

Summary of petitions and proformas responses to the Emerging Core Strategy

In response to the core strategy the Council received a petition from Marshals Drive Residents Association and proformas responses from Redbourn Parish and Harpenden Town Councils.

Marshals Drive Residents' Association

A petition of 321 signatories was submitted to the Council in support for Marshalswick to be defined as an Area of Special or Defined Residential Character in the Core Strategy. The Residents' Association identify a number of criteria, taken from other Councils planning policy, which would need to be satisfied to be granted such a status and believe that Marshalswick fulfils them. The criteria are listed below.

- There should be a sufficient number of properties to form an area of distinctive character.
- The area should be well established, readily identifiable and coherent
- The majority of properties should generally have the same readily identifiable characteristics
- The boundary should be easily defined and defensible
- The area should have an Arcadian character
- There is a need to maintain the character of the area.

The Residents' Association also suggest a number of development control guidelines should be considered for inclusion in a Core Strategy policy on Areas of Special or Defined Residential Character.

- Developments likely to erode the individual quality and character of the Areas of Special or Defined Residential Character will be resisted. Reference will be made to the description of defined areas for a determination of individual quality and character
- Residential density shall accord with that existing in the area.
- The general height of existing buildings in the area shall not be exceeded.
- Back land development will not be permitted

- Existing mature trees and landscaping shall be retained wherever possible.

Redbourn Parish Council

113 proforma responses were submitted on behalf of Redbourn residents. All objected to Land to the East of Redbourn (Site H7) as possible additional Green Belt release for post 2026 housing needs.

The following reasons for objection were given.

- Green Belt
- Flood Plain
- River Ver is a rare chalk stream and land is potential Nature Reserve
- Impact on Schools and medical services
- Congestion (roads are gridlocked when an accident occurs on M1)
- Potential pollution

Harpenden Town Council

Harpenden Town Council submitted over 2000 proforma slips objecting to Land north of Harpenden (AOS8 South East Part) as possible additional Green Belt release for post 2026 housing needs.

The proforma slips support protection and retention of the Green Belt and object to AOS8 South East Part unless and until

- There is substantial investment to meet the needs of Harpenden residents in schools in Harpenden to accommodate all the children of new residents
- There is substantial investment to meet the needs of Harpenden's residents to significantly reduce traffic congestion on the A1081 Luton Road and Harpenden's High Street and to provide more parking in Harpenden's town centre

- The district council take into detailed account in its emerging core strategy the impact on Harpenden of 26,000 new houses being proposed in Luton and surrounding area
- The district council has made public and consulted upon the draft social and community facilities study and those policies demonstrate benefits for Harpenden.

In addition to the above a number of the respondents also highlighted other issues and concerns. These are presented below.

Harpenden Town Council Proforma – other issues and concerns.

- Narrow roads and busy traffic, limited school places, noise, spoiling countryside
- I feel strongly about preventing urban sprawl and I wish to preserve Harpenden's beauty by retaining the surrounding green belt of open countryside.
- Harpenden will lose its unique character and identity if green belt land is turned into residential housing, infrastructure already showing signs of over demand
- Harpenden is FULL there is gridlock (the Country is full) we can't afford our current services so no more development for a while yet
- I agree with everything on the leaflet and I am very concerned as I live on the north side
- I fully agree with all you have said and will emphasis that the traffic congestion is a real problem now
- I oppose all extra building using green belt land. Harpenden is over busy with traffic etc already
- We strongly agree with the above and any other proposal to reduce the Harpenden green belt
- The otherwise attractive approach into Harpenden the A1081 would be visually blighted (sloping Site rising from C105m to 126M
- Harpenden has inadequate hospital facilities, these need to be improved BEFORE ANY additional housing is considered
- Lower Luton Rd to Wheathampstead needs widening
- New/improved hospital nearer than Watford
- Strongly oppose anymore houses, already overcrowded and congested
- The impact on medical services should also be taken into consideration
- This will be the thin edge of the wedge, fully support your opposition

- Traffic is very heavy through our High St and when an accident on the M1 it is horrendous, school places are in adequate now for residence. Don't spoil this town with massive building
- Work at the school opposite the site, the roads are narrow and already a cut thought
- Would like Green belt policy strengthened by removing wherever possible. First step to erode green belt. Need to also invest in youth facilities and improve environ impact of homes.
- Also please consider the stopping of the Willow court proposed extension
- Harpenden children are already being sent to St Alban schools - we cannot support any more houses
- Housing quotas laid down by EERA in part in form this, and numbers are questionable
- More traffic giving further delays into Harpenden schools - what a joke!
- The noise from empty or badly laden commercial vehicles bouncing over the road humps introduced at the top of Piggotshill Lane which should be removed or the weight limit reintroduced
- The school issue is of major import. What about the appalling lack of hospital facilities in this area?
- Trains into London already congested
- Erosion of green belt & the encouragement of continued expansion in S.E. England should be resisted
- I fully support the imperative retention of the green belt
- Ambrose Lane is already busy due to hospital traffic, school traffic & should the plans go ahead this will be a severe problem
- As I live close to the area search 8 I believe this would be very damaging to this good area of Harpenden
- As live close to the Area Search 8 I believe this would be very damaging to this area of Harpenden
- Concern over increased traffic in Ambrose Lane and effect on already oversubscribed schools
- Equally Ambrose Lane has become a rat-run over the years. It is too narrow, the corner with Hollybush Lane is already too dangerous to accommodate significant additional levels of traffic in rush hours!
- I agree with all the above. My major concern is the traffic noise given I live very close to this proposed development
- I agree with all the above. My major concern is the traffic/noise given I live very close to this proposed development
- I endorse the arguments summarised above. If the scheme goes ahead I shall have even more difficulty getting my car out of the drive safely in the mornings.
- In a predominately dry area what about extra water and sewerages needed to sustain the development lack of medical facilities too.
- In addition BEDFORDSHIRE should NOT BE allowed to build in or on Herts green belt
- Increased traffic along Ambrose Lane (narrow bridge) and Cooters End Lane

- Insufficient WATER in County, increased traffic in N. Harpenden & High Street, pressure on schools & infrastructure, erosion of green belt
- Investment in water supplies, power, doctor and dental services
- Medical facilities would also be stressed and waiting times lengthened further
- Rd & pavement quality stop patching roads & resurface!
- The issue of infrastructure too much traffic on roads schools - over crowded water demands and all demands
- The issue of infrastructure, too much traffic on roads, schools, over crowded now water demands and all demands
- The schools are already over subscribed and the roads are busy enough.
- Traffic along Ambrose Lane is already a 'ratrun' it would become impossible if Area 8 was developed for housing
- Traffic in Ambrose Lane is virtually at saturation level at peak times now
- We must not lose our precious green belt. The schools in Harpenden are insufficient to meet the needs of Harpenden residents
- Basic infrastructure sewage power and water also need improving
- Need substantial improvement in the capacity of the rail system to absorb additional commuters
- AOS8 important to preserve the character of Harpenden and contributes to well being of area.
- Strongly opposed to further development
- We already have overcrowded trains that cannot cope with the current numbers
- What extra facilities would be provided for the presumably young new families
- Harpenden station area needs considerable refurbishment
- The construction of house on this site must be stopped totally unnecessary
- I am concerned about the impact further development will have upon services, especially water supplies
- It appears to me that SADC want our money i.e. an extra £750,000 in Council Tax and expect to give us nothing extra in return. The people of Harpenden to further subsidise SADC
- Local schools are already struggling with numbers this would create even more upset
- The roads in Harpenden are cracking and in need of repair before more cars use them from any new houses
- There isn't the infrastructure to cope with this many new residents!
- With developments to the north of Harpenden i.e. Wood End area already underway is it necessary to take more green belt area and also ad further congestion
- More facilities for elderly people when they need care
- Wish to emphasise concern, impact on infrastructure, schools, roads, medical facilities
- Let us practice democracy in this local matter even though we are unable to do so at national level.
- The nation should use only Brownfield sites before considering the use of greenfield

