacceptable to the majority of local residents	Parish Council has written to TfL property setting out the revised policy for the Baldwin's Lane proposed school site

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
7	p.25 et seq	TfL (Property) et seq. Character areas This approach would be consistent with the adopted Three Rivers District Council Local Plan, which has removed the southern part of the site from its Green Belt designation	Noted Factually inaccurate – only for educational purposes	Parish Council has written to TfL (Property) setting out the revised policy for the Baldwin’s Lane proposed school site
8	p.25 et seq	TfL (Property) Character areas For clarity, the exclusion of this site should also be made clear on the associated Character Area map which currently labels this site as part of Area 12	Disagree Map to be amended Site to remain within Area 11 (River Gade, Canal, Cassiobridge & Common Moor)	Importance of this area in fulfilling the functions of the Green belt to divide settlements (Watford & Croxley Green) emphasised in section 6.2.4 6.2.4 modified to emphasise gap between Watford & Croxley Green B.13.3 amended
9	p.26	Resident Area 6 Winton Drive, Bartons Way and Baldwins Lane. Should be Barton	Agreed	Amended
10	p.26	Resident Area 6 Barton Way, no S as in stated Bartons Way.	Agreed	Amended
11	p.26	TfL (Property) 4.2.1 The comment relating to the application of Development Management Policies at the planning stage is acknowledged, but should specify the <i>Three Rivers District Council Development Management policies</i>	Agreed	Amended

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
12	p.26	<p>CGRA 4.2.1</p> <p>Requires re-wording. In respect of the “Horses Field” only the build area of the new school has been taken out of the Green Belt (as per the TRDC SALDD, Nov 2014). The issue of playing fields for the school has yet to be determined and playing fields for the school may even be located outside of the Parish.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>We do NOT want to exclude the Baldwins Lane School site from the rural character area (Area 11)</p>	<p>Point has been clarified in 4.2.1 modified with extra sentence and 4.2.2</p> <p>Policy PRO2 modified.</p> <p>6.2.2 and 6.2.3 added and cross referred to new High Level Aspiration.</p> <p>Also covered in amended B.13.3</p>
13	p.26	<p>CGRA 4.2.1</p> <p>Reference to this key fact demonstrates that the Horse Field remains as a distinct physical feature that looms over Croxley Green, acting as a green barrier that does precisely the job that land in a Green Belt should do as per government Planning Policy. For these reasons I consider that the Horses Field and adjacent rural land should be either designated as a separate Area or incorporated into and named in the title of an existing Area.</p>	<p>Importance of field as green belt agreed.</p> <p>Difficult to create a separate new character area.</p> <p>Identify it as an element within character area 11 (the Canal) as “Cassiobridge”</p>	<p>Title of Area 11 has been amended</p> <p>Also 6.2.4</p>
14	p.26	<p>TfL (Property) 4.2.1</p> <p>It is noted that the Baldwins Lane site is currently allocated within the Three Rivers District Council Site Allocations Local Development Document (SALDD) (2014) (ref: S(b)) for educational purposes</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But only a part of the site has been excluded from the Green Belt</p> <p>This needs to be clarified</p>	<p>Cassiobridge remains in Area 11</p> <p>Killingdown remains in Area 2</p> <p>Status of sites is clarified in section 6</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
15	p.26	<p>TfL (Property) 4.2.1</p> <p>Having regard for the adopted SALDD, and the comments made within the Planning Inspectorate’s final report following its examination of the document, TfL Property remains of the view that, in the event that the site is not developed for such a use (either fully or partly), it could be developed for alternative uses, particularly housing.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But wholly unacceptable to local residents</p>	<p>Cassiobridge remains in Area 11 as the majority remains Green Belt.</p> <p>Status of sites is clarified in section 6 by reference to the Inspector’s Report in paras 6.2.2 and 6.2.3</p> <p>Parish Council has written to TfL (Property) setting out the revised policy for the Baldwin’s Lane proposed school site</p>
16	p.26	<p>CGRA 4.2.1</p> <p>The former Durrants School playing field (referred to in the document latterly as former playing fields to the west of Little Green School) is a huge area that has been included in Area 9.</p> <p>The full title of Area 9 should be Copthorne Wood, Parrots Dell, Killingdown Farm and Former Durrants School Playing Field. The latter has to be included in the title to highlight its importance as a future recreational area that supports the expanded development of Croxley Green, thus supporting the aim referred to on page 41 5.6 Recreational Open Spaces Policies.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Area renamed “Copthorne Wood, Parrots Dell and surrounding Fields and Farms”</p> <p>The former playing fields remain as part of the rural area 9, as they remain part of the green belt.</p> <p>Point clarified in section 6.5.3</p>
17	p.26	<p>TfL (TP) 4.2.2</p> <p>TfL notes the designation of the existing Metropolitan Line rail corridor as rural character area 10 in 4.2.2, the further reference to it in policy CA2 and the inclusion of Baldwins Lane railway bridge and Cassiobury railway bridge in the list of important buildings and structures in policy CA3. Policies CA1, CA2 and CA3 seek to conserve and enhance these character areas.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
18	p.26	CGRA 4.2.2 Area 12 should be more accurately identified as: Croxley Hall Woods, Long Valley Wood and the Buddleia Walk – for the purposes of describing a large publicly accessible area which falls into public and private ownership over which the strongest possible legal rights of public use have been obtained. Within Area 12 the new village green is registered in the name of Long Valley Wood and the Buddleia Walk.	Noted	Amended
19	p.26	CGRA 4.2.2 Finally on Rural Character Areas, I consider the document should make reference to the Open Space designations given by TRDC (new editions referred to in the TRDC SALDD November 2014) to specific areas of Croxley Green.	Noted Checked with the TRDC SALDD	Amended 4.1.1 and 4.1.2. Appendix H added
20	p.27	Resident photo is there a picture of the lock without the graffiti on the gate?	Agreed	Replacement photograph (Wendy Jordan)

Section 5 - The Development Management Policies

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.28	<p>CGRA</p> <p>5.1 Character Area and Heritage Policies.</p> <p>The second paragraph of text states that “Much of the new housing built over the last decade consists of gated communities. This is not the case. The Durrants and Woodland Chase developments aren’t gated. Gated developments have arisen precisely because of the absence of a document such as a Neighbourhood Plan and this is a good example as to why a Neighbourhood Plan should be published matter of urgency.</p>	Noted	Amended
2	p.28	<p>Resident</p> <p>5.1 2nd bullet ‘...for the Parish’s needs....’</p> <p>How and where are these needs defined and how have they been agreed, or how will they be agreed in future as they evolve? I could not find anything about this on-going process.</p>	<p>Good question</p> <p>Process is part of the planning system – Neighbourhood Plan will be reviewed in due course (when it no longer reflects the views of the Parish)</p>	Parish needs are described in the following policies especially in Sections 1.2.5 and 1.2.6 and 5.1 and 5.2
3	p.28	<p>Resident</p> <p>5.1 3rd bullet (and elsewhere)</p> <p>An aspect of infill development which does not seem to be covered is the erection of large detached buildings in back gardens, which can completely change the character of the spaces between dwellings. While (as I understand it) planning permission may not be required for even quite large single story detached buildings, I suggest this Plan should explicitly mention under ‘extensions’ large [to be defined] sheds, garages, greenhouses, workshops and other outbuildings in back gardens.</p>	<p>Good point</p> <p>Discouraging infill / back garden development that changes the character of on area</p> <p>As these are permitted development rights, cannot be controlled though the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>Would require an Article 4 direction</p>	<p>Back land development is now specifically contained in policy CA1</p> <p>Permitted development rights to be excluded from new developments in Policy CA1 page 29.</p> <p>In certain cases in the “special streets” CA4 5.1.3 argues for the use of Article 4 directions but this is not yet contained in the Policy.</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
4	p.29	POSE Policy CA1: New development The policy is long and wordy. Policies need to be succinct and easily understood by those who need to implement them.	Noted	CA1 much abbreviated 5.1.1 to 5.1.3 edited and amended
5	p.29	POSE It is recommended that the policy is split into two, as here, one for new development and the other for residential extensions.	Agreed	Policy divided into CA1 new development and CA2 extensions
6	p.29	POSE Some of the points can be kept within the supporting text and cross-referenced design guidance.	Noted	5.1.1 to 5.1.3 edited and amended
7	p.29	POSE The policy relies on the identification of 8 'Urban' and 4 'Rural' Character Areas. They provide useful descriptions of the characteristics of each of the areas so as to better guide and assess development proposals within them.	Noted	No specific amendment required
8	p.29	POSE However, they do not hold the same status as Conservation Areas and, apart from some limited unspoiled localities and views, they are not exceptional.	Noted Agreed, they do not hold the same status as Conservation Areas The point is to encourage sympathetic rather than unsympathetic development	Introduced policy CA4 to clarify this point

