

KINGS LANGLEY & DISTRICT RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

Local Plans – Quick & simple response cheat sheet

The KL&DRA believe that both Dacorum Borough Council and Three Rivers District Council have modified their plans in ways that protect Kings Langley and our surrounding Green Belt and we encourage residents to respond to **both** consultations positively. The following provides some brief narrative that residents can adapt for themselves when replying to the consultations' questions:

Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan consultation – example responses

The consultation can be found here: <https://bit.ly/dacplan>

Qu 1: Where does your response relate to? (Tick all that apply)

Answer: Kings Langley; Hemel Hempstead

Qu 2: Overall feedback on changes to the strategy

Answer: Agree

Qu 3: Please use this space if you would like to provide any further feedback on the revised strategy

Answer (adapt/put in your own words if possible):

- ***I agree with the current proposals, particularly with regard to Kings Langley.***
- ***The Council are right to focus development on the urban areas in towns***
- ***It is positive to see the council preserving and protecting Green belt sites such as Rectory Farm.***
- ***Villages such as Kings Langley must retain their identity and character by not having excessive development thrust upon them.***
- ***I do have concerns about the lack of infrastructure provision if development is focussed on the A4251 corridor at Apsley.***
- ***I am concerned about increased traffic levels and the effects of additional pollution.***
- ***I welcome brownfield development but only if more public green space is provided.***

Three Rivers District Council Local Plan Consultation

The consultation can be found here: <https://bit.ly/trdcplan>

Qu 1: Do you agree with the Council's proposed stance of not complying with the Government's Standard Method for calculating the District's housing need figure.....

Answer: Yes

Qu 2: Please explain why....

Answer (adapt/put in your own words if possible):

- ***It is right to reduce the target as otherwise, our area will lose too much Green belt.***
- ***It is good for Kings Langley that two major sites have been removed, otherwise Kings Langley would not be a village anymore.***

Continued

- ***Protecting our Green belt means Kings Langley does not merge with Abbots Langley and/or Bedmond.***
- ***Kings Langley does not have sufficient infrastructure and resources to cope with large scale development***
- ***We need to preserve our village's historic setting and character.***

Qu 3: Do you agree that the Council's preferred 'Low Growth and Green Belt Restraint' option is the best growth strategy for the District?

Answer: Yes

Qu 4: Please explain why you agree with the above statement.

Answer (adapt/put in your own words if possible):

I believe that the Council has taken a reasonable approach by producing a plan with acceptable growth that, whilst it does not protect all of the District's Green Belt, does protect the key Green Belt areas, which if built on, would cause significant harm to villages (such as Kings Langley) and settlements around the District.

Qu 5: Do you agree with the sites detailed in Appendix 1 that TRDC are not proposing for development?

Answer: Yes

Qu 6: Please explain why you agree with the above statement.

Answer (adapt/put in your own words if possible):

I agree with the sites not taken forward, not only because two large sites removed were in or adjacent to Kings Langley, but because the reasons the sites have been removed are sensible and proportional. The Council has to balance protecting the District's Green Belt with having to provide a reasonable amount of growth by way of sites for new dwellings, and this is what the new plan supports.

NB: The bulk of the following questions in the consultation are in relation to whether you agree specific sites should be included in the plan as appropriate development sites. There are two potential sites in Kings Langley:

Qu: NSS10: Land at Mill Place, Hunton Bridge. Do you agree this site is an appropriate development site?

Answer: I agree that this site should be included as it is brownfield land.

QU: ACFS8b: Flower House, Station Road. Do you agree this site is an appropriate development site?

Answer:

I do not agree that the whole of this site is an appropriate development site. Only the truly original brownfield part of the site is appropriate for development and that the boundary of the site should be redrawn accordingly to exclude and protect the unlawfully developed green field area. This part of the site has an enforcement notice to restore it back to its former green field state and the Council should ensure this area is reinstated.

End of document