- I am worried about essential infrastructure capacity especially water and sewage being eroded
- Core strategy draft states that this such development does not contribute to coalescence with Luton. Nonsense, any extension of urban outline does so.
- Previously lived opposite site - know area well.
- School places particularly secondary schools are already under pressure
- Any development within the green belt is inappropriate
- Crossed out all points on form - left as I oppose any major housing development in Harpenden
- I have no confidence in SADC Council after seeing some of the planning applications they have allowed
- Lack of al facilities but particularly schools
- Many of the new residents are likely to be commuters and train services are already overstretched
- Traffic already a nightmare.
- Harpenden is a town in its own right it should not be allowed to be submerged into Luton which building on this land may do.
- Concerned about the 26,000 homes to be built in Luton, Lower Luton Road one of busiest B roads in county and these houses make it exceed a manageable level.
- Not enough Drs, hospitals to cope with more families
- The A1081 is prone to flooding if the proposed development of the green belt field goes ahead where will the surface water go?
- Making an exception to the policy in Harpenden would set a dangerous precedent for the rest of green belt area, protect our green belt
- No erosion of green belt, need farmland to produce locally, school places limited, congested already, not want to coalesce with Luton.
- Developing would destroy the natural beauty.
- All the issues seem to be same as previously raised and BACKED by the Council
- Ambrose Lane is already a dangerous rat run with cars speeding, this would increase if land in Search 8 was built up
- Area 8 is totally unsuitable for development - it's loss to housing would be a disaster for Harpenden
- Area is used for recreation and walking by local residents
- Do we really want to repeat the ribbon development of the 1930's?
- Enough Green Belt has already gone with the widening of the M1
- Environmental issue: land available for agricultural use and absorption of rain water would be jeopardised if built on
- Environmental issue: land available for agricultural use and absorption of rain water would be jeopardised if built on

- Even with current housing levels we were unable to get our child into the nearest school so this would put further strain on stretched resources
- Further building in north Harpenden would lead to much pressure on roads and schools particularly
- Green belt must be retained
- Harpenden cannot cope with such a big development. We do not have the roads to do it
- Harpenden Property prices are higher than most. Development should take place in much more affordable areas - only the developers benefit
- I feel this area would not support so many more people. Traffic/schools/doctors/hospitals. Also is there enough water/sewerage?
- In addition to the above more council supplied services, police, fire, ambulance, waste will be required
- In addition to the above SADC has an obligation to future generations to protect the green belt at all costs.
- Increased congestion on already dangerous Ambrose Lane especially over bridge
- Increased pressure on already overburdened facilities. Lots of green belt in one area which can't be recovered.
- No building on what ever.
- Not content with messing up St Albans the Council now want to mess up Harpenden, they should remember who voted for them!
- Secondary School places in Harpenden are already heavily over subscribed.
- Serious concern about road traffic along Ambrose Lane which due to its size & nature is already hazardous
- Substantial investment in infrastructure water mains gas electricity more doctors hospitals etc
- The green belt is the rational border especially to the north of a well balanced and sustainable community
- The Green Belt policy is there for all to abide by - not for the Council to ignore when it suits them. The infrastructure is already creating - we cannot and will not let this happen
- The Green Belt should stay Green
- The SADC's proposals are politically driven. They are not sustainable in planning terms.
- There is a total lack of infrastructure to support this proposed development.
- There would need to be extensive if not new roads built - Ambrose Lane and Cooters End Lane
- This area of Search 8 was part of the area the NCH tried to get released from the green belt in 1982 and 2003 the arguments put forward then still hold good
- We already have nowhere to park can't get a doctor's appointment, children can't get school place.
- We do NOT want any building on the green belt
- We must not build on Green Belt land.

- We must preserve the Green Belt and any additional housing must be preceded by schools provisions/services provision
- We must protect the green Belt for all the futures. The Bedfordshire border is in the middle of the next field
- Trains already overcrowded.
- Will become suburb of Luton or St Albans, need green belt for character and active farmland. A1081 already congested, surrounding roads narrow. Pressure on school places.
- The direct train link to London is an important part of our community and should be maintained
- A1081 & Harpenden High Street cannot support this development - already substantial congestion at peak times even worse when M1 is blocked
- Building permission appears to be given in many instances without due consideration to access roads suitability
- Keep Harpenden surrounded by green belt!
- There are already plans for approx 100 new houses in the Wood End area which will rely on the same services
- The need to expand the provision of utility supplies and services
- Parking in housing areas a big issue garages usually not big enough for cars and road congestion++
- This would be ANOTHER STEP to merging Harpenden with Luton and thus defeats the purpose of having a GREEN BELT
- A regular bus from the town to Broomfield for the people who live here.
- I absolutely oppose the building of 300 new houses in Harpenden
- The pressure on school places is already too great and this new housing development would exacerbate the problem
- We strongly object to this proposed development
- School places are a major issue we cannot cope with existing intake
- All the above points I adhere with
- Roads, pavements already in dangerous condition.
- Where are the services to be put S. Harpenden has had an extra 1,000 houses to take up any slack. Hence the congestion!!!!!!!!!!!!
- If this was to be a new housing development it should be social housing for the young for executive
- Medical and community services roads, schools etc all seem to have reached their limits without extra people moving to the area and green belt should remain just that
- Population growth is the underlying problem really strict immigration control would help but it is probably too late
- The idea of the green belt was that the land would NEVER be used for development
- I am on Herts County Committee of the British Horse Society and deplore any loss of green belt

- The Clerk at the Town Hall 4.09 09 was misleading about the absolute green belt. Harpenden needs to keep it's own identity - surrounded by countryside Luton is encroaching
- TOO MANY PEOPLE
- This will radically change Harpenden as everyone will come here to shop, take the train, use facilities, GP too. It is not big enough to take an increase of this size
- I strongly oppose building on green belt land. Green belt impt and effective at preventing urban sprawl and towns to keep their character and identity. Building houses in North Harpenden with out considering impact of new homes proposed in the neighbouring area is irresponsible and will disproportionably affect the infrastructure for years to come.
- Roads and pot holes!
- The areas around cannot take anymore traffic pressure on local schools not enough places in schools
- Use of brown sites should be considered instead of eating into the countryside - the ex-Vauxhall site 2 miles away could site 300 houses
- We must protect and retain ALL green belt land in this area of Hertfordshire
- I fully support the views above
- It would be highly irresponsible to build new homes where new residents would have little chance of finding school places
- This is green belt land & I understood you made a commitment not to build here. We do not have the proper support mechanism for 300 houses!
- I oppose this development wholeheartedly
- Harpenden station is also full for car parking already
- No more 4-6 bed houses built more & better housing for elderly. Large houses more cars more water & other services and more school places needed
- There is insufficient provision for schools, youth facilities and health care for existing Harpenden residents and this is where priorities should be
- Has anyone thought about how the train station car park could not take any more cars?
- All green belt around & in Harpenden and SADC should be protected
- Also applies to Westfield Allotments
- If we reliant I see this as the thin end of the wedge. We should indeed prevent town merging in all directions
- The green belt village feel, together with excellent schooling under pins the reputation of Harpenden
- I strongly object to this proposal owing to impact on the local green belt and school, road and rail infrastructure that is already at capacity

- Drainage on the A1081, there is an increased risk of flooding on the Luton Road
- Need investment otherwise derogation of quality of life for existing residents.
- I also oppose proposals to build on allotments, propose tighter guidelines on infill development
- Unless and until there are substantial improvements and investments for the elderly e.g. day care homes and nursing homes

- We do NOT want any more houses built in this area
- When will the roads be made better than 3rd world tracks. We pay road tax where is the ££££££££££
- Building on the green belt must be opposed at all times and agricultural land preserved
- We simply cannot support this number of houses and people with the current infrastructure - NO building on green belt
- Hospitals and doctors surgeries are full to bursting point more people in Harpenden NO
- More places badly needed in schools, the traffic congestion in Harpenden at times is really awful!
- Area of search 8 is green belt and is farm land in cultivation has been farmed constantly

- Water pressure in Coopers End Lane often below par and at times no water road traffic accidents A1081 - gridlocked problems on M1 often

- The schools, hospitals and roads cannot provide locally now, further development will bring "gridlock"
- As usual SADC tries to ignore Harpenden wishes. Harpenden does not have enough school places to accommodate its own children and those of surrounding villages as it is
- Harpenden is a market town and should not be ruined by urban sprawl
- A most important piece of countryside/A1081 can't cope!
- Harpenden schools and trains hopelessly overcrowded already
- I don't think we should encourage more travel in/out of Harpenden but we agree with everything else.
- Harpenden is already over crowded and another estate would congest the roads which from the motorway cause HAVOC

- Anyone who lives in Harpenden knows that the infrastructure here has already reached its limit
- No new homes should be built in the S. east until all options for housing development in the north have been explored
- Have you considered the potential increase of crime?
- One of the major appeal to the local area is the working agricultural community and the open space available to residents not to mention the impact on traffic schools etc
- Our roads are already worn out. Additional traffic will put us behind third world roads
- There is enough traffic in Harpenden already especially since Luton Airport has got busier
- Stop building speed bumps and repair roads