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
9	p.29	<p>POSE</p> <p>The national policy requirement for development to conserve and enhance is restricted to historic environments and would be onerous on development in the Character Areas, except where there may be clear opportunities to improve run down or derelict areas, which would need specific policy justification in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The draft policy would benefit from replacing the word ‘preserve’ with ‘conserve’ to be consistent with CP12 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Accept the suggested amendment</p>	<p>Replace “preserve” by “conserve”</p>
10	p.29	<p>POSE</p> <p>Draft Policies CA1 and CA2 need consistency in terminology ‘preserve’/ ‘conserve’.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Replace “preserve” by “conserve”</p>
11	p.29	<p>POSE</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that “preserve” is replaced with “conserve” and that the onerous requirement to “enhance” is omitted other than in specified places where there is an acknowledged need for enhancement.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Disagree that “enhance” needs to be onerous, but accept that it may require clarification</p>	<p>Modify “enhance” to clarify the requirement for sympathetic rather than unsympathetic development</p> <p>“harmonious” rather than “inharmonious” development</p>
12	p.29	<p>POSE</p> <p>Blanket resistance to pastiche and eclectic design is unlikely to succeed other than in the most architecturally coherent streets.</p> <p>The policy should not preclude bespoke, innovative architectural designs which may, on occasion, involve departing from some of the principles in policy CA1.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy to be reconsidered to achieve the overall objective of harmonious rather than conflicting design.</p> <p>Designers to consider the setting and environs rather than simply re-using designs developed for other settings</p>
13	p.29	<p>POSE</p> <p>Without some tidying up there could be disappointment locally with the effectiveness of the policy.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks</p> <p>Tidying up and tightening up to aid clarity in application</p>	<p>Policy divided into CA1 & CA2</p> <p>Policies CA1, CA2 and CA4 amended</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
14	p.29	POSE Policy CA1: Extensions The ability of development to meet all the criteria as set out in CA1 will need to be determined on an individual scheme basis and during the planning application stage process.	Noted	Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended
15	p.29	POSE Flat roofs may be appropriate in some cases, therefore suggest revising the wording by replacing 'totally' with 'generally' and deleting the word 'except' and replacing with 'for example on small dormers on front or side extensions.	Noted	Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended
16	p.29	POSE Some weight can be attributed to Draft CA1 however there is inconsistency with both national and local policy.	Noted Needs to reflect national and local policy To be covered in the basic conditions statement	Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended
17	p.29	POSE The policy needs to be reviewed and each requirement should be evidenced as being necessary rather than desirable, and practical in its wording (e.g. front porches which will often project beyond the building line).	Noted Needs to reflect national and local policy To be covered in the basic conditions statement	Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended
18	p.29	Resident Policy CA1 is this a bit contradictory that all existing and new properties respect the old order but unique designs in modern style are perfectly acceptable. This may need some further clarification.	Noted	Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
19	p.29	<p>Resident Policy CA1 also the point about flat roofs should mention be made about them being acceptable on rear extensions as most currently are</p>	<p>Bullet points need to be re-ordered: Box dormers at rear OK Flat roofs at front unacceptable</p>	<p>Policy divided into CA1 & CA2 Policies CA1 & CA2 amended</p>
20	p.29	<p>Resident Policy CA1 While I assume there would not be any intention to prevent home-owners from renting out room(s) if they wish, and while they continue to live on the premises, I believe we should discourage conversion developments and extensions which are designed to turn conventional house / bungalow dwellings into two or more flats, with separate exterior or interior 'front' doors, and where such development is proposed, adequate off-street parking must be provided. In just trying to write this out I recognise that this is probably a fairly tricky area from a wording perspective, but the intention would be to prevent the area being turned into 'bedsit land' or multi-occupancy converted dwellings of a poor standard, which is increasingly (unfortunately) to be found close to many town centres these days.</p>	<p>Noted This is a new policy issue – a District Councillor has expressed a similar view. Check local plan for current wording Decide whether this can be a policy or an aim Main concerns are the character of the area and the provision of off street parking</p>	<p>Conversions added to new policy CA2 and added elsewhere under sustainability policy HO3 and transport safety and parking policy TP2 to ensure appropriate standards and including implications for parking</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
21	p.30	<p>POSE</p> <p>Aim CA1:</p> <p>The guidance in Appendix C provides useful illustrative examples. However, there is no means in regulation to enforce the guidance and achieve the objective of AIM CA1.</p> <p>It has the appearance of a policy, reinforced by the term “directs”, which overstates its importance.</p> <p>It would be acceptable to include in the supporting text a simple statement regarding the desirability of householders following the guidelines in undertaking permitted development, which would be complemented by amending the Guidelines accordingly and circulating them widely.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Needs to reflect national and local policy</p> <p>Accept the suggestions regarding permitted development</p>	<p>Aim CA1 renumber as Aim CA3 and simplified (abbreviated & clarified)</p>
22	p.30	<p>POSE</p> <p>In circumstances where a street or sub area has a high level of consistency in design that is of acknowledged importance, such as a conservation area, the NP could have a policy seeking consideration by the LPA of making an Article 4 Direction to remove certain PD rights and bring those developments under design control.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>NP needs to reflect national and local policy</p> <p>Conservation Areas are already protected (one with an Article 4 direction)</p> <p>Article 4 direction would probably be excessive in most of Croxley Green</p>	<p>Policy CA2 revised as policy CA4 to cover the point.</p> <p>Comment on Article 4 directions included in 5.1.3</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
23	p.31	<p>POSE</p> <p>There would need to be sound evidence that gating is harmful to local character. Design guidance could show examples of good practice in urban design and how development can be integrated into the existing street pattern.</p> <p>However, the case against is stronger if reference is also made to the social dimensions of urban design such as Lifetime Neighbourhoods – see accompanying note on L.B. Harrow’s DMD policies (Appendix 2)</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Can we add anything on design guidance?</p> <p>Can we add anything on social design of urban neighbourhoods?</p>	<p>Policy HO3 modified to include gated communities</p> <p>5.2.5 refers to evidence base</p>
24	p.31	<p>POSE</p> <p>Consideration should be given to changing Aim CA2 into a policy in the context of seeking new residential development that creates inclusive and mixed communities as well as not detracting from the street scene.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Now included as part of Policy HO3</p>
25	p.31	<p>POSE</p> <p>Aim CA2</p> <p>Should the Council actively pursue a policy of encouraging the removal of gates on existing gated developments?</p>	<p>Interesting suggestion, but not directly relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Suggestion to be considered by Parish Council once Neighbourhood Plan is adopted.</p>
26	p.32	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy CA2</p> <p>A detailed assessment of Character Areas is provided in supporting Appendix B. However, no statutory national or local conservation or heritage status is afforded to these particular streets within the identified Character Areas.</p> <p>Therefore the tests to conserve and enhance the character are inconsistent with national and local policy and potentially subject to challenge.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>How about “harmonise sympathetically”?</p>	<p>Policy CA4 revised to conform with national and local policy</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
27	p.32	POSE Draft Policies CA1 and CA2 need consistency in terminology 'preserve' / 'conserve'.	Noted	Policy wording amended for consistency
28	p.32	POSE The Policy might benefit from revised language to highlight specific local design issues to overcome inconsistency with national and local policy. The requirement to "enhance" should be limited to places or sites where there is special justification e.g. an identified shabby building or street view.	Noted	Amended for consistency with national and local policy
29	p.32	Resident Policy CA2. The comment about Yorke Road being a "character area" should be removed as the replacement street lighting installed along the road "indicates it is not in a character area".	Noted This seems to misunderstand the "character area" approach – which differs from a "Conservation Area" approach	No specific amendment required
30	p.32	Resident Aim CA2 (and elsewhere) Agree no gated communities	Noted	Aim has been enhanced to a policy Now included as part of Policy HO3

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
31	p.32	<p>TfL (TP) Policy CA2</p> <p>TfL notes the designation of the existing Metropolitan Line rail corridor as rural character area 10 in 4.2.2, the further reference to it in policy CA2</p> <p>The current primary role of this corridor and the structures along it is to facilitate rail operations and it needs to be explicitly recognised in the policies or explanatory text that this function is likely to require some changes or alterations to the character area and surrounding structures.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Requires clarification in explanatory text</p>	<p>Text amended in Appendix B Area 11 with reference to it from explanatory text in 5.1.3</p> <p>Similar amendments to Appendix B Area 12 (Canal) under different legislation</p>
32	p.32	<p>TfL (TP) Policy CA2</p> <p>The Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) for the Metropolitan Line Extension provides planning powers to construct the Metropolitan Line Extension along part of this corridor. The provisions of the TWAO need to be acknowledged in the policies and supporting justification.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Requires clarification in explanatory text in Appendix</p>	[ditto]
33	pp. 29, 32 & 34	<p>TfL (TP) Policies CA1, CA2 and CA3</p> <p>The application of policies CA1, CA2 and CA3 must be sufficiently flexible to allow for approved changes to rail structures and infrastructure as part of the Metropolitan Line Extension project and also future changes to structures for ongoing running of rail operation</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Requires clarification in explanatory text in Appendix</p>	[ditto]

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
34	pp. 29, 32 & 34	TfL (TP) pp.29, 32 & 34 Policies CA1, CA2 and CA3 When the Metropolitan Line Extension is operational, Watford station will be closed although it will be retained for use as sidings. Policies CA1, CA2 and CA3 should therefore allow for future changes in the use of the northern part of the corridor which may be brought forward.	Noted Needs minor explanatory amendment in Appendix	[ditto]
35	p.33	Resident pictures photo of the railway CA10 is more appropriate as the photo for the canal CA11 and vice versa	Noted Actually need better pictures of the canal and of the railway, not just the structures	Need a character area photo of the railway Wendy Jordan – (from Winton Approach)
37	p.33	POSE Policy CA3 The photographs in the NP show many buildings and structures of quality, making a positive contribution to local character. However, the buildings / structures have no statutory or local protection. Therefore Draft Policy CA3 is too onerous having regard to paragraphs 56 onwards in the NPPF and the guidance provided by adopted local policy on design.	Note Needs to reflect national and local policy To be covered in the basic conditions statement	Policy CA5 amended to align with NPPF
38	p.33	POSE Consideration should be given to requesting the LPA to add as many of the 12 buildings and structures as possible to the list of Locally Important Buildings.	[ditto]	Policy CA5 identifies buildings suitable for future consideration for local listing

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
39	p.34	Resident Policy CA3 Extremely worrying that none of the local pubs and “especially the ones on the Green” will be listed as assets of community value. Wonders whether this has been presented as an option but turned down?	Noted The local pubs are listed in Table LC1 The Artichoke and The Coach & Horses are listed buildings already	The point about “listed buildings” is explained in the justification
40	p.34	Resident Policy CA3 Why is the Sportsman pub not listed in the table of important buildings. believes it should be added to the list.	Noted Sportsman is not a “listed building” Neither does it have special architectural or heritage qualities It is included as a “community asset”	No specific amendment required
41	p.34	Resident Policy CA3 the Canal Bridge at Lock 79 isn’t an original 18C structure, I don’t think – it dates from the opening of the Mill in 1830, and in any case looks like a rather later version of that.	Noted Have a look at the structure and replace the photograph with the lock, not the bridge	Text amended and photograph of adjacent lock inserted Replacement photograph needed
42	p.35	Resident The photo for Old Lodge House is the same property as for Holly Lodge Cottage! Are they a postman’s nightmare, one and the same property?	Noted – wrong photo, change (But still need a better photo)	Correct photo replaced (But still need a better photo)

