

**Bengeo Neighbourhood Area Plan (BNAP) Community Steering Group
Meeting Minutes: 30 March 2021**

Present: Steve Bayley, Brendan Clifford (Folly Island Association); Cllr. Alex Daar; Veronica Fraser, Nick Gough; Brenda Heninghem; John Howson (Chair); Paul Keyworth, Ben Penrose (Molewood Residents' Association); Tansy Rothwell Cllr. Andrew Stevenson

Apologies: Cllr. Ben Crystall, Justine Perry, Cllr. Peter Ruffles, Cllr. Mari Stevenson

1. John welcomed the group to the meeting and advised that Kit Cooper has decided not to continue membership of the Community Steering Group.

Matters arising from the Minutes of the CSG meeting on the 6 August 2020

Regulation 16 consultation

2. John advised that, following the conclusion of the East Herts District Council Regulation 16 consultation, the Plan was referred for independent examination, which concluded in December 2020. On the 24 March 2021, East Herts Council published a Referendum Information Statement confirming that the Bengeo Neighbourhood Area Plan referendum will be on Thursday, 6th May.
3. Brenda summarised outcomes from the Regulation 16 Consultation and Examination of the Plan. Regulation 16 consultation responses included those from Bidwells, on behalf of Ware Park estates, who lodged objections to Policy HBN1: Local Green Space Designation, specifically the proposed designation of LGS1: Land at Bengeo Field and Policy HBN2: Important Views (previously labelled HBN3: Important Views).
4. The eight green spaces proposed for 'Local Green Space Designation' and 8 views in the 'Important Views' Policy were approved by the Examiner. The examiner noted the objections from Bidwells but was impressed by the level of community support for LGS1: Land at Bengeo Field, The Examiner's report also noted the comments about Bengeo Field from the Planning Inspectorate's report on the Bengeo Quarry Inquiry.
5. The Examiner removed two draft policies from the Plan (Community Garden and Assets of Community Value). The removal of these policies resulted in Steve Bayley having to produce a number of revised maps at short notice and thanks are due to Steve for doing that. Full details on the Examiner's policy revisions and the reasons for the removal of two draft policies are attached in Annex A. Text revisions to the Neighbourhood Plan (arising from the Policy revisions) are in Annex B.
6. The Neighbourhood Plan was revised in line with the Examiner's recommendations and the final Plan has been published on the Hertford Town Council, East Herts District Council and 'Love Bengeo' websites.

Community Garden

7. John advised that, events of the last 12 months have made it challenging to progress the Community Garden project. A Community Garden sub group will be set up to take this project

forward. CSG members suggested asking Nigel Braggins if he would be interested in leading the group. A number of people in the community are interested in participating in this project.

Action Point 1: John to ask Nigel Braggins whether he might lead the Community Garden project group.

Sustainable Travel Town (STT) Proposal

8. Although the Hertford-wide proposal was unsuccessful in the first STT tranche, Alex advised that she and Rob Pinkham have put forward a motion to Hertford Town Council for 20mph limits on Bengeo Street and Sacombe Road (referencing the inclusion of these in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Motion to HTC includes traffic calming measures for areas outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The aim is for Low Traffic Neighbourhood status to be achieved.
9. Andrew advised that the petition to Hertfordshire County Council from the Lower Bengeo Living Streets Group achieved the required volume of signatories for a meeting with Hertfordshire Highways. Andrew requested that senior Highway's officials attend the meeting. Andrew reiterated the importance of safety measures being introduced to protect pedestrians on pavements. John has provided support and advice to the Lower Bengeo Living Streets Group. Andrew advised, and the CSG members agreed, that the Neighbourhood Plan should play an ongoing role in supporting traffic calming and associated measures that benefit the community.

Rights of Way and local footpaths

10. In September 2020, John submitted corrected Modification Orders to the Hertfordshire County Council Rights of Way team, relating to two new proposed Rights of Way across Bengeo Field. He also submitted new User Evidence Statements, completed by local residents. Steve recommended HCC contacts for John to follow up with. The CSG have forwarded Hertford Civic Society's request for Bridleways 14/15 to be resurfaced to the Rights of Way team, together with Neighbourhood Plan requests for the improvement and upgrading of Public Footpaths 17, 18, 19.20 & 23. The RoW team will consider the requests for inclusion in their path recovery programme. At the CSG request, Byways 1 & 9 have been added to the HCC twice yearly mowing programme. A footpath group has not yet been set up.