- I have 2 young children and each year I read with concern how parents in Harpenden have to fight for school places
- Need more housing but more facilities to match the increased provision.
- PLEASE stop the developers taking the green belt or any part of it. THANK YOU
- This proposal does nothing to benefit the residents of Harpenden and can only cause more problems all round
- We strongly oppose these proposals. We believe that brownfield sites should be used to meet housing needs
- It sets a precedent in allowing building in designated green belt and Harpenden does not have the infrastructure to cope with any more
- I would not object to a new school being built on green belt land - all points Mrs Summers agreed with
- It seems to me that planning permission doesn't need to be applied for anymore judging by some of the developments taking place hereabouts. Please no more! Harpenden is already overwhelmed by traffic and the anxiety over schools
- Far better to develop within existing built up area thus increasing density not area of urbanisation
- Investment to make good the very bad state of roads - Cross Way, Manland Ave, Sauncey Ave etc
- Adequate medical care especially for the elderly and terminally ill
- I have lived in this beautiful town for 39 years please let's keep it beautiful for future generations
- Enough public services including medical/dental?
- Drain on hospital resources no mention of extra employment or is Harpenden now just a commuter town?
- I am very concerned about the 26,000 houses proposed for Luton and surrounding area
- We need to keep our green belt for farming more food if productions of more people/less food are correct
- I am TOTALLY AGAINST this type of development involving the green belt
- It is an over development for this area which is a small town
- Our roads and other services will not and can not cope now
- There would be yet more pressure on medical and hospital services
- We do not want the proposed development on vital green belt land already too many cars in Harpenden - it must STOP
- Roads and parking infrastructure cannot cope. Schools seriously overstretched - see letter published in Herts Advertiser July 2007
- Our quality of life will be substantially compromised if this development goes ahead
- As a school teacher I am particularly concerned for local families with lack of school places and other facilities for young people and also dangers of increased traffic
- I am particularly concerned about the threat to the green belt and the problems of traffic congestion

- Also concern about the impact on the train service to London already packed and uncomfortable
- Luton Borough Council have other areas near the town which would not be within the green belt and would be less invasive to nearby residents
- Intensive development of this type is inappropriate in/near Harpenden regardless of any plans to expand infrastructure/services
- There are many empty homes in the south east which should be occupied before building new homes. Green belt should stay green
- I object very strongly to more houses being built in this area - our roads are congested, hospitals overcrowded so also schools we are getting like Hong Kong - stop all immigration!
- It is vital to avoid developments in the green belt which will change the character of Harpenden. Already insufficient school places
- Schools: all local schools are ALREADY over subscribed with long waiting lists. Cannot accommodate this number of new children
- Green belt important for future generations.
- A1081 too congested already. Research shows development of green belt causes problems with water drainage, lowers water tables - causing swings from drought to flood conditions.
- We are totally opposed to any reduction in the green belt around Harpenden. Existing public services are already overstretched
- All new development should use existing brown sites and abandoned properties
- The access to the web erosion and subsequent emailing is quite cumbersome
- Harpenden is already suffering enough through traffic problems and strained services
- No extra provision for doctors surgery and community hospital, travelling to L&D or Watford hospitals takes too long, is difficult all roads congested. We need Harpenden Memorial Hospital back soon. We are all getting older and less mobile.
- 300 more homes in Harpenden you cannot be serious!!! All the services are already over stretched and the car traffic is diabolical
- We will need our farmland to feed ourselves in the future instead of importing so much. PO can't cope with more
- Further development will greatly decrease disabled parking of which there is already insufficient in the High Street
- Harpenden High Street is already congested

- I have lived in Harpenden since 1970 the town has grown enormously but not the facilities we need facilities not more houses
- I support all points relating to Harpenden, but the biggest threat is the Luton Area Development. On no account can building be permitted in Beds south of Luton
- Make sure SADC do not renege on their said policy as Search 8 is NOT in their area
- Overload on all services particularly roads, railways and water/drainage
- The overcrowding of trains from Harpenden are already unacceptable. We cannot cope with more people!
- We are over 75 years old and have to queue at ONE post office without all these extra residents
- Already congested and worrying for elderly. Scary to have an enlargement of Harpenden with extra demand on our limited resources. Both my wife and I against the proposal.
- Harpenden needs a bypass,
- Perhaps nearer St Albans would be less intrusive
- Why do we need more houses?
- Green belt should mean green belt!
- There is not enough infrastructure to support this proposal
- Limited parking problem is poorly address the nonsense proposals to Watford Gen Hospital this is not on
- I have lived in Harpenden for 52 years and am saddened by the growth without consideration for impact on the community
- Harpenden's current envelope to be sacrosanct including the north edge where the wood each side Ambrose Lane makes a natural boundary and infill before modest homes not the usual 5 bedroom exec homes which we already have plenty of
- Harpenden overcrowded, especially with in fill. Character of town being destroyed. Roads and parking overcrowded and wildlife disappearing fast.
- 300 houses = 600 children at the least a new school would be needed also extra heavy builders lorries on the road
- Green belt to be preserved at all costs
- Gypsy pitches in Harpenden?! Should NOT be ALLOWED
- I am totally opposed to any erosion of green belt land
- Increased capacity on FCC trains is also necessary to cope with additional passenger numbers
- Infrastructure? Complete madness to let greedy developers to destroy our green belt
- Since we came here in 1967 the decisions on the size of Harpenden have been continuously eroded. This is wrong
- Against until Complete and detailed review of recommendations on improving all services for existing residents in Harpenden.

- Schools already over subscribed.
- Harpenden is already very crowded - large developments as recommended, will cause further problems to the current community
- Roads adjacent to area 8 are very narrow on N and E sides and cannot take extra traffic
- The affect on Ambrose Lane 7 surrounding narrow roads already used as a rat run or drivers avoiding the congestion plus the dog leg and narrow bridge over the Nicky Line on the A1081 into Harpenden
- The whole of the infrastructure needs examining before development can be considered
- The inevitable increase in demand for essential utility infrastructure that would accompany such proposals with all its attendant upheavals
- Roads and pavements in need of repair
- Rods pavements badly in need of repair
-
- Harpenden is busy enough now!
- I would oppose any major development regardless of the conditions above. The area cannot cope - period
- Services are already over stretched e.g. health visitors and community midwives increasing population in this way could be disastrous
- Development in Area of Search 8 would result in the loss of good quality agricultural land. On the basis of lower food miles and lower carbon emissions no such land should be lost
- I fear water shortages too. Parking is already a real problem
- The infrastructure can barely cope with the existing local population let alone another 1000 or so residents definitely NO
- And for the above reasons neither do we want the fields between Harpenden/Wheathampstead built upon
- There is insufficient capacity on road or rail for extra development
- Harp. Common activities will make road pubs even worse. The Lower Luton rd is narrow and may well have to be widened if all development schemes go ahead
- I feel Walkers Rd needs a pedestrian crossing below the Queens Rd junction. The 30mph speed limit is ignored!
- Increasing development along the river Lee is leading to depletion of water sources strategy must include plans to combat this
- Where is the Herts/Beds boundary?
- Greater control of infill development in residential areas is needed; similarly control cafes/restaurants in Station Road
- The proposals are very ill thought through especially in the current climate

- We fully concur with all the above concerning housing development. We moved to Harpenden in 1967 when one could drive the length of the High St and Luton Rd without having to stop and could easily cruise the High St at any point. The present congestion is already unacceptable & would be made worse with the proposed development. Would Luton Airport be extended?
- Harpenden should decide on developments
- It is essential that the bullet points listed above are fully addressed
- It is essential to avoid even more expansion there has been too much already
- Outside school holidays the facilities in Harpenden are full to capacity station car park trains roads parking for shopping schools look at the annual circus to find school places
- Area of Search 8 would also need to have shopping parking facilities. Also new surgery
- Harpenden is a vibrant and busy distinctive community further residential development will seriously impact on already stretched services
- Other infrastructure issues which should be addressed include health provision and water resources
- The town is already at saturation point a development like this would be a disaster for Harpenden
- We must protect green belts wherever they currently exist or else we will be environmentally impoverished
- Insufficient schools, traffic congestion, need good quality farmland, oppose green belt, need fresh air and leisure
- Both proposals would cause serious problems for current residents and would be a disaster for the local area
- Land is needed for food production NOT more houses and people
- Our northern border is subject to extreme pressure from rising needs of Luton immigration growth
- The control of urban development to and into Luton was dismissed as not a factor at the SADC display in Park Hall
- Would like to see an investment in local health care provision too
- This country will need to produce more of own food AGAIN to build on green belt land is wasteful and immoral
- We think that the Harpenden Community should be **about print(?)** for all community e.g. low crime, happy young people - urban sprawl will change this even new comers want a community not just houses
- Believe it or not Britain is an ISLAND i.e. limited landmass. Are we to import more essential foods & become even more vulnerable to other govts?
- Brownfield sites should be used for housing not green belt as a town's identity is lost when towns merge
- No more infrastructure? No more housing!
- Such an increase in housing in Harpenden is clearly not sustainable given current infrastructure & especially drainage
- Every property advertised for rent is an empty property therefore where is the need for additional housing?
- The road surfaces on many main roads in Harpenden are in a poor state of repair already too much traffic