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
43	p.36	<p>POSE</p> <p>The District Council’s adopted polices require housing proposals to take into account the range of housing needs, in terms of size and type of dwellings as identified by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and subsequent updates.</p> <p>New development will also provide a range of house types and sizes to reflect the existing and future needs of the Three Rivers population and the characteristics of housing in the area.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Evidence in Section 2 of specific imbalances in the stock of available housing, supported by consultation with local estate agents and property surveyors</p>	No specific amendment required
44	p.36	<p>POSE</p> <p>Generally, NP policy should reflect the availability of a range of different products and should not favour one over others, to ensure that some groups are not excluded.</p> <p>An exception would be if there is a recent local evidence base to support the specific needs of the elderly and starter market?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Evidence in Section 2 of specific imbalances in the stock of available housing, supported by consultation with local estate agents and property surveyors</p>	No specific amendment required
45	p.36	<p>POSE</p> <p>However, in order to be practical, the policy should be amended to apply only to development over a threshold number of dwellings.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>As there are very few available larger sites propose to include a threshold of five</p>	Policy amended to include a threshold of five
46	p.36	<p>POSE</p> <p>Also to be mindful of recent consultation on changes to the NPPF which intends to amend the definition of "affordable housing" to include low cost market housing, such as starter homes for sale to first time buyers under the age of 40.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Accept that the national definition of affordable includes lower cost starter homes.</p>	Specifically include the point about “affordable to rent”

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
47	p.36	Resident Objective “...aspirations of the Parish and is suited to its needs” How and where are these aspirations and needs defined and how have they been agreed, or how will they be agreed in future as they evolve? I could not find anything about this on-going process.	Good question Community needs and aspirations established through the survey for the Community Plan, discussion at the Parish Council and consultation with local residents and (in the case especially) local estate agents about the unmet needs in the market	No specific amendment required
48	p.36	Resident Policy HO1 Agree affordable housing critical and a mixture [of housing?].	Noted	No specific amendment required
49	p.36	TfL (Property) Policy HO1 new housing standards should be amended to read: “ <i>subject to viability</i> all new housing proposals...”	Disagree High local land values mean almost any development is viable These are the priorities for the existing community and residents.	No specific amendment required
50	p.36	TfL (Property) Policy HO1 new housing standards TfL Property acknowledge that the NPPF (National Plan Policy Framework) requires boroughs to achieve a mix of housing to reflect the current and future needs of the boroughs population	Noted Neighbourhood Plan seeks to apply NPPF to the specific requirements of the Croxley Green Community	No specific amendment required
51	p.36	TfL (Property) Policy HO1 new housing standards However, a flexible approach should be prescribed due to the location and nature of sites available within the Croxley Green Neighbourhood Plan area and to make the most efficient use of these available development sites	Noted Actually the reverse – due to the very limited opportunities for development, any sites available must be used to meet community priority needs	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
52	p.36	TfL (Property) Policy HO2 new housing standards The approach is consistent with existing adopted policy. However, in October 2015 the Government introduced changes to the Building Regulations to cover the former Lifetime Homes standard and the physical security of dwellings.	Noted with thanks Consequently text needs to be amended	Text has been amended to reflect these changes
53	p.36	POSE Policy HO2 new housing standards Where there is local evidence, policies relating to accessibility, internal space, security and water efficiency, may now require compliance with higher levels of the new national technical standards but those policies must be included in the Local Plan rather than in neighbourhood plans.	Noted with thanks Consequently text needs to be amended	Text has been amended to reflect these changes
54	p.36	POSE Policy HO2 new housing standards This policy should be deleted but the urban design elements of Secured by Design could constitute a new policy - see comments on Aim CS 1 below.	Noted Delete or amend policy HO2	Amended as part of revised policy HO3
55	p.36	TfL (Property) Aim HO1 new housing standards As such, the references to “more than five dwellings” and to “at least two development types” within Aim HO1 should be removed for greater flexibility, whilst still referencing desires to achieve a mixture of dwellings	Disagree Could Aim HO1 be elevated to a policy? c.f. the successful mixed development of the Windmill estate with provision of different sizes of accommodation within a harmonious setting	Amended to form new policy HO4

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
56	p.36	POSE AIM HO1 Affordable housing and housing standards AIM HO1 is generally consistent with adopted policy and guidance, but reference to the Interim London Housing Design Guide should be replaced by reference to National Technical Standards.	Noted Amend reference to National Technical Standards	Reference amended to National Technical Standards
57	p.36	POSE AIM HO1 Affordable housing and housing standards This is a mix of requirements which would be met in different ways. The use of the term “ensure” is not appropriate to advocative policy. The Neighbourhood Plan may encourage carbon neutral and Passivhaus, but only subject to the viability of development. It is suggested that each element of the policy is reviewed and may be dealt with differently.	Noted Consider each element separately	Separated and amended to form parts of new policies HO1, HO2 & HO4
58	p.36	TfL (Property) Aim HO1 energy efficiency TfL Property recommends that the wording relating to energy efficiency requirements in aim HO1 matches that within Policy DM4 of the adopted TRDC Local Plan (Carbon Dioxide Emissions and On-site Renewable Energy), for consistency	Noted but disagree Aim HO1 reflects the community’s wish to aim for a higher standard than the adopted policy DM4	Amended to form new policy HO5 in line with NPPF sustainability objectives
59	p.36	Resident Justification Is the reference to Scotsbridge House too specific to be included in this Plan Doc.	Agreed, particularly as one development proposal has been withdrawn	Specific reference to Scotsbridge House deleted

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
60	p.36	Resident Aim HO1 Agree affordable housing critical and a mixture [of housing?].	Noted	No specific amendment required
61	p.36	Resident Land Use Policies Should there be a short Appendix listing planning proposals causing immediate concern? Croxley Danes School, the risk of housing being 'imposed' on part of the site, and the impending traffic management arrangements which are going to be required might be included in such an appendix	Good suggestion Section 6 has been expanded to include specific policies	Section 6 has been expanded to include specific policies With comments in the relevant parts of the appendices
62	p.37	Resident I feel the last two sentences (diversity of dwellings) warrant their own paragraph	Agreed	Paragraph 5.2.7 has been amended
63	p.37	Resident Policy LC1 '...if it is not economically viable...' seems to weaken the argument, and could be a loophole in the making.	Noted However this is in line with other parts of the adopted local plan	Add text "it can be demonstrated that it is not..."
64	p.37	Resident policy LC1 the policy is a bit 'wordy' could it not be bulleted as Aim H01. There may be others that would benefit from this and aid consistency and readability	Noted Consider bullet style	Amended to bullet style

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
65	p.37	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy LC1 Leisure, community, welfare & health</p> <p>The approach is generally consistent with adopted policy and guidance and the District Council’s approach to protect, retain and enhance existing facilities.</p> <p>Table LC1 provides a useful list of local community assets to inform implementation of the NP policy.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
66	p.37	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy LC1 Leisure, community, welfare & health</p> <p>Suggest change “permit” to “support” since the LPA is the decision maker and ensure that all facilities in Table LC1 have clear records and other evidence of use as leisure, community, welfare or health facilities to ensure inclusion on the list is not challenged.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>How do we secure an evidence base?</p> <p>Refer to PC list of community facilities in use</p>	<p>Amended to “support”</p> <p>Reference to the PC’s “Directory of Clubs, Societies and Groups” added in new para 5.3.2</p>
67	p.37	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM LC1 PC support for social infrastructure</p> <p>The approach is generally consistent with adopted policy and guidance and the District Council’s approach to protect, retain and enhance existing facilities.</p> <p>Table LC1 provides a useful account of local community assets, subject to the above comments.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
68	p.39	<p>Resident</p> <p>Table LC1</p> <p>The Artichoke and the Coach & Horses are not privately owned establishments but part of the national PubCo</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Research on web & at Companies House suggests small private company ownership</p>	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
69	p.39	Sea Cadets Table LC1. Sea Cadets Land is TRDC	Agreed	Amended
70	p.39	Resident Table LC1. Rickmansworth School Scots Hill “ownership of land” HCC. Don’t believe this is correct – believe school has owned this land since becoming grant maintained in 1990	Note the point School asked to clarify. Land was transferred from HCC to the Academy Trust	Amended to Academy Trust
71	p.39	TRM Table LC1 Little Green School is in Lincoln Drive, not Rochester Way	Accept	Amended
72	p.39	CHWAA Table LC1. Confirmed they welcome the proposal to list all Croxley Green allotment sites as ‘community assets’	Accept	No specific amendment required
73	p.40	POSE Policy R1 Protection of retail uses Suggest rewording to say there will be a presumption against the change of use unless the applicants can provide evidence in respect of criteria that would show the use as a shop is no longer viable. Proposed parking and access arrangements will be assessed against the District’s approved standards. (NB Note overlap with policy E1)	Noted <i>“DM13 Parking and Appendix 5: Parking Standards set out the parking requirements for new developments across the District.”</i>	Paragraph 5.4.2 sets out the context for objection on grounds of loss of available parking space below the DM13 requirements