Molewood Millrace Action Group

11. John confirmed that he wrote to the Environment Agency in support of the MMAG and had received a positive response from them. Paul advised that MMAG are still in consultation with the Environment Agency. The hope is that a preferred Action Plan will be in place by June with the aim of providing some flow to the Millrace.

Promoting the Referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan

12. The Referendum Information Statement has been published on the East Herts District Council, Hertford Town Council and Love Bengeo websites. Brenda has submitted articles on the referendum to the Molewood Residents' Association newsletter and website and to the Watermill Estate Residents' Association email group (not mentioned at the CSG meeting, but an article will also be submitted to the Bengeo Magazine). A Folly Island Residents' Association newsletter is

due for distribution soon. Brendan will consult with colleagues on whether distribution can be brought forward to promote the referendum. Extensive and ongoing social media promotion of the referendum and the Plan's policies and Action Plan is underway and will continue until the referendum.

13. The Group unanimously agreed that a flyer, promoting the referendum, should be distributed to all households in the Plan Area, and that it was important to ensure that as many people as possible, who were eligible to vote, were aware of the referendum. Brenda is confirming with HTC that they can print the required number of flyers. If there's a shortfall in funding Ben P. kindly offered to consult MRA colleagues on funding. Veronica and Paul offered suggested text revisions to the flyer. The Group agreed that, after all the hard work that's gone into the Neighbourhood Plan by the community, a good turn out and a 'yes' vote would be very welcome outcomes. The Group agreed that the flyers should be delivered as soon as possible, particularly as some residents will be voting by post from April 12.

Action Point 2: CSG members to send final comments on the wording for the referendum flyer to Brenda by Thursday 1 April. Brenda to send final text to Tansy for layout and design and to liaise with HTC for early printing of the flyers.

Action Point 3: John to ask Aska if she can oversee the distribution of the flyers.

AOB

14. John gave a brief update on fund raising for Beane Marshes and Andrew updated the group on repairs to the pavement on Beane Road and the possible installation of a permanent bollard, close to the former railway land on Port Vale, as well as an update on the Hertford Arts Hub. The Group discussed the future role of the Community Steering Group (CSG) in responding to planning applications (approximately 20 responses to planning applications have been submitted to East Herts District Council during the production of the Plan). The Group agreed (subject to the Plan achieving a majority 'yes' vote at referendum) that the CSG should continue submitting responses to planning applications where there are issues related to policies in the Plan, and where the CSG agree that it's relevant for a response to be submitted.

Next Meeting

15. The group agreed to meet after the Referendum. John suggested Tuesday, 18th May, closed the meeting, and thanked everyone for their attendance.
16. When circulating the draft Minutes Brenda added her thanks to Steve Bayley for providing revised maps for the Plan, at short notice. The removal of two policies from the Plan resulted in several maps having to be replaced.

Appendix A: BNAP Policy Revisions for final Plan

Policy	Regulation 15 Draft Submission wording	Final policy wording	Examiner's revisions and summary of examiner's comments
HBN1: Local Green Space (LGS) Designation	<p>I. Eight Local Green Spaces have been identified on the Policies Map (including Inset Maps) in Appendix A)</p> <p>II. Development within these designated areas will only be permitted where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>(The policy lists LGS1-LGS8)</p>	<p><u>Policy wording unchanged</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy wording reflects national policy • Considerable community support for the designation of LGS1: Land at Bengoe Field
HBN2: Community Garden		<p><u>Policy deleted.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain in Action Plan but delete policy. • This plot is amenity land. Landscaping would not require planning permission,
HBN3: Important Views	<p>1. Development should respect the character, integrity and visual amenity of the local landscape.</p> <p>II. Development should not be permitted if proposals fail to conserve and protect (and, where appropriate, improve) the local landscape. Any development proposals that are likely to impact upon the views below should be accompanied by an assessment of the impact that development will have on those views.</p> <p>III. Proposals where a harmful impact is identified will only be permitted where appropriate mitigation measures can be delivered.</p> <p>(The 8 views are listed underneath the policy wording.)</p>	<p>The following views, as shown in Appendix D, are designated Important Views. If a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and/or a Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, as required by Policy DES2 of the East Herts District Plan, reveals a harmful impact on those views as a result of the proposal, the development will only be permitted where appropriate mitigation measures can be delivered.</p> <p><u>The 8 views will be listed underneath the policy text.</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some draft policy wording covered in District Plan Policy DES2: Landscape Character. • Bidwells' objection noted. • Examiner concluded that it was '<i>perfectly appropriate</i>' for the community to introduce planning policies to recognise the value of important views. <p><u>Examiner's Revisions</u> <u>Delete paras I & II and replace III (see Examiner's text in adjoining column).</u></p>
HBN4: Nature Conservation <u>This policy will be relabelled HBN3</u>	<p>I. All development should conserve and enhance biodiversity and seek to deliver net biodiversity gains.</p> <p>II. Developments located in areas coloured purple on the Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre (HERC) Ecological Network Mapping for the Neighbourhood Plan Area must deliver net biodiversity gains (in accordance with the latest version of Defra's Biodiversity Impact</p>	<p>I. If development is unavoidable in the areas coloured purple on the Hertfordshire Environmental Records Centre (HERC) Ecological Network Mapping for the Neighbourhood Plan Area (as shown in Figure 22), it must deliver net biodiversity gains (in accordance with the latest version of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criterion I in draft policy too onerous as it would apply to all developments, including small scale domestic extensions. • Revised wording now changes the emphasis to a presumption against most development in the areas coloured purple. • Neighbourhood Plan policies cannot require a particular document or information to be

