

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
286	319	2	296	2

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
4 Adams Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DY	<p>On a personal level I'm disappointed that a planning application of this size has been considered for Tring and in this area.</p> <p>We are already impacted in the surrounding environment by the extension of Aylesbury, HS2 and the lack of adherence to the rules by Luton airport. Our natural environment is under such strain. Also because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
3 Thomas Gardens Tring	I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons:

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 5FN</p>	<p>The fact that the plan proposes to build on green belt, which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This, when there is a review currently being undertaken by Dacorum Borough Council to utilise brownfield sites and minimise encroachment on greenbelt. It does not make sense to agree to proposals, when the outcome of the review is unknown.</p> <p>The scale of the development compared to the current size of Tring is inappropriate. There is already a sizeable development at Roman Park and this proposal, in addition, would increase the population of Tring by 34%. This is a huge increase and cannot but impact the nature and character of Tring.</p> <p>I am not against growth for Tring per se, such growth should be appropriate to its size and thereby endeavour to maintain its charm and existing character. It is an historic market town worth preserving because of its unique nature and the way in which it serves people, in the Hertfordshire community and beyond, wishing to enjoy the pleasures of Ashridge and rural landscapes. It is easy to make decisions that change a place forever, and there is no going back, as can be witnessed by developments that change the nature of local communities, increase density and congestion, and have poorly thought through and disjointed provision of necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>A proposal of this nature with all the 152 associated documents and 5,500 pages to digest merits a longer timeframe to respond. It feels like this approach is designed to make appropriate response difficult. I hope that this application will be opposed and Dacorum Borough Council will be able to finish their review and make a highly considered decision about any development on protected land.</p>
<p>The Croft Northchurch Common Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1LR</p>	<p>I write to register my concern & objection to the above planning application. The basis for my concern is that, as it is a Hybrid application, the assurances from the developers concerning resources, layout & scale have no material value. In the Green Belt, adjoining an AONB, surely acceptance of proposals must only occur where officers can confidently assure local residents/voters of the precise nature of the development.</p> <p>My further concern is that the infrastructure required to support the proposed development (and others in the Berkhamsted/Tring area) has had insufficient attention. If this proposal of such major scale is accepted before the Dacorum Local Plan review is completed it will indicate that consultation with residents/voters is a meaningless exercise.</p>
<p>The Toll House Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4NG</p>	<p>I am writing to record my objection to the plan by Harrow Estates to build 1400 properties on greenfield land in the greenbelt just outside Tring.</p> <p>Greenbelt land should be protected. This land is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and is within the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC. No exceptional circumstances have been provided for disregarding this protection.</p>

	<p>The scale of the development is out of scale to the small market town of Tring, especially in the context of the large ongoing "Roman Park" development which is already putting additional pressure on the town's infrastructure. The developer's claims about the provision of new infrastructure are empty: the actual provision of new schools etc would be provided by the local authority, not the developers, and no commitment to new infrastructure has been made. Bulbourne Road to the north of the development is single lane at two points and is already dangerous for cyclists. The development is too far from any amenities to access them on foot and will be overwhelmingly dependent on cars, despite the developer's gestures towards sustainability.</p> <p>Given the scale of environmental degradation and the ongoing collapse of ecosystems within the UK, much more thought needs to be given to largescale developments on protected land. The claims by the developers that concreting over fields will improve biodiversity certainly says something about modern agriculture, but it is not a path that is likely to lead to a liveable environment for our children.</p>
<p>Demeath Shootersway Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3TU</p>	<p>I strongly object to these proposals and request Dacorum Borough Council refuse this application, which would have such an extremely detrimental effect on our Chiltern countryside, its AONB, the Borough and the market town of Tring.</p> <p>DBC is currently reviewing the Local Plan, following community feedback from last year's consultation, with an intention to consider brownfield urban sites within the Borough, rather than release Green Belt. It is imperative that this review should be finalised before any decisions are made on releasing Green Belt, particularly that of such a substantial nature and in such a significant location in the Chilterns and the Borough.</p> <p>The site adjoins and forms part of the setting for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>Development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character</p> <p>Site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, especially at this time , we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over valuable farmland Large number of dwellings will drastically and adversely change the rural setting & character of the market town of Tring</p> <p>Increase in traffic</p> <p>The size of the proposed development is far greater than is appropriate for the present size of the town, which has already been extended recently by a large housing development on its Western edge.</p>
<p>7 Elm Tree Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EB</p>	<p>I am writing to you today as I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on land that is designated Green Belt which abuts and is part of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify releasing this land</p>

	<p>To build on land which is an area protected by the Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation - Any increase in footfall and traffic pollution in this AONB should be cause for alarm</p> <p>To develop a huge area of housing which is completely out of proportion and inappropriate to the scale of the historic market town of Tring which already needs to assimilate the effects of the large Roman Park housing development on existing public health services, local amenities and traffic. The size of the roads in Tring were not built for the existing volume of cars and amenities such as car parks for the station and shops are already full.</p> <p>To provide a contribution to schools and community buildings but there is no commitment or guarantee that Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council or the NHS will provide these buildings and no indication of the percentage of the contribution from the developers. The size of the development does not take into account that GP services and local hospitals are already over-stretched</p> <p>To build on land currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Changes in global food availability due to instability caused by war and the climate emergency makes this agricultural land valuable for our national food security</p> <p>A timeframe of development over 11 years. There will be adverse effects from the construction process for nearby residents and residents of the town and surrounding villages, for a drawn-out period - construction is adjacent to the station and any changes to narrow Station Road will affect commuters and parking for the station as well as in the town's car parks. Schools, GP and hospital services will not cope with any more demand. The impacts from construction such as noise and light pollution will adversely affect the wildlife and biodiversity in and around this protected area</p> <p>To drastically change the size of the ancient, historic market town of Tring. This will completely alter the town's character and its peaceful, rural setting which residents value so highly.</p> <p>I would also like to add that given the volume of the planning application documents the public should be given longer to be able to study and respond than the May 4th deadline.</p>
<p>Watermans Cottage Lock 44 Bulbourne HP23 4NG.</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the

	<p>Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>48 Mill View Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EP</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>2 Grove Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PX</p>	<p>I object to this so called 'Marshcroft Garden Village'for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. Covid 19 over the last two years has proven that open space is a necessity for good mental health and social welfare. 4. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 5. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 6. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>12 Nursery Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HZ</p>	<p>I have resided in Tring since 2001, and I object to this ridiculously oversized development application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the size of the development is out of all proportion to the size of the existing Town. It would totally overwhelm all public services - roads, schools, doctors, dentists, shops - and there is no guarantee as to if or when additional facilities would be built. Even if such additional

	<p>facilities were built, such a large development would totally change the nature of this market town forever.</p> <p>2) green belt land within an AONB should only ever be used for additional housing as a very last resort - there are still brownfield sites around Tring that should be used first for additional housing.</p> <p>3) being in very close proximity to the Grand Union Canal, it would severely degrade the peaceful rural nature of the canal between Wendover and Marsworth. The canal is invaluable as a tourist attraction and also as a nature corridor, and I believe that any developments within a kilometre of the canal should be required to provide a full impact assessment to clarify their potential impacts.</p>
<p>7 Ridgeway Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FT</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p>
<p>10 Grove Park Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JL</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this</p>

	<p>review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>73 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BY</p>	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed development of the building of 1400 houses in the fields adjoining Marshcroft Lane. Tring has already grown by 34% with the building of homes on Icknield Way. To develop the town even further would be devastating. The infrastructure could not cope, even with the building of new schools. This proposed development would change the character of this historic market town.</p> <p>I believe that building on green belt land in an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is wrong.</p>
<p>38 Beaconsfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>I am writing to raise my objection against the above mentioned Planning Application on the following grounds (I was unable to login to the website to raise the objection there):</p> <p>The proposed site is currently green belt land and adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, with no exceptional justification as to why this should be required. Dacorum is currently reviewing all their brownfield sites in urban areas, which should be completed before any further Green belt land is built on.</p> <p>The plan is out of proportion with the current population of Tring - and would comprise a 34% increase in the population of this small town. Additional infrastructure would be required to support this population (Schools, healthcare etc.), but there is no provision or support for this from the Dacorum Borough Council or Hertfordshire County Council - Tring School has recently been refurbished, so I can't see additional funding being supplied to build another school.</p> <p>There is already additional 200+ houses being built on the other side of Tring (Roman Park) which is already built on green belt land.</p> <p>The proposed land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods</p>

	<p>SAC (Special Area of Conservation, which provides protection of Green Belt land near Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodlands. Tring Station does not have sufficient service to support the additional load this population would inevitably bring.</p>
<p>15 Eggleton Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5AJ</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p>
<p>The Frog And Nightgown 22 Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PP</p>	<p>I wish to object to the above planning application for the following reasons</p> <p>This is Green belt Land in a special area of conservation adjacent to an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the review on the need to build on Green belt should be completed !!</p> <p>The scale of this development is inappropriate to the size of the Historic Market Town of Tring and will br-break the local infrastructure !</p> <p>There are more suitable locations to the east of the town where people can walk into town without the need to sacrifice our beautiful Green Belt land.</p> <p>I accept that Housing growth has to develop in Tring in the future but</p>

	<p>should be on a smaller scale and closer to the High Street and the A41</p>
<p>25 Station Road Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2EY</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA to build 1400 homes near Marshcroft Lane. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <p>The proposed development would be on green belt land which is also adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land, whilst Dacorum Borough Council is currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on green belt land.</p> <p>The application proposes to build on land which has the protection to the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed development is totally inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This development combined with Roman Park would increase the population of Tring by 34%. This would have a strongly negative impact to the character of this historic market town and completely overwhelm the local infrastructure. The roads around the proposed development as well as the A41 are already over-used and the A41 is a disaster following even the most minor of incident during commuter hours, and the proposed development would only make this situation worse.</p> <p>There is no concrete commitment to new schools or health facilities contained within the proposal nor any current commitment from Dacorum Borough Council or the NHS to provide such facilities. I note that it already takes up to 10 days just to get a telephone appointment with my GP.</p> <p>The proposed development makes little effort to address the potential negative impacts to the environment and does not provide for green transport or effective alternatives to driving even for the smallest journey.</p>
<p>2 Grove Farmhouse Marshcroft Lane Tring Herts</p>	<p>I am writing to put forward my objections to the speculative planning application to build 1,400 houses, East of Tring (22/01197/MOA).</p> <p>I admit I am little frustrated that even following a council plan for the same space being vetoed, developers are still able to apply for permission, before a council new plan has been put in place. I am aware that the rules allow for this but surely it is more logical and much fairer on local residents to impose a 3-5 year wait on new applications as the reasons for the plan being rejected are still relevant.</p> <p>In terms of my objections, I echo many voices in stating the following...</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.

	<p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>Rowans 85 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the</p>

	<p>scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Tring Rugby Club Cow Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NS</p>	<p>Tring Sports Forum wishes to register its objection in the strongest possible way to the above Planning Application.</p> <p>Although TSF's main methodology over the past 18 years since its formation has been to restrict its comments mainly to matters concerning sporting and leisure activities, in this case it is felt that the tactics of the applicant warrant comment concerning the scale, location and component-mix of the proposed development. The raison d'etre of TSF has always been and still is to ensure that the sporting and leisure facilities in Tring are increased to match the increase of the population; the increase in the amount of extra sporting facilities, both outdoor and indoor required to accommodate any amount of extra housing is considerable. The Green Belt, over-development, ecological and other objections have been well-made by others - TSF concurs with them all.</p> <p>Firstly the scale of development. 1400 extra houses on the outskirts of Tring is totally out of proportion to the existing size of the Town. TSF has always worked very closely with TTC councillors, some of whom also serve on DBC, and concur with their comments. The amount of sports land required to meet the needs of the existing population of Tring is grossly short at present, let alone for the massive new development proposed. This has been identified by various expensive reports and surveys commissioned by DBC and others over the years; the applicant has paid no heed to these whatsoever - the proposals are completely inadequate.</p> <p>Secondly, the location. TSF has made its case at every possible juncture over many years that this is not the best location for any new hybrid development and contends that a much smaller Dunsley Farm proposal would be far superior for many reasons and more popular generally with Tring residents and organisations. This has been identified repeatedly in various Local Plan revisions etc. Many meetings have been held with Herts CC over the years to discuss the possible development of their land, culminating in a planned HCC/DBC/TSF meeting that was cancelled with the onset of Covid 19. TSF waits to be consulted on their proposals by DBC officers and feels that the applicant is pressurising the often-under-staffed officers at DBC to force its proposals through - bullying tactics, it is felt.</p> <p>Thirdly, the component-mix. Although it is appreciated that this is only an Outline Application, it is felt that the applicant's scant regard for sport & leisure facilities is appalling. TSF is concerned that should the application be successful, the red-line has been craftily drawn to allow for an 'in-fill' site of a further 4 - 500 houses at the New Mill end of the site in the future - more over-development.</p> <p>But by far away TSF's biggest objection is to the prematurity of the application - in fact the timing is regarded as cynical. The Govt. are due to make their announcement on planning 'levelling-up' on May 12th, almost certainly the pressure for local-authorities to build 100's of '000's of houses in the SE will be reduced. The school requirement will also reduce, as will the amount of land required for sport, no</p>

	<p>doubt. Existing sports clubs' expansion by way of Community-Use-Agreements etc. is the answer to help create a balanced Local Plan for Tring - this can be achieved by the community negotiating once housing numbers are known. DBC must be very wary of the applicant's tactics - it will probably appeal either a refusal or non-determination, TSF hope and trust that DBC are aware of this and will take action accordingly.</p> <p>The applicant has never approached TSF for its views, despite the fact that it represents some 25+ sporting organisations in Tring. It claims that it has revised its plans after consulting with local organisations!</p> <p>TSF look forward to ongoing discussions with DBC, TTC, and HCC officers and councillors on the revised Local Plan as soon as new housing requirements are known. Please contact the writer.</p>
<p>72B Western Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4BB</p>	<p>I write to request that the Planning Committee refuse permission for this proposal on the following ground:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is located in designated Green Belt Land and as such can only be developed in exceptional and very special circumstances. 2. Notwithstanding the above, the Developer has attempted to slip this application in before DBC has completed it's review of the Local Plan. The Planning Committee must refuse to make a decision until the Local Plan has been updated. 3. The development is proposed on existing productive farmland. We should be reducing our dependency on imported food to reduce food miles and improve the environmental sustainability of food production. 4. The site has in the recent past suffered from flooding and on at least one occasion the Station Road to Marshcroft Lane section was partially under water for several months. 5. Existing local infrastructure would not cope. Not only does the site flood but the roads cannot take the increase in traffic. Also, being an old town, the foul drainage systems would be severely impacted. 6. The site falls within the zone of influence of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. With the site being in such close proximity to Ashridge there would inevitably be an increase visitor numbers to this site. Ashridge already suffers with excessive visitor numbers. 7. There is already inadequate Doctor's Surgery provision in the area. With the number of houses the increase in population of the town could be between 3500 to 5600 people. 8. The amenities in the Town would be swamped. 9. There has already been a large Development on the Icknield Way site which is nearing completion. The Planning Department must consider the cumulative effects of developments and not individual applications in isolation. <p>Please do the right thing and flatly refuse this wholly inappropriate Planning Application.</p>
<p>Bryntirion 106 Grove Road</p>	<p>As a Tring resident born and bred I object to this development ,as it's an erosion of our countryside with out any contribution to the present</p>

<p>Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PA</p>	<p>community, the town is already struggling to cope with the addition of the development at Aylesbury end of the town, and adding more homes is a joke at the expense of the existing residents, for that reason I see no justification for this being granted and putting more traffic in the area already used as a cut through for all the villages.</p>
<p>52 Carrington Place Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LA</p>	<p>I wish to register my strongest objections to the planning application 22/01187/MOA. This is Green Belt/AONB land and deserves protection for that very reason. With the declaration of a climate and ecological emergency by DBC I find it hard to stomach that these plans even have to be considered? This proposed development is too large, and our infrastructure will not cope with it. The character of our historic market town will be forever lost.</p>
<p>3 Church View Long Marston Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4QB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. 6. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>

<p>5 West Passage Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AY</p>	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed Marshcroft Garden Village development on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. Size and scale of the development. Tring is a small market town of approximately 12,000 people, with according amenities and infrastructure. Assuming an average occupancy of three persons per new home, the addition of 1400 houses in this development would effectively increase the population (and geographical area) of the town by a third in one go. Tring does not have the capacity to accommodate such a large and sudden increase. Developer considerations of this are at best speculative (e.g. that they could build schools and doctor surgeries) but on the whole inadequate (e.g. the lack of understanding of the pressure that such an increase would place on already heavily congested narrow roads, such as Station Road and the High Street). There is already a large development being constructed to the west of the town (Roman Park) and no thought is being given to the cumulative effects of so many large developments.</p> <p>2. Environmental impact and loss of protected land. The proposed development would be constructed on protected Greenbelt land that is in near-immediate proximity to a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a Special Area of Conservation. It is not clear why the development needs to be here and why a redevelopment of a Brownfield site elsewhere in the Borough cannot be considered instead.</p> <p>Based on the turnout and nature of the discussions at Tring Town Council's most recent meeting, local objections to this development appear to be widespread and significant. Any representations made by the developer that they have 'consulted the community' are cynical and disingenuous. The online survey only gave the option to comment on the aesthetics of the development, and was designed to deliberately prevent any form of objection or meaningful discussion. Their own in-person consultation was billed as 'not the place to voice objections', and their publication of 1500 pages related to their proposal seems to be a deliberate attempt to obfuscate and deter most ordinary people from scrutinising and engaging with their plans.</p> <p>Speaking as an individual, I agree that there is a need for new housing to be built in the Borough. However, we should be examining opportunities for in-fill and redevelopment. We should not be considering building vast new developments on protected land, and certainly not in such an unsustainable manner.</p>
<p>East View 25 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes: To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this</p>

	<p>review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>2 Fog Cottages Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QP</p>	<p>I strongly object to this planning application for many reasons:</p> <p>It is green belt land. Green belt land was created to protect the environment and communities from unwanted and unnecessary development. This green belt land is adjacent to an AONB and should definitely not be built on.</p> <p>They want to build on land which has protection of Chiltern Beechwoods.</p> <p>The land in question is grade 2 agricultural land which is needed and likely to be needed more in the future.</p> <p>The build along with the recent development of Roman Park will lead to a 34% increase in population which will break our already stretched infrastructure and change the character of our historic market town forever.</p> <p>There is a lot of wildlife living in and on these fields.</p> <p>Once built on, our green land will be gone and irreplaceable.</p> <p>The roads simply cannot take the traffic that will be generated.</p> <p>Tring has changed so much already in the last 50 years.... But this would change it beyond recognition. The damage to our rural communities would be irreversible.</p>
<p>17 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I strongly object to Planning Application 22/01187/MOA for the following reasons:</p> <p>The application is hybrid which means that permission is sought for some of the site with full details of the remainder to follow under</p>

reserved matters, so there is no guarantee that any final development would be anything like that illustrated in the developer's promotional material. In particular, I am very concerned that the Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (which is actually totally unsuitable) would be delivered as this, and other green spaces, will restrict the number of houses which might eventually be built for the developer's profit.

The site is currently a beautiful natural space, providing open views towards the Chilterns AONB and the Grand Union Canal, which are easily accessible to the many people who already enjoy its peace, mature green landscape and wildlife, by walking, cycling, running, horse-riding, boating, fishing.. It cannot be replaced by an artificial man made 'green area' which will take years to mature if ever built.

Local Planning Authorities have complete discretion on whether or not to accept a hybrid application. I urge DBC not to accept this.

The whole site is in designated Green Belt, which can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances, (National Planning Policy Framework 20.7.21 notably paragraphs 147-9). It is quite clear that these proposals fail to fulfil that statutory obligation.

DBC is currently reviewing the Local Plan, following community feedback from last year's consultation, with the intention to consider brownfield and urban sites within the Borough, rather than release Green Belt.

It is imperative that this review should be finalised before any decisions are made on releasing Green Belt, particularly that of such a substantial nature and in such a significant location in the Chilterns and the Borough.

Therefore this application is unwarranted and premature.

The site adjoins and informs the setting for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and will therefore have extremely high adverse impact upon that landscape, which is protected under statute by the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 s85 (CROW Act).

Development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character.

As a Local Authority, DBC has an obligation under the CROW Act to 'protect and enhance' the AONB. If this development goes ahead, it is my considered opinion, that DBC will have failed to fulfil this obligation.

The site is Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over valuable farmland. Crops of barley and linseed oil have already been sown ready for harvesting this year. This permanent contribution to our nation's food would be lost.

The large number of buildings - 1,400 houses plus 2 schools, community hub and associated roads - will drastically and adversely

change the rural setting & character of the market town of Tring forever.

Inevitably there will be a vast increase in traffic to/from any development onto single carriage roads, one with a narrow bridge where access is controlled by traffic lights. I do not accept the developer's premise that cycle ways and foot paths will tempt residents to completely abandon their cars to reach either the station or the town centre. It would certainly be too far to walk back from town centre shops with heavy shopping bags.

The size of the proposed development is far greater than is appropriate for the present size of the town, which has already been extended recently by a large housing development on its Western edge.

I accept there is need for housing within the Borough and affirm DBC's decision, in line with central Government policy, to optimise development of brownfield & urban sites, before any consideration of releasing Green Belt,

The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution'.

The proposals ignore extra demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.

There is no guarantee that authorities responsible for healthcare and educational provision within the Borough will be willing to facilitate or financially contribute towards the schools, health centre and other community resources proposed. Herts CC is in the final stages of extensive renovation of Tring School and, I would suggest, is highly unlikely to make further funds available. Any new schemes for educational provision would not have been costed in under current & forecasted budgets.

The developer (Harrow Estates/Redrow) only owns part of the site (that nearest to Station Road) so no commitment that the whole site would be developed as is outlined in this application.

The timeframe of development over 11 years (2022-33) means long drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents and parking in town centre and at Tring Station

This site falls within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - March 2022. We understand that DBC is required to implement mitigation to alleviate visitor pressure on Ashridge and Tring Woodlands. This site falls within the Zone of Influence and should be protected from development of any kind.

At the recent Tring Town Council meeting which was well attended by

	<p>the public who were unanimously against these proposals, the Council unanimously agreed to recommend refusal of the application. I strongly endorse these statements.</p> <p>These proposals would have an extremely adverse effect on our Chiltern countryside, our precious Green Belt land & AONB, the Borough and the ancient market town of Tring. I urge DBC to refuse the application.</p>
<p>5 Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NG</p>	<p>Please see points below for inclusion in conditions of any granted planning permission.</p> <p>Are there plans to set up an apprenticeship scheme with the developers - some developments include this as a condition to employ local people.</p> <p>Will a community chest be created for local community groups to access as a result of CIL and S106?</p> <p>CIL and S106 gain to be guaranteed to be spent in Tring</p> <p>20mph zone for along Station Road - from station and town centre</p> <p>Secure cycle parking in town centre with CCVT coverage</p> <p>Create a Tring Town Centre Realm improvement plan</p> <p>Improvements to town centre entrances off A41</p> <p>How much as has the town council been involved?</p>
<p>Cherrycroft, Trooper Road, Trooper Road Tring hp235rw</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3) To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5) To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>1 Grove Farm House Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PW</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>12 Posting House Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this

	<p>review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>11 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to this application that would lead to significant over-development of Tring.</p> <p>Not only would the development be on green belt land and significantly impact an AONB but the market town of Tring and its infrastructure just cannot cope with such a significant increase in houses.</p> <p>Services are already over-stretched and traffic barely moves through the centre of town most days due to the existing number of residents (including the new development at the other end of town which is still not 100% occupied).</p> <p>The ability to enjoy the countryside if its built over in such a significant way will be lost forever for future generations.</p> <p>Finally, the inclusion in the plans of provisions for new schools and a Dr's surgery are cynical at best as the developers would know full well there are no guarantees of local authority funding for them.</p> <p>I sincerely hope this suggestion is rejected as simply unsuitable for a town the size of Tring</p>
<p>40 Windmill Way Tring</p>	<p>I strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA.</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 4HH</p>	<p>There are many good reasons to refuse this application, including the following points:</p> <p>1) Unplanned development. This proposal is for an extremely large development which would make Tring approximately a third bigger than it currently is. Such development should *only* take place with the consent and approval of the town, in the context of a detailed vision for the future of the area. The National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) sets this out: paragraph 15 states that "The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area". This application is a developer-led attempt to pre-empt the Dacorum Local Plan, which has not yet been finalised and is in flux. This alone should lead DBC to refuse it. Developers are not in charge: local residents through their elected representatives are.</p> <p>2) Destruction of Green Belt. This application requires the release green field land within the Green Belt. This is contrary to the stated aim of national planning policy, as per NFFP paragraph 137: "The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence." NPPF paragraph 149 states "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt". It gives a list of exceptions to this principle, but importantly none of them apply to the proposed development. NPPF paragraph 140 makes it clear that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only happen "where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans". Paragraph 141 continues: "Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development." With regard to the Green Belt, the planning application should be refused on these grounds: there has not been a justification of exceptional circumstances; it is not part of an up-to-date strategic plan; and there is no evidence that all other options have been exhausted.</p> <p>3) Ineffective use of land. The green fields upon which the application proposes to build are Grade II (very good) Agricultural Land. These fields were analysed in the DBC Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of November 2020, and found to be amongst the "best and most versatile" agricultural land in the Borough and that development here would have "significant adverse effects" (SA 6.4.7). Table 5-6 of the SA shows that this site ("East of Tring") receives the lowest possible score ("The option is likely to have a significant negative effect") when assessed against the Sustainability objective "Make efficient use of land and soil". We live at a time when weak global supply chains, a cost of living</p>
-----------------------------------	---

crisis, and the climate crisis all make it important to produce food locally. High quality agricultural land is already serving an important use, and the need for new homes must be balanced against the need to feed our population.

NPPF paragraph 119, makes it clear that there is a duty to strike this balance of needs:

"Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions."

NPPF paragraph 120(b) explicitly names food production as a function to be taken into consideration during planning:

"Planning policies and decisions should:

(b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;"

Agricultural fields are not just "empty space". It is clear that the proposed development would have a serious negative impact on local food production. As such the application should be further rejected on the grounds of ineffective use of land and soil.

4) Unsustainability due to overdevelopment

The proposed development is far too big to be sustainable. It is utterly inappropriate to the current size of Tring, and would increase the town's population by >30%, whilst bringing thousands more cars to our roads.

The midpoint of the new suburb (1 mile from the centre) would be at the limit of "walkability" threshold for fit adults. The reality of the situation is that it would mean more traffic on roads that are already congested. Attempts to mitigate these problems with additional bus services might well make the situation worse: large vehicles already block the High Street on a regular basis.

Other infrastructure such as town parking, train station parking, supermarkets, surgery places, school places, and allotments are already stretched. This proposal purports to include new local infrastructure and amenities, but these are completely empty promises: outside of the context of a Local Plan, they are not something that the developer can actually deliver - and the developer knows this. As such it should be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment that would be unsustainable.

5) Negative impact on Chilterns AONB, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC & Pendley Manor

The planning application relates to green field sites directly adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. These fields form part of the buffer around the AONB, enhance its beauty and provide a gateway to and from it. A development of this size would invariably have a tremendous impact that would change the setting of the AONB forever. As the local planning authority, DBC has a duty to prevent such impacts under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 s85(1):

"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."

	<p>Furthermore, the proposed development falls within the 12.6km Ashridge Commons and Woods Zone of Influence, which is there to protect the Chilterns Beechwood SAC from visitor damage. It would be irresponsible to allow a large development within this area, with the inevitable result of increased visitor numbers to the SAC. Lastly, the proposed development would negatively impact the rural setting of Pendley Manor. The application should be refused on all these grounds.</p> <p>6) Negative impact on local character Tring is a small market town with a strong character: high levels of walkability, William Huckvale's distinctive "Old English" architecture, a closeness to the countryside, community activities such as parades and markets. The proposed large development would erode all of these facets of Tring's character. It would create greater car dependence in the town, and water down the concentration of distinctive architecture; it would push the countryside further away from those of us who already live here, and erode the sense of community that thrives in small towns. Tring deserves careful stewardship. This planning application fails in that regard, and for that reason, and all the others listed above, it should be rejected.</p>
<p>1 The Barns West Leith Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6JJ</p>	<p>To whom it may concern I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>1 Pheasant Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EQ</p>	<p>This plan will massively increase the number of houses and number of residents of Tring, fundamentally changing the character of this historic market town. It doesn't take into account the needs or feelings of existing residents and of the existing town. It is far too big for Tring and is out of balance with locals' needs for new houses. Local people value their green space! It should also be considered in tandem with the other planned developments, which together will increase Tring by >50% which is not sustainable and not serving the town well.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt, and the legislation says it can only be reclassified if there are "very special circumstances". I don't believe this definiton has been reached. Tring does not need 1400+ new houses. Maybe Dacorum does, but not Tring.</p> <p>I am concerned about the density of housing on this land. 1400 homes is probably in the region of 4000 more bedrooms, equating to 4000 more people. I do not think that that many people can be adequately housed on the land, with space for all of the rewilding, green spaces, and flood mitigation that the plan promises. However, it is hard to tell because the plan does not contain details of the housing developments, the area, etc.</p> <p>Although the fields themselves are not within the AONB, they are completely surrounded by AONB land, and development will have an adverse impact on the views and the character of the Area.</p> <p>This land is part of the waterways system and is an important flood plain. Building on the land will increase the risk of flooding for both the development and the surrounding areas. Even with flood-mitigation plans in place, 1400 homes plus parking spaces and infrastructure will replace absorbant land with artificial surfaces for rain run-off.</p> <p>The roads north and south of the development are both small with congestion issues. They are single carriageways away from the main arterial routes of the A41. They cannot cope with 1400+ new cars, even if not everyone is driving at the same time. There will still be many more cars in the local area than there are now. The developers told me at the public meeting that a transport analysis had been done, but I cannot find it on their web page or the dacroum page.</p> <p>Similarly, can our local freshwater and sewerage system cope? That's a lot of people drawing more water, and emitting more waste into the system. I am yet to be convinced that this is feasible and sustainable.</p> <p>Dear planners</p> <p>I'm writing about the 'Tring Garden Suburb' or 'Land East of Tring', or whatever the development is being called.</p> <p>We wish to object very strongly to the plans, which we believe are bad for the environment and bad for Tring.</p> <p>The sheer amount of space involved - infilling all the fields between station road and bulbourne road up to the canal, is just madness. These are open spaces of greenbelt land, and I do not understand why they would be considered for total destruction in this way.</p> <p>The development would completely change the size and character of Tring. IT's a little market town. This much developed space will at a</p>

	<p>stroke massively increase the size of the town, and start a sprawl towards aldbury and Bulbourne, which is surely what the green belt was specifically intended to prevent. I am suspicious of many of the developers' claims. For instance, about increasing biodiversity. How can building a small town increase anything but human occupation?! When I attended the public consultation, I was told that the land is all currently owned by the developer (Redrow, or Harrow Estate?) so any measurements of the amount of biodiversity or the quality of the land beforehand must be taken with a grain of salt. And surely the land owners are also in part responsible for how productive the land is now. I can't see any incentive for them to make the land attractive for wildlife or to grow good crops if really they want to develop it. Furthermore, I'm underwhelmed by the plans to improve the infrastructure around the new site. I don't think the site, the sewers, the water supply, or the road, can cope with 1400 new homes / 3000+ new people and cars. That's an incredible increase in what is a fairly isolated country setting.</p> <p>And finally, what is really upsetting, is that this might not be the only development permitted in Tring this year. I'm aware of several other parcels of land that are under consideration for new housing. So whatever happens, please do not give permission for all the developments. That could be disastrous for the quality of life of Tring residents, our enjoyment of the countryside and nature, and for our ability to move around our town and enjoy its amenities!</p> <p>THank you for your time</p>
<p>8 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>We wish to register our very strong objection to the planning application to build 1,400 homes in Tring (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This entire proposed development is on Greenbelt land. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. Furthermore the situation has changed since Covid and now there are lots of office spaces which can and are being converted/ rebuilt into residential homes or flats - this has not yet been taken into consideration when assessing housing need and again highlights the importance of allowing the Dacorum Borough Council review of Brownfield sites to happen. 2. To build on Greenbelt land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). I understand that there is currently a moratorium on residential planning applications in this area due to damage from an increasing local population on Beechwoods trees in the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland. This proposal is planning to develop on Greenbelt Land which has this special protection. Furthermore this proposal plans to drastically increased the local population. This is totally contrary to what this new special protection aims to achieve which has only just been put in place in March 2022. We are at a point in history where it's absolutely

essential that habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity cannot be allowed to continue. We must act now to protect these areas for now and future generations not concrete over the same.

3. This large scale development will be highly visible from high points of the area of outstanding natural beauty such as Ivinghoe Beacon and the Ridgeway. This will drastically ruin the rural and peaceful character and appearance of the area forever.

4. The proposed development is on Greenbelt land that is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Nationally we need to increase our food self sufficiency (importing food is detrimental to our fight against climate change). As a consequence we should not be concreting over farmland.

5. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Further exacerbated by the fact that there is no guarantee of local infrastructure in this plan (see below).

6. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. This application is a Hybrid Application which we interpret as seeking outline planning permission for the development of the site as a whole with specific details on house design, location of school, service roads etc is to be sought later. It is very concerning that there is no guarantee of two additional schools in this application. As a parent applying for school places for my young children I know first hand that the local schools are already over subscribed and there simply is not the local infrastructure to support all these additional people and families. We understand that Dacorum has complete discretion regarding whether to allow such a Hybrid application - we urge you to exercise your discretion and reject this application.

7. The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to the essential (but not guaranteed) infrastructure. They just state that they will pay a contribution. We know first hand that there was a successful application to build homes in Pitstone which was supposed to have a nursery and pub built as outlined in the planning application. We understand that these sites are now being sold off to build more residential properties on. This is clearly a very real danger with this Hybrid application and this is unacceptable and inappropriate.

8. This is a large scale development which is given a timescale of 11 years (2022-2033). This means drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, noise, construction traffic on the local people. This is again unacceptable and will ruin the character and appearance of a peaceful, leafy green area.

On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .

We urge Dacorum Borough Council to reject this speculative Hybrid application which will have an extremely detrimental impact on our beautiful Chiltern Countryside, it's AONB, special area of conservation and the historic market town of Tring.

Dear Sirs

We wish to register our very strong objection to the planning application to build 1,400 homes in Tring (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:

1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This entire proposed development is on Greenbelt land. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. Furthermore the situation has changed since Covid and now there are lots of office spaces which can and are being converted/ rebuilt into residential homes or flats - this has not yet been taken into consideration when assessing housing need and again highlights the importance of allowing the Dacorum Borough Council review of Brownfield sites to happen.

2. To build on Greenbelt land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). I understand that there is currently a moratorium on residential planning applications in this area due to damage caused by an increasing local population on Beechwoods trees in the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland. This proposal is planning to develop on Greenbelt Land which has this special protection. Furthermore this proposal plans to drastically increased the local population. This is totally contrary to what this new special protection aims to achieve which has only just been put in place in March 2022. We are at a point in history where it's absolutely essential that habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity cannot be allowed to continue. We must act now to protect these areas for now and future generations not concrete over the same.

3. This large scale development will be highly visible from high points of the area of outstanding natural beauty such as Ivinghoe Beacon and the Ridgeway. This will drastically ruin the rural and peaceful character and appearance of the area forever.

4. The proposed development is on Greenbelt land that is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Nationally we need to increase our food self sufficiency (importing food is detrimental to our fight against climate change). As a consequence we should not be concreting over farmland.

5. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Further exacerbated by the fact that there is no guarantee of local infrastructure in this plan (see below).

6. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. This application is

a Hybrid Application which we interpret as the developer seeking outline planning permission for the development of the site as a whole with specific details on house design, location of school, service roads etc is to be sought later. It is very concerning that there is no guarantee of two additional schools in this application. As a parent applying for school places for my young children I know first hand that the local schools are already over subscribed and there simply is not the local infrastructure to support all these additional people and families. We understand that Dacorum has complete discretion regarding whether to allow such a Hybrid application - we urge you to exercise your discretion and reject this application.

7. The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to the essential (but not guaranteed) infrastructure. They just state that they will pay a contribution. We know first hand that there was a successful application to build homes in Pitstone which was supposed to have a nursery and pub built as outlined in the planning application. We understand that these sites are now being sold off to build more residential properties on instead of the pub and nursery. This is clearly a very real danger with this Hybrid application and this is unacceptable and inappropriate.

8. This is a large scale development which is given a timescale of 11 years (2022-2033). This means drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, noise, construction traffic on the local people. This is again unacceptable and will ruin the character and appearance of a peaceful, leafy green area. This quite clearly is ridiculous overdevelopment of a quiet, rural, beautiful area.

On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .

We urge Dacorum Borough Council to reject this speculative Hybrid application which will have an extremely detrimental impact on our beautiful Chiltern Countryside, it's AONB, special beechwood's conversation area and the historic market town of Tring.

Dear Sirs

We wish to register our very strong objection to the planning application to build 1,400 homes in Tring (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:

1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This entire proposed development is on Greenbelt land. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. Furthermore the situation has changed since Covid and now there are lots of office spaces which can and are being converted/ rebuilt into residential homes or flats - this has not

yet been taken into consideration when assessing housing need and again highlights the importance of allowing the Dacorum Borough Council review of Brownfield sites to happen.

2. To build on Greenbelt land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). I understand that there is currently a moratorium on residential planning applications in this area due to damage from an increasing local population on Beechwoods trees in the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland. This proposal is planning to develop on Greenbelt Land which has this special protection. Furthermore this proposal plans to drastically increased the local population. This is totally contrary to what this new special protection aims to achieve which has only just been put in place in March 2022. We are at a point in history where it's absolutely essential that habitat destruction and loss of biodiversity cannot be allowed to continue. We must act now to protect these areas for now and future generations not concrete over the same.

3. This large scale development will be highly visible from high points of the area of outstanding natural beauty such as Ivinghoe Beacon and the Ridgeway. This will drastically ruin the rural and peaceful character and appearance of the area forever.

4. The proposed development is on Greenbelt land that is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Nationally we need to increase our food self sufficiency (importing food is detrimental to our fight against climate change). As a consequence we should not be concreting over farmland.

5. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Further exacerbated by the fact that there is no guarantee of local infrastructure in this plan (see below).

6. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. This application is a Hybrid Application which we interpret as seeking outline planning permission for the development of the site as a whole with specific details on house design, location of school, service roads etc is to be sought later. It is very concerning that there is no guarantee of two additional schools in this application. As a parent applying for school places for my young children I know first hand that the local schools are already over subscribed and there simply is not the local infrastructure to support all these additional people and families. We understand that Dacorum has complete discretion regarding whether to allow such a Hybrid application - we urge you to exercise your discretion and reject this application.

7. The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to the essential (but not guaranteed) infrastructure. They just state that they will pay a contribution. We know first hand that

	<p>there was a successful application to build homes in Pitstone which was supposed to have a nursery and pub built as outlined in the planning application. We understand that these sites are now being sold off to build more residential properties on. This is clearly a very real danger with this Hybrid application and this is unacceptable and inappropriate.</p> <p>8. This is a large scale development which is given a timescale of 11 years (2022-2033). This means drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, noise, construction traffic on the local people. This is again unacceptable and will ruin the character and appearance of a peaceful, leafy green area. This is ridiculous overdevelopment of a beautiful, quiet, leafy green area.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p> <p>We urge Dacorum Borough Council to reject this speculative Hybrid application which will have an extremely detrimental impact on our beautiful Chiltern Countryside, it's AONB, special beechwood's conservation area and the historic market town of Tring.</p>
<p>Clayesmore Cottage 61 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. It will also destroy the natural habitat of hundreds of species. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 4. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the

	<p>impact on the environment.</p> <p>6. The development will change the character of Tring and put a huge strain on already oversubscribed resources such as local schools, GPs, and parking.</p> <p>7. The development will also increase the level of Traffic along Grove Road, posing a safety risk to the primary school.</p> <p>8. Water and sewage supply and services are already under strain in this area and this huge increased demand is likely to exacerbate both to the detriment of current residents. Thames water are more and more frequently called out to attend sewage problems and water pressure issues already.</p> <p>9. Broadband/electricity supplies - no mention of how they will address this in an ecological way and to not add further strain to local services.</p> <p>10. There is no commitment from HCC or any transport body to provide public transport of any kind for the residents of this proposed development. Tring Station car park is very expensive and was already unable to fulfil pre-lockdown demand. Usage is building steadily again but it would be most likely that people would be dropped off rather than park at the station increasing the already hazardous road and pedestrian conditions at morning and evening peaks.</p> <p>11. Station Road is already a very busy road with current levels of usage. Adding 1,400 additional household vehicles and new road access to the development would be completely inappropriate for a 2 lane road in this location causing severe additional safety hazards and congestion.</p> <p>12. A longer time period than the 4th May should have been provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>91 Grove Park Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JW</p>	<p>The proposed development is too large to be in keeping with the local area. It would be detrimental to the local environment. The proposal is in conflict with the local plan and so should not be agreed.</p>
<p>40 Windmill Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4HH</p>	<p>I strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA.</p> <p>There are many good reasons to refuse this application, including the following points:</p> <p>1) Unplanned development.</p> <p>This application is a developer-led attempt to pre-empt the contents of the Dacorum Local Plan, which has not yet been finalised and is in flux. The National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) paragraph 15 states that "The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area". This is a large and impactful proposal and so it is</p>

important that it has been justified within the context of a Local Plan. Clearly that is not the case here and so DBC should refuse it.

2) Destruction of Green Belt.

This application requires the release green field land within the Green Belt. This is contrary to the stated aim of national planning policy, as per NFFP paragraph 137:

"The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."

NPPF paragraph 149 states "A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt". It gives a list of exceptions to this principle, but importantly none of them apply to the proposed development.

NPPF paragraph 140 makes it clear that changes to Green Belt boundaries should only happen "where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans".

Paragraph 141 continues: "Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development."

With regard to the Green Belt, the planning application should be refused on these grounds: there has not been a justification of exceptional circumstances; it is not part of an up-to-date strategic plan; and there is no evidence that all other options have been exhausted.

3) Ineffective use of land.

The green fields upon which the application proposes to build are Grade II (very good) Agricultural Land. These fields were analysed in the DBC Interim Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of November 2020, and found to be amongst the "best and most versatile" agricultural land in the Borough and that development here would have "significant adverse effects" (SA 6.4.7). Table 5-6 of the SA shows that this site ("East of Tring") receives the lowest possible score ("The option is likely to have a significant negative effect") when assessed against the Sustainability objective "Make efficient use of land and soil".

We live at a time when weak global supply chains, a cost of living crisis, and climate change all make it important to produce food locally. High quality agricultural land is already serving an important use, and the need for new homes must be balanced against the need to feed our population.

NPPF paragraph 119, makes it clear that there is a duty to strike this balance of needs:

"Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions."

NPPF paragraph 120(b) explicitly names food production as a function to be taken into consideration during planning:

"Planning policies and decisions should:
(b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production;"

Agricultural fields are not just "empty space". It is clear that the proposed development would have a serious negative impact on local food production. As such the application should be further rejected on the grounds of ineffective use of land and soil.

4) Unsustainability due to overdevelopment

The proposed development is far too big to be sustainable. It is utterly inappropriate to the current size of Tring, and would increase the town's population by >30%, whilst bringing thousands more cars to our roads.

The midpoint of the new suburb (>1 mile from the centre) would be at the limit of "walkability" threshold for fit adults. The reality of the situation is that it would mean more traffic on roads that are already congested. Attempts to mitigate these problems with additional bus services might well make the situation worse: large vehicles already block the High Street on a regular basis.

Other infrastructure such as town parking, train station parking, supermarkets, surgery places, school places, and allotments are already stretched and this proposal, being outside of the context of a Local Plan, can do nothing but make hollow promises about the provision of such services. As such it should be refused on the grounds of overdevelopment that would be unsustainable.

5) Negative impact on Chilterns AONB, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC & Pendley Manor

The planning application relates to green field sites directly adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. These fields form part of the buffer around the AONB, enhance its beauty and provide a gateway to and from it. A development of this size would invariably have a tremendous impact that would change the setting of the AONB forever. As the local planning authority, DBC has a duty to prevent such impacts under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 s85(1):

	<p>"In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed development falls within the 12.6km Ashridge Commons and Woods Zone of Influence, which is there to protect the Chilterns Beechwood SAC from visitor damage. It would be irresponsible to allow a large development within this area, with the inevitable result of increased visitor numbers to the SAC.</p> <p>Lastly, the proposed development would negatively impact the rural setting of Pendley Manor.</p> <p>The application should be refused on all these grounds.</p> <p>6) Negative impact on local character</p> <p>Tring is a small market town with a strong character: high levels of walkability, William Huckvale's distinctive "Old English" architecture, a closeness to the countryside, community activities such as parades and markets. The proposed large development would erode all of these facets of Tring's character. It would create greater car dependence in the town, and water down the concentration of distinctive architecture; it would push the countryside further away from those of us who already live here, and erode the sense of community that thrives in small towns.</p> <p>Tring deserves careful stewardship so that future generations can enjoy the town in the way that we do today.</p> <p>This planning application fails in that regard, and for that reason, and all the others listed above, it should be rejected.</p>
<p>16 Nursery Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HZ</p>	<p>The area of the application is within the Green Belt and is also valuable farm land. It does not conform to overall county/national planning considerations and a long term solution needs to be found not so called mini villages (development speak) added to a town under strain for all its services. The application is far fetched but needs to be dismissed in the strongest terms and not allowed to be watered down and passed at a later stage.</p>
<p>Chiltern Society White Hill Centre, White Hill Chesham HP5 1AG</p>	<p>The Chiltern Society is a charitable body with almost 7000 members. We campaign for the conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns National Character Area, which includes the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and part of the London Green Belt. Our supporters are passionate about the protection of the Chilterns, which is a special area of landscape within easy travelling distance of several towns and the City of London. Much of the area is classified as both AONB and Green Belt and should receive extensive protection under the national policies in the National Planning Policy</p>

Framework (NPPF).'

The Chiltern Society strongly objects to the proposed development due to detrimental impacts on the Green Belt and the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Society has reviewed the planning application, and the Planning Statement and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in particular, and has the following comments -

1. House Building is classed as 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt. The Society opposes development in the Green Belt which fails to protect its openness or undermines its 5 purposes. These are: 'to check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the settling and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.' The proposed development would clearly be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be by definition harmful. Given the proposed large scale of the development, the impact would lead to substantial harm, and this would need to be given substantial weight against the development.
2. The land is currently open farmland with very few buildings. The development of 1400 homes would lead to a significant loss of openness in the Green Belt. This would also need to be given substantial weight against the development.
3. The development would be in the immediate setting of the Chilterns AONB to the north, east and south. As well as being detrimental to the AONB in terms of intervisibility, this would also add to the harm to be considered in the planning balance.
4. The proposal would lead to the permanent loss of 121ha of open agricultural land. As well as changing the open character of the land it would make the land unavailable for growing of food. In times of changing farming subsidies, reducing food miles and uncertainties with wheat supply from Ukraine, the loss of this land would be significantly harmful.
5. With nature in decline and significant changes to the climate, now is not the time to be sacrificing large areas of protected open countryside for new development. Government policy on levelling up should be reducing pressure for development in the South East and changes to the planning system are imminent but as yet not set out. This, coupled with the delay in the Local Plan, makes this application premature.
6. A development of this scale would be likely to have a significant harmful impact on the character of the town by increasing the population and the resulting traffic congestion, and losing the direct links between the existing town and the open countryside.
7. The applicant appears to be relying on the draft Local Plan to justify the proposal, and in particular that this was one of the sites considered for a housing allocation. The plan was strongly opposed

by the local community and the Council has decided not to proceed with it until further evidence has been gathered and further options considered. This, coupled with the fact that the Plan was at an early stage, mean that the emerging plan should be given little if any weight in determining the application. Decisions should be made based on the adopted Core Strategy and Local Plan. It is therefore an unallocated site in the Green Belt and should be subject to national and local Green Belt policy.

8. We do not agree with the applicant's approach to demonstrating 'very special circumstances' to allow development in the Green Belt. In our view, there needs to be an overwhelming reason why development here would 'clearly outweigh' the substantial harm to the Green Belt and the setting of the AONB. It is not sufficient to simply set out mitigation measures, which would be expected in any case, and add a little bit more. Whilst additional measures such as more Biodiversity Net Gain, more suitable accessible natural greenspace, new schools and leisure facilities can be considered as gains they cannot be considered 'very special' in order to outweigh the significant and substantial harm to a large area of Green Belt.

9. Neither Borough housing targets nor the lack of a 5-year land supply should be considered as substantive reasons for clearly outweighing harm to the openness and permanence of the Green Belt and demonstrating very special circumstances.

10. We also dispute the applicant's assertion that the site should be considered to be 'very special' because it is very large. In fact, the opposite is the case as the cumulative impact of the development proposed would be very significant and extremely harmful.

11. NPPF Para 11 states -

For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or

d) where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or

any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Para d) i clearly applies in this case because the areas identified as being of importance are confirmed to include the AONB and Green Belt in footnote 7. The sheer scale of the loss of Green Belt provides a clear reason for refusing the application.

The applicant has also not demonstrated that the development would overcome the requirements of para d) ii as the harm to the Green Belt and the setting of the AONB clearly outweigh the benefits of the scheme.

12. NPPF Para 140 refers to exceptional circumstances in relation to changes in Green Belt. This is not relevant in this case as it relates to changes in Green Belt itself, which can only be changed as part of a Local Plan. In this respect, the land concerned in this application is currently and will remain Green Belt unless reviewed in the new Dacorum Local Plan. Accordingly, the only basis on which this application could be approved is under NPPF 146/7 which requires very special circumstances to be established."

13. We submit however, that this paragraph is not intended to apply to a wholesale redevelopment of this area, the effect of which if approved, would leave no remaining Green Belt protected land and would have the effect therefore of removing this whole area from Green Belt protection whilst still technically remaining Green Belt. 'Indeed, this proposed development is by definition inappropriate as it does not fall under any of the matters listed in NPPF 149 which only potentially accepts the listed exceptions and anything else is inappropriate. 'If NPPF 148 is applied here, then how can this development qualify given that it entails a full override of the benefits of the Green Belt; so how can it qualify as very special circumstances?'

14. A development on this scale within the Green Belt should only be promoted through the development of a new Local Plan and the demonstration of exceptional circumstances for removing land from the Green Belt. In sensitive locations such as Tring the Council should be rigidly applying a plan-led system and not allowing piecemeal applications for substantial developments.'

15. NPPF Para 176 refers to impacts on the setting of the AONB as follows -

176. Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within all these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the designated areas.

There is clear intervisibility between the site and the AONB, so the cumulative effect of the development on the setting of the AONB would be significant.

16. We are aware that the Dacorum Landscape Sensitivity Study that accompanied the Emerging Strategy for Growth consultation

assessed the site to have Moderate-High landscape susceptibility to change arising from residential and mixed-use development, and to have an overall Moderate-High landscape sensitivity. Given this assessment, the site is not suitable for this size of development and the application should be resisted. The landscape value of Site TRO3 was assessed as "high representativeness of wider landscape character: views to the Chilterns escarpment, transport corridor including the Grand Union canal, mixed open farmland, urban fringe influences around Tring including a garden centre".

17. In the absence of a new Local Plan, the decision should be taken in accordance with the Core Strategy. Core Strategy 2013 made provision for 480 new homes in Tring, including an allocation at West Tring. Tring was identified as an "Area of Limited Opportunity". In these areas, "The general approach in these locations will be to support development that enables the population to remain stable, unless a small element of growth is required to support local community needs".

The proposed development clearly conflicts with this policy and should be refused.

18. Policy CS1 Distribution of Development includes, "The rural character of the borough will be conserved. Development that supports the vitality and viability of local communities, causes no damage to the existing character of a village and/or surrounding area and is compatible with policies protecting and enhancing the Green Belt, Rural Area and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be supported".

This development would certainly not conserve the rural character of the Borough and would not comply with policies on the Green Belt, Rural Area and AONB.

19. Policy CS5 Green Belt includes, "The Council will apply national Green Belt policy to protect the openness and character of the Green Belt, local distinctiveness, and the physical separation of settlements.

There will be no general review of the Green Belt boundary through the Site Allocations DPD, although local allocations (under Policies CS2 and CS3) will be permitted.

Within the Green Belt, small-scale development will be permitted..."

The development would definitely not be small scale and would be contrary to national Green Belt policy as very special circumstances cannot be demonstrated.

20. Policy CS24 Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty includes, "The special qualities of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be conserved".

The development would harm the setting of the AONB by impacting on view into and out of the AONB.

	<p>21. Tring Place Strategy Vision states "Tring remains a successful compact market town surrounded by farmland and delivering a high quality of life and prosperity for its residents and business community. Its built and natural heritage has been retained and enhanced. Accessibility to services and facilities has been improved, whilst promoting sustainable forms of travel.</p> <p>This has been achieved by delivering a greater range of high quality housing to suit long-term local needs that integrates with the character of the town. Small-scale business activity is encouraged and advantage taken of tourist attractions, such as the Zoological Museum, the town's green hinterland and Tring Reservoirs. Additional social facilities have also been sought for the young and elderly, with improved outdoor leisure facilities".</p> <p>Tring would no longer be a compact market town and the farmland surrounding it would be built on. The development would go totally against this adopted vision for Tring.</p> <p>22. Site Allocations 2006-2031 - The site was not allocated in the last round of sites in 2017, so must be considered as an unallocated greenfield site in the Green Belt.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Chiltern Society considers the applicant's proposal to represent 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt and outline planning permission should be refused. We further contend that Very Special Circumstances do not exist for allowing the development.'</p> <p>We strongly object to this proposed development on Green Belt land to the east of Tring. The proposed scheme would result in the loss of open countryside, would go totally against the Council's Vision for Tring, and would adversely affect the local community. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the benefits of the development clearly outweigh the harm that the development will cause with the loss of open countryside and its adverse impact on local biodiversity and environment."</p>
<p>Grangewood 75 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Far too many houses for the local area, with circa 3-4 thousand people, will cause too much strain on existing stretched local facilities.</p> <p>Will permanently remove green belt land which we should be protecting for our children and theirs. Will also cause irreversible damage to local wildlife, removal of hedge rows, trees, fields.</p> <p>Traffic will be crazy, the existing roads will not cope.</p> <p>Will permanently and irreversibly damage the town of Tring.</p> <p>Will also be ugly with identikit housing plastered over our countryside.</p> <p>Do we seriously even need to comment on this in the 21st century?! It's a plan to wipe out wildlife, green space, and create additional traffic and pollution, seriously??!</p>

<p>6 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p>	<p>The proposed development is far too big and will cause irreversible damage to the green belt and wildlife in the area, especially being so close to Tring's beautiful canal. It will also create increased traffic and pollution. Station Road is already busy, especially during rush hour (as evidenced by the terrible state of the road). In addition, Tring cannot cope with the residents it currently has, in terms of GP services, schools, shops and parking - what will a development like this add?</p>
<p>19 Gamnel Terrace Tringford Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4JH</p>	<p>I write to object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. As an example, Tring Railway Station and its associated parking is already inadequate in relation to demand but has no scope for enlargement. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring; however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>22 Adams Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DY</p>	<p>I object to the proposed development on the land east of Tring (Marshcroft) for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty and the proposed development is on green belt land. I understand the need for more housing, but there are brown field sites that would be better suited to this. 2. There would be an impact on local ecology. We should be looking to increase biodiversity and green spaces to reduce the effects of

	<p>climate change - not make things worse.</p> <p>3. The roads around Tring can not handle hundreds or potentially thousands of additional vehicles.</p> <p>4. Within Tring it is already difficult to get a doctors/dentist etc appointment - more houses and residents would put greater stress on these services. Equally the local supermarkets will be overwhelmed.</p> <p>5. The scale of the development is inappropriate for the size of the town. It would inevitably impact on the character of the town.</p>
<p>8 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>The proposed development is far too large for the existing character of Tring town, it's amenities and infrastructure. Tring Station is a hamlet with its own community and identity which would be swallowed up by this development.</p>
<p>10 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1 To build on green belt land and remove hedgerows and fields. This is incompatible with the government's aim to improve biodiversity. This nibbling away of ordinary green spaces is contributing to the plummeting numbers of plants and invertebrates on which our birds and other animals depend. There seems to be an general opinion that wildlife can be preserved in little islands of habitat such as nature reserves, or small areas in developments where a bit of grass and a few trees have been left. It is often assumed that open fields and hedgerows do not support any important wildlife. This is wrong. (The field adjacent to Grove Road used to support a fine selection of butterflies such as the Small Copper and Common Blue until it was ploughed up a few years ago.) All living organisms have a place in the food web which ultimately supports us. All living organisms have a right to space to live, yet it is being squeezed out of existence by increasing numbers of relatively small developments which many people believe do little or no harm. Biodiversity must be prioritised whenever a planning application is considered.</p> <p>2 To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3 To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p>

	<p>4 To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located on brownfield sites where possible and closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Thorburn 92 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Dear Development Management Department,</p> <p>I refer to the above and note that Planning Application (22/01187/MOA) (Application) comprises approximately 140 documents which equates to 5,500 pages, in relation to a proposed project for 1,400 houses which may well lead to a gross income of approximately GBP 1 billion.</p> <p>On any analysis, the Application has taken several years and cost the Applicant several million pounds to prepare, however, as Tenants of Grove Road in Tring we have been provided with 21 days to "Comment" on the same.</p> <p>We assume that we and all the Tenants of Tring will be afforded a proportionate time to the Applicant to provide a full response etc to the Application going forward, however, in the meantime my wife (copied) and I object to the Application as it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring

	<p>when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. We trust the above is clear and reserve our rights.</p> <p>We look forward to your reply acknowledging receipt of the same.</p>
<p>12 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>I object to the proposed development because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It proposes to build on Green Belt land, adjacent to the Chiltern AONB, with no exceptional circumstances to mitigate this. - The proposal is to build on valuable high quality Agriculture land. - The number of houses proposed is inappropriate for the size and nature of Tring, is significantly more than are required, and the local roads would be unable to cope with the increases in traffic. - There are far more appropriate sites around Tring for more modest increases in housing - The development would negatively impact the views from the beautiful local countryside, take a walk along the Ridgeway from Aldbury Nowers to Pitstone Hill (for example) to appreciate this. - Any houses built should be Carbon Neutral, and include a significant proportion of low cost affordable starter homes.
<p>54 Beaconsfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>Green Belt incursion This plan would build on green belt land. However Dacorum are currently reviewing availability of brownfield sites, in order to minimise intrusions on green belt land. Suggest this review, and subsequent revisions to local plan, should be completed before any go-ahead on this current plan for Grove Fields.</p> <p>Disproportionate development This development is disproportionate to the various services and amenities currently available in Tring. The town's High Street is narrow and always a traffic bottleneck; all current services such as doctors' surgeries and schools are already stretched to capacity. Any new infrastructure involved in this development is supposed to be provided by local authorities, but none of them have yet committed to doing so.</p> <p>Hurried timescale Planning documents total 140 and their total page count is 5,500 - surely there should be a longer period than just until 4 May for the public to absorb, assess and respond ?</p>
<p>4 New Mill Terrace Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ET</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons: -</p>

	<p>In July 2021, the Council's Cabinet decided to defer further progress of the Local Plan until such time as further information and evidence gathered. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt. This review should be completed, and the new Local Plan finalised before any green belt site is sacrificed.</p> <p>This proposal seeks to build on a green belt site adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify this request.</p> <p>The scale of development is far too excessive for the current facilities and amenities that serve a small market town.</p> <p>The location of this development, so far from the town centre, will significantly increase traffic on all surrounding roads, including Marshcroft Lane, a single-track road, very popular with walkers, runners, and families, all keen to explore the beautiful countryside. In practice, the proposed extension of an existing bus service (by others), together with the introduction of cycle routes, will not prevent or mitigate this increase in road traffic.</p> <p>There are other sites, closer to Tring town centre and A41, which are more suitable for development to provide a smaller, more proportionate and sympathetic increase to Tring's existing population.</p>
<p>Ladyman Barn Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RU</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permission to build on Green Belt land, which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be refused. No "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward to justify the damage to the Green Belt. The land is also much needed grade 2 agricultural land. - Development is not permitted in view of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Development Restrictions. The offer to provide a suitable alternative natural green space is not an adequate mitigation. - It is not acceptable to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This proposed development, plus Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which would overwhelm the capacity of this historic market town forever. The proposed development would also have a serious impact on Aldbury Parish, in particular on the hamlet of Tring Station (the West Ward of Aldbury Parish). Difficulties of access to, and parking at, the railway station itself would be exacerbated. - There is no commitment from principal authorities and the NHS to fund additional infrastructure, e.g. new schools and health centres. - Dacorum Borough Council should be seeking alternative brownfield sites and should finalise the new local plan in accordance with

	<p>evolving government guidelines, before Green Belt land is sacrificed. If necessary, location Tr01 should be first be considered as a more appropriate site for development.</p>
<p>Bonakanda 55 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>This land is Green Belt and close to an AONB. It is marshy and floods regularly. It provides the only direct access to genuine open green space for disability groups. The alternative, Tring Park, can only be accessed by steps.</p> <p>Access to green space is needed for mental and general health wellbeing. Introducing 4,000 to 5,000 people and homes and cars, pollution and noise into this space will remove that access, and peace. No amount of mitigation, or intention to section off a small area close to the canal, which will be mainly "flood" ponds will replace this.</p> <p>The last local plan was rejected and has not yet been re-written, so no evidence is available that these houses are needed locally. It is ridiculous to consider additional housing of this proportion in isolation, when new houses are being built in and around Tring already at a great rate.</p> <p>Tring is a small town with no room to expand centrally to provide for a 25% increase in population. It already has very high density housing and is very short of local facilities, particularly health, having lost its health centre to housing a few years ago.</p> <p>Tring also has very little employment opportunity, or space for new businesses, so new settlers here will undoubtedly be driving elsewhere for work, adding to pollution and congestion.</p> <p>There is no explanation of how Marshcroft Lane would be for pedestrians and cyclists, but would have a junction with the main traffic through the village.</p> <p>This predatory application is merely a means to make money from land bought speculatively by companies with no connection to Tring, or interest in the well-being of our town and people.</p> <p>The company will have no legal obligation to provide services to a massive influx of people and families. They cannot guarantee the provision of any of the additional services that a new stand-alone village would need. They will have no ongoing obligation once the houses are sold and the Tring community will suffer even more than it currently is doing, especially with access to GPS and Dentists.</p> <p>The car and bus route that winds through the housing from Bulbourne Road to Station Road will be a traffic nightmare and lead to cars using alternative route along Grove Road where there is a primary school.</p> <p>If Tring is in need of affordable homes for people who work in Tring, but can't live here, then more social housing is the answer, not "affordable" homes which are actually expensive, but the owner gets to mortgage 25% and rent 75%. That is no solution.</p> <p>Dacorum council must reject this plan and work on improving the lives</p>

	<p>of people and housing under its remit. It should firmly reject this predatory application and concern itself with investigating how an innovative local plan can be forward-thinking in the light of climate change.</p>
<p>60 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BU</p>	<p>Please do the right thing and reject this request. The land is green belt for a reason.</p>
<p>9 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>The planned development is on greenbelt land and on Grade 2 agricultural land which needs to be saved and used for UK food production. The number of houses proposed is an over development of the town and will increase the population of Tring substantially. The infrastructure and road systems cannot cope with this and no changes are shown in the plan to deal with it. The proposed schools and doctor surgery are not the responsibility of the developer and there is no allocated budget to build or run them.</p> <p>The proposed site is on the edge of an AONB zone and it will impact on wildlife in the zone and on the canal banks below the site. Many species will be threatened by this development.</p>
<p>47 Highfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Ivy Cottage Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QY</p>	<p>I object to this planning application for the following reasons: The proposal is to build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. It would also be built on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. The scale of the development is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Melita 43 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PD</p>	<p>I object to this development within the Tring area for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are currently a number of developments within the Tring area the effects of which on the community and town resources are yet to be felt. Developments such as Roman Park with some 270 houses, the additional properties at both ends of the Bulbourne Road, the new flats along Wingrave Road and the proposed new flats in Mortimer Hill being the main ones. - The road network within Tring is already overburdened. Many of which, although being bus routes, are at times restricted to single track roads due to parked cars. Station Road is one such road that will provide access for this proposed development to the A41 will have to cope with this increase in traffic. - The proposed site for this development is on land that is designated Green Belt and is adjacent an Area of Outstanding Beauty. Tring has already sacrificed one parcel of Green Belt land to Roman Park and further erosion Trings Green Belt seems disproportionate.

	<p>- The objections to the loss of this open space are not just restricted to residents of Tring. Those that use this space for recreation will be aware that visitors arrive from as far as London and Oxford to enjoy this natural habitat.</p>
<p>11 Railway Cottages Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QT</p>	<p>1 Permission to build on Green Belt land, which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be refused. No "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward to justify the damage to the Green Belt. The land is also much needed grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>2 Development is not permitted in view of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Development Restrictions. The offer to provide a suitable alternative natural green space is not an adequate mitigation.</p> <p>3 It is not acceptable to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This proposed development, plus Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which would overwhelm the capacity of this historic market town forever. The proposed development would also have a serious impact on Aldbury Parish, in particular on the hamlet of Tring Station (the West Ward of Aldbury Parish). Difficulties of access to, and parking at, the railway station itself would be exacerbated.</p> <p>4 There is no commitment from principal authorities and the NHS to fund additional infrastructure, e.g. new schools and health centres.</p> <p>5 Dacorum Borough Council should be seeking alternative brownfield sites and should finalise the new local plan in accordance with evolving government guidelines, before Green Belt land is sacrificed. If necessary, location Tr01 should be first be considered as a more appropriate site for development.</p>
<p>5 Thomas Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FN</p>	<p>I very much object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because of the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The plan includes building on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Further to this, Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt. Surely, this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed</p> <p>2. The plan shows that the intention is to build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon</p> <p>3. I feel the scale of the build is inappropriate given the current size of Tring. This development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and</p>

	<p>change the character of this historic market town forever</p> <p>4. The proposal mentions additional infrastructure such as new schools and health centres. However, this would be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS and there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>6 New Mill Place Tringford Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4FF</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. 6. I am considerably worried about the increase in traffic and the inherent pollution that will bring. The air pollution and noise pollution on Bulbourne Road is already horrendous that road is already a dangerous road for pedestrians both in physical terms (a tiny narrow footpath traffic hurtling by at speed) and air and noise pollution add to that the increases that will be brought by the site traffic during development not to mention the probable arrival of thousands of cars belonging to the new home owners.