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
74	p.40	<p>CGRA 5.4 refers to New Road comprising the “Village Centre”. Whilst I concur with this description, TRDC does not.</p> <p>Its Site Allocation Local Dev. Document (SALDD) November 2014 lists Croxley Green (Watford Road) as our local Retail Centre.</p> <p>I think there’s a need for the Parish Council to align with TRDC Core Strategy Policy CP7 whilst ensuring that our local Retail Centre and Village Centre are one and the same – New Road.</p> <p>I consider that this point, in a nutshell, highlights just why a Neighbourhood Plan is needed and just how a higher local authority can document a perception that is not in keeping with local knowledge of the area.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SALDD Policy SA4:RETAIL ALLOCATIONS:</p> <p><i>“Retail development will be acceptable in principle within the identified shopping hierarchy of centres:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The Local Centres at Croxley Green (Watford Road and New Road) and Mill End (Moneyhill Parade)”</i> 	<p>No specific amendment required</p> <p>See also section 6.1</p>
75	p.40	<p>Resident Justification</p> <p>Retail policies to include seeking to protect all remaining sub-post offices and pharmacies (?)</p>	<p>Good point</p>	<p>Added to justification</p>
76	p.41	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy E1 Protection of employment uses</p> <p>The Draft policy covers two issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) support for new employment related development and b) resistance to the loss of employment to residential. <p>It may be better to split the policy into a clear a & b accordingly. (The second sentence should be in the justification rather than the policy).</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Policy divided into two new policies RE2 & RE3 and amended to reflect comment</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
77	p.41	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy E1 Protection of employment uses</p> <p>The erection of buildings or the conversion and extension of business premises would need to be considered on a site by site basis having regard to a list of criteria in the policy and any mitigation measures proposed.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Single criterion: “compatibility” with neighbouring properties</p>	<p>Policy RE3 amended to include “compatible with neighbouring properties”</p>
78	p.41	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy E1 Protection of employment uses</p> <p>Resisting the loss or change of use from any A and B Use Classes to residential on grounds of loss of employment, increased parking demand and potential loss of servicing access is more problematic.</p> <p>It might be dealt with by saying there will be a presumption against the change of use unless the applicants can provide evidence that the use for business purposes is no longer viable.</p> <p>It would need to be supported by evidence of the need for employment locally and bearing in mind the strong national planning policy presumption in favour of residential development the local case will need to be a strong one.</p> <p>(There is overlap with policy R1).</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Policy may require amendment</p> <p>May require evidence on the need for employment locally</p> <p>People commute out to work</p>	<p>Retail and employment combined.</p> <p>Policy RE2 amended</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
79	p.41	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM RO1 Recreational land</p> <p>The approach is generally consistent with adopted policy and guidance and the District Council’s approach to protect, retain and enhance existing facilities.</p> <p>Table LC1 provides a useful account of local community assets. However, to afford this level of protection to recreational land would require a policy supported by clear evidence of the need for the open space, existing and proposed.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is an aim, not a policy</p> <p>To convert to a policy would require extensive additional investigation, impractical at this stage of the Plan development.</p>	<p>Relevant extracts from TRDC policies are set out in Appendix H</p>
80	p.41	<p>CGRA</p> <p>5.6 Recreational Open Spaces</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans have to recognize the priority for development and growth but also need to contain policies that emphasise the importance of protecting and enhancing the environmental context of settlements. The maintenance and creation of open spaces and green corridors are important for visual, recreational and biodiversity purposes and I consider that these elements are not adequately represented in the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Open spaces and green corridors belongs with</p> <p>5.11 trees and landscape and</p> <p>5.12 footpaths and public access to the countryside and also</p> <p>Appendix H for TRDC policies</p>	<p>Now 5.9 Trees and Landscape</p> <p>And 5.10 Footpaths and Public Access to the Countryside.</p> <p>Green corridors contained within TRDC policies</p>
81	p.41	<p>CGRA</p> <p>5.6 Recreational Open Spaces</p> <p>Section 5.6 Recreational Open Spaces Policies is woefully short and, in fact, doesn’t include a single policy! Can the Plan be amended to place Recreational Open Spaces Policies amongst 5.11 Trees and Landscape and 5.12 Footpaths and Public access to the Countryside as well as including and expanding upon TRDC open spaces designations and polices?</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>TRDC core strategy and SALDD define designated Open Spaces</p>	<p>Policy LC1 amended</p> <p>New policy RO1</p> <p>Aims RO2 & RO3</p> <p>AIM PRO7</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
82	p.41	<p>CGRA</p> <p>Aim R01</p> <p>I would like to see the Aim expanded to include “.. and <i>well</i> maintained so as to promote recreational use”. This would tie in with the prior statement about the expense of maintenance and maximized use compatible with long term durability.</p>	Noted	Amended
83	p.42	<p>CGRA</p> <p>Photo</p> <p>This photo of allotments is repeated on page 70 of the appendix</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Replace with good quality photo of Barton Way allotments</p>	Picture replaced
84	p.41	<p>CGRA</p> <p>Allotments.</p> <p>There is no mention of allotments in the Plan. Paragraph 9, sub section 1 of Schedule 29 to the Local Government Act 1972 states that if there is a Parish Council then the responsibility for allotments lies with them.</p> <p>Should it not be Parish Council policy, contained within a Neighbourhood Plan, to be responsible for allotment provision and to promote best practice guidance to those responsible for managing allotments?</p> <p>If our allotments should come under threat from property speculators / developers wishing to add them to subsequent TRDC site Allocations then TRDC would first be obliged to refer to the Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But this would be a matter of policy to be resolved as part of the transfer of lands negotiations with TRDC</p> <p>Not a specific land use planning policy issue for the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Specific reference to allotments inserted in 5.5</p> <p>New Aim RO2 added to safeguard allotments</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
85	43	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM TP1 Transportation planning</p> <p>The PC has no control over these matters and will need to petition the Highway Authority to provide funding for the works.</p> <p>Funding is limited and Highway Authority’s policies could be quoted in order that expectations are not raised too high in public consultation on the Plan.</p> <p>Another approach would be to have a policy of carrying out street audits in areas of particular concern, leading to an action plan – it is best to have policies that have an outcome that is at least a step on the way to achieving the objective.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is where the Neighbourhood Plan is straying into Community planning territory.</p> <p>A policy to do something is not a policy that TRDC can apply to proposed developments.</p>	<p>Aim TP1 revised to reflect comments</p>
86	p.43	<p>CGRA</p> <p>5.7 Transport, Road Safety and Parking Policies</p> <p>I consider that thought should be given to including an Aim or Policy to work with TRDC to designate “Quiet Lanes” via the Quiet Lanes and Home Zones (England) Regulations 2006. Consideration should be given to designating Little Green Lane, Green Lane and Rousebarn Lane. By way of examples, see the online versions of the Ringmer and the Albourne Parish Council Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Covered in principle in Aim TP1</p> <p>More of a Community Plan issue, and subject to consultation with the Parish Council and then with the residents.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
87	p.43	<p>Resident:</p> <p>Aim TP1</p> <p>Strengthen to ‘the prevention of pavement parking’</p>	<p>Not practical to do more</p> <p>Pavement parking is a road traffic offence – the issue is about enforcement, not planning.</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
88	p.43	<p>Resident:</p> <p>Aim TP1</p> <p>Agree 20 mph on all roads except Watford Road, Baldwins Lane and roads across The Green</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
89	p.43	TRM Aim TP1 How will restrictions be enforced? Existing restrictions, such as the 30 mph limit across The Green, are continually ignored, subject to only occasional police speed traps.	Noted Speeding can only be controlled by physical measures or sufficient enforcement to be a deterrent. Not a planning matter	No specific amendment required
90	p.43	TRM Aim TP1 And as you must know, current control of commuter parking around Croxley Station is illogical with some roads restricted and other (including Watford Road) not. If it is a serious inconvenience to residents and shoppers (is the extent actually known?) perhaps, if it has not been done already, residents should be consulted regarding a possible CPZ.	Noted TRDC proposes to carry out a parking study across Croxley Green in 2016/17 Any future action is covered by the various Highways and Road Traffic Acts, not planning legislation Therefore not specifically part of the Neighbourhood Plan	No specific amendment required
91	p.43	POSE AIM TP2 Vehicle parking It is not clear what type of parking arrangements are already in place and, as above, the Parish could request parking surveys to identify and plan to resolve particular problems that may be identified.	Noted TRDC proposes to carry out a parking study across Croxley Green in 2016/17 Any future action is covered by the various Highways and Road Traffic Acts, not planning legislation Therefore not specifically part of the Neighbourhood Plan	Aim TP2 amended to reflect comments

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
92	p.44	<p>POSE</p> <p>Policy SF1 Shopfronts & advertising</p> <p>Appendix G provides useful guidance. This may be further supplemented by TRDC forthcoming Design SPD.</p> <p>Most types of advertisements are controlled by the Town and Country Planning Control of Advertisements Regulations 2007 which require all advertisements proposals to be considered on their individual merit, on the basis of amenity and public safety.</p> <p>The policy should be reworded so as not to be unduly restrictive and contrary to the Control of Advertisements Regulations 2007: “All applications for consent for shopfronts and associated advertising should have regard to the Guidelines in Appendix G of the NP”</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Amendment required</p>	<p>Policy SA1 amended in line with comments</p>
92	p.44	<p>HC</p> <p>Policy SF1</p> <p>I would like to see included that no more than 50% of shop glass frontage is covered with advertising. Sometimes shops such as small supermarkets almost completely cover their front glass windows with advertising, which deadens the street scene, means a lack of interaction from within the shop to the outside and deadens the street scene”</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>Minor amendments to appendix G - guidelines</p>
93	p.44	<p>TRM</p> <p>Policy SF1</p> <p>again, how will such a policy be enforced?</p> <p>The banners on the Rickmansworth School fence, for example, are an eyesore</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Parish Council does not have enforcement powers</p> <p>Enforcement would be the responsibility of TRDC</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
94	p.44	CGPC policy SF 1 SHOP FRONTS AND ADVERTISING p.48 aim SF 1 STREET FURNITURE AND STREET TREES	Potentially confusing to have two “SF” acronyms One needs to change Or SFA and SFT	Acronyms amended
95	p.45	POSE AIM FG1 Forecourt parking Whilst the PC recognises the importance of providing adequate off-street parking, it also evidences the harmful visual effects of parking in front gardens. However, the requirement that 25% of a forecourt should be retained as cultivated garden would need to be tested to ensure it was not over-restrictive. The suggestion that tree planting in front gardens could compensate for the loss of street trees should be considered in the context of design guidance – planting trees in close proximity to buildings, walls and footways without adequate root control could be detrimental.	Noted	Minor amendments to clarify text
96	p.45	POSE AIM FG1 Forecourt parking A policy might be appropriate rather than an Aim for those cases that require planning permission, such as the forecourts of flats. It would refer to design guidance, which would also be appropriate to those cases that are permitted development. The Character Areas might provide evidence of specific problem streets.	Noted	Revised policy CA2 includes the implications of proposed conversions on demand for parking provision