	<p>Calculator) and contribute towards enhancing ecological connectivity (in accordance with the HERC mapping).</p> <p>III. Proposals to create new natural areas and wildlife habitats, or to expand or enhance existing provision, will be supported.</p> <p>IV. Removal of unprotected trees during development should be accompanied by a tree survey and report. Replacement of trees with native species, in suitable locations, will be encouraged.</p>	<p>Defra's Biodiversity Impact Calculator) and contribute towards enhancing ecological connectivity (in accordance with the HERC mapping).</p> <p>II. Proposals to create new natural areas and wildlife habitats, or to expand or enhance existing provision, will be supported.</p> <p>III. Replacement of trees with native species, in suitable locations, will be encouraged where the development results in the unavoidable loss of trees on the site.</p>	<p>provided Reference to tree survey and report to be deleted from policy.</p> <p>Examiner's Revisions Remove criterion I. In Criterion II, replace 'Developments located' with 'If development is unavoidable' and, after 'Plan Area' insert 'as shown in Figure 22'. In final criterion, delete the first sentence and insert at the end of the second sentence, 'where the development results in the unavoidable loss of trees on the site.'</p>
<p>HBN5: Improving Air Quality <u>This policy will be relabelled HBN4</u></p>	<p>I. Development within the Gascoyne Way Air Quality Management Area should mitigate any increase in air pollution.</p> <p>II. Where appropriate, development proposals should support the creation, improvement and extension of foot and cycle path connectivity, particularly to key services such as train stations, local employment, health care, and retail. and leisure services throughout the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>III. Proposals to relocate the Hertford Castle Gardens children's play area to an alternative location within Hertford Castle Gardens, will be supported. Relocation away from the A414 boundary will help to reduce the negative impact of poor air quality on play area users.</p> <p>IV. S106 contributions towards the funding of 'Turn-off engine' signs outside schools, shops and other waiting area throughout the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be encouraged.</p>	<p>I. Development within the Gascoyne Way Air Quality Management Area should minimise and mitigate any increase in air pollution.</p> <p>II. Where appropriate, development proposals should support the creation, improvement and extension of foot and cycle path connectivity, particularly to key services such as train stations, local employment, health care, and retail and leisure services throughout the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>III. Proposals to relocate the Hertford Castle Gardens children's play area to an alternative location within Hertford Castle Gardens, will be supported. Relocation away from the A414 boundary will help to reduce the negative impact of poor air quality on play area users.</p>	<p>Examiner's revisions In criterion I, after 'should' insert 'minimise and'. At the end of last criterion, insert 'where the development is likely to increase waiting traffic in such locations'.</p>