- Train network already at full stretch and simply cannot cope with this sort of increase
- I agree with the policy to protect & retain the green belt, especially at Area of Search 8
- The lack of school places is an absolute disgrace and I feel needs to be the first consideration
- I have lived in Harpenden all my life and have seen the town expand over the years we do not need any more housing
- A poll of public opinion in Harpenden should be conducted
- Any future development of this land also impacts school places further - already an issue here and pressure on other local services

- As well as above railway system can't cope. Trains overcrowded parking at station inadequate as it is reduced service on trains

- Getting on to the A1081 from Roundwood area is already very difficult without additional development of Search Area 8. Building on area 8 will change the rural character and affect very badly the green view of thousands Roundwood and Wood End residents

- No tax for home owners with drives and garages when penalising street parking
- North Harpenden primary schools are already under pressure. If 300 houses (or anything like) are built a new school will be needed FIRST

- *Congestion, schools overstretched already*
- SACD have never been known to be trusted since they took over most of our affairs and this attitude still persists. What benefits!

- This proposal severely impacts Harpenden on many levels, roads, rail, car parking, production, schools, doctors and many more areas

- Need to look at brownfield/ derelict sites in UK
- Need to look at brownfield/ derelict sites in UK
- Need to look at brownfield/ derelict sites in UK
- Need to look at brownfield/ derelict sites in UK
- We do not wish to join up with Luton in Bedfordshire we are Hertfordshire!

- Please keep the green belt its so important for Harpenden
- Water Supply and Medical Services
- Harpenden Drs surgeries will find it difficult to cope with the residents of 300 new houses
- This loophole must be closed; it makes a nonsense of each county's responsibility
- Very clear need to define how infrastructure will be improved before and housing approved
- I support the existing green belt policy there are plenty of brown field sites that can be used

- The green belt land must be retained Harpenden is over stretched on schools, parking and other services we do not wish to join up with Luton and we NOT need more traffic
- Assessment of pressure on public utilities including water supply drainage and sewerage disposal
- Congestion already an issue
- Schools over subscribed already and many infill's have impact on infrastructure.
-
- We as a household strongly OBJECT to these houses being built. PROTECT OUR GREEN BELT!
- We also need to reconsider the fate of the Red House hospital and invest in better/more health care provision
- Extra houses generates extra traffic which causes extra wear and tear on the roads of Harpenden which are already of pretty poor quality
- Particularly at secondary school level
- This town seems to be under constant threat of poor decision making by SADC - this really needs to stop
- I have much concern about Harpenden being able to handle 300 more houses plus the cars and people that would mean
- We already have so much traffic coming along Ambrose Lane due to the (the Yuam Box) the hospital and the school and it is just a small residential road
- Congestion and parking already an issue
- Unless major investment in infrastructure will impede on quality of life in Harpenden
- Thank you for your assistance in preserving the unique character of our town
- Doctors surgeries and hospitals are now well overstretched with the present population inn the area. More housing would make it worse
- In addition the dentists, doctors & hospitals are overstretched as it is.
- Need to address impact on surgeries & dental practices, don't want Harpenden to lose its character by sprawling into other villages
- The scale of the proposed development is totally inappropriate anywhere in the vicinity of Harpenden. It must be rejected utterly
- What are we going to do about hospitals for Harpenden?
- Under no circumstances I would prefer any development in the proposed area
- Increase in commuters will require increased parking and improved access.

- Should regenerate existing housing stock, use brown field sites.
-
- Further proposed parking in Harpenden Town Centre should be off road. It should not encroach on current CPZ. New parking should be either extension up or down of existing car parks or a modified park and ride.
- I agree with and fully support this policy of protection and retention of the green belt. I therefore oppose the sale of area of Search 8 to developers.
- Local shopping facilities would be totally inadequate if scheme goes ahead.
- It is our responsibility to protect and retain the green belt for our quality of life and for that of future generations.
- The green belt should be inviolable once gone it can never be recovered. The area contains or abuts ancient woodland which is valuable for historical and wildlife purposes.
- Please see email - main points use brown field first, Cooters Hill Farmhouse is historic. Damage to wildlife, ancient wood land, distinctive sunken lane.
- I strongly oppose the sale of Area Search 8 to developers.
- Very concerned about school places.
- Paraphrased: Should regenerate existing housing stock, use brown field sites, green belt stops urban sprawl, traffic, impact on wildlife, (ancient woodland), sunken land, medical facilities.
- Harpenden simply cannot accommodate 300 more houses. This is whether or not there is the investment outlined above. Harpenden residents say NO.
- need to look at wildlife site, ancient woodland, plus investment implication with traffic, schools need other community issues.
- On good authority Harpenden is listed as being one of the most congested wreckages in the Country!
- Only brown field sites should be used. Green belt and productive farmland must be protected. Further increase of population - immigration & air traffic and consequential pollution is wrong.
- Schooling, the effect on nearby villages, overload on doctors & dentists, supermarket car parks are full at weekends even before development.
- The traffic noise is already bad, don't make it worse. We live next to the proposed development!
- Given the known extreme pressure on Harpenden secondary school places and the needs of village residents secondary school places must be increased before any further homes are built.
- Increased traffic to Luton airport & potential expansion will further urbanise the vicinity.
- Now the Red House is closed for in patients there is already no NHS provision for terminally ill elderly patients in Harpenden.

- A socially responsible local authority would develop a policy of purchasing (compulsory if not voluntary) refurbishing and selling vacant properties
- A socially responsible local authority would develop a policy of purchasing (compulsory if not voluntary) refurbishing and selling vacant properties
- Green belt land really needs protecting
- There is already over crowding on trains, and lack of sufficient parking spaces in the station car parks
- Need for more doctors youth facilities etc
- Homes will be for new residents looking for good schools and easy communt not for the Harependen young
- Harpenden is becoming very crowded and very aggressive now! More house building will make it worse!
- I am concerned about the extra children and no extra school places or other facilities. There will also be a lot more traffic
- There currently are not enough school places for the current population let alone 300 more children
- Luton Rd is already prone to flooding more building will exacerbate this. Ambrose Lane is quite unsuitable to take extra traffic it is narrow with bends the blind bend at the Nickey Line bridge is especially hazardous
- Ambrose Lane and pavement in an appalling state
- Ambrose Lane is already a narrow rat-run new infrastructure would be required. Too many cars too few schools already
- Ambrose Lane is already an overcrowded rat run more housing would make it impossible.
- Cooters end Lane and Ambrose Lane could not cope with all the extra traffic Entrance to site would be difficult
- Holly Bush Lane, Cooters End Lane & Ambrose Lane totally unsuitable for more traffic
- No green belt can be sold to developer. This is the good value of this Country, once green belt started to develop it will be like domino effect all green belt will disappear
- Not only is the A1081 Luton Rd a problem but Ambrose Lane as well as its bridge is also the other route over the Nickey Line
- Skylarks, hares yellow hammers, clouded yellow butterflies - these and many others will be displaced
- The schools main roads, doctors, social services to name but a few cannot cope with more apart from added pollution.
- This will further overload the drainage system which is struggling already
- Wildlife seen Ambrose lane, Cooters End Lane over last 25 years includes nesting little owls, glow-worms and clouded yellow and marbled white butterflies
- Any further development in this area is not sustainable
- Why not restore empty houses. Farmland is valuable how will we feed everyone - life playing fields once taken can never be RETURNED

- The schools in Harpenden would definitely not be able to cope at the divide between Luton and Harpenden would be even smaller
- Green belt land should be protected as essential to the wealth, well being and character of the community
- Harpenden is bursting at the seams - this proposal is madness. Schools have to be the biggest issue
- How on earth will increased parking spaces lead to reduction in traffic? Provide for cyclists!
- Pressure on L&D Hospital is already extreme - more health care provision would be needed
- There would be an increase in traffic on through roads such as Milton Rd which is already a danger
- Return the Red House to the people of Harpenden
- Stop vehicle owners from parking cars on pavements and walk ways throughout Harpenden
- The green belt is what makes Harpenden so attractive and desirable
- I cannot understand why this has ever been considered. It would be wrong not only for the people already living in the area but also for the people moving in
- Over crowding on the trains to/from Harpenden
- There are more than enough infills without this - can you think what the High Street would look like
- Developments should be directed outside of the green belt and in areas of low population not St Albans & Harpenden
- Harpenden is already struggling to cope with road and traffic problems - it cannot cope with more
- Station car parking is already a problem and the line is full to capacity at peak times
- Any expansion additional housing should be on the district brownfield sites NOT green belt
- Finding increased traffic heavy & problems coming off drive onto Luton Rd
- Green belt land is something we need to treasure for our children. It is essential for a good environment
- If Luton build up to the Beds border the green belt would effectively disappear
- It will be much harder to see a doctor its very hard now bus will have to run much often than they do now
- Rail over crowding lack of doctor and dental surgeries
- The road drainage on the main road is better maintained to stop the flooding at the end of each road whenever there is rain
- There would be 600 kids and 600 extra cars! We should first use brown belt land & we must protect green belt at all costs
- Traffic noise from A1081 is already incessant from 4am to 6pm. Further development would increase noise & pollution quite unacceptable. There are already queues of traffic at certain hrs of the day & always if an accident occurs on the M1 this is diverted. More houses in area 8 wld cause more frequent hold ups on the Luton Rd
- You stop people paving over their front gardens for driveways and yet you want to build on all the green land!