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
97	p.45	<p>Sea Cadets</p> <p>Front gardens – I feel rather strongly that removing one’s front garden wall should not automatically give a resident parking rights over the public highway next to which they live. Forecourt parking is overly respected, and is vigorously but inappropriately defended by householders. Aim FG1 could usefully challenge whether the whole forecourt access opened up has to be kept clear for the resident’s private use.</p>	<p>Accept the point</p> <p>However this is a matter of law under the Road Traffic Acts (not a land use planning matter). Therefore not practicable to include in Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>It is illegal to park across a dropped kerb, even if you are the landowner.</p>	No specific amendment
98	p.45	<p>Resident</p> <p>Aim FG1</p> <p>Why only trees and not other such greenery as bushes, plants and flowers.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The point about trees is that they provide a great deal of “greenery” from a relatively small area of land take, and are visible from a distance.</p> <p>The existing trees provide a great deal of the semi-rural appearance of Croxley Green – they need to be protected and replaced</p>	The importance of trees in defining the character of Croxley Green recurs in the Plan and the Appendix
99	p.45	<p>Resident</p> <p>Justification</p> <p>Baldwins Lane has some particular characteristics which I feel warrant mention to help ensure their on-going preservation and good maintenance, namely the grass verges. With continuing traffic growth, and issues of parking, there may be some pressure to increase the width of the carriageway, or (as I have heard recently) to tarmac over some of the grass verges as a prelude to prohibiting on-road parking (i.e. extended double yellow lines).</p>	<p>Accept the point</p> <p>Character Area specific – i.e. for the Appendix</p>	<p>Reference to the quality of the Baldwins Lane verges added to Appendix B Character Areas</p> <p>Para B.8.7 and B.8.8 Special features</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
100	p.45	<p>CGRA</p> <p>5.10 Street furniture and street trees</p> <p>If the objective is to ensure that street furniture is appropriate to the Character Area there should be an aim to work with Herts Highways to ensure that lampposts and signage are sympathetic to their surroundings in terms of design, co-ordination, planning as well as in being cleaned and maintained in a sustained in accordance with an agreed action plan.</p>	Noted	<p>Minor text amendment</p> <p>Text added to 5.10.1 and 5.10.2</p> <p>Aim SF1 amended</p>
101	p.46	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM SF1 Street signs, furniture & trees</p> <p>Implementation of highway signage falls outside of the LPA control and planning process.</p> <p>The AIM would benefit from rewording to the positive, for example, to 'encourage new planting of street trees and shrubs, by legal agreement if necessary, and provide, restore and/or maintain grass verges on public and private streets.</p> <p>Again, a street audit approach might be helpful.</p>	Noted	<p>Aims SF1 and TL2 amended to reflect comments</p>
102	p.46	<p>Resident</p> <p>Aim SF1</p> <p>Trees should also be suitable for front gardens and streets inasmuch they won't have roots that will undermine foundations, walls and pavements e.g. parts of Dickinson's Avenue footpath.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Not strictly undermined – they cause heave, not subsidence, and an uneven surface</p>	<p>Text amended to explain trees should be appropriate for their location and manageable in context</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
103	p.46	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM TL 1 Tree protection & management</p> <p>Unclear how AIM TL1 adds to existing LPA policies and procedures.</p> <p>Veteran trees are given specific protection by tree preservation orders and, together with trees in conservation areas, are subject to special controls which protect them from inappropriate treatment or removal.</p> <p>Guidance in relation to Tree Preservation Orders can be sought from the Council's Landscape Section.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Parish Council well aware of TPO procedures</p>	<p>Minor text amendment to emphasise role of TPO in protecting landscape and character</p>
104	p.47	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM PF 1 Footpaths & bridleways</p> <p>The approach is consistent with adopted policy and guidance and the District Council's approach on Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>However, the matter of ensuring that all new developments include footpaths [and cycleways] connecting into the existing network is an important feature of sustainable development and should be a policy rather than an aim.</p> <p>The policy could usefully highlight important local routes that need to be completed or improved.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Opportunity to convert an aim to a policy</p>	<p>New sustainability policy HO7</p>
105	p.47	<p>Resident</p> <p>Aim PF1</p> <p>I believe the Plan Doc should include a policy to encourage clear ownership of and responsibility for maintaining fences and hedges, so that they do not encroach on footpaths or pavements. This policy should be directed at home-owners and landowners, including small and large institutions.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Responsibility for fences and hedges lies with the adjoining landowner, and is not a planning matter.</p> <p>Therefore not really suitable for a policy (or even an aim) but could be mentioned in explanatory text</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.10.2 amended to explain the point</p>

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
106	p.46	CGPC Aim SF 1 STREET FURNITURE AND STREET TREES p.44 policy SF 1 SHOP FRONTS AND ADVERTISING	Potentially confusing to have two “SF” acronyms One needs to change Or SFT and SFA	Acronyms changed
107	p.46	POSE AIM S1 Domestic energy saving Existing LPA policy and Herts CC guidance applies to new development. However, The Hertfordshire Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Study (2010) is recognised within the DMD in respect of existing stock. The AIM would benefit from cross referencing the District’s current/ proposed approach.	Noted As this is already recognised within the DMD (and may be subject to change In future) we have kept the Aim general rather than specific	Aim ES1 now under Sustainability as AIM HO7
108	p.48	POSE AIM CS 1 Crime prevention Acceptable as an aim, but whilst the security of new homes in terms of points of entry is now incorporated in the Building Regulations, there is an important role for planning to ensure that Secured by Design principles are included in urban design. That element of the Aim could be a policy. See comments on Policy HO2 above.	Noted Opportunity for a new policy	New policy HO3 under Sustainability
109	p.48	HC Aim CS1 I am pleased with policy CS1 on page 48 - where the Council will continue to support Hertfordshire Constabulary in its efforts to reduce crime.	Noted – no change	No specific amendment required

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
110	p.49	(and elsewhere) Resident Not just the Library that needs to be used more for the community. Schools are an underused resource. Clearly other agencies are involved.	Noted Complex issue of demand, supply and other constraints (e.g. cost of security, etc.) Not simply an issue for the Neighbourhood Plan – possibly for a Community Plan?	No specific amendment required

Section 6 - Specific Project Action Plans and Other Opportunities

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.49	POSE AIM VC1 Village centre action plan The objective of creating an identifiable village centre, offering a range of civic and community services in an attractive setting is laudable. With the cooperation of the landowner(s) the NP gives the opportunity to identify the areas of interest on a plan and to seek commitment to the preparation of an action plan or master plan accordingly.	Noted	No specific amendment required
2	p.49	Resident 6.1 The (fully justified) 'Village Centre' policy must not be at the expense of maintenance and support for the other retail areas.	Noted Covered by the general policies	No specific amendment required

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
3	p.49	<p>WDRA</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>There is also a mention of amalgamating the two medical practices namely those on New Road and Baldwins Lane to make one large medical centre.</p> <p>We would be against this proposal as it would mean a significant number of residents in Croxley Green having to travel much further to see their doctor.</p> <p>The Plan admits we have an above average ageing population and older infirm patients require a local doctors practice.</p>	Noted	Text amended
4	p.50	<p>Resident</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>Croxley needs a health centre for primary care</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Depends on others – NHS, etc.</p>	Text amended
5	p.50	<p>TRM</p> <p>6.1 Justification</p> <p>the Red Cross Centre has been used, and has been for many years, by a number of organisations including Rainbows, Brownies, Croxley Flower Group, a Zumba class, Three Rivers Leisure</p>	Noted	Amended
6	p.50	<p>Resident</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>I question whether the Red Cross building is as well used as is implied. The Red Cross is currently undergoing a review of its facilities nationally; now might be a good time to approach their UK HQ regarding ownership and use the existing facility in Croxley</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>(but not an issue for the Neighbourhood Plan)</p>	No specific amendment required

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
7	p.50	<p>TRM</p> <p>Red Cross centre</p> <p>Whilst not directly relevant to the Plan a bit of background may be of interest. The Centre was built in 1965/66 for use primarily as a Club and Social Centre for the elderly of Croxley through the medium of a Welcome Club, and this is spelt out in the lease. It ran this way, open six days per week, until the mid 1990's with Club members and other volunteers playing an active part in its management.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Might be relevant for context in the appendices?</p>	<p>Appendix D revised accordingly</p>
8	p.50	<p>TRM</p> <p>Red Cross centre</p> <p>Red Cross policy towards such clubs then changed and direct support has progressively reduced. The needs of club members have also changed over the years as their average age has increased and numbers declined (now down to about 60 from 200), with few able to help run things.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>No specific amendment required</p>
9	p.50	<p>Resident</p> <p><i>"The Red Cross building is used exclusively by that organisation"</i></p> <p>This building is hired out by many organisations</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
10	p.51	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM CS1 Croxley Station development</p> <p>This could remain as an Aim.</p> <p>However, If the Parish Council has undertaken preliminary work that would suggest this major development site could realise considerable community benefit and a greater number of dwellings than in the current Local Plan allocation it could use the NP to obtain commitment from other parties to a more ambitious proposal.</p>	<p>Note</p> <p>Preliminary study has been carried out.</p>	<p>Converted to a new policy PRO3</p>

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
11	p.51	<p>POSE</p> <p>A policy could require the preparation of a master plan for the site that could show how dwelling numbers might be increased with various typologies alongside community facilities, car parking and new access arrangements.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that Aim CS1 is replaced by such a policy.</p>	Noted	New Policy PRO3
12	p.51	<p>TfL(TP)</p> <p>6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>TfL supports the aim of maximising the development potential of this highly accessible site although it is essential that development proposals for the site are financially viable. TfL Property will respond separately on the issues relating to development mix, density and the quantum of car parking.</p>	Noted	No specific amendment required
13	p.51	<p>TfL(TP)</p> <p>6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>TfL notes the aspiration to develop step free access at Croxley Station. An initial feasibility study into providing step free access has been initiated by London Underground.</p> <p>This will examine design options for the station as well as costs and potential sources of funding including the possible use of local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds.</p> <p>However, at the present time there is no commitment or funding to provide step free access at the station within the current TfL Business Plan. The Neighbourhood Forum will be kept up to date with emerging findings from this study work.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But this is a reasonable expectation when the site is redeveloped.</p>	No specific amendment required