		IV. S106 contributions towards the funding of 'Turn-off engine' signs outside schools, shops and other waiting area throughout the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be encouraged where the development is likely to increase waiting traffic in such locations.	
HBC1: Assets of Community Value		<u>Policy deleted</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection afforded through ACV registration is short-term. • The 3 buildings and 2 allotment sites are already afforded protection through the 'Enhanced Community Facilities' policy.
HBC2: Enhanced Community Facilities This policy will be relabelled as HBC1	<p>I. Existing community facilities, as listed in Appendix F, should be retained and protected. Loss of facilities will only be acceptable where alternative provision is of a scale and standard equivalent to, or superior to, the existing facilities. Alternative provision should be provided within walking or cycling distance of the existing facility.</p> <p>II. Proposals to improve or enhance community facilities will be supported when they improve the range, quality, suitability, and accessibility of facilities for residents, and when the benefits of development outweigh any disadvantages. S106 contributions should fund accessible GP services and enhanced youth facilities within existing community facilities. Gaps in provision for young people should be identified and agreed between youth and sports/activities providers, young people, Hertford Town Council and the Bengoe Neighbourhood Area Plan Community Steering Group.</p>	<p>I. Existing community facilities, as listed in Appendix E, should be retained and protected. Loss of facilities will only be acceptable where alternative provision is of a scale and standard equivalent to, or superior to, the existing facilities. Alternative provision should be provided within walking or cycling distance of the existing facility.</p> <p>II. Proposals to improve or enhance community facilities will be supported when they improve the range, quality, suitability, and accessibility of facilities for residents, and when the benefits of development outweigh any disadvantages. Contributions towards enhanced youth facilities and accessible GP services, collected pursuant to Policy CFLR7 in the District Plan, will be welcomed to address any shortfall in the existing provision within the Plan Area, which</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient evidence to justify the policy saying S106 contributions 'should' fund GP facilities and youth services. <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> In criterion II, delete all text after the first sentence and insert '<i>Contributions towards enhanced youth facilities and accessible GP services, collected pursuant to Policy CFLR7 in the District Plan, will be welcomed to address any shortfall in the existing provision within the Plan Area, which would be exacerbated as a result of the development.</i>'</p> <p>N.B. As a result of the ACV policy and accompanying appendix, the appendix for this policy will now be appendix E.</p>

		would be exacerbated as a result of the development.	
HBC3: Listed Buildings and Structures This policy will be relabelled HBC2	Development proposals which affect designated heritage assets in the Neighbourhood Plan Area, including listed buildings and structures, will be permitted provided that they preserve or enhance the significance of the asset and its setting. II. A statement setting out any adverse impacts on the asset and its setting, along with any proposed mitigation measures, will be required. III. Proposals to bring empty listed buildings back into appropriate use, in line with Historic England's guidelines, will be supported when the benefits of development outweigh the disadvantages. IV. Proposals for the development, or redevelopment of listed buildings will be supported when they meet identified housing, community or business need and when they are consistent with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.	<u>Policy wording unchanged.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Examiner made no comment on this policy.
HBC4: Non-designated Buildings and Structures This policy will be relabelled HBC3	I. Ten non-listed buildings and structures have been identified as having local historic or architectural importance. More information on each of these is in Appendix G. II. Development proposals which affect these, and other non-designated heritage assets, will be permitted provided they preserve or enhance the significance of the asset and its setting. (The ten buildings and structures are detailed in the policy and appendix).	I. Ten non-listed buildings and structures have been identified as having local historic or architectural importance. II. Development proposals which affect these, and other non-designated heritage assets, will be permitted provided that the scale of any harm or loss is balanced against the significance of the asset. <u>The 10 buildings and structures are listed under the policy wording</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move reference to 'Appendix G' to the supporting text Rephrase the last few words of the policy as the draft wording affords a higher level of protection than that required by the Secretary of State. <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> Delete 2nd sentence of criterion I (and move to supporting text). In criterion II, delete all text after 'provided' and replace with 'that the scale of any harm or loss is balanced against the significance of the asset.'</p>
HBC5: Cultural Facilities	I. Proposals for the development or expansion of cultural facilities should preserve, protect and respect the heritage of existing buildings, be in keeping with the	Proposals for the development or expansion of cultural facilities will be supported subject to compliance with	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft policy wording is site specific by implication and may not be relevant if applied to locations other than the Old Hertford Brewery