- More train station parking, floodline on A1081 will be much worse with land concreted over, lack of health care facilities, general rd surface improvement in Harpenden
- We live on the A1081 Luton Rd and it's already too busy/congested
- Too many cars and people on the road. I moved away from busy city life to enjoy the green countryside not to have it built on, please keep it green
- We would NOT need new housing if the population was reduced!
- Leave OUR green belt alone
- I also believe that productive farm land should not be sacrificed by building up it and by that losing it forever
- If green belt goes it cannot be recovered and will reduce quality of life here. I strongly oppose the plan to develop on the green belt and I am sure SADC will receive non-stop opposition to it
- Provision of improved hospital and medical facilities and efficient sewerage and water supply.
- Much more but... SADC not explain what they mean by sustainable , but use it a lot just a buzz word. There is a city vision and a rural vision neither cover Harpenden. Core Strategy needs to be more proactive in its approach on renewable energy - would welcome opportunity to discuss further.
- I am a local teacher and schools overcrowded, Harpenden residents have to go to school in St Albans, WGC and Hemel. Could affect exam results. Flood risk and could affect my house from flooding.
- Draining along the A1081 needs improving to taken into account the massive increase of surface run off (eye conversion of gardens to driveways takes into consideration.
- Paraphrased: Should regenerate existing housing stock, use brown field sites, green belt stops urban sprawl, traffic, impact on wildlife, (ancient woodland), sunken land, medical facilities.
- Worried about schools, trains and road.
- Luton Road heavily congested past AOS 8. Facilities in Harpenden already over stretched.
- Medical network too small to accommodate such population growth.
- Roads already congested and has been site of serious and fatal accidents.
- Luton Road already too congested.
- Trains already overcrowded
- Absolutely no major housing developments
- Harpenden has too many cars - too many commuters leaving cars all day every day!
- No development should be considered until a new secondary school is built
- This will add to the problems of crime and anti-social behaviour emanating from Luton and present unacceptable pressure on Herts Police

- My wife and I fully endorse the actions of Harpenden Town Council
- Car parking at railway station will need to be extended in order to prevent further street parking and CPZ needs extending.
- **Reduce traffic and enforce 7.5ton lorry ban on Lower Luton Rd**
- My daughter was issued a secondary school place in a failing school in Hemel!
- What about sewerage where will all the water from the river go will it flood more than it does now - leave our green belt alone
- Cyclists using A1081 extra buses, lorries a lengthy new footpath will be required
- The proposed housing is in no way in the interests of Harpenden residents for many reasons some detailed above
- Harpenden is already considerably more crowded than it was even 10 years ago. This would be overwhelming and harmful to the environment
- On the A1081 Luton Rd there is already a bottleneck at the traffic lights going under the bridge for the Nickey Line this development would make this totally unbearable with the with the increased cars
- Commuter parking must be addressed at end of Maldon Court parking on pavement
- Once the green belt is gone it is gone forever please protect it
- I do NOT want the green belt to be developed upon
- Annual school place fiasco ever since Wheathampstead school closed
- Green belt land should remain green
- Because this is a gem of a town and fast becoming overwhelmed as it is no wonder we are worried
- Find all the brown field sites and consider building on those - a number of them - no to green belt use
- All this and 1,200 more houses on Verulam estate - NO
- Does this mean that congestion would take place on the Lower Luton Rd as does now only More so
- I feel we have enough traffic in Harpenden already
- There are not enough secondary school places for current residents existing schools can't be enlarged
- This is a lovely green belt area and should NOT be built on
- Roads in this area are of third world standards. With 26,000 more homes they will be just dire
- Ill conceived and dubious reasons for this area being included
- Brown field sites should be used for new housing under no circumstance should green belt be used
- It will impinge upon the country views of local residents who bought in N. Harpenden for the space

- Reliable, frequent and affordable bus services 7 days a week connecting all areas of Harpenden with access to local towns and shops
- 300 new houses in north Harpenden will put enormous pressure on already overburdened services
- I came to live in Harpenden some 40 years ago because I was impressed with everything it seemed "just right" and I want to see it continue
- Strongly agree the implications of such a development have not been thought through
- Against green belt and need to take into account 26000 homes in Luton and surrounding area.
- Applaud depth width and scope of consultation, see email paraphrase - additional housing will effect schools, traffic and rail. Need large supermarket in Harpenden but need adequate parking, St Albans too distant for young to use leisure facilities. Support Rothamstead Research expansion, impt to national economy.
- Need to improve water pressure for existing residents, need additional post office, need more even mix of shopping premises,
- Green belt invasion is likely to result in further incursions into the diminishing countryside around Harpenden
- For goodness sake DO NOT allow Harpenden to be merged with LUTON; like St Albans to Hatfield
- Impact of sheer living/impact on amenities e.g. sports centre, library, shops need to be fully thought through
- Over the past 50 yrs Harpenden has become a very overcrowded car park our infrastructure cannot sustain further large devel schemes
- Overcrowded trains, overcrowded car parks, overcrowded roads and they are suggesting MORE!
- The natural environment is No 1 - there is plenty of ugly sites in Luton & London why ruin beautiful farm land with more housing (or any building)
- The present road system through Harpenden is already stretched during rush hour further development will make traffic impossible
- Was this land purchased under a compulsory purchase order or voluntarily sold?
- It is important to also ensure increases are made to provisions for services for the elderly before increasing local population
- More policing would be needed and more community services. The approach to Harpenden would be horrendous
- I am totally opposed to any large housing development in Harpenden - it's roads and schools are already at saturation point
- The local infrastructure road, schools, hospitals cannot cope with current in fills in Harpenden this development would totally overload the system a complete disaster
- We feel it is detrimental to the environment to develop Greenfield sites when brownfield sites have not been exhausted
- No homes north of Harpenden. We are already gridlocked with roads not maintained and schools oversubscribed

- We fully endorse all the above it is paramount that Harpenden is not absorbed into Luton
 - Moved from London originally to get away from overcrowding and built up areas already enough building in this area
 - This will take a lot of objection by Harpenden people
 - We are seriously worried already about available school places in years to come without an increase of 300 children
 - With the already congested traffic on the Lower Harpenden rd between Luton/Wheathampstead and the close of the 2 Post Offices in Harpenden we cannot take any more development
 - I hope this policy will be outvoted a resident for 78 years I hope that Harpenden will stay
 - Planning permission is being granted for an increasing number of over large (effectively 3 storey) homes in West Common which is changing nature of area.
 - 300 houses would need 300 jobs but Harpenden already needs 5,000 jobs just counting commuters, no more houses
 - The views of Harpenden residents should be properly taken into account by SADC and Herts CC
 - This is the very last thing Harpenden requires and is no more than profit and greed
-
- It is not just schools/traffic - ALL infrastructure needs review if new development allowed (utilities, doctors etc)
 - At a time when it is obvious that the nation should be becoming more self sufficient the continued destruction of valuable green belt farmland throughout the country will inevitably lead to drastic food shortages
 - Housing must be built only where there is sufficient schools, drs, roads etc not on green belt land
 - The population of Harpenden has more than doubled in 50 years. Yet the road infrastructure services much the same. Building on green belt is a cynical devise of Local Democracy
 - A1081 is often flooded after heavy rain and flooding would increase after these plans were implemented
 - I endorse all the above very strongly
 - Schools, hospitals and other amenities are in short supply here already
 - Trains to London already packed in rush hours. Town centre could not cope
 - Rail services in particular are inadequate infrastructure must be developed before any new housing is even considered
 - Ruining of hedgerows and countryside to widen roads near new housing - Council breaking green belt code
 - Harpenden is too smaller a town to cope with this. Children are not able to get into local schools of choice
-
- My main concern is the effect of any new homes, wherever built on traffic, parking and school places. Need firm plans to improve these 3 areas. Any new building need to provide at least 2 off road parking spaces per property and road wide enough for parking both sides and a dust cart/fire engine down the middle. What happened to proposed western by pass that was mooted some years ago?
-
- I feel strongly about preventing urban sprawl and I wish to preserve Harpenden's beauty by retaining the surrounding green belt of open countryside.