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
14	p.51	<p>TfL (Property) 6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>TfL Property supports the aim of maximising the development potential of this highly accessible site although it is essential that development proposals for the site are financially viable.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p> <p>But there is a difference between “financially viable” and “maximises profit”.</p> <p>We would prefer greater social gain, rather than simply the highest rate of return.</p>	<p>No amendment required here, but amendments in response to TRDC’s independent reviewer</p>
15	p.51	<p>TfL (Property) 6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>The Croxley Station site (Station, car park and timber yard) is allocated within the Three Rivers District Council adopted Site Allocations LDD (2014) (ref:H(13)) for development which “may include retail store with residential above”.</p> <p>The site allocation also aims to safeguard parking provision at the site. It is acknowledged that the site has a dwelling capacity of 25.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>No amendment required here, but amendments in response to TRDC’s independent reviewer</p>	<p>[ditto]</p>
16	p.51	<p>TfL (Property) 6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>We acknowledge the 50+ figure proposed for the site by the Parish Council. However the precise dwelling capacity of the site will be the subject of detailed consideration supported by a viability review when development of the site is progress in order that the potential of the site is optimised.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But there is a difference between “potential optimised” and “maximum profit”.</p> <p>We would prefer greater social gain, rather than simply the highest rate of return.</p>	<p>[ditto]</p>

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
17	p.51	<p>TfL (Property) 6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>You should be made aware that the provision of any community use on this site would not be supported as it could render the development of the site financially unviable when taking into account the requirements for CIL, s106 financial contributions and affordable housing commitments.</p> <p>As a public organisation, TfL has a duty to achieve best value for the site and we are not convinced that the mix of uses proposed by the Parish Council, which includes a community use, would achieve this</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But we should like it to be included in the options considered when development is proposed</p>	<p>New policy PRO3 includes community use as an option to be considered</p>
18	p.51	<p>TfL (Property) 6.2 Croxley Station</p> <p>In addition, we do not consider it appropriate that a figure is used with reference to parking provision.</p> <p>The number of spaces proposed by the Parish Council is arbitrary and would need to be fully assessed in terms of usage under any future planning application</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The Parish Council is aware of on-street parking around the station greatly in excess of the current provision of 93 marked spaces (plus three for disabled use and a small area for motorbikes). There are also 7 parking bays in front of the station, three marked for staff, one for disabled use and three for taxis.</p> <p>On weekdays there are usually up to 20 cars parked all day on the Watford Road near the station, and many more in the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Therefore the figure reflects current demand and is not, in any sense, arbitrary.</p>	<p>Footnote records current allocation which exceeds 100 (in total)</p>

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
19	p.52	<p>POSE</p> <p>Aim DO1 Future housing land</p> <p>Another land use matter that does not benefit from a clear policy statement.</p> <p>The NP is a means of securing advance planning that will ensure that potential housing sites come forward in a manner that takes into account relevant LPA and NP policies and the community's objectives.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Specific sites cannot be included without the landowners' permission.</p> <p>Negotiations with current landowners of potential sites have proved inconclusive.</p> <p>Therefore remains as a general aim</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.5.1 amended to indicate potential use of garage courts for infill housing</p>
20	p.52	<p>POSE</p> <p>An option would be to devise a policy that identifies on a plan the potential sites and requires the preparation of planning briefs by the PC and LPA, in consultation with the landowners, in advance of any planning applications.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that Aim DO1 is replaced by such a policy, preferably in the context of another new overarching policy in support of sustainable development.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Further work required:</p> <p>Approach adopted for the main sites identified in SALDD</p>	<p>Policies added in Section 6.0 for the main allocated housing site stipulating preparation of planning briefs to ensure site meets community requirements.</p> <p>Policies for non-housing allocations modified to include consultation with PC</p>

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
21	p.53	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM DO2 Metropolitan Line extension surplus land</p> <p>As in the case of Aim DO1 above, the opportunity should be taken to make a clear land use policy statement.</p> <p>A policy should identify the sites on a plan and state what the land use options are in each case, with a requirement that planning briefs are prepared by the PC and LPA in consultation with the landowners in advance of planning applications coming forward.</p> <p>However, TRDC has doubts about the suitability of two of the three sites for development and it is therefore recommended that the Parish Council agrees with them the scope of a policy that might replace this Aim.</p>	Noted	Aim PRO6 amended in response to TRDC doubts
22	p.52	<p>TfL (TP)</p> <p>6.3 Other Development Opportunities</p> <p>TfL supports in principle the aim of bringing surplus land remaining after the completion of the Metropolitan Line Extension into beneficial use.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>But perhaps need to stress that this land is part of the natural boundary dividing Croxley Green & Watford, and the proposed uses should support this?</p>	Minor amendment emphasising Green Belt community use
23	p.52	<p>TfL (TP)</p> <p>6.3 Other Development Opportunities</p> <p>It should be noted that the old Croxley Green Station site does not come into TfL possession but transfers to Hertfordshire County Council.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>minor amendment</p>	Minor amendment in 6.5.2

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
24	p.52	TfL (TP) 6.3 Other Development Opportunities Where land is temporarily acquired for construction under the Transport and Works Act Order this must be returned to the land owner, this is the scenario for the Cinnamond site unless agreed otherwise with the land owner.	Noted	Minor amendment in 6.5.2
25	p.52	TfL (TP) 6.3 Other Development Opportunities For land acquired permanently and declared surplus as it is not required for ongoing operation of the railway, the prevailing Government guidance on the disposal of surplus land acquired by or under the threat of compulsion, will be followed. Where the guidance does not apply, TfL will consider all beneficial uses for the land.	Noted May require amendment	Minor amendment in 6.5.2
26	p.52	TfL (Property) 6.3 Other Development Opportunities TfL Property supports the objective of this approach, which aims to bring surplus land remaining after the completion of the Metropolitan Line Extension into beneficial use.	Noted But perhaps need to stress that this land is part of the natural boundary dividing Croxley Green & Watford, and the proposed uses should support this?	Minor amendment in 6.5.2
27	p.52	Resident Aim DO2 add with after work to the 'The PC will work others...'	Agreed	Amended
28	p.52	Resident Aim DO2 "The Parish Council will work others" ? " <i>with others</i> "	Agreed	Amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
29	p.52	<p>CGRA</p> <p>6.3 Other development opportunities</p> <p>Final paragraph – Justification - Bringing surplus land remaining after the Link has been built into beneficial community use. The way it is worded alludes to there being justification that the remnant of the Cinnamon site, which is Green Belt, may be suitable for housing.</p> <p>I assume this is not the suggestion and that the Parish Council agrees this is retained as Green Belt so as to maintain a green divide between Croxley Green and Watford?</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Needs to be reworded to stress that this land is part of the natural boundary dividing Croxley Green & Watford, and the proposed uses should support this</p>	<p>Minor amendment in 6.5.2</p>
30	p.53	<p>POSE</p> <p>AIM DO3 Playing field provision</p> <p>The playing field should be shown on a plan.</p> <p>The proposal is a significant change in land use in the green belt and should be in the form of a policy, underpinned by evidence regarding the need for additional open space to meet LPA standards.</p> <p>The policy should set out the nature of the proposed use, means of access and any other significant matters.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that, should the necessary evidence be in place, Aim DO3 is replaced by such a policy.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Proposal would be a use compatible with Green Belt designation (and historic use of the site).</p>	<p>Footnote added to 6.5.3 referring to standards set out in TRDC SPD on provision of open space</p> <p>Potential use of site also mentioned in 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 6.2.2</p>
31	p.53	<p>CGRA</p> <p>6.3 Other development opportunities Aim DO3</p> <p>the Parish Council should work with others to bring the former playing field west of Little Green School into recreational use. Replace the word “others” with Herts County Council. HCC own the land and its reserved by it for the ominous “educational purposes”. i.e. sell it for development.</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Needs to be reworded</p>	<p>Amended to “HCC and others”</p>

Appendix A – Statistical context

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.4	<p>CGRA figure caption the caption for the picture is: Proposed secondary school site on former Green Belt viewed from footpath off Baldwins Lane. This is incorrect.</p> <p>As previously stated, in respect of the “Horses Field” only the build area of the new school has been taken out of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The caption should read: <i>The Horses Field, Baldwins Lane, from which the “build area” of the new secondary school will have Green Belt designation removed.</i></p>	<p>Agreed To be reworded (maybe with a different picture of Croxley Green?)</p>	<p>Pictures of Common Moor substituted</p>
2	p.5	<p>Resident there is no A.2.2</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amended</p>