<p>This policy will be relabelled HBC4</p>	<p>architecture, style and scale of nearby buildings, and use high quality materials.</p> <p>II. Proposals should include strategies to encourage sustainable travel from outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area and the use of non-motorised travel between venues. These could include the provision of secure, covered cycle parking for residents and visitors but should not result in a loss of amenity (including parking) or privacy to residents in the affected area.</p> <p>III. Development will be supported when it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) enhances and improves existing cultural facilities b) ensures good access for disabled people c) is consistent with Neighbourhood Plan policies HBT3, HBT3 and HBN5. 	<p>other relevant policies in the development plan.</p>	<p>and the Old British School (which are protected under other Plan policies).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable travel criteria are covered in other Plan policies. <p><u>Examiner’s revisions</u> Delete all text and replace (see Examiner’s text in adjoining column).</p>
<p>HBT1: Traffic Congestion and Road Safety</p>	<p>1. Development proposals should be accompanied by a transport assessment proportional to the scale of the development. Transport assessments for significant developments should demonstrate predicted levels of generated vehicular traffic and the impact of this on traffic congestion. Solutions should not only mitigate impact but improve congestion and road and pavement safety, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. S106 agreements could contribute towards the cost of road safety improvement measures. Subject to what is already in place, these could include, but are not restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * a 20 MPH speed limit on Sacombe Road from the Wadesmill Road/Sacombe Road mini roundabout up to The Wick *20 MPH speed limit on Bengoe Street to improve road safety, in consideration of the two nearby primary schools *increased compliance with and enforcement of access restrictions 	<p>1. Transport assessments for developments that will generate significant amounts of transport movement should demonstrate predicted levels of generated vehicular traffic and the impact of this on traffic congestion. Solutions should not only mitigate impact but, where possible, improve congestion and road and pavement safety, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>II. Development proposals that include sustainable measures such as car club provision and the installation of electric car charging points will be supported if they are consistent with other Policies in the Plan.</p> <p>III. Development proposals for new schools or school extensions, which will result in an increase in the capacity of the school, should include</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too onerous to expect all development proposals to provide a transport assessment (even if proportional to the scale of development). NPPF states that schemes should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds where the residual cumulative impact on the road network would be severe. • Move Criterion I road safety bullet points from policy to supporting text as enforcement of speed limits and access restrictions is outside the control of a planning application applicant. • HTC can lobby for the use of S106 funds to meet the Plan Area’s requirements. • Travel plans for school extensions should only be required when the extension results in an increase in the capacity of the school. <p><u>Examiner’s revisions</u> Delete first sentence of criterion I. In second sentence (now first), delete ‘significant’ and, after ‘developments’ insert ‘that will generate significant amounts of transport movement’. In</p>

	<p>II. Development proposals that include sustainable measures such as car club provision and the installation of electric car charging points will be supported if they are consistent with other Policies in the Plan.</p> <p>III. Development proposals for new schools or school extensions should include school travel plans that promote sustainable transport choices and reduce school-gate congestion. Community involvement in the management of travel plans will be encouraged.</p>	<p>school travel plans that promote sustainable transport choices and reduce school-gate congestion. Community involvement in the management of travel plans will be encouraged.</p>	<p>the third sentence, after <i>'impact but'</i> insert <i>'where possible'</i>. Delete the rest of criterion I, including bullet points after <i>'cyclists'</i>. Move bullet points to text. In III, after <i>'school extensions'</i>, insert <i>'which will result in an increase in the capacity of the school.'</i></p>
<p>HBT2: Encouraging More Walking</p>	<p>I. Where possible, all major developments should deliver improvements that result in good connectivity between new and existing pedestrian routes to encourage walking as a first option. The emphasis should be on safe and unobstructed pedestrian routes to key services including health care, railway stations, bus stops, local employment, shops and leisure facilities. S106 contributions should contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improvements to the Public Footpaths from Ware Park Road to Hertford Lock (Hertford 17, 18, 19,20, 23) connecting with Sustrans off-road route 61. The preference is for the footpaths to be upgraded in status to Public Bridleway to permit cycling. Permissive rights could be considered as a compromise • new pedestrian routes separated from other traffic, including cycles, either physically or with road markings. Routes should be suitable for those with pushchairs, wheelchairs or other mobility aids. <p>II. Development proposals should include clear strategies for:</p> <p>*making it easier and safer for children to walk to local schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing maintenance of new routes to ensure they are fully accessible and not obstructed 	<p>I. Where possible, all significant developments should deliver improvements that result in good connectivity between new and existing pedestrian routes to encourage walking as a first option. The emphasis should be on safe and unobstructed pedestrian routes to key services including health care, railway stations, bus stops, local employment, shops and leisure facilities. S106 contributions, collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan, could contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improvements to the Rights of Way network, which could include paths from Ware Park Road to Hertford Lock (Hertford 17, 18, 19,20, 23) connecting with Sustrans off-road route 61. The preference is for the footpaths to be upgraded to be capable of allowing cycling. Permissive rights could be considered as a compromise • new pedestrian routes separated from other traffic, including cycles, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A planning policy cannot stipulate engagement with specific groups. Move text in criterion III to Action Plan. <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> In criterion I, replace <i>'major'</i> with <i>'significant'</i>. In third sentence of I, after <i>'contributions'</i> insert <i>'collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan'</i> and replace <i>'should'</i> with <i>'could'</i>. In the first bullet point of I, replace <i>'Footpaths'</i> with <i>'rights of way network, which could include'</i>. In the second sentence of the first bullet point, after <i>'upgraded'</i> replace the rest of that sentence with <i>'to be capable of allowing cycling.'</i> Delete criterion III.</p>