- A development of this scale and size would ruin the character and fabric of Harpenden and put an intolerable strain on its amenities
- Destroying farm land is NOT a sustainable solution
- Hope this applies to all open spaces in Harpenden including allotments etc
- Perhaps Harpenden Town Council should be linked with Hitchin to reflect the parliamentary line instead of St Albans?
- These homes would drain resources in schools, NHS in area water and noise from cars, pollution and traffic congestion in this area
- Schools already bursting so Harpenden people have to go to Hemel. Imperative developers pay for extra school places in Harpenden. Much longer text.
- Doctors and dentists can't cope. We have too many cars why bring in more people? Do the Council REALLY EVER listen to its residents???
- You are doing a wonderful job. Thank you.
- I do not see how one can provide more parking in Harpenden town centre unless one resorts to multi-storey parking
- No green belt land should be developed unless and until all brownfield sites have been exhausted - across the City & District
- The already lack of short term free parking in and around Harpenden High Street and 100% increase would be required
- Traffic very congested when schools open and close in Harpenden and road to St Albans and Luton
- I think the rail services and parking would struggle as well
- Such building creates ecological damage through the loss of trees, hedges, crops and soil all essential to reduce CO2 everything should be done to reduce population density
- In addition to the afore-mentioned comments I am not sure if there is an adequate infrastructure to service future demand for basic necessities e.g. water, power.
- SE England is too crowded there is much need for northern development
- We strongly oppose this development - it isn't in character with Harpenden (new builds) and too much additional money will need to be spent on roads and infrastructure
- Harpenden big enough, further expansion will alter character for worse. Traffic excessive and impose substantial pressure on existing services and schools. Green belt established for a reason and attempts to build on it must be resisted. Land should not be sacrificed for financial gain, could damage whole area.
- All potential redevelopment areas rather than green belt should be exhausted before we consider further erosion of the limited green belt areas
- All the above very important!
- As a governor of Roundwood Park School and former Chair of the rail commuters association I know that investment in transport and education infrastructure is ESSENTIAL before such developments

- Proper infrastructure is in place prior to start of the development.
- SCAC and DC apply pressure to the CT to provide adequate local hospital care for current and expected residents
- We can view this land from our house and was a main reason for living here for the countryside views
- We do not have enough NHS dentists, drs surgeries or social service support to cope with a development of this size
- I oppose the planned build on the green belt in Harpenden
-
- A resounding NO to ANY development in our green belt and strong opposition to the 26,000 new houses so close to Harpenden
- Agreed!
- Also other infrastructure issues such as water and drainage and sewage on existing systems
- Essential for local MP (and his successor) to be actively involved, and to keep high publicity profile.
- Further substantial investments would need to be made in respect of other infrastructure aspects eg medical/health facilities, fire service
- Harpenden infrastructure is already severely stretched
- Harpenden cannot accommodate the sheer size of this development. The green belt must remain in tact.
- Harpenden is a successful town to increase housing will not give any benefit in fact it will have a detrimental affect
- I agree with all the above comments Harpenden is developed too much already any NEW building should be restricted
- Inadequate doctors, surgeries, medical facilities. Also public transport (buses)
- Is there enough water these days to support so many more people?
- NO more expansion of harpenden PLEASE & hands off our green belt. The present population is more than sufficient
- There is more investment in medical facilities needed locally for the people of Harpenden
- There is no reason to believe there is any need for such developments
- Change of use from residential to business should not receive planning permission
- From north Harpenden we already have to queue up to reach the High Street & schools are already overfull, NO to development
- Needs substantial investment in water supplies, sewerage and drainage.
- Needs substantial investment in water supplies, sewerage and drainage.
- Needs substantial investment in water supplies, sewerage and drainage.
- Needs substantial investment in water supplies, sewerage and drainage.
- The location of AOS 8 is on a hill facing large proportion of residences of North Harpenden so visual impact of development would be significant. Already can see Luton Airport lights.

- Live in area and pressure of schools, traffic and reduce beauty for area. Councils need to protect interest of both current and future residents of this beautiful town.
 - Agreed!
 - Increase problem with speeding on Harpenden Roads
 - Lack infrastructure, roads congested, schools over subscribed, need farm land. Sense community lost.
 - FCC can provide a train service to accommodate further users
 - The green belt must be preserved it is therefore sound reasons and to stop Harpenden becoming another sprawl
 - The green belt should be retained at all costs
 - Trains are already over crowded
-
- Indefensible to allow 300 more households too much pressure already on schools health services care and social services roads and shops water supply and the environment generally
 - Get the roads repaired to a good standard had to spend £700 on my car because of bad road surfaces
 - I agree with all the above especially school investment
 - I am particularly concerned about traffic congestion and lack of school places in the town
 - Roads, roads, roads.
 - Increasing heavy vehicle traffic, anti social noise from traffic calming - use abuse of regular tones
 - This development would threaten the now stable community and infrastructure of the area
 - Green belt should stay as green belt Harpenden's infrastructure would not cope with these homes being built
 - Station parking already under pressure Lower Luton Rd on the verge of being dangerous. Need for all public services , gas water drainage to be augmented
 - A working farm should never be put at risk
 - Public Transport
 - Very little research has been done on the impact of mass development on existing infrastructure no future development should be undertaken until all information is at hand
 - The loss of green belt would be for ever - our quality of life is being slowly affected in so many negative ways. Nor this too!!!
-
- The traffic problem in and on the A1081 is bad now when M1 is closed the town is at a stand still for hours
 - As well as the above issues the impact on doctors surgeries will be enormous
 - I fully agree with the above objective
 - Our son could not get a secondary school place in Harpenden no more houses until more school places provided
 - You will lose my vote if green belt status is lost

- No houses should be built without appropriate extra infrastructure. Where is the water for extra houses coming from?
 - A1081 existing traffic congestion during school term time and is used as by pass if M1 south is congested
 - There are already many access points on to the A1081 between Coopers End Lane and the narrow Nickey Line bridge this development would also have to access the Luton Road. Already there are frequent minor accidents which at peak times with buses and school coaches stopping will be even more dangerous
 - Will have devastating effect of character of Town and scenic agricultural land
 - Will have devastating effect of character of Town and scenic agricultural land
 - Schools oversubscribed from personal experience.
 - Green belt should be preserved for future generations.
 - A1081 congested, schools overstretched, green belts stops urban sprawl. Need to look at Brownfield sites
 - I fully endorse the above comments this expansion would destroy our town and quality of life
 - Over density in south east and pressure on essential services i.e. water supply etc
 - Overcrowding on Thameslink inadequate hospital and doctor facilities
- Strongly support this opposition, especially the practical infrastructure points. Note also that Harpenden is growing already, infilling etc as possible.
- The green belt between must be preserved to stop Luton and Harpenden become one urban sprawl.
 - You should only be using brownfield sites nothing else
- Area already used as cut through, difficulty getting into primary and secondary schools, further housing change character.
 - This search 8 land is opposite my flat it would prompt me to move out of the area if it goes ahead.
 - Extra housing must include provision of low cost housing.
- *Houses with parking facilities used for residence with multiple vehicle ownership*
- A1081 is subject to severe flooding already at road junctions - NO to more houses and cars
 - In Area of Search 8 the fields absorb much rainwater - develop them will increase FLOODING RISK onto A1081 the fields slope quite sharply down to the A1081
 - Resolve the current overcrowding on the railway system during rush hour to London
 - The green belt was established to provide some protection for the environment. We destroy the green belt at our peril
 - The south east of England is already overcrowded. The infrastructure cannot cope with more population. The Government should expand elsewhere in the Country

- The state of roads in Harpenden is a major concern - resurfacing is VITAL
- Traffic regularly queues past the Roundwood Lane traffic lights - 300 more houses will only exacerbate this problem
- The road is too busy
- I am also very much opposed to the proposal for a travellers site in the Harpenden area
- We cannot control how Bedfordshire sprawls towards Hertfordshire but we can ensure a buffer on our side I am against even if promised investment

- Green belt land - keep off
- Core Strategy Questionnaire does not allow us to comment on AOS8 south east & wrongly describes it as landscape quality is not high

- Although we have used this pro-forma we still feel very strongly that this development is wholly inappropriate
- ***Rewrote - paraphrase School places already over subscribed, roads, doctors, hospitals, urban sprawl***