<p>The Timbers Lower Icknield Way, Marsworth TRING HP23 4LN</p>	<p>Such a huge development will totally change the character of Tring, and the area. Schools, doctors, dentists, Station parking, and other local services are all hopelessly inadequate to support such a development. The location is too close to the Chiltern AONB and its development will severely impact that protected environment.</p>
<p>2 Ashcroft Terrace Nathaniel Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DQ</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>18 Christchurch Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EE</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons:</p> <p>This is green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should</p>

	<p>be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>This is land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>The scale of this proposed development is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34% - this would change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>There is no commitment from the authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS to provide the additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres</p> <p>I believe that any development should be more proportionate to the size of Tring. On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>9 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>

<p>Combpayne Icknield Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HJ</p>	<p>The development will change the character of Tring and put a huge strain on already over subscribed resources such as schools, GPs, parking.</p> <p>The land is green belt and should not therefore be built on as it will destroy the natural habitat of hundreds of species.</p> <p>o build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will have less impact on the environment.</p> <p>The 500 bus service to Aylesbury is already overcrowded at school times and the traffic into Aylesbury means a car journey can take 30-40 mins at peak time. Both of these will be made worse by the planned development.</p>
<p>8 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>This plan will massively increase the number of houses and number of residents of Tring, fundamentally changing the character of this historic market town. It doesn't take into account the needs or feelings of existing residents and of the existing town. It is far too big for Tring and is out of balance with locals' needs for new houses. Local people value their green space! It should also be considered in tandem with the other planned developments, which together will increase Tring by >50% which is not sustainable and not serving the town well.</p> <p>The land is currently Green Belt, and the legislation says it can only be reclassified if there are "very special circumstances". I don't believe this definition has been reached. Tring does not need 1400+ new houses. Maybe Dacorum does, but not Tring.</p> <p>I am concerned about the density of housing on this land. 1400 homes is probably in the region of 4000 more bedrooms, equating to 4000 more people. I do not think that that many people can be adequately housed on the land, with space for all of the rewilding, green spaces, and flood mitigation that the plan promises. However, it is hard to tell because the plan does not contain details of the housing developments, the area, etc.</p> <p>Although the fields themselves are not within the AONB, they are completely surrounded by AONB land, and development will have an adverse impact on the views and the character of the Area.</p> <p>This land is part of the waterways system and is an important flood plain. Building on the land will increase the risk of flooding for both the development and the surrounding areas. Even with flood-mitigation plans in place, 1400 homes plus parking spaces and infrastructure will replace absorbant land with artificial surfaces for rain run-off.</p> <p>The roads north and south of the development are both small with congestion issues. They are single carriageways away from the main arterial routes of the A41. They cannot cope with 1400+ new cars, even if not everyone is driving at the same time. There will still be</p>

	<p>many more cars in the local area than there are now.</p> <p>Similarly, can our local freshwater and sewerage system cope? That's a lot of people drawing more water, and emitting more waste into the system.</p>
<p>34 Goldfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AZ</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>26 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable</p>

	<p>location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>4 Fog Cottages Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QP</p>	<p>We object to this development. it is in a green belt zone and close to the AONB , Ashridge estate and Sites of special scientific interest. The existing roads leading to and from the development are not suitable for existing traffic. The fields are prone to severe flooding. A high pressure fuel line runs through the development. A lack of drinking water may be an issue as local water is drawn from aquifers. There are not enough existing facilities and the facilities promised on the plan have not been given enough thought. Who is going to run the schools and where are the medical facilities to provide for extra people? Tring is stretched for these facilities presently. The houses will not address the need for local starter homes at a reasonable price for local key workers. The over development of the area will spoil Tring as an attractive place for visitors to the area , which is a key part of the local economy. Although Tring and Berkhamsted have a bypass, in the event of it being closed the A4251 is at a gridlock for many miles. More cars will add to the congestion and air pollution. With Aylesbury vale council very heavily over developing houses towards Aston Clinton and Pitstone, so that residents can take advantage of Dacorum and Hertfordshire facilities, it will also cause ribbon development from the other side of Aylesbury through Berkhamsted to Watford. HS2 is being built and destroying local green spaces so employment and housing can be moved further north to aid the economy, rather than a north south divide. Putting more houses in the south east so that developers can increase their profits makes no sense.</p>
<p>65 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BX</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. There is already pressure on and damage to the Ashridge Estate from an increase in housing locally. 3) To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring

	<p>i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5) To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. We do not need a suburb.</p> <p>6) To build on an area that has historically been prone to flooding. The "marsh" in "Marshcroft" gives a clue to this. Station Road is also on a flood plain.</p> <p>7) To build on Grade 2 Agricultural land. Farming is a far more effective use of this land at a time when food production is going to be needed more closer to home rather than imported from elsewhere.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>Lynton 118 Western Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4BJ</p>	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>I write to you to register my concern and disapproval about the proposed development of 1,400 homes at "Grove Fields".</p> <p>I am a recent arrival in the town, having moved here from Watford- a much larger town being altered out of all character by ridiculous targets for new dwellings, in December 2020.</p> <p>Already under construction back then was the Roman Park development at the Western extremity of town.</p> <p>I thought I'd outline my own personal concerns about the proposal first, before reinforcing the objection from the Grove Fields Action group.</p> <p>Tring is a special town, nestled amidst and against the Chiltern Hills, it has a special charm which has evolved over its long history.</p> <p>Imagine how the High Street would be impacted by the extra traffic generated by the Grove Fields proposal! Even yesterday (23/4) a small set of roadworks caused significant queuing and traffic noise along its length.</p> <p>The town is surrounded by areas of great natural wealth and beauty, and these already come under pressure from recreational use by local residents and incoming visitors from further afield.</p>

	<p>With specific reference to Tring Reservoirs, Ivinghoe Beacon and Aldbury Nowers (of almost unique importance for insect life), all these would be severely impacted by additional population pressure from Tring.</p> <p>I include here the concise and detailed objections drafted by others, but with which I wholeheartedly concur.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>Yours Sincerely,</p>
<p>19 Gannel Terrace Tringford Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4JH</p>	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I write to object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is

	<p>inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring; however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>27 Morefields Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EU</p>	<p>Only an overview can be provided of our objections to this application. However other responses are providing some detail of the problems that this scale of development poses for a small market town.</p> <p>Location: Development should not be considered for Green Belt and Grade 2 Agricultural Land.</p> <p>Large adverse impacts on Biodiversity and Impacts will result on The Chilterns Beechwoods SAC, and other local areas of nature conservation interest. The recent correspondence from Natural England following on from the piece of evidence instructed by Dacorum Borough Council and completed by Footprint Ecology of the existing local impacts in the area provides some degree of acknowledgement of the scale of degradation suffered by the SAC currently. Existing visitor estimates for the Ashridge Estate are acknowledged in the Natural England correspondence to be an underestimate so it is unclear how a strategic solution can be found to allowing large scale development.</p> <p>However it is clear that whatever strategic response is agreed with Natural England it will not be enough. The results from the existing population levels are leading to a deterioration in the SAC. Of course some mitigation measures can be implemented to reduce impacts from the existing local population. However whatever "strategic solution" is devised to facilitate large scale development will be totally inadequate to prevent further degradation and loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that a "strategic solution" can be found to allowing large scale development and the resultant large adverse impacts on the area so a decision to allow development would be premature.</p> <p>The scale of the development is totally unsuitable for a small market</p>

	town with infrastructure already insufficient for the community needs.
<p>2 Fog Cottages Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QP</p>	<p>This is green belt land that should not be developed and is on the edge of a AONB.</p>
<p>Herts and Middx Wildlife Trust, Grebe House St Michaels Street St Albans AL3 4SN</p>	<p>In order to scrutinise the figures in the biodiversity net gain assessment, the full metric in excel form must be supplied. The application should not be determined without this information. Small changes to species lists and management required. Condition for a biodiversity net gain management plan required to secure habitats outlined in the approved metric. Hedgerow provision required offsite or via a S106 to deliver a 10% net gain in linear habitats. Condition required for integrated swift and bat boxes required.</p> <p>Changes are required to the management of proposed habitats to achieve the intended results.</p> <p>The Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan should be altered:</p> <p>Remove London Plane from the tree planting mix, it is not native. Remove Scots Pine, not appropriate for this area.</p> <p>Hay meadow management involves cutting and clearing twice a year in mid July and October, not once as has been stated. Change Table 5.7 p24 to reflect this.</p> <p>The biodiversity net gain metric shows an acceptable net gain in terrestrial habitats but not in hedgerows. There should be a 10% net gain in hedgerow habitat. If this cannot be delivered on-site it should be provided offsite or via a S106 agreement with the LPA to deliver it on their behalf.</p> <p>The outputs of the biodiversity metric should be secured by a suitably worded condition. This must require a biodiversity net gain plan that demonstrates how the specific habitat units detailed in the metric will be achieved. The plan should link directly to the metric with the number of units explicitly stated for each habitat parcel, together with the establishment, management and monitoring measures required. Contingency in case of failure must also be detailed. A suitable condition is:</p> <p>'Development shall not commence until a Biodiversity Net Gain Management Plan (BNGMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The content of the BNGMP shall ensure the delivery of the agreed number of habitat units identified in the approved NE biodiversity Metric (insert unit total here) as a minimum to achieve a biodiversity net gain. The BNGMP must include the following.</p> <p>a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed. b) Aims and objectives of management. c) Appropriate management options for achieving target condition for all habitat parcels as described in the approved metric.</p>

	<p>d) Prescriptions for management actions, only definitive measures are acceptable.</p> <p>e) Preparation of an annual work schedule capable of being rolled forward in perpetuity, with habitat land parcels clearly marked on plans.</p> <p>f) Details of the body or organisation responsible for implementation of the plan.</p> <p>g) Ongoing monitoring plan and remedial measures to ensure habitat condition targets in the approved metric are met.</p> <p>h) Details of species selected to achieve target habitat conditions as identified in approved metric, definitively stated and marked on plans.</p> <p>The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.</p> <p>The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.'</p> <p>Reason: To achieve a measurable biodiversity net gain in accordance with NPPF.'</p> <p>All houses bordering open space should incorporate an integrated swift and bat boxes. The following condition should be applied to secure this:</p> <p>'Prior to the commencement of the development, details of 400 integrated bat cavity boxes, and 400 integrated swift boxes, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved measures shall be incorporated into the scheme, be fully constructed prior to occupation of the approved development and retained as such thereafter.'</p> <p>Reason: To conserve and enhance biodiversity in accordance with NPPF.</p>
<p>Woodstock 56B Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PD</p>	<p>This plan will massively increase the number of houses and number of residents of Tring, fundamentally changing the character of this historic market town and is effectively linking the hamlet that is Tring Station with the remainder of Tring. Harrow Estates claim to have consulted on the matter and whilst they held an exhibition in town they did not record attendees comments or observations at the event and requested feedback forms be completed. I was then invited to join a working group to discuss the proposals and submit my thoughts but having indicated an interest, my further requests were met with silence and as far as I am aware no meaningful or representative workshops ever took place.</p> <p>The development is out of balance with local needs for new houses. Local people value their green space and Marshcroft Lane is a valued natural green route for the locality.</p>

The land is currently Green Belt, and from the documentation submitted with this application the "very special circumstances" required to permit development on Green Belt land have not been met. Tring does not need 1400+ new houses.

The proposals make no reference to additional utilities required to serve an estate of this size. The electricity power network for Tring cannot support this development without extensive works elsewhere in the Tring area, the water and drainage networks are currently overstretched and also cannot support a development of this size without enlargement of existing facilities elsewhere in the locality.

Development will have an adverse impact on the views and the character of the Area and the views of the higher ground will be adversely impacted from Tring whilst the views of Tring from the high ground surrounding Tring will be adversely affected. The land currently serves as a green buffer between the town and the canal/railway and with the A41 restricting development towards Tring Park, the development will remove all accessible green areas.

Concerning the documents submitted, the applicant has provided a built heritage statement but this make no reference to the archaeological survey completed which has recorded Iron Age remains, ditches and settlements on the site. There is also no reference the crop marks which are present and visible in dry weather from surrounding high ground.

The ecological assessment makes only passing reference to bats in Marshcroft Lane at, before and soon after sunset. There are known maternity roosts in the buildings around the Marshcroft Farm who forage in and around the ditches and woodland and these protected species cannot be relocated. The claim that no dormouse, hedgehogs or badgers are present suggest the survey has been hastily completed or done to avoid any sightings as this and many other wildlife species are visible in the development area.

The roads north and south of the development are single carriageway with congestion issues. and they cannot cope with the number of new cars likely. Access to the A41, towards Dunstable, Aylesbury, Hemel Hempstead or other potential sources of employment are already constrained by the road layout and restrictions imposed with a traffic light controlled bridge over the railway and a narrow canal bridge on Icknield Way, narrow roads leading to the A41 and dangerous junctions which require care and cannot support a large influx of additional traffic.

Tring does not have the community facilities to support a development of this scale. The development proposes new school, community and sports facilities and proposes 1000m² of new shops and services floor space including a day nursery. This is totally inadequate to support the proposed development and will result in pressure on existing facilities in the town. Whilst Tring has two existing supermarkets, neither are capable of supporting additional development of this magnitude and the existing market town shops within Tring are unable

	<p>to support this development.</p> <p>In short, the proposals are a massive overdevelopment of the market town that is Tring and will adversely affect the setting of the town in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and I strongly oppose the development.</p>
<p>19 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I would like to register, in the strongest possible terms, my objection to this application which would have an extremely detrimental effect on the Chiltern countryside, the AONB and the market town of Tring. The whole site is in designated Green Belt which should only be released for development in exceptional circumstances. We cannot afford loss of our Green Belt especially with so many alternative brownfield sites available for development within the Borough.</p> <p>It is unethical that these developers seek to take advantage of the fact that the planning framework for the area is still in the process of being developed by our elected representatives.</p> <p>Further, the detail of the hybrid application is purely illustrative and so provides no firm basis for assurance of the eventual project.</p> <p>I urge Dacorum Borough Council to reject this application outright.</p>
<p>13 Bulbourne Road</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>52 Hunters Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QA</p>	<p>Exceptional circumstances have not been identified to justify approval of the application to build on this green belt site, which is also adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Dacorum Borough Council is currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt. This review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any decision is made to sacrifice green belt here or anywhere in the borough.</p>
<p>49 Grove Park Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JS</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>I am writing to object to planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>The run off of water with added phosphates and Nitrates that will no doubt enter the local watercourse will always be a problem.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should</p>

	<p>be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>43 Grove Road Tring HP23 5PD</p>	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to OBJECT to the planning application for additional 1400 new homes in Tring, as detailed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>4 Fairthorn Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DT</p>	<p>Since I moved to Tring in 1978 repeated efforts have been made by developers to build MANY houses here. They would totally alter and ruin Tring. So far all of them have been denied.</p> <p>The structure of Tring is not suited to a large development. The infrastructure could not cope. Have you seen our high street? Do you live in Tring? I expect the answer is "no". We already have a development on the Icknield Way, Roman Park, of 240 houses i.e a possible 960 extra people and 480 cars? These will already cause more problems.</p> <p>I have already tried to send an email to this address. It was returned 3 times. I hope that this one gets through</p> <p>.We already have the Roman Park development going up with approximately 240 houses, a possible extra 480 cars and 960 people.</p>

	<p>An extra 1,700 houses will overwhelm the town. Where will they park? How will they use the station ?There is no extra parking available there An even larger development would only make these problems much, much worse. Tring will be paralised.</p> <p>How will the surgeries cope with a larger number of residents.</p> <p>This will mean that more green belt will disappear for ever.</p> <p>The high street is blocked one way if only one vehicle parks there.</p> <p>Miswell lane, already a difficult road, will be made worse by the Roman Park estate being built. There is rumour of a possible Residential Home being built there. There is no room for cars etc to go in and out of a building based on the top of Miswell Lane.</p> <p>At the ;moment Tring is a nice place to live, a small market town. These plans would change its character and turn it into a blocked up, overcrowded and unpleasant .place to live. It will become a commuter town. There will not be enough work, parking,or medical surgeries to cope with more people.</p>
<p>8 Mortimer Hill Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JT</p>	<p>I am emailing you to register my strongest objections to the planning application 22/01187/MOA. This is Green Belt/AONB land and deserves protection for that very reason. With the declaration of a climate and ecological emergency by DBC I find it hard to stomach that these plans even have to be considered? This proposed development is too large, and our infrastructure will not cope with it. The character of our historic market town will be forever lost.</p>
<p>11 Netherby Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PJ</p>	<p>I am the Chairman of the Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA). The GFRA objects to the planning application (22/01187/MOA), the GFRA objection is on behalf of our 572 members who are all residents of the local area. Please find attached our response to Dacorum's 'Issues and Options' consultation in 2017 and 'Draft Local Plan Consultation' in 2021. Both of these responses provide significant reasoning as to why this land should not be developed and I therefore submit them as evidence to be considered by Dacorum Borough Council and any subsequent appeals process.</p> <p>The headlines as to why the GFRA objects to this planning application are because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides

	<p>protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3)To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5)To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>116 Western Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4BJ</p>	<p>Hi there</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.

	<p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>8 Sulgrave Crescent Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LG</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong objections to planning application 22/01187/MOA for 1,400 housesp to the east of Tring.</p> <p>I have several detailed objections, which are given below, but would also like to raise some more general objections to the plan as a whole.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). There is local support for additional, affordable housing but this has to be proportionate to the size of the Town and should be on brownfield sites, infill or on sites closer to the centre of Town, such as the Herts CC owned land opposite the Tesco supermarket rather than irreplaceable Green Belt.</p> <p>In addition, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>My detailed objections to planning application 22/01187/MOA are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is to build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. The proposal is to build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland upon which the proposal is planning to develop houses. 3. The proposal is to build on a scale that is disproportionate to the current size of Tring. This development,

	<p>plus Roman Park in the west of Tring, increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will overwhelm the capacity of local infrastructure and forever change the character of this historic market town.</p> <p>4. The proposed additional infrastructure, including new schools and health centres promised by the Developer are unfunded. The assumption is that these are to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. The proposed access to this very large development are from Bulbourne Road and Station Road, with the Developer envisioning little or no impact on surrounding roads, notably Grove Road. At the community event they held, it was proposed that a section of Marshcroft Lane be made one way to avoid this becoming the main access, but doubts were expressed on this plan by the Developer themselves due to the need to provide access for existing householders on Marshcroft Lane. It seems naive to expect that traffic from the west of Tring, particularly School traffic, will only use the designated access points and not simply use Grove Road, Chiltern Way and Mortimer Hill as access, pick up and drop off points. This will greatly impact an area already very congested with traffic at each end of the school day.</p> <p>6. The proposal is to build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>In summary, I object to 22/01187/MOA on all of the above grounds and support the advice from Tring Town Council to the Dacorum Planning Authority to reject the application in the strongest possible terms.</p>
<p>1 Sulgrave Crescent Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LG</p>	<p>Dear Planning Department,</p> <p>I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of</p>

	<p>this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am very much not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>Georgia Trooper Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RW</p>	<p>I am informed that the development proposed: Is on Green Belt land (there was good reason for this designation in the context of maintaining open spaces and providing an alternative would be missing the point), is on Grade 2 agricultural land (the country cannot afford to give up higher quality land that is needed for food production at a time when we are realising that global food supply chains are increasingly threatened), will impact on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (again, there was reason for this designation and the area concerned has been described to me by a Council officer as the jewel in Dacorum's crown), is within the Ashridge Commons and Woods Buffer of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation It seems inappropriate and irresponsible to allow development on this land when alternative sites are available (albeit may be not in the control of this developer).</p> <p>Recognising that you may chose to set aside the objections given above, I ask that you take into consideration that the present centre of Tring is not readily accessible on foot from the proposed area of development (think of a parent with small children). At a time when we are all trying to live more sustainable lives it is important that new developments have community facilities within easy walking distance. These should include but not be limited to shops, schools, medical surgery, places of faith gathering, a community hall, pub(s). These are referred to in the application, but experience tells me that they are often overlooked when developments go ahead; the Council needs to be ahead of the game on this matter.</p> <p>While there is reference to Affordable Housing, there is only slight reference to Social Housing - that is, housing that is, and remains in public ownership and is available for the least well off. This reference needs to be considerably strengthened - and to Dacorum's advantage.</p> <p>On the subject of sustainability I have seen no reference to energy</p>

efficient building standards. This is a lost opportunity for Dacorum to establish housing construction standards for the future that will benefit future generations of residents.

There is also no reference to the provision of public transport in the summary document. Again referring to the need to lead more sustainable lives with fewer cars, this is a serious omission in the application.

Dear Sirs,

Ref the above planning application, please note:

I am informed that the development proposed:

- o Is on Green Belt land (there was good reason for this designation in the context of maintaining open spaces and providing an alternative would be missing the point),
- o is on Grade 2 agricultural land (the country cannot afford to give up higher quality land that is needed for food production at a time when we are realising that global food supply chains are increasingly threatened),
- o will impact on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (again, there was reason for this designation and the area concerned has been described to me by a Council officer as the jewel in Dacorum's crown),
- o is within the Ashridge Commons and Woods Buffer of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation

It seems inappropriate and irresponsible to allow development on this land when alternative sites are available (albeit may be not in the control of this developer).

Recognising that you may chose to set aside the objections given above, I ask that you take into consideration that the present centre of Tring is not readily accessible on foot from the proposed area of development (think of a parent with small children). At a time when we are all trying to live more sustainable lives it is important that new developments have community facilities within easy walking distance. These should include but not be limited to shops, schools, medical surgery, places of faith gathering, a community hall, pub(s). These are referred to in the application, but experience tells me that they are often overlooked when developments go ahead; the Council needs to be ahead of the game on this matter.

While there is reference to Affordable Housing, there is only slight reference to Social Housing - that is, housing that is, and remains in public ownership and is available for the least well off. This reference needs to be considerably strengthened - and to Dacorum's advantage.

There is also no reference to the provision of public transport in the summary document. Again referring to the need to lead more sustainable lives with fewer cars, this is a serious omission in the application.

	<p>Again, on the subject of sustainability I have seen no reference to energy efficient building standards. This is a lost opportunity for Dacorum to establish housing construction standards for the future that will benefit future generations of residents.</p>
<p>The Farmhouse Marshcroft Lane</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>Re the above planning application -</p> <p>o I strongly object to these proposals and request Dacorum Borough Council refuse this application, which would have such an extremely detrimental effect on our Chiltern countryside, its AONB, the Borough and the market town of Tring.</p> <p>o This site falls within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - March 2022. I understand that DBC is required to implement mitigation to alleviate visitor pressure on Ashridge and Tring Woodlands. This site falls within the Zone of Influence and should be protected from development of any kind.</p> <p>o The size of the proposed development is far greater than is appropriate for the present size of the town, which has already been extended recently by a large housing development on its Western edge.</p>
<p>13 New Road Wilstone Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4NZ</p>	<p>To whom it may concern.</p> <p>I strongly object to this development. It is contrary to many local and national planning policies as well as being wholly situated in green belt.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned that the developers state that there are very special circumstances for granting planning permission, stressing the lack of 5 year housing supply by dacorum. This is a frequent method to get planning by appeal to the secretary of state after local refusal. It is important to address this.</p>
<p>St Brannoeks 83 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>We object to further loss of Green Belt Land. The Green Belt is there to preserve the identity of separate developments, originally considered as "breathing space". Bleeding Tring into the hamlets of Bulbourne and Tring Station does not deliver a "sustainable community that will seamlessly integrate with Tring" (Summary Guide, para 3.1).</p> <p>The threat of overdevelopment must also be rejected due to its damage to Tring's relationship with nearby Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The plan's provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) will not protect the beechwoods from further damaging recreational pressure, as people will not confine themselves to this development.</p> <p>Were this Grade 2 agricultural land to be lost, more of our food security would be gone forever. In a world where we are reconsidering the impact of "food miles" surely this is a serious loss.</p>

	<p>The roads north and south of the development are single carriageways with congestion and access difficulties which would worsen with extra traffic. Traveling to nearby towns from the north of the planned development for employment, and elsewhere for leisure, is already problematic with a traffic light controlled bridge over the railway and a narrow canal bridge on Icknield Way near the Grand Junction pub. Both can only take one-way traffic.</p> <p>The chicane by the industrial area on Brook Street suffers serious congestion currently. In order to access the A41 traffic from this new estate will just add to the current chaos.</p> <p>The new developments in Pitstone already impact station road as traffic accesses the A41. Additional traffic would make it even more difficult to leave Grove Road or Cow Lane.</p> <p>It is the county council that provides schools. A development of 1400 dwellings could not support a new secondary school - that land would be used to further inflate the population. (A bit odd considering Tring School is going through a major upgrade. Not the best example of joined-up thinking).</p> <p>The impact of over 200 homes to the west of our pressurised Tring has yet to be felt fully, but at least access to the A41 is easily achieved without the need to drive through the town centre. In addition, the new residents can walk 15 minutes and be on the high street. Something residents of new suburb would not be able to, adding to traffic and pollution.</p> <p>The infrastructure is already at breaking point e.g.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main doctor's surgery has a tiny car park and barely copes with its existing customer base. 2. Tring Station car park (pre-Covid) was full before 8am, causing people to drive to other stations on the line to Euston. 3. Tring's car parks can hardly cope at busy times eg weekends. 4. The narrow High Street's pavements are cramped, often forcing pedestrians into the road in order to pass.
<p>9 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposed development. It is far too big for the size of the town, and the proposed site is green belt land.</p>
<p>Ladyman Barn Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RU</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Permission to build on Green Belt land, which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be refused. No "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward to justify the damage to the Green Belt. The land is also much needed grade 2 agricultural land. 2 Development is not permitted in view of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Development Restrictions. The offer to provide a suitable alternative natural green space is not an adequate mitigation. 3 It is not acceptable to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This proposed development, plus Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which would overwhelm the capacity of this historic market town forever. The proposed development would also have a serious impact on Aldbury

	<p>Parish, in particular on the hamlet of Tring Station (the West Ward of Aldbury Parish). Difficulties of access to, and parking at, the railway station itself would be exacerbated.</p> <p>4 There is no commitment from principal authorities and the NHS to fund additional infrastructure, e.g. new schools and health centres.</p> <p>5 Dacorum Borough Council should be seeking alternative brownfield sites and should finalise the new local plan in accordance with evolving government guidelines, before Green Belt land is sacrificed. If necessary, location Tr01 should be first be considered as a more appropriate site for development.</p>
<p>20 Grange Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JP</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>50 vicarage road Leighton buzzard LU7 9EY</p>	<p>I STRONGLY object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The development will be built on green belt land which is also adjacent to the AONB. Exceptional circumstances have NOT been</p>

	<p>provided to justify building on this green belt land. Dacorum Borough council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on greenbelt- this review should be allowed to be completed and the new local plan should be finalised before ANY greenbelt is sacrificed.</p> <p>The mere thought that we should sacrifice such an enormous portion of greenbelt land when we are in the middle of a climate emergency is absolutely ridiculous. We, as a countryside market town, should be leading the way in trying to protect this important land. It is completely unacceptable that this proposal should even make it to this stage. Huge new developments such as this one will increase pollution, risk of flooding, loss of wildlife and important habitats and will also change the character of this small, countryside town forever.</p> <p>This land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (special area of conservation) This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring woodland which the proposal is planning to build houses on. This is unacceptable and this proposal should never have been allowed to get any further for this reason alone.</p> <p>The scale of these plans are completely inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This development plus the Roman park development will increase the population of Tring by 34% which will break the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>The plans claim that there will be additional infrastructure provided by local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and the NHS) however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. I believe that the promises in these plans are all made up by the developer to make the public more willing to accept the plans.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, but I believe that it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure. Developments should also not be built on important greenbelt land.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and response.</p>
<p>3A New Ground Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RJ</p>	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development (22/01187/MOA) on green belt land. This is precious land, adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and recognised as important by its protection by the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land.</p> <p>Dacorum Borough Council should finish its review of available brownfield sites in urban areas and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>The scale of development is totally out of proportion for a town the size of Tring. This development, along with Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%.</p>

	<p>I am not against any housing growth for Tring. However, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure, in particular the High Street and the A41.</p>
<p>116 Grove Road Tring Hp23 5pa</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>We object to the proposed development on the basis that it is (i) out of proportion with the town, (II) on green belt land and adjacent to areas of AONB / SAC, and (iii) without committed improvements to infrastructure and facilities. Please reconsider.</p>
<p>The White House Northfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QW</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to this application. In my opinion the proposed scheme to build a large 1400 home residential and ancillary mixed use development on the outskirts of Tring is enormously out of keeping with the area.</p> <p>There are several reasons that I believe make this development unsuitable for this location.</p> <p>Firstly, the site is in the Green Belt and most importantly is an area of Green Belt that still retains its rural characteristics. It is also adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and is roughly midpoint between two designated areas of historic Chilterns beechwood, which the Council is looking to protect. The area supports much wildlife which will not see any benefits.</p> <p>Secondly, the proposed size of the development is totally out of scale with the historic market town of Tring. If combined with the ongoing development of Roman Park, this would see an increase of over 30% in the town's population which would permanently distort the characteristics and capacity of the town for ever. It would join the main town to the hamlet of Tring Station and further place further strain on traffic on Station and Bulbourne Roads.</p> <p>In addition with recent world events in Ukraine and current supply and transport issues, it has become clear that food security is a priority. The site is currently grade 2 agricultural land, flat and easily accessible for machinery and should not be lost to agricultural use. In addition the site has historically flooded, thus making it a poor choice for housing, as it will affect any future inhabitants mortgage applications and insurance.</p> <p>The area has a large amount of nocturnal wildlife, including owls, moths and many bats, which would be detrimentally affected by the light pollution that such a development will emit. The area is known by moth enthusiasts, particularly near the Aldbury Nowers as it holds such a diversity of species.</p> <p>If Tring wants to be a sustainable and Green town, developing over and suburbanising green fields and open space is the wrong approach. I am aware that at Tring and Aldbury Council meetings, the feeling has been very much against this particular proposed development. I believe that the local parish council has suggested that alternative brownfield sites could and should be found ahead of any</p>

	<p>proposals to sacrifice green belt land. I would hope that Dacorum Borough Council should finalise their new local plan in accordance with the evolving guidelines.</p> <p>I hope that the Dacorum planning department and officers listen to the local people and reject this application.</p>
<p>The Wolds Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>** Notably, the existing thoroughfare of Station Road reflects the history and provenance of the area separating Tring from Tring Station that will be destroyed by this "ribbon sprawl " development proposal.</p> <p>"The Mall" of the area likes it's name-sake in Central London should be protected and enjoyed as an amenity by future generations.</p> <p>In addition :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Lynwood Park Road Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of</p>

<p>HP23 6AT</p>	<p>Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p>
<p>Foxdale Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>This is a green belt area and should be maintained as such, especially at a time where we're faced with unprecedented destruction to our environment.</p> <p>The local road network simply could not cope. Our house is on Station Road, close to Tring train station. A section of the road - from the Iron Room towards the bridge - is single file traffic (except for between 10am-12pm) owing to parked cars, and the volume of traffic at busy times already leads to heavy congestion and frustrated drivers who take matters into their own hands by mounting the kerb intended for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Do the developers have any evidence that there would be support from local government for the schools / health care facilities they are proposing? As Tring School has only just been renovated, I cannot imagine that any additional funding will be offered up from the government for new schools in Tring. This would mean pupils from Tring would need to travel to Berkhamsted / Hemel Hempstead thus creating more traffic problems. With local resources already stretched, the existing infrastructure of Tring can't support this development without having a severe negative impact on its current population.</p> <p>The building of the quantity of houses suggested, and over the area that has been earmarked, would mean Tring could no longer be</p>

	<p>viewed as a market town, which is has been since 1315. Is seems very unnecessary to build on green belt areas and loose one of the few remaining characterful historic market towns in Hertfordshire.</p>
<p>8 Grange Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JP</p>	<p>This complete scheme is an opportunistic attempt to make profit from a building development which is totally unsuitable and inappropriate to the area.</p> <p>It is being made on the back of an earlier area development plan which is itself flawed and totally discredited with particular reference to the number of properties it proposed for Tring being absolutely disproportionate to developments in other areas. This fact has been established by numerous responses and disproved aspects of the area plan.</p> <p>The so called "Marshcroft Area" is an historic and beautiful part of Tring and is an essential link to the AONB, the ASSI, and the Green Belt.</p> <p>House building on the scale envisaged is unthinkable and will destroy the ambience, atmosphere and very nature of our town and surroundings.</p> <p>The claims of balanced development with appropriate Infrastructure and open areas is blatant nonsense to those who know the area. The concept of such as "affordable housing" is impossible within such an area as Tring unless they are constructed to a totally inadequate standard.</p> <p>This plan must be rejected in its entirety.</p>
<p>5 West Passage Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6AY</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to this proposal. The proposed development concerns protected green belt land, which in addition to being very important for the local ecosystem, is also suitable for growing food. As such, it needs protecting in light of growing population and increased need for food supplies. The development proposes 1400 new homes - this is over 50% increase on the current size of the market town of Tring. We do not have the facilities, the infrastructure or the space for all the additional people and cars in this area. This would completely block the high street, and indeed the train station car park would not cope with the supply. The proposal's inclusion of schools and GP surgeries are unrealistic and unfeasible - even if the buildings for them are built, they cannot guarantee that GPs will be establishing new partnerships, or that the council will establish new schools in the area. For these reasons, the proposal is completely inadequate - it would put a significant strain on the community facilities, and would destroy our Area of Natural Beauty so close to both the Asridge estate and the Chilterns. The developers should be looking to redevelop disused brown land in Dacorum, where building new homes would be an improvement, rather than the destruction of the local area.</p>
<p>4 Jubilee Gardens Tring</p>	<p>I strongly object to this application. The whole site is in designated Green Belt and as I understand it, Green Belt can only be released for</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 4JG</p>	<p>development in exceptional & very special circumstances. This is neither.</p> <p>The site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland! This large number of dwellings will drastically and adversely change the rural setting and character of the market town of Tring and increase traffic with insufficient though or evidence over the supporting infrastructure.</p>
<p>89 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BZ</p>	<p>This development shouldn't be granted permission as it will have a detrimental effect on Tring and the surrounding area.</p> <p>The developers promise new schools and doctors but yet they don't ever get built, a prime example of this is Leighton Buzzard where they have built numerous housing estate, the latest one with 4000 homes and there aren't any new schools, doctors or dentists and the roads are gridlocked most of the day. Tring roads weren't built for excessive amounts of traffic.</p> <p>Marshcroft Lane is an idilic place to walk now, it doesn't need a "village" to improve that. Once our green belt land is gone we're never going to get it back and we should be protecting it for future generations.</p>
<p>2 Posting House Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QS</p>	<p>I object to the development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disproportionate to the scale of Tring as existing. It increases the size of Tring by over 30% which is not a sustainable way of developing a small town with limited facilities. 2. Plans put forward by the developer for infrastructure are questionable. The surface water drainage strategy solely relies on infiltration with rather poor rates recorded on site. The proposed attenuation basins are located adjacent to the Grand Union Canal. which is approximately 10m below the development site. Discharge ending up in a controlled watercourse as well as the impact on the structural integrity of the bank has not been considered. Also the half drain times quoted in the calculations are only just below 24 hours which suggests that there is insufficient scope to deliver a surface water solution purely using infiltration. 3. SANG area is not really open area available to the public as this is extensively utilised for drainage features. 4. The road junctions suggested does not offer any improvements to the existing road network to accommodate the increased number of vehicles (approx. 2800) introduced to the area as a result of the development. Proposals to reduce the speed along Station Road is not a means of offering better connectivity or road network to accommodate the development. 5. No clear indication on project programme or how community facilities will be developed. Is the developer funding these facilities? Council should consider carefully how these are integrated to the

	<p>development programme and the budget they do not end up with a large number of housing and land allocated to community facilities but no facilities actually constructed.</p> <p>6. Is the character of the development being questioned by the Council Planners? A development of this scale which is based on a standard house type will alter the character of the whole town in a damaging manner.</p>
<p>1 Grove Leys Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>1. As many people are now able to work from home, are these new houses really needed? Why buy an expensive property in Tring, when there are much cheaper homes available elsewhere? There has been a well-documented demographic shift to more affordable rural areas.</p> <p>2. The Government's stated policy of levelling up and developing industry, commerce etc., in the Midlands and North, surely obviates the need for increased housing in this locality.</p> <p>3. This development provides the wrong type of private residential properties. It will simply produce huge profits for the Construction Company and landowners. What Tring really requires to thrive as an inclusive community is more affordable housing for key workers and young people, developed by a Housing Association, shared ownership scheme or otherwise in conjunction with the Council. What provision is being made under Section 106 and its proposed replacement?</p> <p>I have had personal experience of the difficulties in recruiting teachers, who were unable to afford homes in the area.</p> <p>4. It will change the whole character of an historic market town. The sheer size of the proposed development will alter the whole environment from a homogeneous town, centred around the High Street, to an urban area split in two.</p> <p>5. It will be a blot on the landscape in an area of outstanding natural beauty and damage the ecology of the area.</p> <p>6. Marshcroft Lane is an important amenity for the people of Tring - a very popular walk, providing rural peace and charm, and leads to further footpaths along the canal and to Aldbury Nowers. Its value was highlighted during the Covid lockdown, when it proved essential for mental health and wellbeing. Increased traffic along a narrow, one-laned road will render the Lane unusable for walkers.</p> <p>7. Though shops are planned for the proposed development, if these follow the usual pattern of suburban shops, they are likely only to sell daily essentials at a higher price than High Street stores. Therefore, it will increase the pressure on the existing car parks in the High Street, which are barely adequate at present, as new residents will wish to access cafes, restaurants, dentists, doctors, opticians, ironmongers, the weekly market etc.</p> <p>8. Despite the by-pass, traffic in Tring High Street is problematic. Jams are frequent as delivery vans block the road and buses and lorries have difficulty in passing one another. Drivers from this proposed development will inevitably exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>9. If a new secondary and primary school are built, this will increase traffic throughout the town (with its associated problems), as pupils will not be confined to the new development. At the beginning and end of the school day, traffic is considerably increased throughout Tring.</p> <p>10. Building 1,400 dwellings is totally excessive. The new Roman Park development has provided a great number of extra houses in the</p>

	<p>area and many of these are still for sale. The full impact of these on local facilities, in particular, on the station carpark, is yet unknown.</p> <p>11. As there are few executive jobs in the area, the proposed development will be mainly inhabited by commuters, albeit some part-time, as working from home seems to be an increasing pattern. This will alter the sense of community that we enjoy in Tring and turn it into a suburban sprawl. The expansion of Aylesbury eastwards, which is fast approaching the engulfment of Aston Clinton, should alert Dacorum Planning Authorities to the detrimental effects of large developments altering the characteristics of a town.</p> <p>12. Tring simply does not have the facilities or infrastructure to cope with an extra population of what will be at least 3,000 people. The proposed development includes very limited facilities. Additional pressure will be put on doctors, dentists, childcare, station parking and council services (for which the Planning Application makes no provision).</p>
<p>5 Meadow Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BT</p>	<p>I object to planning application (22/01187/MOA) because of the following:</p> <p>1. The Climate Change Emergency is not at the core of the Local Plan. The central thread of the Local Plan should be net zero carbon (ultimately zero carbon) emissions by 2030 and minimising carbon emissions during any construction. Although the Climate Change Emergency is rightly a headline statement in the plan, there is little follow through in the subsequent detail except ill-defined aims, such as promoting an unquantified reduction in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions.</p> <p>2. The promotion of renewable energy as proposed in the plan is insufficient to meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency. To achieve net zero emissions by 2030 all new homes and offices must have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · maximum insulation, · only utilise electrical energy, · must have rooftop solar panels installed at the time of construction, · must be fitted with efficient heating such as air source heat pumps. · All public transport must be electrified. · All construction should be done with sustainable materials or low embodied energy or carbon. · At construction provision must be made for home electric vehicle chargers and an adequate number of community fast chargers. · All power must be supplied by electricity or hydrogen generated from sustainable energy sources.

3. The plan I wish to see should give preference to developments which fit with the likely changes to working patterns in the aftermath of the COVID-19 epidemic. Priority should be given to plans and developments which will support local green business, including green STEM businesses, close-to-home communal office space, green domestic builders & installers to help decarbonise Dacorum, and small businesses selling locally sourced goods.