	<p>III. Residents with reduced mobility and visual impairment should be invited to contribute to the design of new pedestrian routes.</p> <p>IV. Development proposals that include safe crossing points for pedestrians, traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds, minimising of unnecessary road and pavement gradients, level/even pavements, and widening of pavements, will be supported when consistent with other policies in the Plan.</p>	<p>either physically or with road markings. Routes should be suitable for those with pushchairs, wheelchairs or other mobility aids.</p> <p>II. Development proposals should include clear strategies for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making it easier and safer for children to walk to local schools • ongoing maintenance of new routes to ensure they are fully accessible and not obstructed. <p>III. Development proposals that include safe crossing points for pedestrians, traffic calming measures to reduce vehicle speeds, minimising of unnecessary road and pavement gradients, level/even pavements, and widening of pavements, will be supported when consistent with other policies in the Plan.</p>	
<p>HBT3: Encouraging more cycling</p>	<p>I. Development proposals should contribute to the establishment, enhancement, and improved connectivity of cycle routes into, out of, and through the Neighbourhood Plan Area. S106 contributions should contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the installation of secure covered cycle racks within Hertford North Station car park • cycle training courses for children and adults <p>II. Development proposals that include segregated cycle paths and the on-site provision of electric bikes, cycle hire, and bike club schemes, will be supported if they are consistent with other policies in this Plan.</p>	<p>I. Development proposals should contribute to the establishment, enhancement, and improved connectivity of cycle routes into, out of, and through the Neighbourhood Plan Area. S106 contributions, collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan, could contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the installation of secure covered cycle racks within Hertford North Station car park • cycle training courses for children and adults <p>II. Development proposals that include segregated cycle paths and the on-site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert reference to District Plan policy and replace 'should' with 'could' in second sentence. <p>Examiner's revisions In the second sentence of criterion I, after 'contributions' insert 'collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan' and replace 'should' with 'could'.</p>

		provision of electric bikes, cycle hire, and bike club schemes, will be supported if they are consistent with other policies in this Plan.	
HBT4: Public Transport	<p>I. Maintaining and developing high quality bus and community transport services should be integral to all major developments and should complement the provision of safe walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>II. Travel Plans should include information on local transport and, where feasible, incentives to use public transport e.g., travel vouchers. The overall aim should be to facilitate behavioural change and reduce pollution.</p> <p>III. S106 funding could contribute towards the extension of public and community transport services to new developments.</p>	<p>I. The masterplanning of significant new residential development should allow, where it would be appropriate, the development to be capable of being served by local public transport services which should complement the provision of safe walking and cycling routes.</p> <p>II. Travel Plans should include information on local transport and, where feasible, incentives to use public transport e.g., travel vouchers. The overall aim should be to facilitate behavioural change and reduce pollution.</p> <p>III. S106 contributions, collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan, could contribute towards the extension of public and community transport services to new developments.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not within the gift of developers to maintain bus and community transport services on all major sites. • Insert reference to District Plan policy in Criterion III and replace 'should' with 'could' <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> In criterion I, replace all text in the first sentence up to 'major developments and' with 'The masterplanning of significant new residential development should allow, where it would be appropriate, the development to be capable of being served by local public transport services which'. In III, after 'S106' replace 'funding' with 'contributions collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan'.</p>
HBT5: Parking	<p>I. Proposals to increase off-street parking provision in areas with insufficient residents' parking (particularly near to Hertford North Station) will be supported when consistent with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. S106 contributions should contribute to solutions to improve residents' parking in areas with limited parking.</p> <p>II. Provision of electric car charging points in car parks and other developments will be supported.</p>	<p>I. Proposals to increase off-street parking provision in areas with insufficient residents' parking (particularly near to Hertford North Station) will be supported when consistent with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. S106 contributions, collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan, could contribute to</p>	<p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> In the second sentence of I, after 'contributions' insert 'collected under the provisions of Policy TRA1 of the District Plan' and replace 'should' with 'could'.</p>