- Green belt for reason, for future generations, infrastructure not support, schools overstretched, roads and water concerns.
- If this development goes ahead are we going to have another school and more medical facilities as what we have is already overstretched

- Harpenden has already reached full capacity on all its major needs I understand already in N Harpenden more houses are going to be build on Yeomans Avenue, Wood End
- Harpenden schools too large already due to centralisation. Road developments and more car parking would encourage car usage to the detriment of Harpenden
- I question whether there is LOCAL employment for more people. Any population increase in this REGION I would resist

- I strongly believe that adding a large volume of houses into a small area will decimate what Harpenden is and stands for
- It is not just the apparent absence of consideration about congestion, school places etc but spaces must be left to BREATHE

- Surgeries are also crowded the bus service to Hemel Hempstead has been cancelled these open spaces are very valuable - we don't want to be an off shoot of Luton
- The actions and aspirations of one local authority has significant impact which needs consultation and agreement with another

- The medical facilities in the town are already at capacity
- Paraphrased: loss of green belt, impact on wildlife, strain on local services,
- Was a school governor - know the pressure already on schools in Harpenden

- Harpenden is also short of hospital facilities and needs its own NHS cottage hospital before expanding the resident population
- Any development in north Harpenden will also add to the heavy traffic congestion on the B653 Luton/Wheathampstead Rd
- Trains - it is hard now to get on at Harpenden and will be standing all the way Drs and hospitals. Harder to get appointments, and queues of sick people!
- Local doctors and dentists will come under more pressure to cope. Harpenden will be spoilt if expands too much.
- Please address local traffic issues and transport issues before increasing population density
- **Address is: 2 The Cottages, The Bourne**
- Having lived in Harpenden since 1972 I have seen a decline in the quality of life largely due to increase in traffic and more aggressive driving
- I work at the school opposite Area 8 so I know it well - it would be a total disaster to build 300 houses there and against the green belt laws
- If these houses are built extra traffic controls (roundabouts lights etc) will be needed on A1081 more congestion
- We can't cope with more commuters on our already overcrowded trains or their cars here in the town
- Our ELECTED Town, District & County Councillors need to fight the UNELECTED Regional Authority to stop putting forward planning guidelines like this. Our elected Councillors need to tell this short sighted government the problem is voted in their stupid migration policy. All the pressure and thus impact on green belt/housing targets as well as infrastructure and unemployment of our youth is your uncontrolled migration and must be stopped
- Coalesce with Luton could be an issue as close to border of Luton.
- Why try to spoil a very pleasant small town by over crowding
- Don't impose this on Harpenden please against the wishes of those of us who live here
- I totally agree with your comments; Harpenden does not have the facilities for a larger population
- Particularly concerned about schools already under pressure
- I am a commuter & cannot get a seat on the train in the morning for which I pay £3647 - how much busier would it get with 300 more houses in Harpenden?
- I am particularly concerned about the social and community services and am not convinced by the number of houses proposed in the core strategy where is the evidence
- I am particularly concerned about the social and community services and am not convinced by the number of houses proposed in the core strategy where is the evidence
- There would also need to be substantial investment in train services to/from Harpenden & already stretched leisure facilities i.e. children's pool & library

- This will also impact on a stretched train service that is always over capacity in rush hours
 - All the above plus we need every acre of food producing ground - good arable land
 - The infrastructure will not take a large housing development
 - There are other areas e.g. wasteland that could be used leave our green belt alone!
 - I heartily agree with all the above comments
 - My main concerns would be lack of parking spaces in the town over crowded roads and of course schools
 - Green belt land must NOT be build on! Is it not illegal?
 - Increased demand for local health services also provision needed for children and youth activities
 - Green belt land should be invaluable otherwise it is all at risk
 - The area is much of the green belt land between Luton and Harpenden in St Albans if land is built on little green belt land is left
- If Luton expands to Beds border and the site in question is built on there will only be a nominal amount of green belt land remaining
- The present attraction of Harpenden is not having urban sprawl which blights other towns and keeps individuality
 - We need a re-opened Red House and Post Office in addition to more nurses both District and practice before this is considered
- Significant and appropriate investment in providing social community services are required
 - Insufficient water supplies, health facilities could not cope, quality of life severely compromised
 - We are in full agreement with the Town Council on these issues. Thank you for drawing them to our attention
 - With all schools in Harpenden currently over capacity no new development should take place even a single new house let along 300 new homes proposed
- I have watched increasing infill sites close to my home in Spenser Road, and Harpenden generally putting strain on local road and facilities. I do not want development of AOS 8 to go ahead.
 - Birds, habitats green belt land is so important for the general well-being of everyone
 - Concern erosion of green belt also the knock on effect on the infrastructure
 - Is there an adequate water supply for all these new houses? Sewage disposal??? SE England is already overcrowded
 - Please think of the future and the following generations when the green belt has been eroded there is no more!
 - This would devastate the beautiful countryside around Harpenden. Never to be returned.
 - I totally agree with your desire to deny any development of this particular site
 - We are told to be more food sufficient and you want to build on growing land
 - An additional call on the services of the NHS which is already creating

- I agree totally with all the above especially congestion on A1081
- More development without improving the infrastructure facilities and schools is insane. Improve these then housing development can be justified
- I support the building of additional houses if they are to the standard of housing in Harpenden and additional schooling and infrastructure is in place to cope with additional people/families
- (removed 2 bullet points)
- I feel town already suffering form increase in housing from old single properties being made into multiple dwelling and green space in town is built on. This is all piecemeal growth and cannot be sustained with the pressure of AOS8 added in.
- Enhanced public transport especially bus services to avoid increased congestion in Harpenden during peak hours
- Harpenden already takes the overflow from Luton and St Albans. We already feel like a car park
- Pavements in Southdown from Grove school to Plough & Harrow
- Shortage of school places, town has reached its saturation point with traffic
- Harpenden is already over crowded due to the in-filling and building of blocks of flats on any space available - NO MORE!
- We should not erode the green belt surrounding Harpenden
- The current rainwater drainage system cannot cope with the run off from driveways especially Station Rd area train system full to overflowing
- Rail capacity for commute to London already overcrowded
- There is already significant development mostly contravening planning permission on Faulkners Farm/Yeomans Avenue
- Shops closing down due to exorbitant rents our town is already overcrowded. The schools are full and so are the roads
- Has the impact of these further 300 homes on water/sewage and other facilities been investigated?
- I see no reason for expanding Harpenden further
- It is only a matter of time before all the green belt areas around us are threatened. We cannot support the increased pressure on our resources
- Over populated in the South East as it is; facilities inadequate for further expansion
- Protect green belt
- The strategy by the Council is insufficient to and totally inadequate for this plan
- We must maintain the green belt
- Harpenden overcrowded and schools over subscribed.
- Harpenden area & schools far too overcrowded already

- There is enough development now. The schools GP's A&E services just can't cope now
- Any housing developments should be sustainable and environmentally friendly and not jeopardise the future of the river Lea. House sizes should suit local needs not massive luxury developments which increase developers profits. Green belt must be saved. Infrastructure needs must be addressed before new housing built. Quality of life for extra residents should be maintained
- Pls do not allow development on this land.
- Traffic is already unbearable on Luton Rd this will only make it worse
- Bedfordshire is empty OR why not add to HERTFORD?
- Oppose development until incorporate localised renewable energy generation of the development.
- Any major housing development would also add to the already stretched local transport & infrastructure
- Housing in this area will cause severe traffic problems. Repropose the bypass scheme rejected by Lib Dems 1991
- Put a school there? Standing on trains, crawling in traffic - we're mad to tolerate it
- We recently moved to Harpenden attracted by the town's sense of scale this proposal seems out of scale
- Can't condone any development unless ecologically sound and eliminates the dependency on cars.
- Certain areas of the town are gridlocked at peak times e.g. Station Rd please no more cars from extra houses
- Once built, there is no way back from this damage to the environment.
- Harpenden already struggles to cope with number of residents re: school places, doctors appointments, parking. Keep it green
- I support the policy to protect the green belt around Harpenden and am opposed to further expansion in the area
- I agree we need to protect and retain the green belt
- Resident in Harpenden for 53 years and seen much growth still a lovely place to live & must not be allowed to merge northward!
- We have problems with drains on the A1081 its always flooding when we get a drop of rain and it will be made worse with houses on Search 8
- There would be NO benefits to Harpenden at all it would tear the heart and soul out of this so very loved village
- Need to look at elec and lack of power to Harpenden.
- Need more youth facilities and health facilities
- Accidents emergency hospitals to few and too far away
- Also the adequate supply of water, gas and electricity