4. Affordable housing needs is not properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.

5. The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.

6. The plan does not guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.

Thank you in advance for including my submission in the considerations,

The Climate Change Emergency is not at the core of the Local Plan. The central thread of the Local Plan should be net zero carbon (ultimately zero carbon) emissions by 2030 and minimising carbon emissions during any construction. Although the Climate Change Emergency is rightly a headline statement in the plan, there is little follow through in the subsequent detail except ill-defined aims, such as promoting an unquantified reduction in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions.

The promotion of renewable energy as proposed in the plan is insufficient to meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency. To achieve net zero emissions by 2030 all new homes and offices must have:

maximum insulation,

only utilise electrical energy,

must have rooftop solar panels installed at the time of construction,

must be fitted with efficient heating such as air source heat pumps.

All public transport must be electrified.

All construction should be done with sustainable materials or low embodied energy or carbon.

At construction provision must be made for home electric vehicle chargers and an adequate number of community fast chargers.

All power must be supplied by electricity or hydrogen generated from sustainable energy sources.

The plan I wish to see preference given to developments which fit with the likely changes to working patterns in the aftermath of the COVID-19 epidemic. Priority should be given to plans and developments which will support local green business, including green STEM businesses, close-to-home communal office space, green domestic

	<p>builders & installers to help decarbonise Dacorum, and small businesses selling locally sourced goods. Affordable housing needs is not properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.</p> <p>The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.</p> <p>The plan does not guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.</p> <p>This is a commuter town and residents rely on transport to make journeys out of the town to travel to work. The present rail and road networks will not sustain such an increase in population.</p>
<p>26 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>To whom it may concern, I am writing to express my objection to planning application 22/01187/MOA.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth in general. I appreciate that we have both a housing shortage, and an affordability problem, and that while there are ways to alleviate both, the only way to ultimately solve them is through more building.</p> <p>However, I strongly believe housing growth needs to be proportionate to the communities it is expanding, be located close to existing infrastructure (in our case, the A41), and on brownfield or infill sites where possible (rather than irreplaceable Green Belt).</p> <p>There are no circumstances here sufficient to justify building on Green Belt land (at least, not until all of the potential brownfield sites have been sufficiently discounted). The scale of the proposal will overwhelm local infrastructure and ruin the character of the historic old town in the process, and the proposed additional infrastructure is insufficient and currently unfunded.</p>
<p>8 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>I support the comments of the Grove Fields Residents Association submitted on 3 May.</p>
<p>Beauchamp House 8A Bulbourne Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HF</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p>

	<p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board The Lodge Station Road Chinnor OX39 4HA</p>	<p>Hybrid application (with access details of two main access points from Bulbourne Road and Station road in full and the main development on the rest of the site in outline with all matters reserved) for the demolition of all existing buildings on the site and the development of up to 1,400 dwellings (including up to 140 use class C2 dwellings); a new local centre and sports /community hub, primary school, secondary school, and public open spaces including creation of a suitable alternative natural green space.</p> <p>Land East of Tring - CCB Holding Direction (SAC) Comments (AONB setting)</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB). This application is largely enveloped by the AONB to the northeast, south and southwestern boundaries.</p> <p>SUMMARY POINTS</p> <p>Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Holding Objection)</p> <p>In our judgment this application requires a strategic assessment of policy. The Local Plan process is the best means, by far, in which to resolve issues of housing need and environmental protection. The Local Plan is paused but not withdrawn and the recent Natural England (14th March 2022) pronouncement on the Chilterns Beechwood SAC is a matter of great importance. We conclude, ultimately, that the long-term protection of the SAC requires an appropriate mitigation strategy to be delivered via the Local Plan process. To attempt such mitigation at application only level must be considered an incremental approach. This cannot be sustainable when applying the appropriate assessment methodology in the Habitat Regulations because it prevents a holistic and cumulative assessment of all sites in preference to a case by case (incremental) approach.</p> <p>The CCB in delivering its duties as established by the CROW Act</p>

section 87 promotes the need for a strategic solution to the protection of the SAC, which the planning authority themselves have been striving to deliver over the last 18 months or so. The 'bespoke mitigation strategy' as promoted by Harrow Estates / Redrow Homes is backed up by a SANGs statement (document 28) and a Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) (document 31). 26.88 ha of SANGs (total site area 121 ha) is proposed, in phased delivery and discussions have been held with various parties, including Natural England, albeit they are yet to respond on this application. The key problem is that such an approach is not sustainable for the whole District. The HRA regulations sets the test as a 'significant effect' (either direct or indirect) and this requires cumulative assessment of impact. In our view the LPA would struggle to reach a robust conclusion on such a matter by applying the SANGs methodology in this manner, i.e., on a site-by-site and piecemeal basis.

We raise a holding objection here because the proposed 'bespoke solution' cannot be the way forward for the long-term planning of the District. The NPPF stipulates at its paragraph 15 that, 'The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings'.

The supporting planning statement at 19.3 states that, 'the impact of growth on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC has been effectively mitigated'. We content that such a bold statement is impossible to prove either way because what is proposed here is, by definition, a piecemeal approach. Looking at the 14th March 2022 Natural England publication on the SAC we cannot envisage that this approach aligns itself correctly with the new mitigation strategy that they are now promoting.

AONB Setting (comments).

The setting of the AONB is a matter of material importance, with the AONB wrapping around the site, to a large extent. A ZVI plan (figure 8.6) shows the nature of intervisibility, and this is required to influence appropriate mitigation. Sensitivity to nighttime light sources (also see figure 8.7) is relevant, to avoid lighting glare and spill into the AONB. Reference to the ILP Environment Zone E1 'natural' and thus the AONB, notes the high sensitivity of this receiving landscape.

The setting of the AONB is a matter relevant to legislation (see CROW Act section 85 for matters, 'so as to affect' the AONB), Development Plan policy (Core Strategy CS24) and in the NPPF (paragraph 176 as revised to include AONB setting in July 2022). The CCB has also produced a position statement on setting and this states (its paragraph 14) that, 'The setting of the Chilterns AONB does not have a geographical border. The location, scale, materials or design of a proposed development or land management activity will determine whether it affects the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB. A very large development may have an impact even if some considerable distance from the AONB boundary. However, the

distance away from the AONB will be a material factor in forming a decision on any proposals, in that the further away a development is from the AONB boundary the more the impact is likely to be reduced'. Examples can include,:

- Blocking or interference of views out of the AONB particularly from public viewpoints or rights of way;
- Blocking or interference of views of the AONB from public viewpoints or rights of way outside the AONB;
- Breaking the skyline, particularly when this is associated with developments that have a vertical emphasis and/or movement (viaducts, chimneys, plumes or rotors for example);
- The visual intrusion caused by the introduction of new transport corridors, in particular roads and railways;
- Loss of tranquillity through the introduction of lighting, noise, or traffic movement;
- Introduction of significant or abrupt changes to landscape character particularly where they are originally of a similar character to the AONB;
- Change of use of land that is of sufficient scale to cause harm to landscape character;
- Loss of biodiversity, particularly in connection with those habitats or species of importance in the AONB;
- Loss of features of historic interest, particularly if these are contiguous with the AONB;
- Reduction in public access and detrimental impacts on the character and appearance of rural roads and lanes.

The AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 also contains a policy on setting as DP4 'In the setting of the AONB, take full account of whether proposals harm the AONB. For example, development of land visible in panoramic views from the Chilterns escarpment, or which generates traffic in or travelling across the AONB, or which increases water abstraction from the chalk aquifer, thereby reducing flow in chalk streams'.

DETAILED POINTS (linked to our comments at the Local Plan consultation stage, Summer 2021).

GB Land as essential Buffer to the AONB and including the SAC.

CCB made the point at the Local Plan stage that the Green Belt acts as a buffer for the AONB and provides a means of managing development within in its setting. Nowhere are the shortcomings in this respect of the draft local plan clearer than in the justification (insofar as it is made in the plan itself) for the release of land from the Green Belt. This is of importance to the CCB because the Green Belt, especially around Tring, Berkhamsted and the north of Hemel Hempstead, fulfils part of its defined purpose of "safeguarding the countryside from encroachment" by providing a permanent and substantial open buffer between built-up areas and the designated AONB, as well as sensitive habitats such as the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC. The Green Belt here also serves as a key means of managing the setting of the AONB as part of protecting its natural beauty and providing space within which that beauty may be enhanced through landscape restoration. Releasing land from the Green Belt in these locations requires rigorous justification, and the "exceptional circumstances" demonstrated surely must, explicitly, take account of issues regarding the setting of the AONB, as well as impacts arising from those developments on the AONB itself, such as visitor management, air quality and light pollution. It is not evident from either the local plan or the "Green Belt and Rural Area" topic

paper that this matter has been considered properly by the council. The supporting text to the Green Belt policy (SP11) at paragraph 19.6 of the draft local plan refers the reader to the "Sustainable Development Strategy" section for the demonstration that "exceptional circumstances" apply to release land from the Green Belt. That section runs to some 28 pages and contains no obvious rationale for Green Belt release.

As applies to this application. The application papers argue very special circumstances for green belt release. This is a matter for the Local Plan process, which allows a valuable opportunity to consider the relationship between AONB protection and setting, including the contribution made by the green belt to that setting.

Transformation / Regeneration of Hemel Hempstead

The main justification for "exceptional circumstances" to release any land from the Green Belt in the local plan appears to be that there is a need for development that cannot be met elsewhere (either within the Borough or in a neighbouring authority). It may be inferred from reading this section (and the topic paper) that the over-riding issue, beyond estimates of need and aspirations for growth (which should, under NPPF para 11(b), be outweighed by the policies that provide a "strong reason" for development restraint), is the sustainable "transformation and regeneration of Hemel Hempstead and renewal of its New Town infrastructure" (para 5.3 of the Local Plan). This is a laudable objective but is hard to see how this necessarily justifies significant releases of Green Belt at Tring or Berkhamsted. This objective may justify the release of Green Belt land around Hemel Hempstead, but not necessarily to determine that the main focus for development should be in the setting of the AONB: preferable alternatives are available.

As applies to this application. Again, and as above the Local Plan process permits an appropriate opportunity for review.

Policy DM31 on the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC

CCB raised an objection to this policy. This was set against an expression of thanks for the engagement undertaken by DBC on the policies and proposals supporting the protection and enhancement of the Chiltern Beechwood SAC sites at Ashridge and Tring Park. Whilst we expressed support for the principle and objectives behind this policy, our objection to this policy raised the point that the focus in much of the plan, including policy DM31, is on mitigating or compensating for the impacts of these developments on the SAC, rather than avoiding the harm arising in the first place

This policy continues to focus on mitigation (with avoidance of harm only considered in terms of the development taking place) and this framework is not considered to provide sufficient protection for the SAC in terms of setting out what evidence is required to justify the assumption that there is need for development sufficient to over-ride the general presumption against causing harm to these sites. There is not even the application of the precautionary principle.

Natural England's subsequent publication on 14th March 2022 regarding the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC takes this point further and adds authority and weight to the need for a strategic approach to any mitigation strategy.

New Natural England advice on Chilterns Beechwoods SAC

The creation on 14 March 2022 of Natural England's Zone of influence (ZOI) of 12.6km around the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC now means that a reappraisal of mitigation is necessary for new residential development, as well as for the Tring Woodlands SSSI. Whilst it may be anticipated that such mitigation will manifest as the creation of SANG's, the development of a strategic approach is necessary amongst the host LPAs and Natural England will require this. The need for this necessary strategic direction and approach makes it 'premature' to determine applications as now proposed for the east of Tring.

Dacorum issued an update on this (via their website) and stated (selected excerpts) that, 'more action is needed to help protect Ashridge Estate on the Hertfordshire-Buckinghamshire border, and Tring Woodlands, which are under increasing visitor pressure from the borough and surrounding areas'. The integrity of the SAC requires a mitigation strategy in fulfilment of the regulatory duties contained in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

The statement went further to clarify that 'the way we deal with planning applications in the future that involve new homes (and some other types of development) is going to change. Such proposals that are within 500 metres of Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodlands are likely to be refused'.

[it continued]. 'In addition to this, we are legally required not to issue decisions on similar applications elsewhere in the borough until appropriate mitigation is secured. In the interim, this will mean additional checks for affected planning applications and the need for us to put on hold issuing the final decision notice. All other applications will be processed and determined as normal'.

As applies to this application.

This application falls within the spatially defined ZOI. NE's requirement to reinforce an appropriate and long-term mitigation strategy is very timely and will carry weight as a material planning consideration. It gives real force to the argument, itself accepted by DBC, that a strategic approach to mitigation is required.

The Board recommends that the decision-maker takes into account the following:

- The Chilterns AONB Management Plan (<http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html>), which deals with the special qualities of the Chilterns and the development chapter notes that 'the attractiveness of the Chilterns' landscape is due to its natural, built and cultural

	<p>environment. It is not a wilderness but countryside adorned by villages, hamlets and scattered buildings'.</p> <p>- The Board is a body that represents the interests of all those people that live in and enjoy the Chilterns AONB</p> <p>The Chilterns AONB is nationally protected as one of the finest areas of countryside in the UK. Public bodies and statutory undertakers have a statutory duty of regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB (Section 85 of CroW Act</p>
<p>2 Okeford Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AJ</p>	<p>I agree with all of the points put forward by the Grove Fields Residents Association in objection to this proposal and would add that any approval for any number of houses should REQUIRE that they ALL incorporate renewable energy generation for heat and power.</p>
<p>Langdale Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QE</p>	<p>Number of main objections to this massive development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Development is on designated green belt (and grade 2 agricultural land). Development on this designation defeats the object of the designation and should not be allowed. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on Green Belt land. 2) Development is within short distance and in view of designated AONB, again the whole purpose of which is to preserve scenery, wildlife and ecological aspects of the land. The additional number of residents and visitors to those residents will increase the use of that AONB designated land 3) It is close to the Chilterns Beechwood Special Area of Conservation which I believe includes Ashridge Estate. This was massively over used during the pandemic and has suffered as a result. This is now being investigated and the next few years are not the time to add to the footfall in this area with additional residents and their visitors. <p>Other objections centre around Tring:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) This Development is far too large and way out of scale with the town of Tring itself and will completely dominate the town and alter it's character beyond repair. 5) The infrastructure, particularly the roads, surrounding this development cannot deal with the additional traffic and residents that may want to use public transport. There may be a bus stop on Bulbourne Road but there is virtually no service on the route, and the service down Station road is only aimed at the station. 6) The Local Development Plan for Tring is currently under review and no development of any reasonable size should be allowed to go ahead until this Local Plan is complete and approved. <p>Other objections include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7) The Developer claims to have areas for a primary school, secondary school and medical centre and other facilities such as bus routes through the development. It makes it sound like these are a given, but the provision of these are not within their remit and they cannot commit to these. Unless they put forward the funds up front to be ringfenced for these uses, I have no faith they would happen. They should not be allowed to propose them within the development if they are not providing them. They cannot force a bus company to run a route through the development and the bus services for Tring and villages are inadequate for people to commit to using them. 8) The Developer is trying to imply it is being generous in providing recreational areas and a SANG including ponds & waterways, but there is no need for this. This whole area, if left to being Green Belt

	<p>and the adjacent AONB provides this already with many large Reservoirs, canals and nature Reserves.</p> <p>I appreciate we need to build more homes, particularly affordable homes, not large executive homes for people moving out of London to snap up. Tring already has the large Roman Park development that is currently being built and altering the size and character of Tring.</p> <p>There are smaller pockets that may fit better with gradually growing Tring in an organic manner once we know under the new Local Plan what is required of us as a town.</p> <p>This Development of this size should not be allowed to proceed even in a revised format.</p>
<p>Noways Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QE</p>	<p>I object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is on Green belt land. Dacorum are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on green belt. The review should be completed and the new local plan finalised before any green belt is sacrificed</p> <p>On Grade 1 farming land which is desperately needed to feed everyone</p> <p>Inappropriate to the size of Tring and the Infrastructure could not cope with this increase</p> <p>Adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and which has the protection of Chiltern Beechwood's SAC</p>
<p>Highway Upper Icknield Way Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QF</p>	<p>This proposed development is another massive development within Tring which is within an AONB.</p> <p>Ecologically, it will destroy more farmland and hedge and field margins thus having a negative impact on the biodiversity of the Chilterns.</p> <p>It will again increase the size of Tring and put increased pressure on the land at Tring Park (Woodland Trust) and Ashridge (National Trust). Both areas are within walking distance and are already suffering from a massive increase in footfall which is damaging the environment. Woodland Trust have already stopped Parkrun from taking place in Tring Park due to concerns about this.</p> <p>The development will substantially alter the size and nature of Tring as a market town and Bulbourne as a hamlet. Bulbourne itself with its rural and canal associations will be swallowed up by Tring.</p> <p>I note that the development proposes a new school. There are insufficient dwellings for a whole new school. Thus students will potentially be brought in from the surrounding areas including out of county to the school, increasing the traffic still further. The existing community facilities and road system will be unable to cope with the increase in demand with a development of this size.</p>
<p>9 Myrtle Cottages Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I object because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability

<p>HP23 5QE</p>	<p>of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>Woodlands Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QE</p>	<p>We object to the planning application relating to farmland in the East of Tring, Marshcroft area (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which is Grade 2 Agricultural land.</p> <p>3. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>4. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>5. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>6. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to</p>

	<p>walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>7. As residents of Bulbourne we are concerned at the additional traffic that would be using both Bulbourne Road and Station Road if this development were to be approved. The canal and railway bridges at Bulbourne already create traffic jams, creating noise and pollution in an otherwise rural location. The road is not suitable for any additional traffic.</p> <p>8. We regularly walk the footpaths adjacent to this proposed development and know the diversity and rarity of plant and animal life its habitat currently provides. It is important to the ecology of Tring that its countryside is preserved and maintained rather than destroyed.</p> <p>We are not against housing growth for Tring. However, we believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should have been provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>We sincerely hope that the planning committee will reject this and any other proposals for development of this land.</p>
<p>Jubilee Cottage Bulbourne Road Bulbourne Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QE</p>	<p>I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons:</p> <p>The definition of Consultation is technically any activity that gives local people a voice and an opportunity to influence important decisions. It involves listening to and learning from local people before decisions are made or priorities are set.</p> <p>Under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, the relevant local authority, must make sure that all decisions have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Decisions and activities must consider the potential effect it will have within the AONB and land outside its boundary.</p> <p>With the above in mind my main objections to this proposed development are due to the impact of the quality of life for our community and these include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The visual impact and harm that may be caused to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the surrounding areas. - The proposed development would potentially affect drainage, soil stability, wildlife habitat, atmosphere and appearance of the area. - Increased noise and traffic as a result of the proposed development could affect living conditions and our quality of life will undoubtedly be compromised. - The stress on an already limited infrastructure which includes utilities, road thoroughfare, parking and availability of school places. - The impact on the road (B488) and the additional load on the canal bridge. It is estimated that currently in excess of 14,000 vehicles already pass through Bulbourne in a 24 hour period. Within 300 yards

	<p>through Bulbourne there are at least 6 access points to the already overstretched B488 particularly during busy times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The hamlet of Bulbourne already has a canal bridge with narrow priority access which is frequently disregarded as well as multiple access points i.e., Garden Centre, allotment car parking, the Close, Grand Junction Public House, Canal roadway and the new Bulbourne Yard, therefore I am extremely concerned that the proposed development will exacerbate an already overused and dangerous stretch of highway with no effective traffic calming measures leading to the potential of serious injury or death. - I believe that the impact this proposed development will have on the environment of our Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - its landscape, biodiversity, amenity, access and natural resources - have not been adequately considered, assessed or addressed within the consultation documentation/design documentation.
<p>1 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>We object to this development for the following reasons.</p> <p>It would have a devastating impact on biodiversity in an area of green belt which currently has ancient hedgerows and woodland on it. The green belt should be maintained, and brownfield sites in the borough developed and converted instead.</p> <p>Parts of this land has flooded in the past and as a result would appear to be unsuitable for residential buildings.</p> <p>This scale of development is excessive and is not needed in Tring. It would unnecessarily and irreversibly change the character of this small, historic market town. Amenities and road capacity are already limited and the locality would not be able to support the increased population or related vehicles.</p> <p>Tring Station is a small hamlet and this development would change it completely, and see it absorbed into a suburban sprawl.</p> <p>Employment opportunities are very limited in this area so people would need to travel to work - public transport is not sufficient so more people would use cars which is not good for the environment.</p> <p>The infrastructure is not designed to accommodate such a large increase in population - for example there aren't enough doctors, leisure facilities and childcare providers.</p> <p>This development is excessive and inappropriate for this location.</p>
<p>19 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>We strongly and wholeheartedly OBJECT to this proposal because it proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Brownfield sites should always be prioritised in the first instance. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. - To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. - Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. - Put simply, green spaces like these are vital for the wellbeing of local residents and wildlife. - On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.
<p>9 Barbers Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DB</p>	<p>I would like to raise my objection to the Tring planning application (22/01187/MOA).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development would be on Green Belt which should be only used where exceptional circumstances apply. There are no exceptional circumstances demonstrated in the proposal. The notion of a 'Hybrid' application suggests that future plans may change with possibly increased impact. 2. This application would result in a massive negative impact on Tring town centre and links out to the A41. Increased noise, pollution and congestion during development and the subsequent impact of increased traffic post development, plus increased light pollution from 1400+ houses and associated infrastructure. 3. Significant housing development has already taken and is taking place in Tring which is proportionate to the locality and fabric of a small market town. 4. In light of the current Climate Change Emergency, any large scale development will incur massive carbon emissions, caused by building materials, transportation, power consumption from machinery and operational usage. The development could already be in carbon deficit before any 'claimed' reductions from can be applied.
<p>13 Drummond Ride Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DE</p>	<p>This application sits within the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC entirely within Designated Greenbelt and Grade 2 quality agricultural land abutting an ANOB and is a totally unacceptable change of use. The application states that it is moving Tring closer to the Railway Station. As a 35 year resident of Tring (10 years at Tring Station and 25 years in Tring) I have never heard anyone ask for houses to be built on the fields between Tring, Bulbourne & Pendley. A</p>

	<p>development of this size and location will fundamentally alter Tring and not for the better.</p> <p>If you accept that there is a need to sacrifice greenbelt land for investment in social infrastructure then there is a preferential site already identified in the Draft Local Plan TR01 Dunsley Farm. This is more local to the Town Centre and A41 junction and is listed as an opportunity for mixed use development (housing, industrial, primary school and supermarket).</p> <p>Please do not accept this Hybrid Application. It offers land for schools which are not funded which can be designed out at a later date if they decide it is not viable. A current example of this is over the border at Pitstone Bucks where a developer has stepped back from a commitment to install a pub & nursery on the Castlemead development and has submitted an application to replace these with additional housing.</p> <p>This developer has offered a SANG as an alternative to Ashridge. In reality it is on land that the developer is not allowed to build upon or change any ground levels (refer to comments by pipeline consultation). The SANG car park will be used by train commuters. It is not a real alternative.</p> <p>There are many other detail points that are wrong on highways and school catchment for example but the fundamental issue is that this is prime greenbelt and high quality agricultural land abutting an ANOB. This should never be permitted for housing</p>
<p>Long Barn Chapel Lane Long Marston Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4QT</p>	<p>Object due to lack of amenities such as doctors surgery's, hospitals and dentists in the area. All of these are already full to capacity. Tring is a small market town and cannot cope with another 1,400 dwellings as it does not have the jobs to support an increase in population. It also cannot cope with the traffic pollution. I strongly object to this proposal as it will ruin Tring.</p>
<p>Saddlers Cottage White House Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6FA</p>	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no</p>

	commitment from these public bodies to do so.
8 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL	Too much of a development- takes away the "market town" character that Tring brings. Adds too much pressure on doctors surgery who are already under immense pressure. Increased traffic on the country roads will only cause more accidents and lead to the high street being clogged up which adds danger too all resident of tring.
Martins Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QX	<p>I object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 Permission to build on Green Belt land, which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be refused. No "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward to justify the damage to the Green Belt. The land is also much needed grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>2 Development is not permitted in view of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Development Restrictions. The offer to provide a suitable alternative natural green space is not an adequate mitigation.</p> <p>3 It is not acceptable to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This proposed development, plus Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which would overwhelm the capacity of this historic market town forever. The proposed development would also have a serious impact the hamlet of Tring Station. Difficulties of access to, and parking at, the railway station itself would be exacerbated.</p> <p>4 There is no commitment from principal authorities and the NHS to fund additional infrastructure, e.g. new schools and health centres.</p> <p>5 Dacorum Borough Council should be seeking alternative brownfield sites and should finalise the new local plan in accordance with evolving government guidelines, before Green Belt land is sacrificed. If necessary, location Tr01 should be first be considered is a more appropriate site for development.</p>
3 Pendley Bridge Cottages Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU	<p>Dear Sirs, I am a resident of Tring Station and wish to strongly object to the above application for 1400 houses on land between Tring and Tring Station on the following grounds.</p> <p>The land on which this is proposed is all Green Belt and adjacent to an AONB.</p> <p>The size of the development is wholly inappropriate and would totally change the nature of Tring from a pleasant market town to a conurbation, and would put damaging pressure on already stretched local facilities.</p> <p>The need for such a condensed and large scale development has not been proven, especially post Covid, in the light of people's changing work patterns and the rise in home working. This is likely to result in much more office and retail space in towns becoming available for conversion to domestic use.</p> <p>The developer is being opportunistic in trying to push this through in the light of the local authority's pause and re-think of local planning</p>

	<p>policy. Any development should be on a smaller scale and spread over many sites to prevent an irreversible change in the nature of Tring.</p>
<p>1 Pendley Bridge Cottages Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>Greenbelt land should only be used in exceptional circumstances, which is not proven in this case. All brown field possibilities should be found and used instead. We should be protecting our green areas to encourage wild life, to produce food locally and to enhance well-being for the existing community.</p> <p>Tring is too small and congested to support such an increase in population. Tring High Street is already dangerous as the pavements are so narrow that passing bus wing mirrors could easily hit pedestrians. The existing services and infra structure will not support such an increase and the historic character of the town and neighbourhood would be completely transformed, from a small rural market town to a sub-urban sprawl.</p> <p>I, object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o To build on an area which includes many hedgerows which house a rich variety of birdlife (most notably the Yellowhammer- a species which is currently on the British Trust for Ornithology 'Red List' - birds whose decreasing abundance renders them of great national concern.) The UK has lost some 600 million birds since 1980. I object most strongly to Dacorum adding in any way to this disastrous loss. o To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. o To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. o To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. o Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. o To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to

	<p>walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment</p> <p>It is totally understandable to me that housing needs to be considered, however, the proposed site of planning application 22/01187/MOA is in my opinion thoroughly misguided in so many ways.</p>
<p>Buckeye Barn Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>This land is agricultural green belt land which must be protected, particularly given it's adjacency to AONB. It's easy to see that once green belt is built upon, AONB isn't seen in the same way and won't look quite as appealing surrounded by concrete. Once green belt land is gone, it isn't coming back.</p> <p>The Chiltern Hills are to be protected for future generations and the view from, in them and around them cannot be destroyed in this way. Building on ancient land such as this with hedgerows bursting with insects and wildlife is damaging to our planet; change for the better needs to begin in our local neighbourhoods and we need to protect this land and hedgerows.</p> <p>Currently the Ashridge Estate & Chiltern Beechwood area has a protection order which extends 500m around it's perimeter on it whilst the findings of how much the recent increase in visitors has had on it. The Marshcroft site is 1.5 miles from this area and it is unthinkable that 1400 homes plus could be proposed on this site.</p> <p>It looks like a main access point to the proposed development is on Station Road, close to Cow Lane. Cow Lane and Station Road, especially next to the Station area cannot take more traffic; they are already busy and cause issues with cars parked on pavements (Cow Lane) or driving up pavements to get past cyclists and pedestrians (Station Road) where is the space to expand these roads? Marshcroft Lane is tiny and leads onto Grove Road and it's busy school activity - I am really unsure how this can possibly work for access to so many new homes?</p> <p>The vision of the centre of the town of Tring needs to be clearly expressed as part of this development as it is already congested. The new proposal may state now that there will be shops etc built into the proposal but we've all seen developers work and what is planned initially is VERY different to what is built finally. For this reason it's important for all town residents to understand how the infrastructure of Tring overall will change to accommodate an additional area that looks to be about a sixth of the size of the current town.</p> <p>The initial proposal calls out the building of dog walking routes, cycle routes, rambling routes and water side routes...these aren't selling points, these already exists naturally - the building of these is unnecessary and a waste of resources, which given the current state of the world, is irresponsible.</p>

	<p>A small but significant point I'd like to make is that there wouldn't be a need for an allotment (as shown on the master plan,) if the housing plan that we have yet to see was truly rural...the fact that an allotment has been mentioned is concerning.</p> <p>The fields that run parallel to Station Road are often flooded - it's very wet and damp - is this a flood plain??</p> <p>Tring School has been run down and needing much improvement for years; it's currently being rebuilt after gaining much needed funding - yet now we see plans for a spanking new school or 2 if we can also have 1400 homes in the same area - this is somewhat sickening to read and whilst not directly linked to those proposing this scheme, shows the motivation of greed of those who govern over these areas. On top of this, I don't believe a developer can state that a school will be built on the development so this is somewhat misleading.</p> <p>Light pollution also needs to be considered. Why should rural communities who chose to live a little more remotely have street lights forced upon them? How will the inevitable light pollution impact the local wildlife?</p> <p>To summarise, we don't need houses, street lights, roads, manmade paths, walks, routes etc on this rural side of Tring. This is the Chiltern Hills bordering AONB; we need to maintain it in all it's natural beauty for future generations to enjoy.</p>
<p>Ashdown Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>The use of greenbelt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should not be approved. It is incredible that it is even being considered. Brownfield sites should be prioritised for any such development.</p> <p>There are numerous infrastructure challenges with this proposal, with notably the road infrastructure being woefully inadequate for the number of houses proposed. Most households appear to have at least 2 cars, which at 1400 houses makes an additional 2800 cars trying to use the small roads of Tring, not to mention the increase in carbon arising. The infrastructure at Tring Railway Station is also inadequate to support a development of this size and it is extremely surprising to see that none is identified as being required. Naturally it is therefore entirely feasible that further development of the station will be required in due course (car parking, station facilities etc) and as this area is wholly within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be taken into account now. Problematical parking within Tring Station and along Beggars Lane (all within the AONB) can be expected to increase. It is exceptionally naïve for the developer to place any reliance on people walking, cycling or using the bus to get to the station. As soon as the nights draw in, or the weather becomes inclement, residents will reach for their car keys and we will have chaos at Tring Station when the car park becomes full. The proposed site will also adversely affect the bio-diversity of the area which is a natural habitat for foxes, badgers and red kites to name just a few.</p> <p>The hamlet of Tring Station will be permanently and irrevocably damaged by this development with the increased traffic travelling</p>

	<p>between Tring and Tring Station making it impossible to cross the road or allow our children to play out the front. The unique identity of Tring Station, which is alive today, will be consigned to the history books. We will go from a proper functioning community to simply a main road with houses on either side and increased emissions, with all the side effects that brings.</p>
<p>Pendley Manor Lodge Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QY</p>	<p>Having lived in the tring area for over 35 years I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the above planning application. I note that it would increase the size of Tring's housing by 34% which would not only change but damage a relatively small market town that historically has had a rural feel.</p> <p>The intention to allow an access point on to station road would vastly increase traffic on to an already fast and extremely busy road which is tantamount to endangering life. This would especially impact the cyclists who choose not to use the cycle path as it is poorly maintained.</p> <p>The added noise and roar of that traffic would be a constant irritation and unwelcome disturbance.</p> <p>The existing infrastructure would be sorely tested and as yet there is no guarantee that the required schools, surgeries and shops would be built.</p> <p>To build on green belt is borderline criminal as there are available brown belt areas that are far more sensible in terms of access to Tring's amenities. This is a complete failure to adhere to green belt policy.</p> <p>I hope you do take my and the other residents of Tring's objections into account and throw this appalling plan out.</p>
<p>Hilldale Cow Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NS</p>	<p>I write to object to planning application number 22/01187/MOA, in respect of the noise and disturbance resulting from use. Design and Access Statement. Part Three Demonstrating Compliance.</p> <p>This document fails to demonstrate compliance with the National Design Guidance and National Model Design Code (NMDC) or with the recommendations of the 'Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission'. With respect to noise and disturbance from Transport and Accessibility and Traffic and Transport amongst other matters.</p> <p>Transport and accessibility (Disturbance resulting from use) 11 Transport Assessment - Part 1. Appendix A of this document refers to the HCC scoping Correspondence which includes the 'Transport Assessment and Modelling Scoping Report'. Paragraph 2.5 states that " a review of the local highway network will be undertaken. This will include a detailed review of Station Road, Bulbourne Road, Marshcroft Lane and Grove Lane." No mention is made of Cow Lane along which the vast majority of the traffic generated by the proposed development will pass. The effect on this main transport artery has not been considered.</p> <p>In addition, on Cow Lane is the Dorian Williams Sports Ground, used by 100's of people every week attending the numerous sports clubs on the site; not least the Tring Rugby Club, one of the premier clubs in Hertfordshire.</p> <p>Elsewhere in the planning application it is mentioned that the development has been designed to connect with the existing town facilities and transport infrastructure. The design does not include for</p>

the connection to the principal sports facility in the Tring District, with no cycleway or footway proposed. On the contrary it has been completely ignored.

The report acknowledges that the junctions at either end of Cow Lane will not be able to cope with the envisaged traffic volumes and will need mitigation measures to be put in place if congestion is to be avoided. The impact on the lives of the residents of Cow Lane and the users of the sports facility has not been addressed.

The traffic study is based on data gathered in 2021 factored by 10% to acknowledge the impact of the Covid lock down on traffic flows. This factor is woefully inadequate. The traffic flows on Cow Lane and queuing at each end of Cow Lane is far in excess of that contemplated by the data modelling. Clearly no one had actually been to Cow Lane in the morning and afternoon peak periods - pre-pandemic - to witness the queuing. As a resident of Cow Lane, based on the data provided, be assured that the scheme is not designed to reflect reality.

6 Environmental Statement

10 Traffic and Transport. (Disturbance resulting from use and Noise)

10.4 Methodology. The IEMA Guidelines states that 'people at home, people in work places, people walking, people cycling ' should be considered. The only sensitive receptor considered on Cow Lane (link 13) was the Rugby Club. Table 10.6. The report fails to address the effect of an +81% increase in traffic volumes will have on the lives of the residents. The effect of an increase of circa six thousand vehicles a day passing within 5m of my house has not been addressed. No attempt has been made to mitigate the environmental impact on the residents of Cow Lane. The statement in paragraph 10.7.24 that a 81% increase in traffic flow will have a " Minor adverse effect to both pedestrian delay and amenity along this link based on professional judgement and experience." The amenity value of Cow Lane will be massively affected by this development. Suggesting the development will have a minor adverse effect; is ludicrous at best.

In addition, the section 10.7.11 only considers the effect of construction traffic on the Site, no consideration is given in any part of the document to the blight 10 years of construction traffic will have on the lives of the local residents.

The statements within paragraph 10.9.2 and 10.9.3 that the construction and operational phases of the proposed development will have a negligible effect on all highway links is unbelievable and once again does not reflect reality. No strategic thinking or material enhancements are proposed to the existing highway infrastructure for this development that will increase the size of Tring by over 30%. The report only considers two committed developments and does not acknowledge future proposed housing development adjacent to Marshcroft on Grove Road or the development of the Cow Lane Farm/ Dunsley Farm site. Both of these two sites will further significantly increase the traffic on Cow Lane. The Summary 10.12 is not a fair reflection of the effect of this development.