		<p>solutions to improve residents' parking in areas with limited parking.</p> <p>II. Provision of electric car charging points in car parks and other developments will be supported.</p>	
HBH1: Housing Supply	Development proposals that demonstrate how they meet unmet demand, particularly schemes delivering at least the minimum criteria for affordable housing (to rent or buy), will be supported when consistent with other policies in the Plan.	<u>Policy wording unchanged.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy encourages developers to address sectors where there is unmet provision.
HBH2: Design and Layout	<p>I. Development proposals should aim to incorporate all of the following provisions:</p> <p>a) meet 'Building for Life' (or equivalent replacement scheme) criteria</p> <p>b) be set back from the road to minimise the impact of traffic noise on site occupants</p> <p>c) ensure green amenity areas are overlooked by windows to increase connection with outdoor spaces</p> <p>d) provide two off-road parking spaces per dwelling plus visitor parking to avoid adding parking pressures to overloaded local roads. A lower number of parking spaces may be acceptable if other policies in this Plan, together with Local Plan and national policies, are successful in reducing car use</p> <p>e) avoid unnecessary uniformity in external design to increase individuality between buildings</p> <p>f) reflect the best examples of local housing density, proportion and scale, as demonstrated in Hertford's Brewhouse Lane development</p> <p>g) provide discreet, accessible, bin storage (for residents in apartments as well as those in houses), with sufficient space to accommodate the full complement of recycling/refuse bins</p> <p>h) protect the amenity and privacy of existing and future residents</p>	<p>I. In addition to meeting the requirements set out in District Plan Policy DES4, residential development proposals should aim to incorporate all of the following provisions:</p> <p>a) follow the principles set out in the 'Building for Life' (or equivalent replacement scheme) criteria</p> <p>b) be set back from the road to minimise the impact of traffic noise on site occupants, in those locations subject to high levels of road traffic noise</p> <p>c) ensure green amenity areas are overlooked by windows to increase connection with outdoor spaces</p> <p>d) avoid unnecessary uniformity in external design to increase individuality between buildings</p> <p>e) provide discreet, accessible, bin storage (for residents in apartments as well as those in houses), with sufficient space to accommodate the full complement of recycling/refuse bins</p> <p>f) protect the amenity and privacy of existing and future residents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for developments to be set back from the road should only apply in locations where traffic volumes are high Parking standards in policy are not in accordance with Secretary of State advice and do not meet the basic conditions Given variety of housing across the area, one model (however good) cannot be replicated. An applicant could not demonstrate how aspirations in draft policy criterion ii) could be met. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot impose the requirement for a developer to provide parking for Bengo School. The area could not yield the required number of homes if also required to provide school parking. <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> <i>At the start of I, insert 'in addition to meeting the requirements set out in District Plan Policy DES4, residential'. In a) replace 'meet' with 'follow the principles set out in the'. At the end of b) 'in those locations subject to high levels of road traffic noise'. Delete d) f) and i). Delete II (parking for Bengo School).</i></p>

	<p>i) employ innovative, sustainable design principles to the best national standards, taking account of the latest peer-reviewed research on the impact of climate change, to optimise energy and water conservation and mitigate flood risk.</p> <p>II. In addition, the HERT4 development should allocate on-site parking for Bengo School to help relieve parking pressures on local roads.</p> <p>III. Proposals for Gated Communities in the Plan Area will not be supported. It is considered that they do not support the principles of community cohesion and inclusion.</p>	<p>II. Proposals for Gated Communities in the Plan Area will not be supported. It is considered that they do not support the principles of community cohesion and inclusion.</p>	
<p>HBH3: Landscape Design</p>	<p>I. Landscaping schemes should enhance the character of the development and reflect and complement the surrounding landscape, particularly when in or adjacent to the Green Belt. All the following criteria should be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) welcoming, accessible, open spaces and natural play areas b) planting of native tree and hedgerow species with green buffers between large developments and adjacent countryside, and between new developments and existing residential areas c) sufficient, secure, covered cycle parking to encourage active travel d) hard landscaping for vehicle parking should be constructed from permeable materials to reduce water run-off. <p>II. In addition, landscaping within the HERT4 development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) incorporate highway improvements and a network of paths that provide good connectivity to existing routes and key services, and improve safe and accessible walking and cycling routes b) ensure protection of local aquifers and Hertford's water supply 	<p>I. Landscaping schemes should enhance the character of the development and reflect and complement the surrounding landscape, particularly when in or adjacent to the Green Belt. All the following criteria should be incorporated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) welcoming, accessible, open spaces and natural play areas b) planting of native tree and hedgerow species with green buffers between large developments and adjacent countryside, and between new developments and existing residential areas c) sufficient, secure, covered cycle parking to encourage active travel d) hard landscaping for vehicle parking should be constructed from permeable materials to reduce water run-off. <p>II. In addition, landscaping within the HERT4 development is encouraged to:</p>	<p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> In Criterion II, replace 'should' with 'are encouraged to'</p>