- Harpenden is saturated already! Traffic jams caused by local residence and outsiders is at its maximum We definitely don't need more
- Mayor improvement required in cycleway to reduce traffic N/S of A1081 and W to Redbourn
- The state of the roads and the management of the Council estates leave a lot to be desired
- We totally agree with the comments made above.
- I support in particular the points highlighted in red. In addition I wish to point out that the town's infrastructure will not support the SADC's proposals
- Congestion on the A1081 at peak periods is already unacceptable - the proposed development would seriously exacerbate it
- I am very concerned about the over density of people, cars etc and lack of infrastructure
- We must do all you can to stop the ongoing encroachment of development totally ruining Harpenden
- We should like to see some positive proposals concerning a Harpenden response to the need for houses
- Harpenden Town cannot support 300 homes re parking, schools, traffic, shops
- An emphatic NO to this development
- The expression 'the thin end of the wedge' springs to mind. Further development towards Luton would surely follow
- Another major concern I have is the significantly increased pressure on the rail services from Harpenden which are already over crowded at peak hours
- Harpenden is already failing to cope with the current population dreadful roads, not enough schools or parking
- The infrastructure and public services in Harpenden are already stretch severely. I agree strongly with the above points
- There is an urgent need to provide multilevel car parking at the rail station to provide congestion in residential streets like Topstreet Way
- I agree with all your objections to the developments. I add the need of an increase in car parking capacity at Harpenden station as multi-storey car park. Our roads are congested and dangerous because of commuter parking
- Every side rd in and around central Harpenden and within walking distance of the station is CONGESTED by car parking of commuters and town workers. This not only endangers the lives of those residents affected but damages the quality of life. My own Townsend Lane is particularly badly affected. MONEY is URGENTLY required for the provision of more parking and restrictions imposed elsewhere
- Hundreds of dwellings have been built in Harpenden in recent years which have already strained the infrastructure
- I agree!
- I am appalled this is even being considered

- I support the opposition regards school places & traffic congestion. Also what about hospitals? Closing Red House and limiting St A and HH and making us go to Watford. In a drought year our region is short of water
- Under no circumstances do we want any more housing estates built adjacent to the green belt and no more cars
- We are totally against any more interference with our precious green belt, which will eventually be consumed if such constant nibbling is allowed
- When you have an attractive small town why do you try to destroy it. Build on less attractive land and improve poorer areas
- The infrastructure of the town cannot accommodate these additional houses. Congestion is at breaking point already
- Brownfield sites not properly investigated and rejected as more expensive to develop
- No sign of planning for the extra children, extra traffic. Green belt is to stop urban sprawl. Policing minimal in Harpenden, healthcare over stretched. Need to look at derelict housing or Brownfield commercial sites.
- Needs to be improvement in healthcare to accommodate extra residents
- There is already a high level of dangerous and inconvenient commuter parking in this road and this will be made worse
- Already flooding in Luton Rd - affect on water too and congestion with schools
- Building of more houses will increase pressure on local hospitals and medical facilities
- Drainage on the A1081 floods on a regular basis
- Inadequate medical services
- Need improved infrastructure/schools/transport in place before more new housing is introduced
- Substantial traffic problems already when M1 south bound traffic problems
- The present roads cannot cope with traffic now neither can the schools cope. How will they manage with the extra traffic/children another 300 houses will bring?
- Traffic feeding onto A1081 every morning would add to congestion which is always worse when problems on motorway
- We live on the edge of Harpenden to be close to the countryside: please don't take this away from us
- Where is the new school going to be built if this pie in the sky project approved??????
- Adequate surface drainage for run off water, until ring road around Harpenden to take M1 diverted traffic in addition to Heavy peak hours on A1081
- Restrictions on developers about density parking, open spaces, space for brownie club and scout hut etc variety in number bedrooms some lower prices
- Infrastructure already under pressure
- Loss of productive agricultural land should not be considered, railway station could not cope with increase, health overstretched already, water limited.

- Loss of productive agricultural land should not be considered, railway station could not cope with increase, health overstretched already, water limited.
- EVEN if the above happened I oppose a development
- In addition the increased surface cover will make the potential to flood from run off greater the A1081 already suffers flooding when rainfall is heavy
- Speed of traffic needs to be reduced from 40-30mph on Luton rd up to Kinsbourne Green
- The local school classes are at their maximum capacity the A1081 traffic jams are notorious at rush hour more housing will increase existing flooding that occurs on A1081
- There really is no need for this proposed development particularly with the lack of investment in our current infrastructure
- We are totally against the planned proposed building on our green belt land
- NO. Builders will probably plan for 3 car parking spaces per house where is the new school, shops there is no employment in this area. Problems on M1 grid locks Luton to St Albans, We must preserve green belt
- There would be more delivery trucks - emissions more chaos on road loss of wildlife habitat
- There will also be an increased need for doctors dentists hospitals fire police and ambulance cover in the area
- I strongly support the protection of Harpenden's green belt
- Extra investment required for schools GP surgeries health clinics services, parking and measures to decrease congestion at St Albans end of A1081
- It would turn the narrow Ambrose Lane into a major traffic route
- Please get rid of the road humps particularly in Bowers Way which can wreck your suspension on one visit just use cameras
- The institutions of Harpenden are already strained this construction will only worsen the situation
- The issue of school places is critical: local schools are already unable to meet the needs of the local population
- There is already not enough schools in Harpenden as some children get given schools in Hemel!
- This proposal will lead to a further degradation in the quality of life for all people in this area
- Shops? Post Office? Medical Provision?
- There should be additional amenities (school, shops community centre, sports centre, parks at that end of Harpenden I am basically opposed to this development we also object to the constant in-filling of large gardens with houses and knocking down houses and building several in its place all without taking into consideration the increase in traffic and people in this town
- The infrastructure of the area cannot cope with anymore demands schools etc
- There would be an adverse impact on health care provision in Harpenden

- Our formerly lovely village is already grossly overcrowded No more Development EVER
- Residential development must be supported by the necessary facilities, education, drains, roads etc. Industrial development should be denied.
- Traffic in Harpenden is already approaching gridlock at peak times and school places for existing satellite villages are insufficient
- Harpenden & its facilities are already overloaded by housing development
- Insufficient car parking for more commuters at Harpenden station
- The developers should make full financial payment to cover the costs of infrastructure investment
- Schools already over subscribed for local residents
- Who will be receiving the 30 pieces of silver if the green belt land is built on?
- I am not aware of any political parties at SADC who were voted in on a manifesto promise of disregarding protection of the Green Belt. As such, have no right to arbitrarily grant permission for development on this site. Already enormous pressure on public services in Harpenden, esp. schools. I have serious objection to this development.
- Edited letter and does not think environmental impact and sustainability have been considered.
- Immigration! Must stop our Country can stand no more our Country is being destroyed. This country is our's and by right
- The B653 through Batford is unable to cope with the possible rat run for lorries some travel it now and cause stoppage
- Green belt land is there for the specific purpose of "NOT TO BE BUILT UPON"
- Increased capacity on commuter trains would be required too congested at present
- The green belt will be lost for ever?
- There will not be enough school places and admission to schools is difficult enough now
- We feel that once our green fields start disappearing they will continue to do so we have lost enough already
- Why build Bedfordshire's houses in Hertfordshire?
- Current lack of investment in rd, pavement condition, police and social services
- Also pressures on medical services etc
- Town already congested and parking a nightmare. Further development will cause problem for local businesses and Harpenden will become suburb of Luton
- Traffic congestion is already considerable

- Pedestrians already find crossing the High Street & Luton Rd hazardous. Doctors dentists and hospital appointments are already stretched almost to the limit
- We oppose the development of green belt under any circumstances
- Congestion will only increase until a by-pass is built - proposing 300 more houses in north Harpenden is to ignore the present reality
- The area is ALREADY over developed getting into Harpenden is very difficult 8-9.15!
- The green belt should be sacrosanct otherwise to define it is pointless
- Infill already causing problem, extra 300 homes will add burden of community problems and shortage of essential facilities.
- The overall housing need in the south east should be reviewed in the light of half of the 1.3 million East European immigrants having returned home
- This would be a huge step towards Luton & Harpenden being one. We must resist this encroachment on green belt
- It would be a disaster if this was allowed to go ahead schools roads etc are enough clogged up as it is it would ruin Harpenden
- The green belt is crucial in the fight against urban development HCC & SADC should maintain the gap between Herts & Beds at all costs
- Density of traffic already on road in area and even more if 80 plus houses are built in Yeomans Avenue ref: 5/08/2643
- No population increase many of our surroundings and roads are already in a shocking state and Councils cannot afford to increase them
- Traffic a really issue already. Development of green belt land for housing is deplorable and another step to degrade Harpenden.
- Stop the overcrowding in the town