Appendix B – Character Areas

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.15 et seq	POSE Section 4.0 of the Plan describes how the Parish has been divided into 8 urban and 4 rural “Character Areas”. These are described in full in Appendix B of the Plan, which is a body of careful and well-illustrated work that should provide useful evidence in support of some of the policies and provide general assistance to those involved in the preparation and determination of planning applications.	Noted with thanks	No specific amendment required
2	p.15	Resident map as for Page 25 above: a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.	Agreed Map to be amended	Map amended
3	p.17	CGRA B.1.5 contains a further reference to the Baldwins Lane School site. It should be referred to as a part of the Horses Field site for the build area of a new secondary school. Do not give the mistaken impression that the entirety of this site will be developed for use as a school.	Agreed Needs rewording	B.1.5 text amended
4	p.21	TRM B.3.2 Copthorne Road Although much of Copthorne Road is covered by restrictive covenants enforceable by the Trustees of the Residents Society, there are a number of plots which are not restricted to one dwelling, which could lead to further development.	Noted	B.3.2 text amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
5	p.22	TRM B.3.4 Copthorne Road The roads off Copthorne Road – Copthorne Close, Milthorne Close and Uplands are public highways, not privately owned. Chess Vale Rise is owned by the Copthorne Road residents Society	Noted	B.3.3 text amended
6	p.24	CGRA B.4.1 it would be helpful to add to the first part of the first sentence and state: <i>“The Green which is common land, in the ownership of Three Rivers District Council, running north to south.....”</i>	Noted	B.4.1 text amended
7	pp. 24 to 28	CGRA B.5 character Area 2: No mention of Stones Orchard, another Croxley Green jewel. Consider referring to current TRDC ownership of Stones Orchard and The Green.	Noted Ownership of the land is not a material factor for planning Potential future transfer of ownership is not a part of the Neighbourhood Plan	B.4.2 text amended
8	p.26	Resident “Old Barn Way and Elmcote Way and Green Lane, cul-de-sacs of detached 1950’s houses. Elmcote Way has many bungalows	Agreed	B.4.5 text amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
9	p.27	<p>WDRA B.4.7 There is a derogatory remark which infers that Windmill Drive is a bit of an eyesore but is largely screened by dense trees so it does not impact on this part of the character area. We request that this ie reworded and the offensive comment be watered down or deleted.</p>	Noted	B.4.7 text amended
10	p.27	<p>WDRA B.4.7 When Windmill Drive was first completed it was considered a bit of a showpiece by TRDC and the residents committee have tried to maintain standards as much as they are able.</p>	Noted	B.4.7 amended
11	p.27	<p>WDRA B.4.7 There are a number of covenants applicable to Windmill Drive; these are not mentioned in the plan. We request that a statement similar to the following be inserted in the Plan where Windmill Drive is referenced> <i>“There are a number of covenants applicable to Windmill Drive such as maintaining an open plan aspect of the estate, overnight parking of commercial vehicles on the estate is not allowed and refuse containers should not be visible from the road”</i> This is requested as covenants are mentioned elsewhere in the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted Enforcement of the existing covenants is a matter for the local planning authority and not specifically part of the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	Brief reference included in B.4.7

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
12	p.27	WDRA B.4.7 Another comment on the detrimental effect to the character area that includes Windmill Drive should be the lawnmower repair business that is being carried out at a private dwelling within the confines of the conservation area. This property really is an eyesore.	Noted, but this is an enforcement matter, rather than directly affecting the Neighbourhood Plan.	No specific amendment required
13	p.27	WDRA B.4.7 Another problem we have is the car wash at Greystone Industrial Facility. TRDC have been dithering over the legality of this for well over 12 months. This is also detrimental to the said character area.	Noted, but this is an enforcement issue, rather than directly affecting the Neighbourhood Plan.	No specific amendment required
14	p.27	WDRA B.4.7 the Residents with the help and permission of TRDC have also enhanced Windmill Drive by planting trees on the estate and a substantial number of spring bulbs that bring colour and lots of positive comments in the flowering season.	Noted, but this is a management issue, rather than directly affecting the Neighbourhood Plan.	No specific amendment required
15	pp. 27 & 28	Resident: B.4.9 & B.4.10 3 rd bullet Suggest the reference to Killingdown Farm development is re-worded to more positively state what the Parish Council wishes to see rather than the difficulties of securing it.	Noted Section 6 in the main report to be enhanced This section to be amended	Section 6 of Plan amended to include specific Policy PRO4 Section B.4 rearranged and some text amended or deleted

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
16	p.28	<p>CGRA B.4.10 There is reference to “Little Green” (?) as a feature and that no proposal in respect of development of Killingdown Farm should detract from “Little Green” as a feature. I think this needs clarification. Is the reference to access or to overbearing design – or both?</p>	<p>Noted Requires clarification Need to point out that the Killingdown Farm site is bisected by the Conservation Area boundary</p>	Text in B.4.10 amended
17	pp. 29 to 34	<p>CGRA B.5 character Area 3: New Road and Dickinson Square. This area includes Croxley Green Sports Ground and allotments yet is not referred to / described in this section. There is no reference to the ownership (by TRDC) or status of this section of the Area.</p>	<p>Noted Ownership of the land is not a material consideration</p>	<p>New paragraph 5.2 Two additional photographs</p>
18	p.31	<p>Resident B.5.4 with regard to climbers on the allotment fence I know of people, especially children, who enjoy looking at some of the things in the allotments e.g. dummy owls, scarecrows, sunflowers, chickens etc. Maybe rather than blocking in the view of the allotments a suitable replacement fence may improve the aesthetics.</p>	noted	Minor amendments

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
19	p.33	Resident B.5.8 New Road 'creation of off-street parking is becoming a major issue' but given part is a main bus route etc. (kerbside trees vs double-decker buses and Co-op delivery lorries, interesting!) I would have thought this is better than the problems of on-street parking at the easterly end of New Road. Theory / aesthetics vs real world practicalities!	Noted <i>"loss of front gardens and boundary walls to frontage wide forecourts"</i> Control of on street parking versus adequate provision for an increasing number of cars	No amendment here, but see also AIM TP1, policy TP2 and AIM FG1 in the Plan itself.
20	p.35	Resident map as for p.25 above a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.	Agreed Map to be amended	Map amended
21	p.35	Resident end of B.6.1 "and may have been developed by the same company in the 1920s and 1930s" Many builders were involved in the development of Croxley Green in the 1920s/1930s	Agreed But there is a very strong similarity of design and materials	B.6.1 amended
22	p.37	Resident B.6.4 "a more temporary looking single storey parade, probably of earlier date" This was the Crown Post Office building	Agreed	B.6.4 amended
23	p.37	Resident B.6.4 add house after public in 'Red House public has....'	Agreed	B.6.4 amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
24	p.38	Resident bottom photo has no caption	Caption on p.39 refers to block of 3 photos. Needs realignment	realigned
25	p.42	Resident map as for p.25 above a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.	Agreed Map to be amended	Map amended
26	p.42	Resident B.7.1 “the development is lees coherent” Should be less	Agreed	B.6.4 amended
27	p.42	Resident B.7.2 Croxley Good Yard development: limit the overall height as viewed from Watford road – no higher than adjoining houses (i.e. not as high as shops / flats opposite) and retain the shielding trees.	Noted	B.7.2 amended
28	p.42	TfL(TP) B.7 character area 5 TfL notes the references to Croxley station and surroundings and supports further exploration of the site’s development potential. Please refer to the response from TfL Property for more details.	Noted	No specific amendment required

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
29	p.42	TfL(TP) p.42 B.7 character area 5 The discussed Croxley Green station area is currently Network Rail land and will transfer to Hertfordshire County Council as part of the Metropolitan Line Extension.	Noted (B.7.9) As drawn, this is within Character area 11 (the canal) not character area 5	Text in B.7.9 transferred to B.13.9 and amended
30	p.46	Resident caption below right picture Valley Road should be Valley Walk	Agreed	caption amended
31	p.46	Resident bottom of page "much of the area is located on steeply slopes" Should be "steep"	Agreed	amended
32	p.48	Resident B.8.1 last lines Cherwell Court is off Dulwich Way, not the north end of Manor Way	Agreed	B.8.1 amended
33	p.50	Resident B.8.4 maybe I'm getting a bit plot and lost now but, the photo of Rugby Way looks to me like it is Fuller Way looking down to Barton Way, hey ho!	Agreed (checked with Google Street View)	caption amended to Fuller Way
34	p.50	Resident B.8.5 "such as Sherbourne Way are particular important for preserving" Should be particularly	Agreed	B.8.5 amended
35	pp. 50 51	Resident the bottom photo has its' caption over the page	Noted Need to control pagination when printing / publishing	amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
36	p.51	Resident B.8.7 Fullers Way should be Fuller Way	Agreed	B.8.7 amended
37	p.52	Resident Barton Way	Agreed	B.8.9 amended
38	p.52	Resident B.8.9 Barton Road should be Barton Way	Agreed	B.8.9 amended
39	p.54	Resident B.9 section heading First figure caption Also B.9.1 Also second caption should be Little Green Lane	Agreed	all amended
40	p.55	Resident B.9.2 first line Durrants Way should be Durrants Drive	Agreed	B.9.2 amended
41	p.55	CGRA B.9.3 Grove Crescent There is a reference to an opportunity for infill redevelopment of the garage courts. Is this speculation on the part of the author or is it based on TRDC information? I'm aware that the garages are fully subscribed.	Noted	B.9.3 amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
42	p.56	WDRA B.9.6 We are vehemently against the proposed new school at the bottom of Baldwins Lane. This is or at least should be green belt land. There are various reasons for our stance on this issue	Noted but the decisions by TRDC and Herts CC are beyond the competence of the Parish Council	Transferred to B.13.3 with minor amendments Section 6 of the Plan amended (Policy PRO2)
43	p.56	WDRA B.9.6 There are now only a few green spaces that separate Croxley from Watford, the school site is on one of these areas, also any developments on green sites adjacent to the new Metropolitan Line viaduct would in our view be detrimental for the same reason	Noted Development issue	Transferred to B.13.3 with minor amendments Amendments in the Plan (Policy PRO2 and AIM PRO6)
44	p.56	WDRA B.9.6 There are of course the added problem of extra traffic congestion that would result from a large secondary school	Noted Development issue	Transferred to B.13.3 with minor amendments Section 6 of the Plan amended (Policy PRO2)
45	p.56	WDRA B.9.6 The Plan mentions that on the proposed school site there are mature limes and several other fine trees that are worth preserving. We agree, but what is being done about this? Before Windmill Drive was built a number of fine trees quite rightly were given preservation status. Preservation status should be sought for the trees in question on the proposed school site or they may be lost.	Noted (and agreed) Preservation status is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan. Tree Preservation Orders have been put in place by TRDC.	B.13.3 text amended to refer to TPOs Section 6 of the Plan amended (Policy PRO2)