12 Noise and Vibration. (Noise resulting from use)

Within this section of the report background noise has been measured at various locations on the site. However, once again Cow Lane which is the most affected of all roads is not included within the study area. However it is acknowledged in Table 12.7 that the link road that is

	<p>most affected is Cow Lane. The change in noise level is as assessed a 2.5 (dB) described in table 12.5 as 'very low but potentially perceptible increase'. The affect of an additional circa six thousand vehicles passing my house is not minor. The increase is +81% in traffic volume. The efficacy of these data is challenged.</p> <p>Finally, the period offered by the Council to comment on this planning application is wholly inadequate. This is a significant development which will change the character of the town for ever and affect the lives of 1000's of people. The circa two weeks offered does not allow time to digest the content of the planning application and provide a full and considered response.</p>
<p>Oddy Fields Cow Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NS</p>	<p>My husband and I object to this planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The green belt should be protected. Circumstances have not been provided to justify building on it. And the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2.To built on the scale that is inappropriate to the size of Tring. Our infrastructure which is already under stress would be broken. With the all ready new builds in the town population it would increase by 34% and change this market town forever. 3.We have no commitment from either the developer or HCC or DBC for new infrastructure funds. Funds are scarce and a promise of an outline is not enough. 4 . Our environment and health go hand in hand. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.
<p>Jasmine Cow Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NS</p>	<p>This is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which should be protected. The development will result in significant harm to the environment, be a visual intrusion and put significant strain on already overloaded public services. It will also have a significant impact on the local road and infrastructure networks causing bottlenecks and traffic problems.</p>
<p>The Cedars 68 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a hybrid application and one which I urge Dacorum Borough Council to use their discretion not to accept. 2. The Developer (Harrow Estates/ Redrow) only owns part of the site (that nearest to Station Road) so there is no commitment that the site would be developed as is outlined in this application. 3. The timeframe of development of over 11 years (2022-33) is very long and will mean adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity,

increased demand on local resources for a very considerable time and without obligation for the developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects including parking in the town centre..

4. Community infrastructure such as new schools, health centres, and I believe a larger building for Tring station and perhaps increased car parking at the station too will all be needed. The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution'.

5. The whole site is designated green belt and such land can only be released for development in exceptional and very special circumstances. I understand that these proposals fail to demonstrate exceptional circumstances (see national Planning Policy Framework revised 20.7.21 in particular paragraphs 147-9).

6. As pointed out in the Report to Inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment (at 3.2.3.) Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) Competent Authorities have a duty to ensure that all the activities they regulate have no adverse effect on the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites e.g. Special Areas of Conservation (SACs).

7. The site is close to nine conservation sites (these being listed in Table 1, paragraph 1.4 of the above Report). including an SAC, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), Local Wildlife Sites (LWSs) and an Ancient Wood (LW). Traffic from the proposed Development is predicted to increase on roads near to four of these namely:

Ashridge Commons and Woods SSSI/ Chiltern Beechwoods SAC,
No-Man's Friend Wood AW
College Lake (91HO2) LWS
Pitstone Fen (91HO1) LWS

There is a potential impact on air quality therefore relating to road traffic emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) and ammonia (NH3), and their subsequent impacts on NOx and NH3 concentrations, and on nitrogen and acid deposition fluxes.

College Lake and Pitstone Fen are separated by a railway and the bridge over this section of line is narrow and controlled by traffic lights. Emissions would be particularly high here with traffic decelerating and then accelerating on both sides of the bridge.

8. Apart from emissions the extent of housing envisaged for the development will generate an enormous additional human pressure on those conservation sites open to the public which of course includes the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC

9. 'Limited potential sources of contamination have been identified on or near the site, however, on-site fuel tanks and the presence of vulnerable aquifers beneath the site represent potential environmental risks' (see document 'Phase 1 Geo-Environmental Assessment Report Part 1')

	<p>10. The proposed road across Marshcroft Lane will completely spoil the enjoyment of so many who currently walk from Grove Road to Marshcroft Bridge and beyond. This intersection of Marshcroft Road should not be permitted.</p> <p>11. While I am not against housing growth for Tring, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring.</p> <p>12. While I have looked at several of the planning documents it has been impossible in the time available to review all of them. A longer period than the 4th May should be given for the public to respond.</p>
<p>Greenways 88 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I live in Grove Road, Tring and have done so for the last 47 years. The reason we stay here has much to do with the character of Tring - a town that has managed to stay within its boundaries rather than becoming part of the urban sprawl that threatens to despoil our area of outstanding natural beauty. The Green Belt land and the Ashridge Estate are irreplaceable resources. I object to this application which seems very ill-thought-through for the following reasons:</p> <p>It proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the</p>

	<p>public to review, digest and respond . I trust you will consider these comments and come to a wise decision.</p>
<p>3 The Grove Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PN</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed development of up to 1,400 dwellings would change Tring from a small rural Town to a more suburban sprawl. 2. Where are the residents expected to work? 3 Pre pandemic it was difficult to park at Tring Station all the other parking in the area of Tring Station is resident parking only. 4 The bus service, 500, to Watford and Aylesbury is not that regular. The B1 service to Dunstable is very few and far between. They all stop early evening 5 I think this proposed development is too large for Tring
<p>Highgrove House 122 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PA</p>	<p>Please see below my family objection to the proposed development and we support all the reasons raised by the GFRA. "I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Beauport</p>	<p>OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 22/01187/MOA</p>

<p>74 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed site is adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the scale of this development will no doubt have a deleterious effect. In particular I understand Ashridge is currently under review to assess the impact from an influx of visitors. 2. This is good agricultural land which is cropped annually and in view of increasing food security issues impacting the UK it makes no sense to build on this site. 3. The population of Tring is approximately 12,000. The proposed development of 1,400 houses will likely increase the population by 4-5,000. This is a wholly disproportionate increase in population which will severely impact the infrastructure and character of this small market town. 4. The town's infrastructure of, for example, medical services is already stretched and when I attended the open day at the end of 2021 no assurance could be given by the planning consultants that further resources would be provided for the increased population. 5. Whilst I am sure there are planning assumptions, realistically 1,400 houses will give rise to some 2-3,000 extra cars. These vehicles will use Station Road and Bulbourne Road. In my view these roads are inadequate to take this extra volume and in the case of the Bulbourne Road there are the pinch points of roadside parking, the one lane bridge over the canal and railway line. 6. If planning consent is granted for this development will the owner of the land behind New Mill/Bulbourne Road seek planning approval for building houses on this adjacent land? If so, will a precedent have been set with the consequence of even further development which will destroy the character of this small market town. 7. The planning application states building work will take place over a protracted period. How is this consistent with the probable constant disturbance to the residents of the town and impact on their mental health? 8. I note there will be a strip of allotments abutting the rear gardens of the properties in Grove Road. Who will own these allotments, how will they be accessed and are they potential "ransom strips" for further infill development at some later stage?
<p>Abbotsford 114 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PA</p>	<p>I am not against housing growth in Tring, as long as it is in proportion to the size of the town, and is located on the adequate brownfield sites which are closer to the town and the main infrastructure (town centre and A41) thus reducing traffic needs.</p> <p>The time allotted to allow the public to consider and comment on this proposal is inadequate, given the weight of the documentation which needs to be examined, and more time should be made available to consider its contents.</p>

However I wish to object to the planned development on the following grounds:

1. It preempts the process by Dacorum Borough Council of creating a plan for the future development of Tring. At present the appropriate level of housing development is unclear, and no exceptional circumstances have been provided to justify such a large development (1400 Houses). Dacorum Borough Council are reviewing available brownfield sites to minimise Green Belt use. The New Local Plan should be finalised before planning permission is given to develop Green Belt land. There are several sites closer to the town each able to provide, like Roman Park, several hundred dwellings. There is no need to build on this Green Belt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

2. This Green Belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring woodlands is protected by the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation) from the proposed plans to build what amounts to a new town of houses with no underlying infrastructure.

3. This is good agricultural land, which in today's climate of political uncertainty should be preserved for this purpose.

4. This proposal is on an inappropriate scale to the current town of Tring, and is inappropriate for its town centre facilities, where development is extremely constrained. Together with Roman Park on the western fringe, it would increase the population by 34%. Further projected developments within the current boundaries will increase the population to well over 50%. There is no suggestion anywhere that Tring is a New Town, justifying such expansion. This proposal will alter the character of this ancient historical town for ever, causing the loss of ambience which makes it special.

5. The local infrastructure is already under considerable strain. The additional infrastructure required to increase the population by half for schools, health centres, roads, water, sewage etc. has to be provided, not by developers such as Harrow Estates, who contribute nothing other than space, but by the Local Authorities (Hertfordshire County Council, Dacorum Borough Council and the NHS). There is no commitment to provide any of these currently. A new senior school has just opened, which cannot provide for the demand which would arise if these plans were accepted. Health provision is under immense strain and is already failing the population of Tring.

6. Building east of Tring will involve heavy traffic movement. It will add at least 2500 private vehicles alone to the roads. Claims of massive bicycle use and walking, based on present evidence around a smaller area, are preposterous. In winter and bad weather only a handful of people travel to shops and station by these means. There is a more suitable location (TR01) closer to the A41 from which people can walk to the town centre. TR01 provides sufficient space for a proportionate development of Tring's housing supply, in a location which minimises the impact on the environment.

<p>Radlett 108 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PA</p>	<p>This seems to be a planning application designed to exploit Dacorum's current lack of an agreed long term development plan rather than provide something that the community needs. It should be rejected because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 It is on green belt land in an area of outstanding natural beauty. 2 Tring's infrastructure cannot cope with an influx of 6000+ people without significant investment. The developers don't address this issue. 3 The road network surrounding the proposed development cannot cope with an additional 1400+ cars without new bridges over the canal and railway. 4 The development is too far from the centre of Tring to be able to get there without the use of a car. There are no facilities in Tring to cope with such increased traffic and no room to create them. <p>In summary a development of this scale must be integrated with an agreed public plan as otherwise the developers won't pay a fair share towards the development of appropriate infrastructure on what would be a £1 billion development and an increase the size of Tring of circa 33%.</p>
<p>Greenpoint 102 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PA</p>	<p>Simply no - please don't do this. Building on this land that has long been protected as green belt land that will fundamentally change the character of Tring and isn't required here.</p>
<p>The Clock Cottage 82 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>This Planning Application must be for one of the largest ever development proposals for the expansion of Tring. If it were to be approved, it has considerable implications not only for Tring but also the wider communities in Dacorum, Hertfordshire and Buckinghamshire. It would dramatically change Tring's setting immediately adjacent to the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>The proposal is clearly contrary to the current Development Plan in that the proposal falls within the designated Green Belt. We OBJECT to this application.</p> <p>The designation of Green Belt has been a long established policy and this, coupled with the adjacent Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty has successfully preserved a sensible balance between urban and rural uses. If this application were to be permitted, the urban area of Tring would increase substantially, thus changing the urban / rural balance with nearby communities. This would be most detrimental to the character of this part of the Chilterns. There cannot be any justifiable reason to override the established Green Belt policy.</p>
<p>2 Fog Cottages Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QP</p>	<p>I strongly object to development of green belt land. Green belt land was created to protect the environment and communities from unwanted and unnecessary urban development. The land in question is also Grade 2 agricultural land, which is needed and will continue to be needed for food production. The current situation in Ukraine will lead to grain shortages and price increases. Agricultural production needs to be maintained. I am aware that the developers will claim to</p>

	<p>be providing green spaces, ponds etc. but why remove this green belt land by building on it? Leave it as it is. These fields are home to a lot of wildlife. Building on the land will remove habitats for rabbits, deer, birds and insects. This area is also overlooked by an area of outstanding natural beauty (Ashridge) and any view of such a large development will be a blot on the landscape. Light pollution will be visible from the surrounding hills. This area has been known to flood. Covering it in tarmac and concrete can only cause problems with increased surface water. I also have a concern about sewage and where this additional sewage will be dispersed. Access from Station road will cause potential danger and much increased traffic along station road towards the station and Aldbury. Every way you look at this, I fail to see how increased traffic, congestion and resulting pollution, can be seen as beneficial to the local community. Tring, Tring Station and Aldbury are rural communities. This development will completely change the character of these communities and the area in general.</p> <p>This development is unnecessary and should not be allowed to proceed.</p> <p>I object very strongly to this development.</p>
<p>3 Mansion Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BD</p>	<p>I have six reasons for objecting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1,400 homes means an additional 4-5,000 people. While it is possible to build more schools, etc, the size of Tring town centre is finite. Increasing Tring's population so much, so quickly would severely strain its facilities. 2. Tring is a small and ancient market town with great historical character that attracts many visitors. Such towns are virtually an 'endangered species' in southern England and, therefore, worth preserving. 3. The site is an AONB. This application fails to meet any form of threshold that would allow the removal of AONB status. Wildlife in this area has already been under pressure from increased development in Tring and the surrounding area, not to mention the very large developments in Aylesbury and Aston Clinton. Protecting local wildlife in a period of climate change should be a high priority for Dacorum. 4. The application would contradict Dacorum's own criteria for protecting the Chilterns Beechwood SAC as this level of development, so close to both parts of the SAC, would very significantly increase human intrusion of the Beechwoods. 5. This application has been submitted before changes to the Government's required level of development in south-east England has been announced and is, therefore, premature. 6. The proposed site is quality productive farmland. Using it for housing would be a significant loss at a time when political affairs and climate change emphasise the need to become more agriculturally self-sufficient.
<p>50 vicarage road Leighton Buzzard LU7 9EY</p>	<p>I STRONGLY object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The development will be built on green belt land which is also</p>

	<p>adjacent to the AONB. Exceptional circumstances have NOT been provided to justify building on this green belt land. Dacorum Borough council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on greenbelt- this review should be allowed to be completed and the new local plan should be finalised before ANY greenbelt is sacrificed.</p> <p>The mere thought that we should sacrifice such an enormous portion of greenbelt land when we are in the middle of a climate emergency is absolutely ridiculous. We, as a countryside market town, should be leading the way in trying to protect this important land. It is completely unacceptable that this proposal should even make it to this stage. Huge new developments such as this one will increase pollution, risk of flooding, loss of wildlife and important habitats and will also change the character of this small, countryside town forever.</p> <p>This land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (special area of conservation) This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring woodland which the proposal is planning to build houses on. This is unacceptable and this proposal should never have been allowed to get any further for this reason alone.</p> <p>The scale of these plans are completely inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This development plus the Roman park development will increase the population of Tring by 34% which will break the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>The plans claim that there will be additional infrastructure provided by local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and the NHS) however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. I believe that the promises in these plans are all made up by the developer to make the public more willing to accept the plans.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, but I believe that it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure. Developments should also not be built on important greenbelt land.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and response.</p>
<p>23 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>The proposed development will overwhelm the already inadequate local community infrastructure (transport, schools, shopping etc etc) It will violate the Green Belt strategy and turn what is a precious rural environment into yet another urban jungle (more houses more strain on resources, more pollution).</p>
<p>28 Chapel Meadow Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HB</p>	<p>I object to the proposal for a number of reasons 1) The development will considerably alter the character of Tring which has already seen the building of the large Roman Park estate. 2) The town of Tring does not have the amenities to support such a large population increase - the doctors surgery is already</p>

	<p>overstretched.</p> <p>3) There is an assumption, as with all new proposals, that residents will travel sustainably and not use cars for local journeys. This is a complete myth and will place additional strain on the local road system. Recent developments have insufficient parking for the 2 or 3 cars per household, and the new estate will become clogged with parked cars.</p> <p>4) The fields form a natural buffer zone to the canal. This is a vital wildlife corridor which cannot be replicated by the proposed limited thoroughfares for nature.</p> <p>5) The land is currently prone to flooding in winter. Additional housing will disrupt the already strained natural drainage, and potentially suffer from a high water table.</p> <p>6) The local area is already seeing extremely large scale housing developments (Aylesbury, Weston Turville) which have not influenced the Dacorum Plan because they are in a different borough, but will impact Tring and the surrounding villages.</p>
<p>28 Chapel Meadow Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HB</p>	<p>I object on the grounds of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Dacorum Local Plan has yet to be agreed - The scale of the development is far too great and would put pressure on local infrastructure - This is agricultural Green Belt Land and despite the grand claims would be a negative impact on biodiversity - This area is prone to flooding and may also cause further flooding in the town itself (e.g recent flooding of the Brook in Chapel Meadow)
<p>14 Chiltern Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JY</p>	<p>I would like to OBJECT to the planning application for additional 1400 new homes in Tring, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plot is green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on said land. 2. The proposal to build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. Any development to this site will damage the ecosystem and be of great detriment to the wildlife which people travel from many miles away to enjoy. 3. The need to build on a scale that is appropriate to the current size of Tring - this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which Tring's infrastructure cannot handle. 4. The new schools and health centres mentioned in the proposal have had no commitment from the appropriate bodies to fund or run these services (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS. Tring School has only recently been redeveloped, I do not believe there will be enough funds or the purpose in creating another secondary school so close to the existing one. 5. There are more appropriate places to build which are nearer to the

	<p>high street and existing amenities. There has been grazing land close to Tring Triangle and the A41 available for sale in the past couple of years which is within walking distance of the high street. I do not believe the residents of any houses at the far East of the proposed development will walk to the high street, which will create more traffic. The traffic and noise disruption for those of the Grove estate has been high for many years already with smaller new developments such as King Edwards Gardens and Thomas Gardens, plus additional houses being built on Station Road and Grove Road. In addition to the works carried out on Tring School as mentioned earlier. The road network cannot support the high volume of traffic created by building site vehicles, as well as the traffic of the two schools at the East edge Tring.</p> <p>6. The proposal claims to create affordable housing so that families who were from the area can move back. I however am sceptical the cost will be in line to allow this, going by the prices of houses in Tring which have shot up for 2-3 bed houses as much as an additional £100K in price in the past 3-5 years. I do not believe the new builds will be priced lower than the existing housing stock.</p> <p>Lastly, due to the large scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review the documentation and respond.</p>
<p>42 Weston Road Aston Clinton Hp22 5eg</p>	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to you to express my deep concern and objection for the planning application 22/01187/MOA which proposes to build 1,400 new houses in Tring as well as 2 schools and a community hub.</p> <p>I STRONGLY object to this proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>The development will be built on green belt land which is also adjacent to the AONB. exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on this green belt land. Dacorum Borough council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on greenbelt- this review should be allowed to be completed and the new local plan should be finalised before ANY greenbelt is sacrificed.</p> <p>The mere thought that we should sacrifice such an enormous portion of greenbelt land when we are in the middle of a climate emergency is absolutely ridiculous. We, as a countryside market town, should be leading the way in trying to protect this important land. It is completely unacceptable that this proposal should even make it to this stage. Huge new developments such as this one will increase pollution, risk of flooding, loss of wildlife and important habitats and will also change the character of this small, countryside town.</p> <p>This land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (special area of conservation) This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring woodland which the proposal is planning to build houses on. This is unacceptable and this proposal</p>

	<p>should never have been allowed to get any further for this reason alone.</p> <p>The scale of these plans are completely inappropriate to the current size of Tring. this development plus the Roman park development will increase the population of Tring by 34% which will break the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>The plans claim that there will be additional infrastructure provided by local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and the NHS) however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. I believe that the promises in these plans are all made up by the developer to make the public more willing to accept the plans. This exact situation has happened recently in Pitstone on the new development at the end of Vicarage road where it was proposed that there would be a new nursery school/dentist/pub built but now the developers have totally gone back on their word and have now decided to build 13 flats on the area. Developers couldn't care less about local infrastructure. They just want to make as much money as they can from the projects and then they move on to the next town. I do not want this to happen in Tring.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Tring is already at breaking point with doctors surgeries and dentists being completely oversubscribed. The small roads in the town centre are difficult to navigate at the best of times and the increase in population will mean a higher volume of traffic and the town will become unlivable.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, but I believe that it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure. Developments should also not be built on important greenbelt land.</p> <p>on a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, I hope you will consider these points and pass my comments on to the appropriate bodies.</p>
<p>26 Longfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DG</p>	<p>This speculative application to massively increase the size of Tring would destroy the character of the small market town and overstress all the existing infrastructure. There is not sufficient local employment to require local housing at this scale, so inevitably this would be a dormitory development where the majority of people would commute out of Tring for work. The proposed development is too far away from the centre of Tring to allow easy walking to shops/services. I can see no justification for releasing green belt land for this purpose.</p>
<p>Ashridge House Orchard Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FF</p>	<p>Dear Sir / Madam,</p> <p>We are writing to you in response to the proposed development of the Land East of Tring (reference number 22/01187/MOA).</p>

	<p>We object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>We, like many others, are not against housing growth for Tring. However, we believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p> <p>I hope our comments are taken into consideration.</p>
<p>4 The Grove Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PN</p>	<p>"I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new

	<p>local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>
<p>2 The Grove Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PN</p>	<p>This proposal constitutes a risk to the local ecology as it is within greenbelt. A proposal of this scale is likely to have an impact not only on the site ecology but surrounding areas such as Ashridge and Tring Woodlands including Aldbury Nowers with a significant increase in residents accessing these areas.</p> <p>The fields proposed for building are Marsh land and the impact of removing this will increase the likelihood of flooding in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The development will significantly alter the character of Tring which is a small market town and in particular the east of Tring.</p> <p>Inevitably there would be an unsustainable increase in traffic through Marshcroft lane that although not a direct vehicle access route would be used as such with foot access to schools and the site being at the end of the Lane. The addition of vehicles using Marshcroft lane and parking to walk to school cannot be accommodated.</p> <p>The proposal would annex an important part of the lane and cause a significant change to the community of Marshcroft lane.</p> <p>The local plan had previously dismissed a proposal to develop in this area for these reasons.</p>
<p>6 The Grove Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) concerning proposed development on green belt land in and around Tring because it proposes:</p>

<p>HP23 5PN</p>	<p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The developer's proposals fail to demonstrate the exceptional and very special circumstances which would be required in order to justify the release of green belt land for development. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park (currently under construction) increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will overwhelm the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>3. The developer's application proposes that additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. The inclusion of such community facilities in the developer's plans in the absence of committed funding for the same is extremely misleading and the unfortunate reality is that such additional development is more likely to exacerbate problems with local infrastructure rather than ease them.</p> <p>4. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed (which I do not suggest to be the case) then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment and other residents.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41) and that any applications for such development must include fully-funded proposals for the significant additional local community infrastructure which would undoubtedly be required to support the additional population which would come with it. On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>1 The Grove Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PN</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We are writing to place our objection to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the</p>

	<p>green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>We are not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Englemere 80 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I strongly object to the application because the proposed development is completely out of proportion to what Tring can cope with particularly taking in to account the Roman Park development which has already caused pressures on existing infrastructure, traffic etc.</p> <p>Given the number and complexity of the application documents it is unreasonable to expect the general public to properly digest the content and a longer period should be provided to allow for proper review and comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed development site is entirely within designated Green Belt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty - Green Belt can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances. The hybrid application fails to demonstrate what, if any, exceptional circumstances exist - The Council should be exhausting the availability of other sites, including Brownfield sites and/or the more suitable location of TR01 thus allowing easy access on foot to the town centre and far easier access to the A41 rather than sacrificing Green Belt land - The proposed site has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation, and it is difficult to see what possible mitigation measures could be adopted to minimise the impact of such a large development from Ashridge, Ivinghoe Beacon and Pitstone Hill thus destroying the rural and peaceful green character of the area - The proposed development is on such a scale in comparison to the

	<p>current size of Tring that it would destroy the character of this historic market town and its rural setting by increasing the population by some 34% (having taken into account the recent Roman Park development)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with the proposed increase in population and the hybrid nature of the application means that the infrastructure proposed in the plan is not guaranteed - There would be an enormous increase in traffic onto Station Road, Cow Lane and Icknield Way none of which would cope without considerable development of the existing road network which would further ruin the rural landscape to the east of Tring - The proposals ignore the obvious extra demand from the occupants of 1,400 homes on hospital health care which is already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve the new housing and would not alleviate the current demand on local hospitals - Site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland - The timeframe of the proposed development over 11 years (2022-33) means long drawn-out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources. <p>In summary, I object to 22/01187/MOA on all of the above grounds and support the advice from Tring Town Council to the Dacorum Planning Authority to reject the application in the strongest possible terms.</p>
<p>Beacon View Orchard Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FF</p>	<p>I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC , which provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure, for example new schools and health centres, that are to be provided by the local authorities and NHS, however, there is currently no

	<p>commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth in Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p> <p>Therefore, this planning application is completely unacceptable. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>
<p>Mentmore House Orchard Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FF</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>19 New Mill Terrace Tring</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 5ET</p>	<p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>2 Astley Place Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QX</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I object to this proposal because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed site is arable green belt, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation), which provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. I do not see any exceptional reason to justify a single house on this protected land, let alone 1400. - It merges Tring with the hamlet of Tring Station which as a resident I object to. - The roads in Tring station hamlet & Tring town are already busy, this will only exacerbate the problem. - It is in conflict with the current local plan which does not include this site.

<p>Rosebank Donkey Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DY</p>	<p>This is an appalling proposal. Tring is a market town of limited size and limited possibilities for expansion on such a ridiculous scale. The so called GREEN BELT has already been ignored and a huge development of homes in the east of the town was bad enough. I suppose the powers that be won't be happy until the Chiltern hills are completely trashed. So much for the preservation of green spaces and care for the environment. Don't do it.</p>
<p>87 Grove Park Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JR</p>	<p>Like many others who have submitted objections I am against the proposed development for a number of reasons:</p> <p>1 Building on good quality agricultural land - now more than ever we should appreciate the need to retain such land for the production of food. Also, to build on green belt should be an absolute exception, not justified in this case.</p> <p>2 The infrastructure is already under strain. It is already near impossible to see a GP at present. The plan may include provision for a medical centre but that is no guarantee that funds will be made available to build it and more importantly it is unlikely that additional medical personnel will be available to staff it.</p> <p>3 Parking in Tring is already a major problem. Add another 1,400 houses and where will they park when visiting the town centre. It is too far away to assume that people will walk.</p> <p>4 Tring has already provided a large site to the West of Tring for large scale housing which threatens infrastructure and a fundamental change to our market town.</p> <p>5 The proposal is to access Station Road and Bulbourne Road, both of which are already busy roads and congestion can be expected. Marshcroft Lane must be closed off in order to avoid this narrow road becoming a "rat run" into town.</p> <p>6 The enjoyment of the public who benefit from accessing the hills beyond via Marshcroft Lane would be lost forever. Walkers, runners, dog-walkers and cyclists all gain great pleasure from the enjoyment this brings. It links to Pitstone hill, the Ridgeway and other places. Housing as proposed would ruin this environment.</p> <p>7 The sheer scale of the proposed development is completely out of scale to the market town of Tring.</p>
<p>Ashdown Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QU</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. Reasons as follows (but not limited to):</p> <p>1. Building on greenbelt land, adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) should not be permitted. There are no exceptional circumstances and it is not more sustainable to do so.</p> <p>2. The wonderful view of the Chiltern Hills over the AONB, from Station Road will be lost forever.</p> <p>3. Consequential development into the AONB is inevitable and is omitted from this proposal. Examples include station facilities, station car park, road and path infrastructure to the station.</p>

	<p>4. Consequential disruption into the AONB is inevitable with construction traffic and increased traffic thereafter.</p> <p>5. This proposal is a gross over development of Tring. It would fundamentally change our town, which does not have the infrastructure to support such growth.</p> <p>6. The ecological and carbon impact to Tring and the surrounding areas is unacceptable, particularly when other approved developments are considered. The area is home to many species of wild animal including badgers and red kites.</p> <p>7. The area is prone to flooding. This will either result in lots of new unhappy residents each spring, or a surplus of water being diverted into other parts of Tring, with unknown consequences.</p> <p>8. The proposal does not consider the adverse impact to the hamlet of Tring Station. Tring Station would become subsumed into Tring as part of this scheme and we would lose our community, by not only this, but the increased traffic diving the community into two.</p>
<p>31 Friars Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AP</p>	<p>I strongly object to this development being built on green belt land, close to AONB's and protected Chiltern Beechwood's. In the current climate emergency and concerns about wildlife extinctions, we should be preserving such land at all costs for current and future populations. There has not been a exceptional case shown for why this land should be used and brownfield sites should be looked at first alongside changing use of other buildings such as offices no longer used after changes in working practices.</p> <p>Developments on this site would be seen from high points of AONB such as Ivinghoe Beacon ruining its rural and green character. It would also take away prime agricultural land in a time when the Uk needs to focus on improving food security.</p> <p>The amount of proposed housing is highly disproportionate to the current size and character of Tring. It would completely change the small market town into an urban sprawl. The need for this amount of housing has not been shown in Tring. It is naive in the extreme to suggest that new residents would not all have at least one car which would greatly increase pollution and traffic congestion in the small town. Other infrastructure including health and local authority services (already under great pressure) would be unable to cope. Please do not agree to this hybrid application</p> <p>Finally the time given to read the numerous reports and pages was ridiculously short and more time should be given so that residents are aware of the application and can respond</p>
<p>Ty Isaf Trelewis CF46 6RD</p>	<p>In response to your letter to my family home address (Friars Gate, Marshcroft Lane) dated 13 April 2022, please see below my objections to the application.</p> <p>I preface my objections with the thought that the description "Land East of Tring" is misleading. The developer's description infers that they will be adding value to a derelict or otherwise empty area by adding houses, shops and so forth, when in fact this is a rural area bordered on four sides by main roads to the railway station and joining other parts of Tring to one another, to footpaths and to local villages.</p>

These fields are not a low value, unused area but are in fact treasured and integral to Tring life.

Marshcroft Lane is an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Greenbelt land, with trees and hedges dating back over 500 years. The trees, wildflowers, hedges, ditches, and fields either side of the lane are recognised for its wildlife. The fields are of Grade 2 (very good/high quality) status.

We will lose biodiversity as a result of churning up the fields, digging down into the soil, the construction traffic, and then the human inhabitants and pollution from heating and vehicles. The developers claims that biodiversity will grow under this development are clearly not possible. If or when wildlife returns, it will be lost in houses in the same way that deer wander lost in the relatively new housing developments just across the border in Pitstone.

The proposal to build two estates of c.1400 houses with schools, surgeries, etc., will only have negative impacts on the town and people. Leaving aside the destruction involved in building on this land, the environment and local human and non-human inhabitants will never recover due to the many-fold increase in houses, population, pollution and so forth caused by the plan. The town centre will also be further damaged as shoppers either drift away to the estate for shopping, or yet another huge increase in population and traffic hits the town - bear in mind that there are currently several other huge housing developments taking place on the west side of the town. The town can barely cope with the current levels of traffic with parts of Tring Park being turned into car parks, and jams when buses pass through.

The building of the development will not improve access to the countryside, but destroy it. Marshcroft Lane leads to tranquil paths to the Grand Union Canal and reservoirs, and across Northfield Road to the Ridgeway, Ivinghoe Beacon and local villages. The area is enjoyed by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders. Many children learn to ride their bikes here due to the lack of traffic. It is the recommended route for ramblers to explore the area according to the official "Grand Tour of Tring" Guide. As a child, the local school took us on many trips down the lane to learn about the environment, pick blackberries, identify birds, animals and trees, and so on. Construction traffic, and the post-construction proposed road block to stop the new inhabitants coming through Marshcroft Lane, will put an end to educational and recreational use of the lane by locals and visitors.

The above descriptions of the area and its value to a wide variety of people serves to show quite clearly why building housing estates on this land is a plan which, quite reasonably, will be rejected in all reasonable ways by Tring people. The residents of Tring who have chosen to make their home in a country environment do not want to see that country environment wrecked by developers.

The Council has a clear responsibility to local residents and visitors to protect this Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty from speculators and

	<p>people who have no genuine interest in Tring and who will only "bury" it beneath housing if given the slightest opportunity. Such an outcome cannot be justified on any grounds.</p> <p>As the cost of living soars, inflation hits 40 year highs, we approach the 2030 climate target to cut emissions, and Dacorum has over 1500 empty properties, surely the council should be looking to get existing properties fit for habitation rather than continuing to damage the environment with the huge carbon footprint of building new developments, in particular in areas like Marshcroft Lane where the natural environment is fortunate to be flourishing.</p> <p>Please ensure my objections are properly considered as this unique and ancient natural environment, once destroyed, is irreplaceable. The impact of felling 500 year old trees and digging deep footings for these developments can never be repaired.</p> <p>I call upon the council to refuse the planning permission.</p>
<p>78 Broadstone Road Harpenden AL5 1RE</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Gardens Trust, of which HGT is a member.</p> <p>The site of the proposed development abuts the Chilterns AONB, is in the Green Belt and would cause harm to the setting of the Locally Listed Pendley Manor Historic Park. Sufficient justification for development on the Green Belt has not been made and is thus contrary both to the national NPPF policies and DBC current policies. Tring Park and Ashridge Park both suffer from public use with degradation of footpaths and other areas due to high usage. This would increase with the 1400 dwellings proposed. The development would also affect the historic designed long views from Ashridge at Duncombe and Aldbury Terraces, towards Tring, which have recently been the subject of a listing application to Historic England. The effect on Ashridge, Tring Park and Pendley Manor landscapes is contrary to NPPF and DBC Heritage policies.</p> <p>The site is not included in the current DBC site allocations (adopted 2017) and would not be suitable for the reasons given above. We thus object to this proposal.</p>
<p>30 Elm Tree Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EJ</p>	<p>I object to the Tring planning application (22/01187/MOA) because of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Climate Change Emergency is not at the core of the Local Plan. The central thread of the Local Plan should be net zero carbon (ultimately zero carbon) emissions by 2030 and minimising carbon emissions during any construction. Although the Climate Change Emergency is rightly a headline statement in the plan, there is little follow through in the subsequent detail except ill-defined aims, such as promoting an unquantified reduction in greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions. 2. The promotion of renewable energy as proposed in the plan is insufficient to meet the challenge of the Climate Emergency. To achieve net zero emissions by 2030 all new homes and offices must have: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · maximum insulation, · only utilise electrical energy,

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · must have rooftop solar panels installed at the time of construction, · must be fitted with efficient heating such as air source heat pumps. · All public transport must be electrified. · All construction should be done with sustainable materials or low embodied energy or carbon. · At construction provision must be made for home electric vehicle chargers and an adequate number of community fast chargers. · All power must be supplied by electricity or hydrogen generated from sustainable energy sources. <p>3. The plan we wish to see preference given to developments which fit with the likely changes to working patterns in the aftermath of the COVID-19 epidemic. Priority should be given to plans and developments which will support local green business, including green STEM businesses, close-to-home communal office space, green domestic builders & installers to help decarbonise Dacorum, and small businesses selling locally sourced goods.</p> <p>4. Affordable housing needs is not properly defined in the plan and must contain an adequate proportion of social housing with rents set at no more than a third of the average income of workers in Dacorum.</p> <p>5. The proposals in the plan for infrastructure and employment growth are not sufficient for the number of new dwellings proposed in these market towns.</p> <p>6. The plan does not guarantee the protection of existing natural habitats and creation of new ones by rewilding. It must ensure that there are migration corridors that connect the green spaces as far as possible to increase biodiversity.</p> <p>7. What guarantees are there that any environmental or rewilding plans will actually be delivered?</p> <p>8. Has adequate consideration been given to the provision for utilities such as water, gas, electricity and for doctors, dentists and school places that will be required for the additional 1400 homes? That could be an additional 3000 people - an increase of around 1/3 of the current population of Tring.</p>
<p>1 Hazely Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JH</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons:</p> <p>In addition to all of the very valid points made below I would like to add that it would be unforgivable to irrevocably destroy this area which is a source of peace and nature to the whole community not just those living in Tring but to those from surrounding areas who come to Marchcroft Lane and the canal/reservoir areas to share in the wildlife that it provides. I have lived in Tring for over 50 years and have enjoyed being able to share this amazing location with my children and grandchildren to help to educate and encourage them to appreciate nature and their surroundings. Please do not allow this area to be destroyed, as it would undoubtedly be, if this huge development were to be approved. It should be Tring's legacy to it's residents and those of the surrounding area. I recognise that development is needed but please look for other places in the area to do this and do not allow the destruction of an area of such outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>I feel that the developers are just trying to wear everyone down in an effort to push their undesirable plans through. Please do not allow us to be bullied;</p>

	<p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>3 Mansion Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BD</p>	<p>My reasons for objecting to this proposal are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An extra 1400 homes in Tring, in addition to the large development at the top of Western Road, Tring, will increase the population of Tring by about 50%. By any reasonable assessment this is unacceptable, both because it would change the character of Tring as a small market town and because there is insufficient infrastructure to support such an influx. Tring already has poor local facilities for residents; a development this size would only make the problem worse. What makes up for the poor local facilities is the beautiful surrounding countryside, so any attempt to destroy that countryside should be resisted. 2. The site is AONB. The application fails to demonstrate that it provides sufficient protections to allow that AONB status to be removed. The AONB is essential to preserve and support local wildlife which is under increasing pressure from building developments within Tring and the surrounding area, both within Hertfordshire and immediately to the west of the county where it meets Aylesbury Vale. The environment and local wildlife habitats should be regarded as a priority issue because climate change is resulting in a very significant reduction in UK wildlife both nationally and locally. 3. The application, if allowed, would be inconsistent with Dacorum Council's stated intention to protect the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC. A development of this size, sited so close to both parts of the SAC,

	<p>would severely increase the numbers of people using the Beechwoods and could only result in further damage to the SAC.</p> <p>4. Parts of the proposed site have been subject to flooding during high winter rainfall in recent years and presumably should be regarded as a flood plain as it helps to reduce some of the excess rainfall that drains down to the area around Tring Station.</p> <p>5. The proposed site is quality productive farmland for summer crops. UK Government policy is to be more self-sufficient in food production, both for reasons of climate change and problems with obtaining food from overseas.</p> <p>6. For the record, the developers did a small and very limited exhibition in Tring, which was poorly attended by residents because of Covid restrictions and inadequate advertising. The current application runs to a very large number of pages and residents will therefore have found it difficult to comment on some of the detail.</p>
<p>The Standings 6 Stocks Farm Barns Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RX</p>	<p>I am writing to object to this large scale planning development near Tring. This area already has a large housing development being built and this further one would destroy the area. Developers wish to build on and near green belt as the selling prices they can charge are way higher than brown areas - but that is no reason to build. The road and rail infrastructure also wont be able to cope and these are not in the control of the council or the developer so it will be chaos. This is a beautiful area which will be destroyed by this development.</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>Badgers Crossing 3 New Ground Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RJ</p>	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam,</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1)To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Furthermore, this development directly undermines the critical need to manage the threat to biodiversity and preservation of nature which has been recognised UK wide. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise</p>

	<p>the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3) To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>I have lived in or around Tring for the past 47 years and have witnessed the rapid development of the town. I believe any further expansion of Tring will require significant investment in its infrastructure (e.g. Schools, Medical Services, Roads etc.). I object to this specific planning application based on the above points. However, I also object to any further expansion of Tring unless there is a clear and unambiguous investment plan that is aligned to the planning application.</p>
<p>27 Morefields Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EU</p>	<p>Object for following reasons: Green Belt Land Concern for wildlife and biodiversity, due to closeness of AONB and Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Concerns over the infrastructure of Tring Scale of development is totally unsuitable for a small market town</p>
<p>12 Manor Street Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 2BN</p>	<p>This is Green Belt/AONB Land and should therefore be protected areas.</p> <p>Site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>DBC have declared a climate and ecological emergency and these proposals which would have an extremely detrimental effect on our Chiltern countryside, its AONB and the market town of Tring.</p> <p>This development is of a too larger scale and will have an major impact on our environment and nature and wild life such as diversity of plant species, the air we breath and pollination of plants.</p>
<p>6 Valpy Close Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I strongly object to the plan to build up to 1,400 houses on Green Belt land. This is an overcrowded area as it is. Tring is so full of people and cars now that it is in danger of becoming completely overwhelmed. Roads are too busy, not enough parking spaces for the</p>

<p>HP23 6EY</p>	<p>numbers of cars and local amenities such as GP surgeries full to bursting and unable to cope. Green Belt should stay green/undeveloped. That was the plan originally. Why is it possible to now build on it? The wider area is one of AONB. It is essential to keep this unspoilt and wildlife protected. There is simply no room for more people and cars in an already overcrowded area. Tring and Aldbury are small towns. That is their charm, already threatened by overdevelopment. Surely a massive new housing development, such as proposed, should be sited close to a large town/city? Not as an adjunct to already over developed small towns? Please, please do not let this go ahead.</p>
<p>The Stables Pendley Farm Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QY</p>	<p>We have enormous concern about the proposal and its affect on Tring and the surrounding neighbourhood. Specifically;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1. It is fundamentally wrong for a proposal to build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. As far as we are aware, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on green belt land, particularly when Dacorum Borough Council are reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt 2. Furthermore this proposal is to build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. The scale of the development is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development on top of the Roman Park is totally out of proportion and will change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. If a further sizeable development is to be considered for Tring, there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. If it becomes essential to sacrifice some green belt land then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>We are not against some further housing growth for Tring, however, we believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p>
<p>Marshcroft House Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QN</p>	<p>Ref. Planning Application ref. 22/01187/MOA To Whom it May Concern, Thank you for your letter dated 13th April 2022 relating to the above planning application. I am writing to object to the above proposal on the grounds that it is an inappropriate development within the established Green Belt in Dacorum, adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed development would result in the complete loss of approximately 121 hectares of quality, productive agricultural land -</p>

	<p>with the associated impact on food security and environmental impact. The proposal goes against Dacorum Borough Council's current Adopted Core Strategy Policy CS5, which itself follows national planning policy for development within the Green Belt. The proposed development fails all respects of National Planning Policy Framework [July 2021 edition] paragraphs 148, 149 and 150, "Proposals affecting the Green Belt".</p> <p>While I recognise that the Adopted Core Strategy in Dacorum is subject to review, this review has not yet been completed. Until this has been completed, Dacorum Borough Council cannot demonstrate that all other avenues have been exhausted and therefore the application for any green-field development on the Green Belt should be refused.</p> <p>The applicant's "hybrid planning application" should be rejected on the grounds that there is no requirement for the "Full application" part [the two access points at Station Road and Bulbourne Road], without there being approval (in principle, implied or otherwise) for the "outline part" [outline planning permission for up to 1400 houses, schools, etc.]. Granting approval for the "Full application" part could be construed as expressing support for the "Outline application" part - which would likely compromise the future objectivity of the planning authority.</p>
<p>2 Marshcroft Cottages Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QN</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed</p> <p>The area proposed to be developed is productive farm land. At a time when this country should be producing more of its own food, rather than being reliant on Ukraine or Russia this proposed development would be taking land. which is providing crops and cattle, out of producing and filling it with mouths to feed.</p> <p>The land is also habitat to many types of wild animals which would be displaced.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the</p>

	<p>impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>1 Marshcroft Cottages Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QN</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this</p>

	<p>review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>4 Goldsworth Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FY</p>	<p>Objection due to :</p> <p>This is a Green Belt Area - these are protected areas and should not be built on especially to this extent !</p> <p>There are estates already being built in many surrounding areas - either recently completed, part way through build or approved and about to start - areas such as Aylesbury, Pitstone, Aston Clinton, Cheddington and Tring (excluding this proposal). Are 1400 homes in this proposed location therefore actually needed, appropriate with the pressure already placed on the local area by all the already approved new build estates.</p> <p>The roads in certain areas cant cope now - 1400 homes must bring over 2000 cars. The roads will be impossible and the parking in places terrible too. Local roads in many areas are single track lanes or very narrow due to parking ie Brook Street and the high street. How will these areas cope ? (and no you will not convert car drivers to suddenly use a bus !!!)</p> <p>Have you explored derelict land? Industrial estates and other such "built up " areas ? Rather than destroying green belt ?</p>

	<p>Have you looked at creating more NEW TOWN models - rather than attaching this kind of a development to an already pressurised, town ?</p> <p>The local hospital is surely too far if this proposal goes ahead plus other medical facilities are seriously stretched already - what will this development do to fix that if this outrageous proposal goes ahead ? There is no dentist here that you can sign up to at present - how many dentists surgeries will be opening to fix demand now and for the future ?</p> <p>You say you wish to encourage walking - the Bulbourne Road - one main access road to this proposal is not suitable or safe today for pedestrians. No one at the town hall event seemed to care or be able to address my comment on this.</p> <p>I know of planning permission that has been rejected due to lack of green planting on a driveway - yet right opposite you wish to place 1400 homes on green belt land - how can there be such inconsistency?</p> <p>In conclusion - building on green belt land is a terrible proposition and the quantity of homes puts an inordinate amount of pressure on the infrastructure in the area. This is too big as a proposal and puts a mockery to the protection of green spaces. There is enough building in this area, we have supported the new build requirement heavily in this area and this plan needs to be halted.</p>
<p>Rosslyn 13 Bulbourne Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HF</p>	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt

	<p>land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>I strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Beauchamp House 8A Bulbourne Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HF</p>	<p>I strongly object to this planning application because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in

- urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.
2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.
 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.
 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.
 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.

I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).

On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."

I strongly object to this planning application because it proposes:

1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.
2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.
3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.
4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.
5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the

	<p>impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p> <p>I strongly object to this planning application because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>8 Bulbourne Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HF</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns

	<p>Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>2 Ridge View Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PU</p>	<p>I am a Tring resident and wish to formally object to the Planning Application 22/01187/MOA (Marshcroft Lane) on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. The Application represents a gross overdevelopment of the area, entirely inappropriate in a Market town the size of Tring, especially in addition to the existing development at Roman Park.</p> <p>2. The area is designated Green Belt Land. There are other alternatives which render this case for developing green belt untenable. If Green Belt is to be sacrificed for profit then the TR01 area represents a less invasive impact on the environment</p> <p>3. The land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC. This undeveloped, natural land is clearly very precious to the local community.</p> <p>4. The Application proposes developing land immediately adjacent to a designated AONB. These areas demand special consideration when reviewing any planning applications on adjacent land. This proposal would severely degrade the AONB.</p> <p>5. The application mentions the provision of Medical and Social facilities, but fails to identify any commitment from any source to fund these gratuitous offers. It would certainly not be the developer sacrificing any of its significant profits to fund community services.</p> <p>I would be grateful if would include my objection points when viewing the application.</p>

<p>5 Netherby Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PJ</p>	<p>Planning application 22/01187/MDA We strongly object to the proposed planning application which is wholly disproportionate to the needs of Tring, will destroy current green belt land and be counterproductive to Tring as a whole. Reasonable future development on brownfield sites should be the future in parallel with much greater infrastructure investment for town.</p>
<p>Mon Nid 32 Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PP</p>	<p>Good morning</p> <p>I have attempted to access your online public page to lodge my objection to the above planning, but have not been able to get in. Therefore, I'm adding my objection here - I fully concur with all the objections already noted by GFRA, of which I am a member.</p> <p>Tring is a lovely market town with hundreds of years of history, and already has enough residents for its current infrastructure. There are no commitments from Harrow Estates to build anything other than houses, so this will clearly overstretch our schools and GP surgeries etc.</p> <p>But most worrying is the complete disregard for the status of Green Belt land, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and Special Areas of Conservation. This reckless abandonment of common sense across our country, with respect to the greater issues of climate change, will be disastrous in the not very long term. We have to find a way to allow for the increase of housing while preserving the biodiversity on which we are utterly dependent.</p> <p>I trust you will do everything in your power to prevent this application from being approved.</p>
<p>21 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>We wish to raise objection to the above planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Green Belt Land - should be protected in line with original green belt aims to prevent urban sprawl. Arguably the area east of Tring is the first large area of green space west of London. 2. AONB - Tring is the Gateway Town to the Chilterns AONB, the site is overlooked by some of the finest wild life sites in Herts. 3. Dacorum Development Plan - A new local plan is proposed, to be submitted in October 2025, with a further public consultation to be held in June 2023. No ad hoc decisions should be taken before this date. 4. Local Infrastructure - Tring is a small market town, the facilities offered can only accommodate the needs of the present population. In particular medical facilities and reliance on hospitals outside the area already coping with the needs of large towns. Additionally the road infrastructure giving access to the site is inadequate, both Bulbourne Road and Station Road/Cow Lane already carry large volumes of traffic accessing the A41 and onward to the M25. 5. Tring Character - Tring has a unique character and architectural style, this should not be put at risk by being overwhelmed by the current excessive building schemes.

	<p>6. Environmental impact - As already mentioned this is green belt land and should not be lost to such a development. The impact of such a large built up area on the local wild life and the pollution caused by so many vehicles accessing the site both during construction and when occupied, is immeasurable.</p> <p>7. We suggest you take a walk, with the Tring Town Council members, along the Ridgeway Path at Aldbury Nowers to visualise the impact such a development would have on Tring and the surrounding area!</p>
<p>2 Grove Leys Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>We are writing to place our objection to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>We are not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Grove Lodge Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to planning application (22/01187/MOA) because -</p> <p>It is green belt with Beechwoods SAC protection and adjacent to one of the most beautiful and serene amenities we have in Tring - the canal, which would inevitably suffer severe detriment if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>It is also out of proportion to the existing population of Tring, especially added to the existing Roman Park development, Tring's whose would be changed for the worse.</p>

	<p>I recognise that more housing is needed and must be subject to provision of supporting infrastructure, but the other sites available to the east of Tring and closer to the centre should be given priority over this site.</p> <p>I also note the short time the public have to comment and believe the response time should be extended and the application more widely publicised to encourage more comments.</p>
<p>19 Christchurch Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EE</p>	<p>26th April 2022 Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Re: Planning Application 22/01187/MOA</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187) because it proposes:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on Greenbelt land. This planning permission is seeking to build on a site that is 100% Greenbelt land. The Greenbelt was introduced for a reason; to be a barrier between built up areas and the countryside and to ensure that this was maintained. The reasons for its introduction are still relevant today and perhaps even more relevant with the stresses of modern life. Tring is set in the Chilterns, in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and surrounded by Greenbelt land. Greenbelt is only allowed to be built on in exceptional and very special circumstances and these have not been provided to justify building on this greenbelt thereby failing the government's prerequisite requirements for permission to build on greenbelt land making this application null and void. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt land is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on land which abuts the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This development will be visible from the high points of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, thereby destroying its rural and peaceful green character. 4. To build on land which is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Nationally we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland. 5. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This development plus the on-going development of Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%. Tring is a small market town in a rural setting and a massive influx of people would drastically and adversely change the character of the town forever and this

development would change the rural nature of the town's setting forever. Block developments tend to be bad for towns, in terms of changing the character of a town and this development would irreversibly change the character of this historic market town forever.

6. To take no account of the impact on the local infrastructure as there does not appear to be any thought as to whether the local infrastructure, including the road systems can cope. There has been considerable expansion of Aylesbury and with planned housing in the soon to be decommissioned RAF Halton there is already pressure on the local roads. This development is very much on the edge of the town and consequently the vast majority of needs for people living in this proposed development would involve driving and would have a massively adverse impact on the roads. Additionally, has any consideration been given to the massively increased pressure that the local infrastructure, such as, parking, water availability, sewage structure etc would be under? This plan just seems to have slotted housing on the very outer eastern edges of the town beyond the current housing boundaries with no regard for the character nor infrastructure capabilities of the town.

7. No committed infrastructure, as whilst there may be new schools and health centres in the plan these would need to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and the NHS, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. Whilst the developer states that it will contribute towards the cost of such infrastructure there is no reference to what this 'contribution' would be and therefore, it is far from fully funded. Currently Tring has one secondary and the vast majority of the children attend this school giving a sense of common purpose and a truly comprehensive schooling system and having split secondary education would undoubtedly adversely change the character of the town. Additionally, the schools would need to be in place before any sizeable housing development takes place as all primary schools and Tring (Secondary) School are full to capacity and whilst Tring School is being rebuilt there is no additional capacity being added.

8. To take no consideration of the extra demands on local hospital health care, which is already under extreme pressure. Building a health care centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.

9. No provision for local jobs and services. There does not appear to be any thought as to providing local jobs and services for any proposed residents therefore adding to the pressures on the local road network as people need to commute to their places of work.

10. A planning application for a site which is not wholly owned by the developer. The developers, Harrow Estates/Redrow, do not own the whole site so there is no commitment that the site would be developed as is outlined in the application.

11. The application is hybrid. This means that permission is being sought for some of the site with full details of the remainder to follow. This can be interpreted as seeking outline planning permission for the

	<p>development of the site as a whole, with specific details on house design, location of school (indicated as possible only), service roads etc, to be sought later.</p> <p>12. A timeframe of development of over 11 years (2022-33). This would mean a long drawn out adverse impact of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents.</p> <p>13. To take no account of the fact that there could be more suitable locations which are closer to the local road infrastructure of the A41 and close enough for people to walk into the town centre. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be on a more proportionate scale bearing in mind the size of Tring and that any such development should be located closer to the main infrastructure of Tring.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of the planning application document (over 140 separate documents and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my opinions into account when considering this planning application.</p>
<p>15 Railway Cottages Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QT</p>	<p>Considering we have had a development already at the East end of Tring, the number of dwellings proposed is overdevelopment and not suited to the area of outstanding natural beauty that is Ashridge and the Ivinghoe Beacon.</p> <p>The creation of this development will remove valuable green spaces for local families and increase pollution and noise with a huge increase in traffic. It is likely that those in the proposed houses will need to use schools and nurseries that will not be provided immediately with this development, the commuting to which, and onwards to the station will make Station Road a busy main road completely out of character with the town.</p> <p>The infrastructure proposed for this development of the schools and community areas I can not see happening at the same time as the dwellings and therefore the strain on local services will impact the lives of residents already living in the community. An already busy and crowded station car park and trains will become overburdened and it will become extremely hazardous with traffic near the main road and station at Tring Station.</p> <p>This proposal is completely unnecessary for Tring and because of property values in Tring they will not be affordable either. I strongly object to a proposal of this size being forced between Tring and Tring Station.</p>
<p>28 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of

<p>HP23 5PL</p>	<p>Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to be completed, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>2 Posting House Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QS</p>	<p>I object to the development on the following grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development would effectively create a new built land bridge between Tring and Tring station. From my experience of living at Tring Station, we have our own community identity comprising the Fog Cottages, Posting Houses, Royal Court, Clarke Springs and properties along Station Road; with the Iron Room on Station Road being our shared community space. Geographically, Albury is our next nearest local community and closest shop, Post Office, school, cafe, pub and Church. The majority of Tring Station Primary age Children attend Albury Primary school, strongly reinforcing our community ties with Albury. In my view, the proposed development threatens the existing local community balance with the creation of a hard built link to Tring, which over time might fundamentally and irreversibly change the Tring Station community identity and strong connection to Albury.</p> <p>In addition to the above, I would urge those with whom the planning decision resides to walk the Ridgeway path from Bishops Wood (south of Tring) to Ivinghoe Beacon (northeast of Tring), constituting the high ground overlooking the local area. Many tourists and Londoners travel to Tring Station to step out of the station into beautiful countryside for walks along the Ridgeway, Chiltern Way and the Grand Union canal. From Pitstone Hill on the Ridgeway, the full</p>

	<p>vista of land proposed for development can be seen within the context of the landscape stretching out towards Tring, Wendover and across the county. The proposed development would irreversibly change this view by turning over a substantial proportion of farmed greenfield land to buildings, which in my view would constitute a vandalism of the landscape in this area. From Pitstone Hill, the much smaller Pitstone chalk pit development (I think about 200 units built within the last 8-years) can be seen, which appears as an out of place blight within the overall landscape . A development of the scale proposed would be a far more tragic loss of Hertfordshire landscape.</p>
<p>3 Grove Leys Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>The local plan has not been finalised so how can a development like this be considered at this stage? Development on Green Belt requires exceptional circumstances. I do not believe these circumstances exist for this proposal. The site adjoins an AONB and will be detrimental to the AONB both in terms of ecology and visual intrusion. The scale of development is out of proportion to the scale of Tring as a market town. There is no commitment to the infrastructure that would be required to support a development of this scale. Marshcroft Lane is a special green corridor and is widely used for recreational purposes. Imagine a roundabout/traffic lights halfway down Marshcroft to provide for the proposed new crossing road to realise the folly of this proposal!</p>
<p>21 Dunston Hill Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AT</p>	<p>The whole site is in designated Green Belt Green Belt can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances The proposals fail to demonstrate exceptional circumstances (see National Planning Policy Framework revised 20.7.21 in particular paragraphs 147-9) The site abuts the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character Site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland Large number of dwellings will drastically and adversely change the rural setting and character of the market town of Tring Increase in traffic Despite developer's proposals to include some community infrastructure, such as two schools, this is not guaranteed, as this is a hybrid planning application Developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution' Proposals ignore extra demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals Developer (Harrow Estates/Redrow) only owns part of the site (that nearest to Station Road) so no commitment that the site would be developed as is outlined in this application Timeframe of development over 11 years (2022-33) means long drawn-out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide</p>

	<p>infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents and parking in town centre This site falls within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - March 2022</p>
<p>Trinity Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SA</p>	<p>I am writing to object to the above planning application to develop this area with a large number of houses. I am concerned that the impact on the town's facilities, the railway station and local health care would be totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Living in Aldbury I would be badly affected by increased traffic flow through the village and increased footfall in Ashridge which is already under threat.</p> <p>Tring has recently had a large number of houses built at the far end of the town which are putting pressure on all local facilities .</p>
<p>Walnut Tree Cottage 3 Toms Hill Close Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SL</p>	<p>Please note that I have the following objections to the 'Marshcroft Garden Suburb' proposed development.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to it for the following reasons:</p> <p>It is on green belt land which we need for growing food, not houses. It is next to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. No special reasons have been put forward to justify using green belt land like this.</p> <p>The new rules for the Chilterns Beechwood SAC, which is in the area, must apply and no adequate mitigation has been proposed.</p> <p>The scale of the development is out of all proportion to the size of Tring, which already has a lot of extra new housing.</p> <p>The hamlet of Tring Staion would be overwhelmed.</p> <p>Tring Station does not have sufficient facilities for the extra usage.</p> <p>The developers state that facilities such as schools and a medical centre will be provided but do not say by whom. They do not say they will fund this, only that the land will be provided. It seems unlikely that the relevant authorities will provide funding. Tring School is near and has very recently been rebuilt, so it is unlikely the education authority will spend more on a new secondary school nearby.</p> <p>Dacorum Council should focus on finalising the Local Plan so that there is a framework for development in the borough and so that massively oversized and inappropriate schemes such as this never see the light of day.</p>
<p>1 Hollyfield Close Tring</p>	<p>As a homeowner directly alongside this planning application (22/01187/MOA) I strongly object because it proposes:</p>

<p>Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>3 Ridge View Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PU</p>	<p>1. The proposed land is part of the Green Belt which, although originally intended to protect open land, is now recognised for having so many other benefits. These include providing areas for walking/ other countryside activities, helping to slow climate change, addressing air pollution, and providing essential habitats for wildlife. The land subject to this planning application is presently home to roe deer, foxes, countless bats, owls and pheasants. All this would be lost if the application goes ahead.</p> <p>The land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation) which provides protection to Green Belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland.</p> <p>Quite rightly Dacorum Borough Council is currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the Green Belt. The review must be allowed to complete and a new local plan finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. Such an approach is in line with current Government strategy not to build on Green Belt unless there are exceptional circumstances which there</p>

	<p>are not.</p> <p>2. The scale of the development is inappropriate for the historic market town of Tring and the local infrastructure. The whole character of the town will be changed should the development be allowed. From looking through all the comments opposing the application and other comments made at the various public meetings, Tring residents do not want such a massive change to take place. This view must be respected.</p> <p>3. The developer has allowed for new infrastructure in the planning application including "a new local centre and sports /community hub, primary school, and secondary school". However there is no commitment by Local Authorities and Public Bodies to provide this infrastructure. There is a risk that such areas and "the public open spaces as alternative to Green Belt" will just become sites for additional housing. In the meantime, without the land being managed it will become an overgrown eyesore.</p> <p>4. Housing growth in moderation is necessary if only to provide opportunities for people to move from more urban area to take advantage of the countryside. More affordable homes are also required in Tring. However there is a more suitable location (TR01 - near the Tesco superstore) with better access to the town centre that minimises the impact on the environment and avoids the need to destroy Green Belt.</p>
<p>11 Netherby Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PJ</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1) To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3)To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5)To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to</p>

	<p>walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>23 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>See full response within the application's documents on DBC's website.</p>
<p>19 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I should like to register my objection to the application. It is not possible for the council or individuals to make an informed assessment of the proposal for two reasons: first, because the planning framework by which to judge it is still in the process of being developed by our elected representatives; and second because the detail of the plan is illustrative and so provides no firm basis for assurance of the eventual project. In the circumstances, an opportunistic application for such a large-scale development is totally inappropriate.</p> <p>While there may be a valid case for considering a significant expansion for Tring, it should be examined in a measured and democratically-led manner, and in conjunction with an expansion of all the required supporting community and transport facilities.</p>
<p>17 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because of:</p> <p>The prematurity of the application, before any mitigation plans have been prepared for the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation), and before the new Dacorum Local Plan has been agreed.</p> <p>The Chilterns Beechwoods SAC mandates mitigation from the pressure of visitor numbers from a Zone of Influence (Zol) around Ashridge and Tring Woodlands. As well as the land around Tring, such as this significant proposed development, the Zol covers areas around Aston Clinton and Aylesbury which have already significant housing developments just constructed or approved, such as the Buckinghamshire Advantage approved development from Aylesbury up to the Arla factory near Aston Clinton. All these developments will need to be considered in mitigation plans.</p> <p>Natural England also requires a Habitats Regulations Assessment to include demonstrations of Water Neutrality and Nutrient Neutrality. This has not been prepared yet; the developers have only included a "Report to Inform a HRA" which has minimal information on</p>

hydrological abstraction, sewage, surface water and nutrient run-off from the existing farmland.

The proposals to create a SANG to fulfil HRA requirements seems incomplete and solely focused on the development itself; with proposals for a cafe to attract visitors, it would increase footfall from people visiting both that and Ashridge from a wider area, compromising the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC; and there seems little provision for car parking that such a provision would require.

To build on Green Belt land which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty needs to demonstrate very exceptional circumstances. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on Green Belt land. Dacorum Borough Council is currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the Green Belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any Green Belt is sacrificed.

The site abuts and affords the setting for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character.

The developers' "Very Special Circumstances" are very generic, and could be applied to many more suitable or brownfield sites. There is no good justification why this site should be chosen over others. See National Planning Policy Framework revised 20.7.21 in particular paragraphs 147-9

This development is on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus the already constructed Roman Park increases the population of Tring by c. 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.

Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.

The application is hybrid which means that permission is sought for some of the site with full details of the remainder to follow. We understand this seeks outline planning permission for the development of the site as a whole, with specific details on house design, location of school (indicated as possible only), service roads etc... to be sought later and therefore with no guarantee that future applications under reserved matters would provide any of the promoted facilities. I urge Dacorum Borough Council to use their discretion to refuse a hybrid application.

The site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland.

	<p>The large number of dwellings will drastically and adversely change the rural setting & character of the market town of Tring.</p> <p>The increase in traffic on busy minor roads with only two access points for the entire site of 1400 dwellings and SANG visitors.</p> <p>The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution'.</p> <p>The proposals ignore extra demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.</p> <p>The developer (Harrow Estates/Redrow) only owns part of the site (that nearest to Station Road) so no commitment that the site would be developed as is outlined in this application.</p> <p>The timeframe of development over 11 years (2022-33) means long drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents and parking in town centre.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (150 documents and 5,623 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>7 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>I object to this development. due to many reasons, the main ones being;</p> <p>The whole site is in designated Green Belt Green Belt can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances.</p> <p>Despite developer's proposals to include some community infrastructure, such as 2 schools, this is not guaranteed, as this is a hybrid planning application.</p> <p>Developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution'</p>
<p>5 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>write to offer my objection to the current plan to build 1400 homes on the easter edge of Tring. I have no doubt that new homes are needed, but the scale of this build and the inorganic nature will fundamentally change the town of Tring, and there is no way of saying that this will be for the better.</p> <p>3 main points come to mind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not reduce it. o DBC is currently reviewing the Local Plan, following community feedback from last year's consultation, with an intention to consider brownfield urban sites

	<p>within the Borough, rather than release Green Belt It is imperative that this review should be finalised before any decisions are made on releasing Green Belt, particularly that of such a substantial nature and in such a significant location in the Chilterns and the Borough.</p> <p>o Green Belt can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances, (National Planning Policy Framework 20.7.21 notably paragraphs 147-9), which these proposals fail to fulfil.</p>
<p>61 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>'I object to the recent proposal for 1,400 houses to be built between Bulborne Road and Station Road east of Tring and west of the Grand Union Canal.</p> <p>Tring is a historical market town embedded in the chilterns in or on the edge of an area of outstanding area of natural beauty and surrounded by an established green belt environment embellished with ancient hedgerows within an agricultural landscape. The scale of the proposed development for housing will severely impact not only on the environment but the market town of Tring and be a blight on the countryside surrounding the town.</p> <p>I have already observed a decline in flora and fauna with the change of use of land west of the proposed site. Do we need to see more? This proposal will certainly damage the richness the area offers environmentally and to the town.</p> <p>This proposal together with the current development of Roman Park by Carla Housing north of Tring will increase the geographical footprint of Tring town in excess of 35%. The currant infrasture of amenities of public transport, schooling, health support, transport cannot support the scale of this development.</p> <p>I would like Dacorum Borough Council to seriously reconsider their decision of this proposed development and consider brown field sites in favour of green belt destruction.</p>
<p>Bryher House 16 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>1. build on Greenbelt land. This planning permission is seeking to build on a site that is 100% Greenbelt land. The Greenbelt was introduced for a reason; to be a barrier between built up areas and the countryside and to ensure that this was maintained. The reasons for its introduction are still relevant today and perhaps even more relevant with the stresses of modern life. Tring is set in the Chilterns, in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and surrounded by Greenbelt land. Greenbelt is only allowed to be built on in exceptional and very special circumstances and these have not been provided to justify building on this greenbelt thereby failing the government's prerequisite requirements for permission to build on greenbelt land making this application null and void.</p> <p>Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt land is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the</p>

protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.

3. To build on land which abuts the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This development will be visible from the high points of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, thereby destroying its rural and peaceful green character.

4. To build on land which is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land. Nationally we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland.

5. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This development plus the on-going development of Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%. Tring is a small market town in a rural setting and a massive influx of people would drastically and adversely change the character of the town forever and this development would change the rural nature of the town's setting forever. Block developments tend to be bad for towns, in terms of changing the character of a town and this development would irreversibly change the character of this historic market town forever.

6. To take no account of the impact on the local infrastructure as there does not appear to be any thought as to whether the local infrastructure, including the road systems can cope. There has been considerable expansion of Aylesbury and with planned housing in the soon to be decommissioned RAF Halton there is already pressure on the local roads. This development is very much on the edge of the town and consequently the vast majority of needs for people living in this proposed development would involve driving and would have a massively adverse impact on the roads. Additionally, has any consideration been given to the massively increased pressure that the local infrastructure, such as, parking, water availability, sewage structure etc would be under? This plan just seems to have slotted housing on the very outer eastern edges of the town beyond the current housing boundaries with no regard for the character nor infrastructure capabilities of the town.