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
46	p.56	CGRA B.8.6. (should be B.9.6) The first line is factually incorrect and should read as: <i>the build area of a new secondary school will occupy a part of the grounds</i>	Agreed	B.9.6 transferred to B.13.3 and text amended
47	p.56	CGRA top photo caption is incorrect and should read as: <i>the southern part of the Horses Field site, part of which will be the build area of a new secondary school showing the old lime avenue and the site of Cassiobridge House</i> (courtesy Google Earth)	Noted Caption to be amended	Caption amended
48	p.56	CGRA middle photo caption is incorrect and should read as: <i>Remnant of the old lime avenue on the Horses Field site looking east as seen from the Baldwins Lane/Lodge Lane track</i>	Noted Caption to be amended	Caption amended
49	p.56	CGRA bottom photo caption is incorrect and should read as: <i>Remnant of the old lime tree avenue on the skyline of the Horses field, off Baldwins Lane, looking west seen from Cassiobridge lock</i>	Noted Caption to be amended (need photo of Cassiobridge lock as well)	Caption amended
50	p.58	Resident B.9.9 Links Road should be Links Way	Agreed	B.9.9 amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
51	p.59	Resident B.10.2 Beggars Bush Lane (original access road to / from Croxley Mill) should be protected / maintained as a footway	Agreed Beggars Bush Lane is within Character Area 11	Text amended in B.13.7
52	p.61	TRM B.11 Copthorne Wood Copthorne Wood is covered by a TPO and much of it is owned (in sections) by residents on the western side of Copthorne Road.	Noted	Amended – now B.11.4
53	p.63	Resident B.11.2 Green lane access to Killingdown Farm should be Little Green Lane	Agreed	Amended – now B.11.5
54	p.63	CGRA Reference is made in the about the development of Killingdown Farm and access via Green Lane whereas the detailed TRDC Site Allocation re Killingdown Farm referred to access to this new development via the Grove Crescent entrance. I feel the Parish Council would be missing a trick if it didn't reiterate this TRDC point whilst also strengthening its hand with the Quiet Lanes initiative.	Noted Clarified that this is the entrance to the existing Farm	B.11.2 amended Point covered in more detail in B.9.4 as this access would be from Character area 7
55	p.64	Resident map as for p.25 above a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.	Agreed Map to be amended	Map amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
56	p.64	<p>TfL (TP) B.12 TfL notes the description of the rail corridor and embankment. As stated above the current primary use of the corridor is as an operational railway which will experience changes as a result of works associated with the Metropolitan Line Extension. The northern part of the corridor will become sidings when the Metropolitan Line Extension opens</p>	<p>Noted This is probably the place to put the detailed information about the Transport Works Act, etc.</p>	<p>B.12.2 and B.12.4 amended</p>
57	p.65	<p>Resident B.12.2 isn't it Croxley Station locally listed not Croxley Green Station</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>B.12.2 amended</p>
58	p.66	<p>Resident as for p.25 above a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.</p>	<p>Agreed Map to be amended</p>	<p>Map amended</p>
59	p.66	<p>Sea Cadets It's not clear from the map on p.66 which Character area the Sea Cadets are in. The text is clear that it's Area 11, being in the canal corridor, which is fine: but my eye doesn't follow the lines on the map as showing that: in fact the canal doesn't seem to be highlighted in the map at all.</p>	<p>Agreed Map to be amended</p>	<p>Map amended</p>

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
60	p.67	Sea Cadets on p.67, the railway bridge isn't really at Byewaters, it's much more Lot Mead, I'd suggest. Whether the Cassiobridge viaduct is really a "splendid" structure I doubt, I'm afraid – bits continue to fall off it, and it really ought to go!	Lot Mead is not within the Parish. Cassiobridge viaduct on the Metropolitan line. LNWR lattice girder bridge (disused).	Text now B.13.5 amended
61	p.67	Resident: B.13.3 expand CRT to Canal & River Trust	Agreed	B.13.3 amended
62	p.67	Resident: photo as for Page 27 above is there a picture of the lock without the graffiti on the gate?	Agreed	Replacement photograph required Or airbrush using Photoshop
63	p.68	Resident: B.13.4 Cress should be Chess	agreed	B.13.4 amended
64	p.68	Resident: B.13.4 last bullet '...also on the Cress to the west....' should be Chess	agreed	B.13.4 amended
65	p.68	Sea Cadets B.13.4 fifth bullet, Chess vice Cress, I suspect	agreed	B.13.4 amended

No.		Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
66	p.69	Resident: map as for p.25 above a red line down Mill Lane separating areas 4 and 5, also add a 4 in the Frankland Road area.	Agreed Map to be amended	Map amended
67	p.69	Resident: B.14.2 end of second paragraph “and dog’s mercury” should be dog mercury	Agreed (text was quoted verbatim)	B.14.2 amended

Appendix C – Extension Guidelines

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.73	Resident C.2 “ADD EXAMPLES OF UNSIGHTLY EXTENSIONS” Would like to kept up-to-date in regards to this and believes that a house in Yorke Road is one example	Noted What one person considers unsightly will be someone else’s home and it is difficult to present examples without causing unintended offence	Section deleted
2	p.73	Resident C.2 Add picture of backfill recent development in Little Green Lane as great example of what NOT to do. (How on earth did it get planning permission?).	Noted See also p.58 B.9.8 final bullet “Another infill “modernist” new house, timber clad and with a flat roof has just been completed in Little Green Lane” (difference of opinion here)	Section deleted

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
3	p.74	Resident C.3 Add note about large [to be defined] sheds, garages, greenhouses, workshops and other outbuildings in back gardens as per proposal for 5.1 in Plan Doc.	Noted This section is specifically about extensions, not about outbuildings	No specific amendment here
4	p.74	Resident C.3 as for Page 29 the comment about flat roofs to the rear of properties also the point about flat roofs should mention be made about them being acceptable on rear extensions as most currently are	Noted	Text amended

Appendix D – The “Village” Centre

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
1	p.75	CGPC The presentation below is a bit of a mess. The table does not work well in portrait – it would be better in landscape. Also it is not rather out of date (and addresses a different subject).	Accept the comment. Text to be rearranged in the same layout as the rest of the Appendices and substantially revised end edited.	Rearranged in the same layout as the rest of the Appendices and substantially revised and edited with replacement photographs

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
2	p.75	<p>WDRA</p> <p>The Plan refers to New Road and the immediate environs and states it should become the hub of the village.</p> <p>We consider in most respects that this area is already the hub of the village.</p> <p>Of course this area could be improved and perhaps a project to include the Community Centre, Red Cross Building, the library and the parish council offices has some merit</p> <p>One of our members recalls a similar plan being put together a number of years ago but after a study this was shelved because of the considerable cost involved.</p> <p>We would however be against any plan to use the Barton way allotments site for this village hub joint amenity.</p>	Noted	Rearranged in the same layout as the rest of the Appendices and substantially revised and edited with replacement photographs
3	p.75	<p>Resident</p> <p>D.1.1 Community Way “Ugly to drive along and dangerous for pedestrians” is worrying, as a proportion of the road forms part of the public footpath running from The Green to Springfield Close</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Note that it has been designated and marked as a “shared surface” with speed control humps to reduce safety risks</p> <p>New photo required</p>	D.1.1 amended
4	p.75	<p>Resident</p> <p>D.1.1 Community Way description</p> <p>“It doubles as a footpath running linking two public footpaths”</p> <p>Should running be deleted?</p>	Agreed	D.1.1 amended

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
5	p.75	Resident D.1.1 Community Way Community Way will be dangerous to pedestrians if car drivers are looking at how ugly it is, maybe a little bit of rewording is required	Agreed	D.1.1 amended
6	p.75	Resident The public car park On a personal note I would like to add that parking in the public car park (Page 75) is nearly impossible these days! When we go to our creative textile class on a Tuesday because the Red Cross hall has no caretaker despite being senior citizens we have to put up all the tables and chairs, so we need to arrive before ten and leave after twelve so the two hour slots aren't very helpful and there is never a non two hour space available, having said that there is not normally a two hour limited one available either. Despite using the hall the library have told us not to park in the car park there so it is incredibly frustrating. It is not always possible to walk as we need to carry work and we all do try to car share.	Noted Does not conflict with current text Not a material consideration for planning Not relevant for Neighbourhood Plan	No specific amendment required
7	p.75	Resident Community Centre Bar as far as I know the Community Centre Bar is still run by the members and is not at present run by a subsidiary limited company, clarification maybe required	Noted Checked 20/09/2016: <i>"the Community Club is non-profit making and run by volunteers"</i>	Text amended (D.4.1)
	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building I do not think the times for the Welcome Club are correct I can find a contact for the welcome club if you would like one.	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	Proposed Resolution
9	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building As well as the activities listed: The Three Rivers Council run a creative textile course on Tuesday mornings 10 – 12.00 – three terms each year.	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)
10	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building As well as the activities listed: Every Wednesday morning there is a Zumba class	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)
11	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building As well as the activities listed: I understand that a new club run by Three Rivers now meets on a Thursday called getting together.	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)
12	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building As well as the activities listed: MENCAP have taken over two plots on Barton Way allotment and they sometimes have a workshop at the hall.	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)
13	p.77	Resident The Red Cross building The times for the medical loan are incorrect. It opens Monday to Friday 10- 12.30 and Monday and Thursday 7p.m. – 8.00. As the information has been obtained from the Red Cross Website I am copying this to Sue Hillier who is the contact for the medical loans.	Noted Rewrite the Red Cross section with less specific information	Section on the Red Cross Building rewritten (D.9)

Appendix E – Trees & Hedges

No specific comments received

Appendix F – Transport & Roads

No.	Page	Consultation comment	CG Response	CG Action/ Proposed Resolution
1	p.80	Harvey Road School F.1 The reason for my email is that I thought you might like to know Chris Lloyd (District Councillor) has successfully managed to gather together a team of people ranging from local police officers to Headteachers and governors to review what can be done to reduce the real and perceived risk young people currently face by the level of traffic in the area. Although this does not alter your plan this action group are reviewing an area covered by it and for that reason the outcomes of this group may be of interest to you and your team.	Noted As stated, does not alter the plan	Include concerns about traffic generation from development of proposed new Croxley Danes school in section 6
2	p.80	Resident F.1.2 replace ‘the north western mainline railway’ with ‘the West Coast mainline railway’	Noted	F.1.2 amended
3	p.80	Resident F.1.5 as for Page 21, 2.7.5 above restricted bus services also affect those without a car especially the elderly who may feel ‘trapped in the village’	agreed	amended