7. No committed infrastructure, as whilst there may be new schools and health centres in the plan these would need to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and the NHS, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. Whilst the developer states that it will contribute towards the cost of such infrastructure there is no reference to what this 'contribution' would be and therefore, it is far from fully funded. Currently Tring has one secondary and the vast majority of the children attend this school giving a sense of common purpose and a truly comprehensive schooling system and having split secondary education would undoubtedly adversely change the character of the town. Additionally,

	<p>the schools would need to be in place before any sizeable housing development takes place as all primary schools and Tring (Secondary) School are full to capacity and whilst Tring School is being rebuilt there is no additional capacity being added.</p> <p>8. To take no consideration of the extra demands on local hospital health care, which is already under extreme pressure. Building a health care centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.</p> <p>9. No provision for local jobs and services. There does not appear to be any thought as to providing local jobs and services for any proposed residents therefore adding to the pressures on the local road network as people need to commute to their places of work.</p> <p>10. A planning application for a site which is not wholly owned by the developer. The developers, Harrow Estates/Redrow, do not own the whole site so there is no commitment that the site would be developed as is outlined in the application.</p> <p>11. The application is hybrid. This means that permission is being sought for some of the site with full details of the remainder to follow. This can be interpreted as seeking outline planning permission for the development of the site as a whole, with specific details on house design, location of school (indicated as possible only), service roads etc, to be sought later.</p> <p>12. A timeframe of development of over 11 years (2022-33). This would mean a long drawn out adverse impact of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents.</p> <p>13. To take no account of the fact that there could be more suitable locations which are closer to the local road infrastructure of the A41 and close enough for people to walk into the town centre. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be on a more proportionate scale bearing in mind the size of Tring and that any such development should be located closer to the main infrastructure of Tring. On a final note, due to the scale of the planning application document (over 140 separate documents and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond. Thank you for taking my opinions into account when considering this planning application.</p>
<p>57 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>Object because it is development on Greenbelt land, which is fundamentally wrong, it will reduce the ability of the soil to deliver ecosystem services (biodiversity, flood prevention, carbon sequestration) and damage soil health and so is contrary to the governments environmental targets and policy (Environment Bill),</p>

	<p>there is a disconnect between the proposed development and Tring, it will do little if anything to improve life for current Tring residents and there are many things that will make it worse (traffic, lack of facilities etc). Land is currently used for agriculture and so it will reduce food sustainability.</p> <p>We object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>54 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring</p>

	<p>by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>30 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I object to this planning application to build 1,400 more houses in Tring.</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages)</p>

	<p>a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>52 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>15 Adams Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DY</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We are writing to place our objection to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of

	<p>Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>We are not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Memorial Hall The Green Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RR</p>	<p>Aldbury Parish Council, at its Extraordinary Parish Council meeting on Monday 25 April 2022, resolved to make the following objections to the planning application.</p> <p>1 Permission to build on Green Belt land, which is also adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, should be refused. No "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward to justify the damage to the Green Belt. The land is also much needed grade 2 agricultural land.</p> <p>2 Development is not permitted in view of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC Development Restrictions. The offer to provide a suitable alternative natural green space is not an adequate mitigation.</p> <p>3 It is not acceptable to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. This proposed development, plus Roman Park, would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which would overwhelm the capacity of this historic market town forever. The proposed development would also have a serious impact on Aldbury Parish, in particular on the hamlet of Tring Station (the West Ward of Aldbury Parish). Difficulties of access to, and parking at, the railway station itself would be exacerbated.</p> <p>4 There is no commitment from principal authorities and the NHS to fund additional infrastructure, e.g. new schools and health centres.</p> <p>5 Dacorum Borough Council should be seeking alternative brownfield sites and should finalise the new local plan in accordance with evolving government guidelines, before Green Belt land is sacrificed. If necessary, location Tr01 should be first be considered as a more appropriate site for development.</p>
<p>15A Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in</p>

	<p>urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>14 Fields End Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ER</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable</p>

	<p>location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>The White House Northfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QW</p>	<p>I would like to register, that in my opinion the proposed scheme to build a large 1400 home residential and ancillary mixed use development on the outskirts of Tring, should be rejected.</p> <p>It seems clear, that this development is unsuitable for this location on several strong grounds, which I think outweigh any argument that there are special considerations to allow this development.</p> <p>Firstly, the site is in the Green Belt. Not only that but it is an area of Green Belt that still retains a rural character, with much wildlife to preserve. It also bounds an AONB and is midway between 2 specially designated areas of historic Chilterns beechwood, which the Council is looking to protect.</p> <p>The site is currently grade 2 agricultural land, which is flat and easily accessible for machinery. It has become clear with recent World events, that food security is becoming a priority. The site has historically flooded, thus making it a poor choice for housing, as it will affect any future inhabitants mortgage applications and insurance.</p> <p>The proposed size of the development is totally out of scale with the town. The main streets in Tring, which feed the High Street are all only wide enough for 1 car to pass at a time, due to parked cars. The High Street itself, is only just wide enough for 2 vehicles. When there is a funeral or the Postman stops, it holds up the traffic and there is a tailback. The increased population would put too much strain on the road network, let alone the bridges across the canal and railway at the Bulbourne end, only being wide enough for 1 vehicle.</p> <p>We have a large amount of nocturnal wildlife, including owls and many bats, which would be detrimentally affected by the light pollution that such a development would emit. I have regularly seen moth enthusiasts coming to the area near the Nowers as it holds such a diversity of species. Tring wants to be a sustainable and Green town and saying that suburbanising green fields and open space is equivalent to the natural environment is false.</p>
<p>1 Danvers Croft Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LE</p>	<p>I write with objection to the above planning application:</p> <p>The area concerned is green belt and adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is also within 750 metres of the Ashridge Estate which has a moratorium on development.</p>

	<p>It includes an area of Special Conservation (Chiltern Beechwoods)</p> <p>It is grade 2 agricultural land . In a time with decreasing food security. And a need for increased UK production this will be vital in the Medium term.</p> <p>The development is out of proportion with both the population of Tring (this development would increase the population by Circa 42% . This massive increase EXCLUDES the impact on the Roman Park development to the west of Tring.</p> <p>Relevant to item 4 the town infrastructure is totally unable to cope with this level of development. The proposition for schools and or Doctors Surgery are outwith the remit of the developer's.</p> <p>This proposal ignores the current absence of a Dacorum Plan which was delayed in part because of the very considerable opposition.and in EVERY election address (all parties) described themselves as being in opposition to the original Dacorum Plan)</p> <p>If it is the intention that Tring should become a " New Town" then the appropriate consultation (including central government) should make this clear).</p> <p>I am not opposed to additional housing in Tring but this should be both gradual and proportionate</p>
<p>17 Mill Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ES</p>	<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>I write in response to the above application.</p> <p>I wish to object to this application being approved on a number of points.</p> <p>The proposed development is way to large for a small market town like Tring.We are already having land built on to the west of the town. The very considerable amount of extra traffic would make station road and ickniel way grid locked at peak times and un bearably busy at most other times as the developer has not even been asked to upgrade any roads.</p> <p>They say they are building two new schools but what about doctors dentists and many other infrastructure that is already under great pressure in this area with out another 1;400 properties to support. We also have very few shops left to do any shopping in meaning even more travelling.</p> <p>To call it a new village ,well the clue is in the name MARSHCROFT. And how will it be a new village when it is in fact joined to Tring.</p> <p>4). The land is grade 2 agricultural land and should therefore stay as that . A lot of people walk the lane and footpaths and get a lot of pleasure from the area being by the grand union canal. The canal will probably suffer increased litter and fly tipping by having housing so close to it ,just like other built up areas close to the canal. There is lots of wildlife there , a lot of which live in damp wet ground hence its name MARSHCROFT which must be protected. This application would do nothing to protect anything just destroy it.</p> <p>5). The land is very close to AONBs and the Chiltern Woodlands, both of which are under great pressure from too many people. With Aylesbury on our doorstep and getting nearer daily with the vast</p>

	<p>amount of housing being built there I strongly wish to see the council turn this development down.</p> <p>As just stated I very much hope the council sees sense and listens to people like me . We just cannot keep developing land on this scale ,(contrary to what the PM says) . We cannot live in ever more urban areas . We need green spaces more than ever and this proposal falls seriously short on a lot of points.</p> <p>I would like to see the council use its power constructively and turn this application DOWN 100%.</p>
<p>Northfield Grange Northfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QW</p>	<p>Dear sir/madam</p> <p>I strongly object to the Marshcroft development East of Tring application on the grounds that it is proposed to be built on greenbelt and grade 2 agricultural land. This is outrageous. It is also extremely proximate to AONB and Chilterns special area of conservation. The adverse implications for biodiversity and the wildlife are very concerning indeed. This sort of development should be built on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Ashridge is already under threat from increased visitors and now is not the time to introduce a large planning application with an increased threat to the environment. I am extremely concerned that such a huge proposal is even being considered in a such a rural area. This sort of planning should not be allowed to take place in green belt, prime agricultural land.</p>
<p>15 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We are writing to place our objection to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed

	<p>then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>Toms Hill Estate Toms Hill Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5SD</p>	<p>I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the planning application 22/01187/MOA proposing the construction of 1,400 new homes on the north side of Tring.</p> <p>To build housing on green belt land in an area of outstanding natural beauty would be violation of the environment and a wholesale dereliction of your duty to preserve the character of Tring as a finite market town.</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>

	<p>I would also add that nowhere have I seen that it is the intention of planners to merge towns with villages and in effect this proposed development does exactly that- encroaching on the houses around the station and over time no doubt creep towards the village of Aldbury.</p>
<p>8 Pages Croft Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1BX</p>	<p>This site is designated Green Belt land which should only be released in exceptional circumstances. Moreover the land is cultivated as grade 11 agricultural land, which should be kept as such as the UK needs to increase self-sufficiency in food. The site would be next to the Chilterns AONB and the size of the development would change the views from high points such as Ivinghoe Beacon. The site is also within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation so should not be allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>The developer does not state his contribution toward building infrastructure, such as schools, medical and dental surgeries. Until a new hospital is built to serve West Herts local hospital health care will continue to be under strain.</p> <p>A development of this size would also have an adverse effect on the small market town of Tring through increased traffic.</p>
<p>11 Highfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DX</p>	<p>I don't agree with the analysis that the majority of commuter traffic will be towards Hemel Hempstead, Berkhamsted and Aylesbury. I suspect there will be a significant amount of traffic towards Dunstable, Luton, Leighton Buzzard and Milton Keynes. This would have a major impact on the traffic using the canal and railway bridges at Bulbourne.</p> <p>I feel 1400 houses is a major step change which would be difficult to absorb into the existing town and community. There is insufficient parking in Tring for the additional vehicles.</p> <p>Having 1400 houses adjacent to Aldbury/Ashridge would devalue the beauty of these natural resources.</p> <p>Given our over reliance on imported food it would be a better strategy to keep the land as agricultural rather than housing.</p>
<p>4 Nursery Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HZ</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building on green belt land adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances. These circumstances have not been justified in the proposal. 2. Dacorum Borough Council's review of the availability of brownfield sites has not been completed, and any new planning application proposing to build on greenbelt land should be postponed until the review has been completed. 3. The development is excessive in scale and is inappropriate to Tring's current size, particularly considering the current development at Roman Park. 4. There is a more appropriate location for a development at TR01. <p>I do not oppose all housing growth for Tring, but it should be in a</p>

	location and at a scale appropriate to to the area.
<p>1 Grove Leys Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Response to Planning Application for Land East of Tring.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As many people are now able to work from home, are these new houses really needed? Why buy an expensive property in Tring when there are much cheaper homes available elsewhere? There has been a well-documented demographic shift to more affordable rural areas. 2. The Government's stated policy of levelling up and developing industry, commerce etc., in the Midlands and North, surely obviates the need for increased general housing in this locality. BUT see 3 below 3. This development provides the wrong type of private residential properties, which will produce huge profits for the Construction Company and landowners subject to section 106 or its replacement - see below. What Tring really requires to thrive, as an inclusive community, is more affordable housing for key workers and young people, developed by a Housing Association/shared ownership or other in conjunction with the Council. What provision is being made under Section 106 and its proposed replacement? 4. It will change the whole character of an historic market town. The sheer size of the proposed development will alter the whole environment from a homogeneous town, centered around the High Street, to an urban area split in two. 5. It will be a blot on the landscape in an area of outstanding natural beauty and damage the ecology of the area. 6. Marshcroft Lane is an important amenity for the people of Tring - a very popular walk, providing rural peace and charm, and leads to further footpaths along the canal and to Aldbury Nowers. Its value was highlighted during the Covid lockdown, when it proved essential for physical and mental health and wellbeing. Increased traffic along a narrow, one-laned road will render the Lane unusable for walkers. Coupled with the lack of view of the countryside this will render it useless 7. Though shops are planned for the proposed development, if these follow the usual pattern of suburban shops, they are likely only to sell daily essentials at a higher price than High Street stores. Therefore, it will increase the pressure on the existing car parks in the High Street, which are barely adequate at present, as new residents will wish to access cafes, restaurants, dentists, doctors, opticians, ironmongers, the weekly market etc. 8. Despite the by-pass, traffic in Tring High Street is problematic. Jams are frequent as delivery vans block the road and buses and lorries have difficulty in passing one another. Drivers from this proposed development will inevitably exacerbate the problem. 9. If a new secondary and primary school are built, this will increase traffic throughout the town (with its associated problems), as pupils will not be confined to the new development. At the beginning and end of the school day, traffic will be considerably increased throughout Tring. Moreover, from where will they get the teachers? 10. Building 1,400 dwellings is excessive. The new Roman Park development has provided a great number of extra houses in the area and many of these are still for sale. The full impact of these on local facilities on the station carpark, given they are at the "wrong end" of town is yet unknown. 11. As there are few "executive" jobs in the area, the proposed

	<p>development will be mainly inhabited by commuters, albeit some part-time, as working from home seems to be an increasing pattern. This development merely adds to the suburban sprawl which is plaguing the area. The expansion of Aylesbury eastwards, which is fast approaching the engulfment of Aston Clinton, should alert Dacorum Planning Authorities to the detrimental effects of large developments altering the characteristics of a town.</p> <p>12. Tring simply does not have the facilities or infrastructure to cope with an extra population of what will be at least 3,000 people. The proposed development includes very limited facilities. Additional pressure will be put on doctors, dentists, childcare, station parking and council services (for which the Planning Application makes no provision).</p> <p>13. What are the section 106 proposals other than the absolute minimum which seems to be included here? And, if it comes to being a development levy, what amount will recompense Tring for the loss of amenity that this proposal will incur? Please reject this proposal outright.</p>
<p>11 Highfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DX</p>	<p>We object to further loss of Green Belt Land. The Green Belt is there to preserve the identity of separate developments. Bleeding Tring into the hamlets of Bulbourne and Tring Station does not deliver a "sustainable community that will seamlessly integrate with Tring" (Summary Guide, para 3.1).</p> <p>The threat of such parasitic overdevelopment must also be repelled due to its damage to Tring's relationship with nearby Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The plan's provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) will not protect the beechwoods from further damaging recreational pressure, as people will not confine themselves to this development.</p> <p>Were this Grade 2 agricultural land to be lost, more of our food security would be gone forever.</p> <p>The roads north and south of the development are single carriageway with congestion and access difficulties which would worsen with extra traffic. Travelling to nearby towns from the north of the planned development for employment, and elsewhere for leisure, is already problematic with a traffic light controlled bridge over the railway and a narrow canal bridge on Icknield Way.</p> <p>It is the county council which provides schools. A development of 1400 dwellings could not support a new secondary school - that land would be used to further inflate the population.</p> <p>The impact of over 200 homes to the west of our pressurized Tring has yet to be felt fully. The infrastructure is already at breaking point e.g.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The main doctor's surgery has a tiny carpark and barely copes. 2. Brook Street is barely passable. 3. Tring Station carpark (pre-Covid) was full before 8am, causing people to drive to other stations on the line to Euston. 4. Tring's car parks can hardly cope.

	<p>5. Tesco seems to be trading to capacity. 6. The narrow High Street's pavements are cramped.</p> <p>Save our Tring.</p>
<p>19 Longfield Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DN</p>	<p>It is self evident that a development of this scale in context of the locality which is already stretched for infrastructure, roads, amenities, health etc is totally inappropriate and should be massively scaled down or rejected.</p>
<p>2 Sinfield Place Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5FE</p>	<p>I could list all the reasons not for this planning to go ahead like the other comments (I agree with them all) but hand on heart you know this development is completely wrong for Tring!!!</p> <p>The land is green belt and green belt was put in place for a reason! Never should it be built on.</p> <p>It is a place which I walk weekly (and with my children) and for it to turn in to a concrete jungle is devastating. For physical and mental health our countryside should stay countryside! Once it's gone it will never be countryside again and that is heartbreaking.</p> <p>The last 2 years has proven that we need our countryside more than ever! When we couldn't do anything 'normal' we could still walk in our countryside. Those memories of our lockdown walks will last with me forever as my children were happy, carefree and outdoors in fresh air.</p> <p>Please do the right thing and reject this planning application.</p>
<p>6 Albany Terrace Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HP</p>	<p>I am writing this to inform you that I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring

	<p>when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>6. The development builds upon an area with an abundance of Wildlife. Bats, hedgehogs - both of which are a protected, endangered species, we are meant to be protecting.</p> <p>7. These types of areas offer us great defences against flooding, and climate change. The more trees, fields we have, the better flooding protection.</p> <p>8. The area offers beautiful walks for the local people of Tring. This is hugely important for peoples health, and mental health.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>Appleby Wharf Lane Northchurch Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 3TG</p>	<p>Overall, DBC needs to revise its Local Plan to take account of all the issues raised in the consultation before any such major development is considered.</p> <p>Local Councillors realized finally how important it was to review the changing needs of the area in the light of changing work practices post pandemic. Also the high value local residents place on protecting the Green Belt. I understand that work is underway to look at urban and brownfield sites before sacrificing any further Green Belt land. This proposal takes a significant area of Green Belt land next to an AONB and should therefore be rejected at this stage.</p> <p>I believe there was a recent decision to halt all development on the Chiltern Beechwood's SAC near Ashridge and Tring. I believe this is another reason that this application should not proceed.</p> <p>The size of the proposed development is completely out of proportion with Tring taken with the existing development at Roman Park. It would ruin the essential nature of this attractive market town.</p> <p>There is insufficient infrastructure in this community to service such an increase in population. Developers depend on HCC and the NHS to provide these and that is by no means guaranteed.</p> <p>Please revise the Local Plan and allow the moderate additional housing in Tring to meet local need without sacrificing Green Belt land.</p>
<p>11 Mortimer Hill Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JT</p>	<p>We very strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on a site which is in entirety designated as green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is a tantamount to ecological vandalism. Green Belt can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances. These proposals fail to demonstrate exceptional circumstances (see National Planning Policy Framework revised 20.7.21 in particular paragraphs 147-9). Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to

	<p>build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. Local Planning Authorities have complete discretion on whether or not to accept a hybrid application. We urge DBC not to accept this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed site has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation) March 2022. This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. This protection is key if we to prevent any further impacts upon those estates. - The site is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland - The development is on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. - Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. Developers proposals of additional schools and health centres are not at all guaranteed, as this is a hybrid planning application. Proposals ignore extra demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. - Developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution' - To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. In particular, the proposed land for development on Marshcroft lane is so close to the AONB that the disputation cause by the 11 years of development would have a significantly greater impact on the nature and biodiversity of not just the surrounding green belt but also the AONB - I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). - On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .
<p>94 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BZ</p>	<p>With the recent and ongoing large housing development at the other end side of Tring (top of Ickniel Way), this further over development of green belt land will absolutely ruin the charatcer of our once small market town. On top of thid other development it's completely disporportionate to any population increase. There is not enough parking in town currently due to the recent developments expanding Tring. Places at surgeries, dental surgeries and schools are already like gold dust and waiting times are getting ever longer. The only major supermarket in Tring which also serves the surrounding villages cannot cope with the number of shoppers it has presently and simply</p>

	<p>put Tring is just too small to take in yet more families. Overdevelopment has already had a tangible detrimental impact on the current lives of residents in Tring and the services that we receive. As we've all had a raise in Council Taxes to pay for a poorer quality of service it is objectionable that this proposal is even being considered.</p>
<p>21 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>This plan is just ludicrous - 1400 houses in greenbelt. What about the wildlife, the greenspace, the fact that this area is used by hundreds of local people to walk, run, cycle and enjoy the countryside without any need to get into their cars.</p> <p>We are being urged to protect the environment, reduce our carbon footprint and for Britain to use our own agricultural land yet this plan is being considered and it goes against all of these.</p> <p>The hedgerows will be destroyed just like at the other end of Tring. Hasn't Tring already taken far more than their share of housing? I urge our planners to see sense and reject these plans before we completely ruin the lovely town of Tring and the countryside around it, please do not bow down to the developers who will just make their money and move on!!</p>
<p>Grove Fields Residents Association Tring HP23 5PJ</p>	<p>I am the Chairman of the Grove Fields Residents Association (GFRA). The GFRA objects to the planning application (22/01187/MOA), the GFRA objection is on behalf of our 572 members who are all residents of the local area. The GFRA objects to this planning application because it proposes:</p> <p>1) To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2) To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3) To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4) Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5) To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>31 Friars Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4AP</p>	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. In the wider context of a worldwide climate emergency it is extremely important not to build on green belt land with all the effects on the environment, flora and fauna that this would entail.</p> <p>The green belt land is very close to areas of outstanding natural beauty and exceptional circumstances have not been shown to justify building on it.</p> <p>The land has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC and this protection should be observed rather than the area being built on. The outcome of the previous local plan consultation showed that an increase in population in Tring would have adverse effects on the Ashridge estate and Tring Woodland. These should be preserved for current and future generations, not ruined or destroyed.</p> <p>The scale of the building is totally inappropriate to the current size of Tring and the need for the number of houses has not been shown. As it would be on top of the current Roman Park development, together they would increase the population by 34%. This would both change the character of this historic town forever and totally overwhelm the current infrastructure capacity. This includes local health and education facilities as well as the major impact of more cars and pollution. It is unrealistic in the extreme to think that new occupants would not use cars, particularly in the absence of a good local bus service.</p> <p>Tring is a small market town with a wonderful friendly character. It would be ruined by such a massive increase in population and detract from the quality of life of those living here.</p> <p>Although additional infrastructure of schools and health centres are mentioned these are to be provided by local authorities and the NHS and there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. In current economic climate it is unlikely, in my view, that funding will be readily available.</p> <p>Finally the length of time given to read and digest the planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) was very short and more time should be given to the public to review and respond to them.</p>
<p>19 Elm Tree Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EB</p>	<p>I object to this proposal.</p> <p>This is an overdevelopment Destroy natural habitats, including hedgerows a nationally threatened habitat and route way.</p>

	<p>Changing small market town character. Towns infrastructure already under strain will not cope. Roads are in poor condition, schools oversubscribed and waiting time/inability to access local health care. Will only be made worse by additional population from this development. These proposed improvements to Tring's infrastructure are not guaranteed or financed by the developers - it will be up to local authorities to provide.</p> <p>Already had development to West of town Roman Park, no new school was built although was in the original plans. Would expect the same here, the land set aside for schools, would eventually become extra house.</p> <p>Deterioration in quality of life for many residents of Tring. Pressure on services and amenities and also disruption, noise and air pollution throughout the many years of construction.</p> <p>Quite simply this development is UNSUSTAINABLE, it will not meet the needs of Tring's population today nor the needs of future generations.</p> <p>It is a greenfield site surrounded by an area of Natural Beauty, brownfield sites in towns e.g. Watford and Hemel should be redeveloped to meet the additional housing needs in the area. Not changing Tring from a small town into one with a population increased by 40%.</p> <p>I object to this proposal.</p>
<p>1 Astley Place Station Road Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QX</p>	<p>I object to the planned Marshcroft development for the following reasons;</p> <p>1. Building on green belt land in close proximity to the AONB. Green belt land is precious and any building/development should only be undertaken as a last resort. The pandemic gave everyone a much stronger appreciation of the value of wild countryside and open space and this should be available for the enjoyment not just of residents but of the many people who choose to visit every year for recreation. This will be lost with a development of this size and nature and there are far more suitable areas for development to take place on brown belt land or in already urban areas. Building on the green belt will detrimentally affect the AONB, and is likely to lead to further development of this land, which completely undermines the designation of land as green belt/AONB in the first place.</p> <p>With so much focus on sustainability and environment, it does not make any sense at all to sacrifice yet more green belt land to building, especially when it is not clear that inner city/town office buildings will ever be utilised in the same way again, creating an opportunity for new housing in existing built-up areas close to existing facilities and particularly suitable for the young and elderly people for whom suitable housing is most needed.</p> <p>2. There is no plan to fund the planned facilities such as schools, leisure facilities and doctors surgeries described in the plan. These facilities would only be required due to the size of the development and are not of any benefit at all to existing residents. Current residents of Tring and the surrounding area value the countryside and open</p>

	<p>space and do not choose to live in the area for 'facilities' which can be found in existing urban towns, if needed. Furthermore, the plans for 'open space' within the development, which is presented as a positive, completely fail to take into account that the area at present is entirely an open space, perfect for dog-walking and recreation and so there is no requirement whatsoever for 'open space facilities'.</p> <p>3. The size of the development is out of all proportion to the size of Tring, and would be to the detriment of local communities, damaging the character of the area and putting an unacceptable strain on infrastructure including traffic and parking, and increasing the flood risk for both new and existing residents. Even with the existing transport links it is inevitable that residents will use cars to get around and this must be taken into account to reflect the reality of modern life, rather than what we might wish it to be!</p> <p>4. Such a huge development must be considered alongside a plan for the county/country. There is a reason why Dacorum rejected this area for development in the local plan and this should be respected in the current decision-making process.</p>
<p>67 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Please note that I have the following objections to the 'Marshcroft Garden Suburb' proposed development.</p> <p>The building is proposed on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. No exceptional circumstances have been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be completed, and the new local plan should be finalised before any plans like this are considered.</p> <p>Building on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation) is proposed. This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>This plan is to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and proper planning put in place so that it does not have an adverse effect on the town.</p>
<p>2 Grove Leys Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam,</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in</p>

	<p>urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>I have lived in or around Tring for the past 28 years and have witnessed the rapid development of the town. I believe any further expansion of Tring will require significant investment in its infrastructure (e.g. Schools, Medical Services, Roads etc.). I object to this specific planning application based on the above points. However, I also object to any further expansion of Tring unless there is a clear and unambiguous investment plan that is aligned to the planning application.</p>
<p>9 Malting Lane Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RH</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. The proposed land for the development is cultivated as high quality Grade 2 agricultural land, adjoining and informing the setting of the Chilterns AONB. Recent experience consequent upon the conflict in Ukraine has emphasised the importance of the UK sustaining agricultural land for future needs when supplies from other countries may be compromised.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. The development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring. The proposed Marshcroft development and the in-progress Roman Park estate will increase the population of Tring by an estimated 34%.</p>

	<p>Such an increase will severely test an already overloaded existing infrastructure, any additional infrastructure notwithstanding. Thus, the character of Tring as a historic market town will be irreparably damaged and changed forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres. Such infrastructure is to be provided by Hertfordshire County Council, Dacorum Borough Council and the National Health Service. Each of these bodies are, and will be for the foreseeable future, subject to significant financial pressures. None of the named bodies have yet committed to providing additional infrastructure. Further, the proposal ignores the consequent additional demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.</p> <p>Additionally,</p> <p>1. The proposal does not address the time scale of the development between 2022 and 2033) and the consequent adverse impacts (e.g. construction and associated traffic; loss of amenity; increased demand on local resources). There is no acknowledgement of developer obligations to address the adverse impacts, particularly those affecting neighbouring residents.</p> <p>2. Throughout the development time scale and thereafter, there are two traffic pinch points in close proximity to the site; the Station Road bridge over the Grand Union Canal and the railway bridge adjacent to Tring Station. Whatever measures are taken to mitigate the increase in traffic at these locations (e.g. alternate flow traffic lights, and strengthened bridge structures), the impact of heavy construction vehicles and other traffic is likely to be significant.</p>
<p>27 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale of the development is enormous compared to the current size of Tring. It will completely alter the character of the market town. 2. The current infrastructure cannot support 1400 new homes (and by default thousands more people). This proposed development, together with the recent one at Roman Park, will increase the population of Tring by 34%. 3. The proposed development is entirely on Greenbelt land. 4. Brownfield sites should be considered first. 5. The opportunistic timing of the application while the revised Local Plan has yet to be agreed and published. 6. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of Brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the Greenbelt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new Local Plan should be finished before any Greenbelt is sacrificed. 7. The proposed major development is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. 8. The area, being undeveloped land, is currently unlit and does not suffer from light pollution that could adversely affect wildlife. 9. The impact on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (i.e. Ashridge and Tring Woods specifically) needs proper attention and mitigation, endorsed by Natural England to satisfy the legal requirements of a

	Habitats Regulations Assessment.
<p>East View 25 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>We strongly object to this application due to.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Green Belt Land - should be protected in line with original green belt aims to prevent urban sprawl. Arguably the area east of Tring is the first large area of green space west of London. 2. AONB - Tring is the Gateway Town to the Chilterns AONB, the site is overlooked by some of the finest wild life sites in Herts. 3. Dacorum Development Plan - A new local plan is proposed, to be submitted in October 2025, with a further public consultation to be held in June 2023. No ad hoc decisions should be taken before this date. 4. Local Infrastructure - Tring is a small market town, the facilities offered can only accommodate the needs of the present population. In particular medical facilities and reliance on hospitals outside the area already coping with the needs of large towns. Additionally the road infrastructure giving access to the site is inadequate, both Bulbourne Road and Station Road/Cow Lane already carry large volumes of traffic accessing the A41 and onward to the M25. 5. Tring Character - Tring has a unique character and architectural style, this should not be put at risk by being overwhelmed by the current excessive building schemes. 6. Environmental impact - As already mentioned this is green belt land and should not be lost to such a development. The impact of such a large built up area on the local wild life and the pollution caused by so many vehicles accessing the site both during construction and when occupied, is immeasurable. 7. We suggest you take a walk, with the Tring Town Council members, along the Ridgeway Path at Aldbury Nowers to visualise the impact such a development would have on Tring and the surrounding area!
<p>58 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object strongly to this application as it is building on green belt land which is next to a area of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The size and scale of this development is inappropriate to the size of Tring along with the Roman park development it will increase the size of the population by 34% which will spoil the character and infrastructure of tring .</p> <p>I know housing is needed but should be within keeping of the area and other brown sites could be utilised first.nearer to the town .</p> <p>I do hope that as a council that you give this a lot of consideration and think about the residents of Tring .</p>
<p>9 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the reasons set out by all the other comments, but also due to the fact there are so many brownfied sites locally that could be proposed for any such development or certainly sites that are not so agriculturally viable.</p> <p>These fields are harvested every year and with world supply diminishing due to conflict and cost we need to maintain local supply.</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the reasons set out by all the other comments, but also due to the fact there are so many brownfied sites locally that could be proposed for any such development or certainly sites that are not so agriculturally viable.</p>

	<p>These fields are harvested every year and with world supply diminishing due to conflict and cost we need to maintain local supply. I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) for the reasons set out by all the other comments, but also due to the fact there are so many brownfied sites locally that could be proposed for any such development or certainly sites that are not so agriculturally viable. These fields are harvested every year and with world supply diminishing due to conflict and cost we need to maintain local supply.</p>
<p>64 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>7 Albany Terrace Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HP</p>	<p>I object to planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to be completed, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on green belt land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of

	<p>Conservation), provides protection to the green belt near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal plans to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale of this size is inappropriate to the current size of Tring ie this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure, eg new schools and health centres, stated to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS. There is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. It seems pointless to build on a Green Belt location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring which is within a location which minimises an impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure, ie the High Street and A41.</p> <p>On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>49 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>My comments are as follows: Such a large development with plans to build such a large set of housing simply cannot be structured into the current road network of the surrounding area. Even with the proposed additions to the network, the influx of traffic will add to the already strained infrastructure in Tring. The noise pollution of the added traffic will add strain to residential roads, adding busy traffic sections to roads that simply were not designed for such a large volume of traffic.</p> <p>I have concerns over the ecological impact this will have on the surrounding green areas, with an impact on flooding and drainage in local areas. An increasing loss of hedgerows and native species in the area will highlight the loss of the ever-shrinking greenbelt and the surrounding areas of the Tring area.</p>
<p>1 Fantail Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EN</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring</p>

	<p>Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>29 Kingsley Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5DN</p>	<p>Dear sir or madam</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides legal protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides legal protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>19 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>We strongly and wholeheartedly OBJECT to this proposal because it proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Brownfield sites should always be prioritised in the first instance. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should

	<p>be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. - To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. - Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. - Put simply, green spaces like these are vital for the wellbeing of local residents and wildlife. - On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.
<p>Ivy Todd Northchurch Common Berkhamsted Hertfordshire HP4 1LR</p>	<p>This is Green Belt/AONB Land and should therefore be protected areas. DBC have declared a climate and ecological emergency and these proposals which would have an extremely detrimental effect on our Chiltern countryside, its AONB and the market town of Tring.</p>
<p>43 lower ickniel way Marsworth Hp23 4ln</p>	<p>I write to strongly object to this proposal. It is get too many houses on greenbelt. I do not fit one minute believe in the schools being built as I have seen this countless times in other similar proposals and nothing has happened. Far too big a project which will change the character of Tring forever.</p>
<p>36 Chiltern Way Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5LD</p>	<p>I have lived in Chiltern Way in Tring for more than 10 years. From experience of the ability of the present area and its facilities to cope with the present population without failing, I make the following comments about this proposal: The scheme would build on beautiful 'green belt' land, when this action has not been justified. Building on this area of land is protected, which this scheme appears to just ignore. The sale of building is far from reasonable for a single new development in this area and is inappropriate. With no new schools, doctors' surgeries, hospitals, police and fire authorities planned for this area, in conjunction with the development, the proposal seems irresponsible. My family and myself are well aware of the need for additional housing, but this needs to be built in a well considered manner and discussed and agreed with Planners, not pushed into a great money-making exercise by a developer on an unsuitable area to spoil and overload the town of Tring.</p>

<p>5 Queen Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6BQ</p>	<p>This application seems like a logical next step for a mid sized market town like Tring.</p> <p>1/If you are a young family with a desire to settle here you are currently unable to purchase a property (cost and supply issues)</p> <p>2/ If you are looking to live close enough to walk or cycle to the train station you are constrained by the availability of housing in the Grove area</p> <p>3/ Tring Town needs more footfall for the local businesses to be viable (we have a number of vacant shops in the High st and this will get worse without an economic injection like 1400 houses)</p> <p>4/ Tring School has extra capacity built in and to my understanding our Primary schools have never been full in the last 20 years</p> <p>5/ The extra schools and sports facilities are most welcome.</p>
<p>1 Fog Cottages Tring Station Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QP</p>	<p>I wish to register my objection to Planning application 22/01187/MOA for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. It proposes to build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to be completed, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. It is a, hybrid application, therefore without detail for the whole of the proposed site and as such, in the current circumstances where the new strategic plan is not yet completed, should be rejected until such time as the plan is ready. It is too large a proposed development to be allowed to slip through.</p> <p>3. It proposes to build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to a zone of influence within a 12.6km radius of the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland, directly within which this proposal is planning a very large scale development. It proposes to build on a site that is currently cultivated as Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally it has become evident, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over farmland It proposes a large development which would be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, and Ashridge thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character</p> <p>6. It proposes to build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park would increase the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>7. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, are proposed to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from</p>

these public bodies to do so. Current provision for Schools, hospitals and GPs and supporting care is already overstretched and professionals to support increased demand in the area are, and will be, in very short supply.

8. Water and sewage supply and services are already under strain in this area and this huge increased demand is likely to exacerbate both to the detriment of current residents. Thames water are more and more frequently called out to attend sewage problems and water pressure issues already. Also broadband/electricity supplies - no mention of how they will address this in an ecological way and to not add further strain to local services.

9. There is no commitment from HCC or any transport body to provide public transport of any kind for the residents of this proposed development. Tring Station car park is very expensive and was already unable to fulfil pre-lockdown demand. Usage is building steadily again but it would be most likely that people would be dropped off rather than park at the station increasing the already hazardous road and pedestrian conditions at morning and evening peaks.

10. Station Rd is already a very busy road with current levels of usage. Adding likely over 1,000 additional household vehicles and new road access to the development would be completely inappropriate for a 2 lane road in this location causing severe additional safety hazards and congestion. Bulborne road is already very constrained by the signalled one way bridge so is obviously not an appropriate access road.

11. Building on this location would essentially join the main town of Tring to the tiny hamlet of Tring Station. This has always been stated as something that should be avoided in rural town developments.

12. There is also just one reasonably sized (Tesco) supermarket in the area which services all the small villages as well as many from Berkhamsted. There is no space with suitable access to locate additional large stores within the surrounds of Tring town so service an additional 1,000 or more households.

13. It proposes to build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.

I am not averse to housing growth for Tring, however, however I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring, and a good percentage of properties priced in keeping with average local household incomes, not average value of the housing stock in the area. It should also be located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41).

I only found out about this application by word of mouth which is very poor for a proposal of this size to be located less than a mile from where I live and particularly given the very short time allowed for responding, shortened by the application having been submitted prior to a long holiday weekend. In addition, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review,

	digest and respond.
<p>32 Station Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NW</p>	<p>I wish to object to the planning application 22/01187/MOA because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>I am against so much housing growth for Tring, as I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>4 Nursery Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HZ</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is

	<p>inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>32 Morefields Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EU</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>Beech Cottage Fox Road Wigginton Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6EE</p>	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to register my opposition to the above planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The scale of the proposal is completely out of proportion and will put severe pressure on the current infrastructure of the town. Already there is an increase in the amount of traffic and pollution and lack of adequate facilities.</p> <p>Green belt land should be preserved at all costs and alternative brown land should be used first. Green and open spaces are essential for well being and people who live in the area should not have their pleasure in the environment and their surroundings compromised.</p> <p>Another point that I would like to draw to your attention is the short time limit in which people can respond to the proposal. I think it is disingenuous for the Council to make such a short deadline, given the complexity of the proposal, as it does not allow for proper consultation and discussion.</p>
<p>10 Grove Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PX</p>	<p>I am writing to object to planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed</p>

	<p>then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>The run off of water with added phosphates and Nitrates that will no doubt enter the local watercourse will always be a problem.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>The Copper House 30 New Mill Terrace Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5ET</p>	<p>We have recently been made aware of planning application (22/01187/MOA). We object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. Given that the name Tring is believed to derive from the Old English Tredunga or Trehangr, 'Tre' meaning tree and 'ing' implying a slope where trees grow we believe it's important to protect the green spaces and trees of the area. (Source https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tring) 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>We are not against housing growth for Tring, however, we believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for</p>

	the public to review, digest and respond.
<p>The Granary Marshcroft Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QN</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. 5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. <p>We am not against housing growth for Tring, however, we believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>1 Fantail Lane Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4EN</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning

	<p>to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>66 Grove Road Tring HP23 5PD</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p>

	<p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Hillview 45 Stock Road Aldbury HP23 5RT</p>	<p>Dear Sirs / Madam,</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. 4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. <p>I have lived in or around Tring for the past 28 years and have witnessed the rapid development of the town. I believe any further expansion of Tring will require significant investment in its infrastructure (e.g. Schools, Medical Services, Roads etc.). I object to this specific planning application based on the above points. However, I also object to any further expansion of Tring unless there is a clear and unambiguous investment plan that is aligned to the planning application.</p>
<p>33 Stoneycroft Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RP</p>	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p>

	<p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond ."</p>
<p>The Grove House 63 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should</p>

	<p>be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond</p>
<p>1 The Beeches Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NP</p>	<p>Totally agree with all the other comments, so I won't repeat myself. This development will ruin and spoil what Tring is all about. Wildlife, trees, Green belt, open spaces, peace, quiet and tranquility. Many open, long lovely walks on and around the canal . Tring has so much character and is known for its beauty and visited by many. Station road is and can be a busy road. It's currently very bumpy and not maintained. This will only get worse. It's a place I often run/walk with the dogs and we love it. It's great for our health both physically and mentally. One of the many reasons we chose to move here. I often hear friends and others say how beautiful Tring is and how much they love visiting. Please let's not ruin this by over building and populating, especially In this area. There surely has been enough new homes in Tring already. Can another area be considered. For the new homes recently built where is the new infrastructure, health centres, schools, new roads. Old roads being maintained.</p>
<p>57 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation) is unacceptable. This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41) and should not be on green belt land.</p> <p>Due to the scale of planning application documents a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>

<p>6 Nursery Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HZ</p>	<p>We strongly object to this planning application. Any proposals on this scale on green belt land should not be considered before the availability of brownfield sites has been assessed and before the local plan has been finalised. Tring enjoys a unique setting adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and Beechwoods SAC. This offers protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring woodland. We consider this proposal totally out of proportion for a town of Tring's size offering little in the way of additional guaranteed infrastructure. Any suggestion that the proposed new garden suburb (suburb: an outlying district of a city) will "protect and enhance (the) existing landscape....to increase biodiversity" and "....enhance environmental sustainability to tackle climate change" is complete greenwashing.</p>
<p>Copper Beech 46 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PD</p>	<p>I object to the planning application for a number of reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is an extensive development on green belt land which cannot be justified. - There is no consideration for the existing trees, hedgerows and wildlife on the site. - The scale is extremely excessive and inappropriate given the current size of Tring. - There is not the infrastructure to support the additional population. The local schools are already under pressure with the existing housing on the other side of Tring and a school needs to be built on the other side of Tring so that children can attend without driving across town. There's no suitable supermarket - I'm concerned about the roads and access to the site as they are not suitable for the existing traffic. There is no decent route to the A41 for a development of this size - the existing route via Cow Lane would not be suitable as there is already a significant issue on this route when junior training is on at the rugby and football clubs (which results in kids walking on the road while there are still cars driving fast down the thin road - it is already an accident waiting to happen). - There is no consideration for where the excess water will go given that the area already floods in heavy rain - There's no consideration for the other issues already in Tring (such as the parking issues along Cow Lane) <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring, located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41) and be a part of the overall planning for the town (rather than this significant stand alone request).</p>
<p>65 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BX</p>	<p>Central Tring itself has a very poor road layout, based originally on Victorian road layouts and lanes. Traffic chaos often occurs if a delivery takes place anywhere in Tring High Street at peak times due to its very narrow width. The roads which link to central Tring (eg Frogmore Street, Miswell Lane, Brook Street, Akeman Street) all have very narrow sections which rely on drivers giving way and are effectively one way traffic. Central Tring cannot cope with a significant increase in Traffic. There is no scope to widen or improve the traffic flows unless substantial one way systems were to be introduced, and very widescale restrictions on car parking on the roads in a Victorian</p>

	<p>town which has no scope for parking elsewhere for the residents. Station Road is a busy route to the station which floods whenever it rains. This has never been sorted out, and the whole area gets waterlogged relatively easily. The extensive disruption caused by the proposed development will cause chaos, especially given the need to cut through the only pedestrian and cycle route between Tring Town and Tring Station, which can get very busy.</p> <p>There are better sites closer to Tring, and closer to the bypass (TR01 ?), where the extensive construction traffic can be kept away from the currently congested and at times dangerous roads around Tring and access the bypass relatively easily.</p> <p>Pre-Covid, Tring Station Car Park was often overflowing. It was often not possible to park there on weekdays after mid morning. More homes would mean more commuters from Tring and hence the car park would become full much earlier, so a solution to this is fundamental to any development going ahead. However, the station car park is in an AONB, so cannot just be expanded.</p> <p>The proposed developments all take up very large swathes of green belt land. Whilst the developers and planners say that other areas can be designated Green Belt in their place, this is a fundamental principle at stake. The landowners and developers who have bought Green Belt land at agricultural rates (when Green Belt was more sacrosanct) now stand to make a great deal of profit for themselves. It will also open the floodgates for further land speculation and development if the principle of de-classifying large swathes of Green Belt around Tring is allowed to go ahead. There have to be some clear principles invoked and very clear guidelines and rules on when Green Belt can stop being Green belt. Not just to suit which developer puts plans forward for any area of land that they happen to own. It must also not lead to creeping development.</p> <p>There is currently no commitment to provide any new schools or health centres, and the developer does not actually care about these. It will therefore cause major issues if the houses start before the required schooling and health requirements are catered for.</p> <p>Very major infrastructure improvements are needed well in advance of any works of any scale starting.</p>
<p>Pathside 51 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and</p>

	<p>change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p> <p>Also concerned that the provision of local amenities eg school etc will not be met as is the case on many development plans</p> <p>Also as a resident who would be directly affected, no written notice of the planning application was received.</p>
<p>1 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes: To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages)</p>

	<p>a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>69 Beaconsfield Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4DW</p>	<p>How could anyone looking at this plan not object to the size of this development. It will ruin Tring with a potential immediate addition of 4,000 people, which will increase as the population ages. There are so many areas that this is catastrophic for Tring - a small market town already increased recently by a high number of new housing. Schools, doctors, hospitals, parking etc. etc. What will impact hugely is the lack of jobs in Tring. This will mean a massive increase in traffic (another 2,800 cars immediately?). The A41, which, although OK during the day, has regular accidents, queues at both ends and was originally designed as a motorway. It was downgraded to an A road with dangerously short slip roads and no hard shoulder. The regular breakdowns and accidents have to be attended by blue light police vehicles. The increase in cars affect parking and more impactful the environment. Looking at your site, and specifically the "Local Character" section, Tring will change in every aspect (not the character of buildings that this seems to centre on), but the fact that it is a small market town surrounded by green belt. How on earth has this been allowed to have even progressed this far. Have any of the planners used Station Road. I foresee many, many accidents (there are plenty already) both along this road and the junction with Cow Lane. Just in case this is not clear - I object very strongly on every level.</p>
<p>11 Harcourt Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JJ</p>	<p>Dear Sir or Madam I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes: To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should</p>

	<p>be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>45 Stocks Road Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5RT</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>I believe any further expansion of Tring will require significant investment in its infrastructure (e.g. Schools, Medical Services, Roads etc.). I object to this specific planning application based on the above points. However, I also object to any further expansion of Tring unless there is a clear and unambiguous investment plan that is aligned to the planning application.</p>
<p>17 New Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5EY</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council is currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. 2. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. 3. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.

	<p>4. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>5. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>9 Clarkes Spring Aldbury Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5QL</p>	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>

<p>5 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes: To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed. To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon. To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever. Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so. To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment. I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>7 Mortimer Hill Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JT</p>	<p>Dear Sirs, I would like to express a strong objection to the outlandish scale of this planning application. Apart from the plan to build on Green Field sites , which is highly undesirable anyway, the proposed size and out of town location is unwarranted. This is particularly so, considering the size of the estate currently being built on the western end of Tring. Despite Government directives on house building, the inevitable impact of this development and then coupled with the above planning proposal, on local services, traffic etc is, we believe is untenable for Tring. The ruination of the countryside to meet so-called housing needs is not justified when alternative brown field sites can be found, despite the eagerness of developers to capitalise on the housing needs.</p>
<p>11 Harcourt Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JJ</p>	<p>I want to add my voice to those who are objecting to the Planning Application for 1,400 houses - 22/01187/MOA. As a resident of Tring since the early 1980's, I have grown to enjoy its many amenities as a small town. The Planning Application would bring so many more</p>

	<p>houses that the small town element of Tring would be lost with no other improvements by way of compensation for the excessive growth.</p> <p>My colleagues, neighbours and friends in Tring have listed a number of objections with which I agree:-</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p>
<p>7 Bunyan Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PS</p>	<p>I am writing to object, in the strongest possible terms, to the planning application 22/01187/MOA proposing the construction of 1,400 new homes on the north side of Tring.</p> <p>In short, to build housing on green belt land in an area of outstanding natural beauty would be violation of the environment and a wholesale dereliction of your duty to preserve the character of Tring as a finite market town.</p> <p>I recognise the need for more *affordable* homes, and reluctantly concede that the current sizeable development at Roman Park as necessary expansion of the town's housing capacity.</p> <p>But the proposed urban sprawl would be wholly unacceptable vandalism - and on what legal basis is Tring expected to shoulder the burden of house-building way above the national average?</p> <p>If this proposed development is not stopped, you will be turning Tring into a suburb of Milton Keynes and destroying the town's character forever. It will greatly damage the green belt.</p> <p>Specifically, in line with many other residents, my objections are as follows:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not</p>

	<p>been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS. However, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring; however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (more than 5,500 pages), a longer time period than the deadline 4 May 2022 should be provided for council taxpayers to review, digest and respond to this ecological outrage.</p> <p>Why must the population of Tring be expanded by 34 per cent?</p>
<p>85 Grove Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PY</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p>

	<p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond.</p>
<p>46 Grove Gardens Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PX</p>	<p>Destroying any green belt land is surely bad for any area, however in Tring we are surrounded by such beautiful scenery that to wipe it off the map would be even worse.</p>
<p>15 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HA</p>	<p>I wish to object to the above planning application because it has been proposed before Dacorum Borough Council has finalised its Local Plan.</p> <p>Our local councillors are aware that there is strong opposition to building on this particular site for many reasons, not least of which are that it is Green Belt land, near an AONB and five SSI sites and also near a BBOWT site.</p> <p>The number and type of houses needed in Tring has again not been finalised. A development of this size in this position is out of proportion to the size of Tring. It also impinges on an area of outstanding national beauty which should be protected and cherished.</p> <p>The question of where to build new homes is an important one. It needs input from many bodies, full consideration of other sites and options and a longer period for full public discussion. This application should not be approved.</p>
<p>9 Brookfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 4ED</p>	<p>I strongly oppose this application for building on this fertile farmland. This application has also been submitted in an underhand way, trying to force a decision before any proposed changes are made to the DBC Local Plan. DBC are still working on its Local Plan and with Government policy being recalled for revision the development of this site clearly does not meet with Government's recently announced policy plan to safeguard Green Belt and to focus development on brown field sites. It will also contravene the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which protects the setting of AONBs.</p> <p>I look forward to seeing this application rejected and for DBC to subsequently re circulate an amended Local Plan for further comment following the change of Governmental policy.</p>
<p>64 Wingrave Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5HE</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not</p>

	<p>been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>5 Beech Walk Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JQ</p>	<p>I object to this development. This is greenbelt and should never be built on. I totally agree with the other the other comments that disagree with the development. It is an ecological disaster with regards to loss of wildlife. The promises of schools, GP surgeries, shops etc will probably never get built. This must be stopped.</p>
<p>1 Dundale Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5BS</p>	<p>I object to the planning application (22/01187/MOA) because it proposes:</p> <p>To build on green belt land which is also adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Exceptional circumstances have not been provided to justify building on green belt land. Dacorum Borough Council are currently reviewing the availability of brownfield sites in urban areas to minimise the need to build on the green belt - this review should be allowed to complete, and the new local plan should be finalised before any green belt is sacrificed.</p> <p>To build on land which has the protection of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (Special Area of Conservation). This provides protection to green belt land near the Ashridge Estate and Tring Woodland which the proposal is planning to develop houses upon.</p> <p>To build on a scale that is inappropriate to the current size of Tring i.e. this development plus Roman Park increases the population of Tring by 34%, which will 'break' the capacity of local infrastructure and change the character of this historic market town forever.</p> <p>Additional infrastructure e.g. new schools and health centres, that is to be provided by the local authorities (Hertfordshire County Council and</p>

	<p>Dacorum Borough Council) and NHS, however, there is currently no commitment from these public bodies to do so.</p> <p>To build on a location east of Tring when there is a more suitable location (TR01), closer to the A41 and close enough for people to walk to the town centre. Should green belt land need to be sacrificed then TR01 provides sufficient space for a more proportionate growth of the housing supply for Tring with a location which will minimise the impact on the environment.</p> <p>I am not against housing growth for Tring, however, I believe it should be more proportionate to the size of Tring and located closer to the main infrastructure (High Street and A41). On a final note, due to the scale of planning application documents (over 140 and 5,500 pages) a longer time period than the 4th May should be provided for the public to review, digest and respond .</p>
<p>Mendip 53 Grove Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PB</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tring is a small market town that does not have the infrastructure to cope with such a massive development. 2. Roads leading to the site would need to be upgraded as Bulbourne Road and Station road both lead to the Canal. The idea that all residents are going to use bikes is not viable. 3. It has taken at least 20 years to get a new secondary school in Tring so the proposal that the development would include new schools is wishful thinking. 4. Doctors surgeries already have to cope with the new development at Roman Park which is still ongoing. 5. The massive developments that have been built around Aylesbury over the last few years have a dramatic effect on Stoke Mandeville hospital so will residents of Tring have to be referred to Watford Hospital ? <p>Finally the developers propose to provide a public open space which is laughable as Marshcroft lane is already a wonderful safe place used by families. walkers and bikers.</p>
<p>6 Harcourt Road Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5JJ</p>	<p>I am writing to place on record my formal objection to the proposed development. My objection is based upon the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The access to proposed development from the A41 via Cow Lane/Station Road is inadequate. The current road cannot cope with the inevitable rise in traffic heading to and from the A41. Notwithstanding the junction with Grove Road/Cow Lane/ Station Road is not suited to the demands of increased traffic levels. 2. I echo the comments made by others regarding the lack of provision of additional medical facilities and schooling for an increased population. In addition, where is it envisaged that these people will do their weekly shop? Tesco as it suits Tring fine, I do not wish this to be the prelude to an application for a Tesco Extra! Essentially Tring is not big enough for what is being proposed. 3. The inevitable loss of the Green Belt. Once built on you'll never git it back. 4. The overall development size is not in keeping with a market town of the size of Tring. Small incremental development is fine but not 1400 homes.

<p>2 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p>	<p>I object to the building of up to 1400 new houses in Tring because a development of this size will diminish the quality of life for everyone who lives here, with the strain on infrastructure: roads and services and lack of space. With narrow and ancient roads all around the town area, it would become gridlocked. Tring would lose its character as a small market town. I was told that the proposed cycle routes would prevent gridlocked roads but people tend to get in their cars. We would be swamped.</p> <p>Tring is in green belt land next to an area of outstanding beauty; green belt land is only to be used in exceptional circumstances. I understand that Dacorum Borough Council and Herts County Council have given no commitment to provide new schools though they feature in the plan, nor health centres.</p> <p>The plan is disproportionate and inappropriate for Tring.</p>
<p>17 Hollyfield Close Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5PL</p>	<p>We write on behalf of the supporters of the Chiltern Countryside Group (www.chilterncountrysidegroup.org) to state our strong objection to the hybrid planning application ref: 22/01187/MOA for access roads and development of up to 1,400 dwellings and associated buildings.</p> <p>We object to this application for the reasons given below which we request that Dacorum Borough Council takes into account in its consideration of these proposals. Should you require further information, please do not hesitate to get in touch.</p> <p>Our core reasons for objecting (which is not a definitive list) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The application is hybrid which means that permission is sought for some of the site with full details of the remainder to follow under reserved matters, so there is no guarantee that any final development would be anything like that illustrated in the developer's promotional material. In particular, We remain extremely concerned whether the Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANG) would be delivered as this, and other green spaces, will restrict the number of houses which might eventually be built for the developer's profit. o The site is currently a beautiful natural space, providing open views towards the Chilterns AONB and the Grand Union Canal, which are easily accessible to the many people who already enjoy its peace, mature green landscape and wildlife, by walking, cycling, running, horse-riding, boating, fishing.. It cannot be replaced by an artificial man made 'green area' which will take years to mature if ever built. o Local Planning Authorities have complete discretion on whether or not to accept a hybrid application. We urge DBC not to accept this. o The whole site is in designated Green Belt, which can only be released for development in exceptional & very special circumstances, (National Planning Policy Framework 20.7.21 notably paragraphs 147-9). It is quite clear that these proposals fail to fulfil that statutory obligation. o DBC is currently reviewing the

Local Plan, following community feedback from last year's consultation, with the intention to consider brownfield and urban sites within the Borough, rather than release Green Belt.

o It is imperative that this review should be finalised before any decisions are made on releasing Green Belt, particularly that of such a substantial nature and in such a significant location for the Chilterns and the Borough. Therefore this application is unwarranted and premature.

o The site adjoins and informs the setting for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and will therefore have extremely high adverse impact upon that landscape, which is protected under statute by the Countryside & Rights of Way Act 2000 s85 (CROW Act).

o Development will be visible from the high points of the AONB, such as Ivinghoe Beacon, thus destroying its rural and peaceful green character.

o As a Local Authority, DBC has an obligation under the CROW Act to 'protect and enhance' the AONB. If this development goes ahead, with due respect, it is our considered view, that DBC will have failed to fulfil this obligation

o The site is Grade 2 agricultural land - nationally, we need to increase our food self-sufficiency, not concrete over valuable farmland. Crops have already been sown ready for harvesting this year. This contribution to our nation's food would be lost forever

o The large number of buildings - 1,400 houses plus 2 schools, community hub and associated roads - will drastically and adversely change the rural setting & character of the market town of Tring forever

o Inevitably there will be a vast increase in traffic to/from any development onto single carriage roads, one with a narrow bridge where access is controlled by traffic lights. We do not accept the developer's premise that cycle ways and foot paths will tempt residents to completely abandon their cars to reach either the station or the town centre. It would certainly be too far to walk back from town centre shops with heavy shopping bags

o The size of the proposed development is far greater than is appropriate for the present size of the town, which has already been extended recently by a large and ongoing housing development on its Western edge.

o The CCG accepts there is need for housing within the Borough and affirm DBC's decision, in line with central Government policy, to optimise development of brownfield & urban sites, before any consideration of releasing Green Belt,

o The developer does not state what proportion of costs they will contribute to building infrastructure, but merely 'a contribution'.

o The proposals ignore extra demand on hospital health care, already under pressure. Building a health centre, which will only serve new housing, does not alleviate demand on local hospitals.

o There is no guarantee that authorities responsible for healthcare and educational provision within the Borough will be willing to facilitate or financially contribute towards the schools, health centre and other community resources proposed.

	<p>Herts CC is in the final stages of extensive renovation of Tring School and, we would suggest, is highly unlikely to make further funds available. Any new schemes for educational provision would not have been costed in under current & forecasted budgets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The developer (Harrow Estates/Redrow) only owns part of the site (that nearest to Station Road) so no commitment that the whole site would be developed as is outlined in this application. o The timeframe of development over 11 years (2022-33) means long drawn out adverse impacts of construction, loss of amenity, increased demand on local resources without obligation for developer to provide infrastructure, and other associated adverse effects, especially for presently neighbouring residents and parking in town centre and at Tring Station o This site falls within the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) - March 2022. We understand that DBC is required to implement mitigation to alleviate visitor pressure on Ashridge and Tring Woodlands. This site falls within the Zone of Influence and should be protected from development of any kind. o These proposals would have an extremely adverse effect on our Chiltern countryside, our precious Green Belt land & AONB, the Borough and the ancient market town of Tring. Again, the CCG urges DBC to refuse the application. Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this matter.
<p>39 Charles Street Tring Hertfordshire HP23 6BD</p>	<p>I am strongly opposed to this proposal for all of the reasons that so many residents have listed: overdevelopment, loss of natural habitat, deterioration of quality of life for the residents who have worked so hard to make this a unique place to live, strain on an already expanding population - the list goes on.</p> <p>I am floored by the scale of this proposed development not justified by any "exceptional circumstances." This proposal threatens to undermine everything that makes this area unique and would be a deeply painful loss for so many residents here.</p>
<p>9 Aidan Close Aylesbury Bucks HP21 9XQ</p>	<p>I have just been made aware of the application of 1400 houses east of Tring on green belt farm land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > If you look around the area you will see the vast amount of house building that has already been built and is still being built. > On top of this we also have the horrendous devastation of HS2. > It does appear that local councils and the government do not have the environment and wildlife at heart despite the fact that global warming is already here profits are still coming before what is best for us, the environment and the planet. > We have plenty of housing, we need our green spaces.
<p>42 Lukes Lea Marsworth HP23 4NH</p>	<p>22/01187/MOA - 1400 houses in (east) Tring</p> <p>I add my name to the huge number of objections to this huge development. It will take up a large amount of fertile agricultural land, which we are supposed to be protecting; it will take away the character and image of the small historic market town of Tring;</p>

	<p>amenities in the area cannot sustain this development - schools, GP, dentist etc already stretched. There is a waiting list at Tring School and it has to support local villages as well as Tring. Village children are already in danger of being excluded due to the school's over population. Where are children in the village supposed to go to school? Also the number of vehicles it will generate, during (for many years) development, and once it is populated is detrimental to the environment. Only a small number of residents will use Tring station and it is already stretched, as is its carpark. This site is too close to the AONB and SSSIs in the area so will have a devastating affect on the wildlife habitat, and will conflict with the policies drawn up to protect the Chilterns Beechwoods. There is no way this number of new residents can mitigate the additional damage that will be caused by this number of users. A development of this size is in the wrong place and is unsustainable. Following the Roman Park development to the west of Tring there is already an additional strain on all services in the area.</p> <p>The planners will find it conflicts with just about every planning policy including guidelines set out in the NPPF.</p>
<p>1 Hawkwell Drive Tring Hertfordshire HP23 5NN</p>	<p>The following comments are made on behalf of Dacorum Sports Network (DSN) the local community sports network for the borough. We represent local sports clubs and other sports providers in the area and are Sport England recognised. We have active working partnerships with both Dacorum Borough Council, for whom we are a consultee on both strategic and operational issues, and Herts Sports Partnership.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. On the surface the proposed Marshcroft application (and especially the revision documents submitted in August 2022) looks as though they provide overall sports hub facilities that are both needed and welcomed as well as being well specified. 2. The delayed building of the school obviously muddies the water as to what is actually is being provided for the school and what is for the wider community. The only facility that is additional to what is required by the school and intended for their primary use appears to be the 1x youth and 2x junior football pitches to the North West of the school. This doesn't constitute a sports hub on its own and unless community use and management of additional facilities is built into a community/school use agreement it is likely to be difficult for community clubs to be full partners in the site. This can affect obtaining funding, facility management and maintenance, decisions on usage in bad weather, health and safety etc. It should be considered therefore that the sports hub and its operator had all the facilities under its control, with an educational use agreement that specified that the school (once built) had priority use of any (or even all) of the facilities during the school day / term. 3. The options for how the hub might be managed are well laid out and we do not have a problem if the council wish to retain ownership and lease or pass management control to a third party. There is at least one potential community based sports organisation (which is an incorporated charity) who have expressed an interest in taking on management of the entire hub. This would be preferable to DSN than

for a commercial operator to take it or for it to be given to Tring School / Ridgeway Learning Partnership as we are concerned that it would not be good for the community to have a closed shop / no competition between the two sports centres etc. in the town.

4. We are pleased to see in the August amendments that the proposed community centre is now to be delivered as part of a clubhouse for the sports hub adjacent to the cricket oval. If this can include changing rooms and a bar that can be run by the hub it can support the sports centre as well. It can still offer a meeting facility for community use - but it will need sufficient parking. There is clear evidence that "Sports clubs are today's community centres" and a well run club can provide and maintain a great meeting place for community of which it is part.

5. We are unclear on how fencing and providing a secure school boundary would work - would it mean fencing between adjacent football pitches for example. And we would like consideration to be given as to how the development can make sure there is still playing space for unstructured play? Also there needs to be access from the pitches outside the school boundary to the sports centre for changing rooms etc.

6. Changing the proposed specification of the ATP from W22 to football only (and not rugby as well) as in the August 22 amendments is supported. However at least one of the grass pitches should possibly be considered to be a rugby pitch for school use and a contribution to support improvement of other rugby pitches/facilities in the Town (i.e. at Tring Rugby Club) should be considered to offset the saving this amendment would make.

7. We are a little concerned about whether car parking will be sufficient for the sports centre and the school - and also what about for the cricket and football pitches the other side of the school from the sports centre and school car parks.

8. While the new Local Plan process would usually provide the most appropriate mechanism to consider a strategic approach towards meeting the current and future sports facility needs in the Tring area, DSN has concerns which are echoed by the governing bodies, the Dacorum Sports Network and local sports clubs that the Marshcroft application if approved by the Council, or by the Planning Inspectorate at appeal, before the Local Plan is finalised could inhibit this more holistic strategic approach. This is pertinent as the Marshcroft application includes facilities that may meet needs over and above those generated by the development itself. The Dunsley Farm site in Tring (if progressed as an allocation through the Local Plan) also offers potential to meet the significant community sports facility needs in the Town especially in view of its close proximity to the existing sports club sites. A discussion about a strategic approach to meeting Tring's community sports facility needs would therefore be welcomed to try and ensure a co-ordinated and complementary approach is taken if the Marshcroft and Dunsley Farm sites progress in tandem which maximises the opportunities that these potential allocations may offer but also helps ensure that each site caters for the most suitable facilities. It would be preferable to avoid a scenario where

	<p>whatever is agreed in a sports hub as part of a potential planning permission for the Marshcroft when considered in isolation then subsequently dictates what may be provided at a later date at Dunsley Farm and elsewhere.</p> <p>9. DSN has previously stated in our response to the Local Plan consultation, that: Policy SP24 - "The Dunsley Farm Site Tr01 in South East Tring has for some time been the priority site for new sporting development and expansion in Tring (see comments below). However, with a need for extra facilities in excess of 15 Ha to meet current needs, with the proposed 50% plus expansion of the town, then it is clear that more than one major new sporting location will be required for an even larger allocation of new land for sport in Tring. Therefore, the inclusion of a proposed sporting hub in the development Tr03 is welcomed; as long as there is appropriate consultation with local clubs and DSN to ensure it is delivered sustainably and with full local partnership and engagement".</p> <p>10. We believe it is critical in trying to ensure that the combined facilities proposed for the sports hub and school are appropriate and sustainable that close consultation with local community clubs (which could be managed through DSN) is undertaken at all stages of the process and especially in the formulation of community use agreements and strategies. We also believe local community organisations, especially sports clubs, would be preferred management partners for the hub; but would ask that in selecting partners an uncompetitive monopoly of such facilities in Tring should be avoided.</p>
<p>3rd Floor, Gainsborough House 34-40 Grey Street Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 6AE</p>	<p>Representations Planning Application Ref. 22/01187/MOA - Hybrid Planning Application at Land East of Tring</p> <p>We write on behalf of our clients, L&Q Estates, regarding the live Hybrid planning application (reference 22/01187/MOA) at Land East of Tring as submitted by Harrow Estates, herein the 'Harrow' application. The Harrow application seeks full planning permission for the two main access points from Bulbourne Road and Station Road, and Outline consent on the remainder of the site with all matters reserved.</p> <p>The Outline element seeks to demolish all existing buildings on the site and replace them with 1,400 dwellings, a new local centre and sports /community hub, a primary school, a secondary school, and public open spaces, including the creation of a Suitable Alternative Natural Green space (SANG).</p> <p>L&Q Estates have a commercial interest in the site known as Land at New Mill, which is a c.15ha site located immediately to the southwestern boundary of Land East of Tring - this site is identified as site 'Tr02: New Mill' which is identified as an allocation for housing development in the latest draft of the Local Plan. Given the scale of the two development sites and the prospective policy requirement for the sites to be delivered comprehensively and cohesively and having considered the various documents that support the Harrow application, we provide Dacorum Borough Council with a number of</p>

observations to ensure the Hybrid application is compliant with the draft policies and allows Land at New Mill to come forward as intended by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) as set out in the Dacorum Emerging Strategy (2020 - 2038) for Growth published in November 2020.

We have focused our attention on the documents which would be approved as part of any Outline consent and in particular, the submitted Parameter Plans and documents submitted for approval at this stage.

Draft Growth Area Policy Tr02 and Tr03

As highlighted above, Dacorum Borough Council are currently in the process of preparing their new Local Plan and published the draft Plan for consultation under Regulation 18 in November 2020. The Plan, titled the 'Dacorum Local Plan (2020-2028) Emerging Strategy for Growth' sets out the preferred spatial strategy for the Borough, including preferred allocations for new development.

Both the New Mill site and Land East of Tring site are allocated as "Major Urban Extensions" in the emerging Local Plan; the New Mill Site is allocated under ref. 'Tr02: New Mill', and Land East of Tring has a proposed draft allocation ref. 'Tr03: East of Tring'.

The preamble to Draft Policy SP24 (Delivering Growth in East Tring) states that the expansion of Tring to the East represents the single largest combined allocations in the town, and one of the largest growth areas in the Borough. It continues, setting out that growth will come forward over a long period of time, across multiple sites [including across allocations Tr02 and Tr03] and in a sensitive location, which requires a cohesive approach which binds these elements together.

Draft Policy SP24 then details how the Sites are to come forward, requiring a "Masterplan-led approach" which will be prepared by the Council and adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document, but this will also be prepared in collaboration with key partners and landowners and be subject to community and stakeholder involvement.

Draft Growth Area Policies Tr02: New Mill and Tr03: East of Tring provide further detailed requirements for the two sites, confirming that the allocations should be planned together, preferably as a joint plan or as a minimum through closely aligned masterplans taking an integrated approach to the joint site area. The policies also require high quality green infrastructure and sustainable transport linkages between the two sites, including connections to the new community hub, local centre and primary and secondary schools.

Specifically, draft Policy Tr03 requires the creation of a new green corridor linking the new woodland area to the northeast of the site with the existing built-up area of Tring, along Marshcroft Lane to the adjacent allocation "New Mill".

Masterplanning

An Illustrative Masterplan has been prepared on behalf of the applicants - Harrow Estates, and forms part of the submission documents for the Hybrid Application. As far as we are aware, the Masterplan, whilst for illustrative purposes, has not been prepared in collaboration with Dacorum Borough Council as required by Draft Policy SP24 and it has not been developed in conjunction with L&Q Estates who are a key stakeholder in bringing forward sites Tr02 and Tr03.

Nevertheless, it should be ensured that the Site is now brought forward as part of a comprehensive Masterplan with strategic infrastructure appropriately planned for to meet the needs arising from both the occupants of the new development (in accordance with the planning obligations test) and the existing residents of Tring (for example, through the provision of educational facilities that will be used by the wider community). We would ask for the Council to be assured by the applicants, through the setting of parameters for the proposals, to ensure that it meets with the policy aspirations to create a sustainable development which integrate the Site, not only with the proposals for Land at New Mill, but also with the existing settlement of Tring.

Movement and Connectivity

Draft Policy SP24 also requires a number of deliverables in the development of Land East of Tring, including promoting sustainable travel choices by delivering an integrated and accessible development with walking, cycling and public transport prioritised. Whilst the proposals as put forward in the current Hybrid application at Land East of Tring appear to be in broad compliance with the site-specific requirements of Policy Tr03, including providing the land uses required, the Development Framework Parameters Plan and Movement and Connectivity Parameter Plan (as well as accompanying parameters and Illustrative Masterplan) do not suggest any pedestrian, cycle, or vehicular links between Land East of Tring and Land at New Mill.

On the contrary, both the Development Framework Parameter Plan and Movement and Connectivity Parameter Plan show the segregation of the two sites through a green buffer, consisting of existing hedgerows, allotments, and amenity space. This is more evident on the Illustrative Masterplan, which although illustrative, shows this barrier more clearly.

As part of their case for Very Special Circumstances, the applicants have proposed primary and secondary schools, along with a new sports and recreation facility to meet gaps in provision. The land uses have been provided to help alleviate existing pressures on education and other facilities already existing in the town, which have been identified as nearing capacity. The proposed facilities, however, are not as accessible to the wider locality as they could be, particularly to the north of the Site, both in terms of enabling pedestrian and cycle connections to Land at New Mill and externally beyond this Site from Bulbourne Road into Tring, whereby the conditions for cyclists and

pedestrians leading to the proposed access point for the Site could be improved to encourage sustainable journeys to, for example, the educational and / or leisure facilities. It is also important to note that a number of sustainable route options need to be provided for varying users seeking to reach the facilities, including for example more lightly trafficked routes for more vulnerable users. Offering choice is the best way to get users to utilise more sustainable methods of travel.

Further, as part of wider highways considerations, it is requested that the Council, when reviewing the access proposed as part of this application, ensures that the scheme put forward can allow for a further access at Bulbourne Road for Land at New Mill in accordance with the emerging policy requirements.

The submitted Landscape and Open Space Framework Plan submitted does show gaps in the parcels of proposed built form along the boundary with Land at New Mill, yet these are shown to contain the existing hedgerow and vegetation. There are no identified access points highlighted on the Movement and Access Plan as indicative primary walking or cycling or general access routes. To ensure that future access between the Sites is maintained as a parameter for future reserved matters applications as envisaged by the emerging Local Plan, it is recommended that points of access between the Sites are identified at this stage.

Of assistance in this regard, it is important to note that L&Q Estates, in carrying out their own assessment work for Land at New Mill, have established that there are a number of existing gaps in the hedgerow on the boundary of the two sites. Such gaps could provide an opportunity for the creation of a pedestrian and cycle linkage through a sustainable green corridor without any significant removal of the existing soft landscaping. It is suggested that two points of access are maintained between the Sites, one in a central location to allow ease of access to the sustainable transport proposals (although noted the bus stop location is indicative at this stage) and another to facilitate a more direct access to the educational and community facilities, which would require an access point where the allotments are currently proposed to meet Land at New Mill.

Phasing

Draft Growth Area Policy Tr03 requires the site to be brought forward with a comprehensive phasing programme for development which is to be prepared in consultation with the Local Planning Authority.

The Planning Statement submitted in support of the Hybrid application suggests that the development is anticipated to commence on site in 2023, with first residential occupation taking place in 2025, and full completion by 2033. Although it is understood that this information is contextual and that details are likely to be confirmed through additional approvals as required by any planning permission for the Outline proposal.

A Draft Phasing Plan has also been provided as part of the application submission and shows indicative phases of development. The Plan

suggests that the spine road leading from Marshcroft Lane to Station Road will be delivered as part of a first phase, and the spine road leading from Marshcroft Lane to Bulbourne Road will come forward along with two residential parcels as a second phase. The residential cells located on the boundary of the New Mill Site are predominantly anticipated to come forward in phase 4 and phase 5+.

Whilst this is a more detailed point for a later stage, it is suggested that the phasing of parcels 4 and 5 should take place at an earlier stage in the overall build process to enable the comprehensive Masterplanning of the urban edge of Tring prior to the parcels that be adjacent to the SANG. We would, on behalf of L&Q Estates, therefore, question the justification behind the phasing proposed.

Summary

In summary, while the proposed development has regard for the forthcoming proposals at the New Mill site and has taken into account many of the site requirements of draft allocation Tr03, little reference has been made to Tr02 Land at New Mill, other than to state that both Sites can be delivered.

Dacorum Borough Council as the Local Planning Authority must be content that a cohesive approach is taken between the two development sites. It is suggested that clear parameters are identified showing integration with neighbouring proposals linking Land at New Mill prioritising walking, cycling and public transport between the two development sites. In addition, to provide integration with the existing settlement of Tring itself particularly to the north of the Site, to ensure wider accessibility benefits and multiple route options for more vulnerable users of the facilities and to utilise more sustainable methods of travel. Further, it should be ensured that access can be accommodated on Bulbourne Road for Land at New Mill to be developed at an appropriate stage in the future, alongside Land East of Tring. These aspects would better achieve the aspirations identified within the emerging policies that provide direction for the development of the land.

Finally, we would ask Dacorum Borough Council to ensure that other infrastructure be comprehensively planned and delivered in a timely manner, including the new community hub, local centre, primary and secondary schools and other facilities that will be used more widely.

L&Q Estates would be happy to enter into further discussions with both Harrow Estates and Dacorum Borough Council to ensure a cohesive approach is taken in developing the Sites going forward. Should any changes be made to the proposed means of access, parameters and/ or description/ scale of development, we would appreciate being informed via email.