	<p>c) achieve a Building with Nature 'Excellent' rating</p> <p>d) incorporate headland wildflower planting, bee bricks and nesting boxes for swifts</p> <p>e) provide opportunities to grow food</p>	<p>a) incorporate highways improvements and a network of paths that provide good connectivity to existing routes and key services, and improve safe and accessible walking and cycling routes</p> <p>b) ensure protection of local aquifers and Hertford's water supply</p> <p>c) achieve a Building with Nature 'Excellent' rating</p> <p>d) incorporate headland wildflower planting, bee bricks and nesting boxes for swifts</p> <p>e) provide opportunities to grow food</p>	
<p>HBH4: Brownfield Development</p>	<p>I. Proposals for development on Brownfield land will be supported when they are consistent with other policies in the Plan and when they demonstrate that regeneration will:</p> <p>a) significantly improve the visual appearance of the site or building</p> <p>b) complement the design and heritage of nearby buildings</p> <p>c) protect the amenity of nearby residents and nearby business occupants</p> <p>II. Proposals that provide tangible benefits to the community through the provision of community facilities, live/work spaces or housing that meets an identified need, will be encouraged.</p>	<p>Proposals for the development of brownfield sites will be supported, especially those that provide tangible benefits to the community through the provision of community facilities, live/work spaces or housing that meets an identified need.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making effective and efficient use of brownfield sites should be sufficient justification in its own right; it should not be dependent on securing a significant improvement on the visual appearance of the site or buildings. • Matters relating to protecting the amenity of neighbours and compatibility with the design and heritage of nearby buildings will be covered by other policies. <p>Examiner's revisions Delete I. In II, after '<i>Proposals</i>' insert '<i>for the development of brownfield sites will be supported, especially those</i>'.</p>
<p>HBB1: Local Business Development</p>	<p>I. Sustainable proposals for the development and/or re-development of business premises will be supported when they:</p> <p>* provide enhanced employment opportunities</p> <p>* demonstrate sustainable options for long-term business use.</p>	<p>Sustainable proposals for the development and/or redevelopment of business premises will be supported.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst desirable, it's not justified to make the conditions set out in the draft policy a condition of support. The policy text can be incorporated into the supporting text. • Proposals in Criterion II are covered by District Plan Policy DES4.

	<p>* provide new or enhanced community facilities that meet an identified need, and economic benefit to the local community</p> <p>II. Proposals should:</p> <p>a) be designed to be in keeping with and complement the surrounding landscape and nearby buildings</p> <p>b) enhance and complement the appearance and aesthetics of the existing building/s</p> <p>c) mitigate the impact of development on the occupants of nearby residential and business premises</p> <p>d) be consistent with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>II. Developments in the St. Andrew Quarter should support the Vision in the Hertford Town Centre Design Strategy of a mix of national and independent retailers who will provide services to the local and wider population.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals in Criterion II are laudable but it's beyond the scope of the planning system to restrict the occupancy of particular buildings. <p><u>Examiner's revisions</u> Delete all text after '<i>supported</i>'.</p>
--	--	--	--

Appendix B: BNAP Text Revisions for final Plan

Para/Page/Appendix	Revised Text	Deleted text/reason for change
Para 1.11, after bullet 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>'Eight-week East Herts District Council Regulation 16 consultation'</i> 	New text to reflect Regulation 16 consultation
Para 2.7, lines 5 & 6	The last 2 sentences will be replaced with – <i>'Through its Sustainable Travel policies and the Action Plan, the Neighbourhood Plan aims to mitigate the impact of development and help improve local travel conditions.'</i>	As Hertford is no longer a designated Sustainable Travel Town, the sentence referring to it this has been deleted.
Para 2.10, line 3	<i>'An adopted Neighbourhood Plan has the same legal status as the Local Plan.'</i>	This replaces – <i>If adopted, the Neighbourhood Plan will have the same legal status as the Local Plan.'</i>
Para 4.1, line 4		The reference to Appendix I will be revised to Appendix H. This has resulted from the deletion of the ACV policy and the accompanying Appendix E. The appendices from Appendix E onwards will be relabelled.
Para 4.8, line 13	<i>'are included in the designation'</i>	To replace: <i>'are also proposed for designation'</i> .
Para 4.9, lines 9-10	<i>'gives it'</i>	To replace <i>'will give it'</i>
Para 4.11, line 8	<i>'has taken place'</i>	To replace <i>'is underway'</i>
Para 4.13, lines 10-11	<i>'Local Green Space designation gives it additional protection from development.'</i>	To replace: <i>'It's being proposed for'</i>
Paras 4.14-4.15 and Policy HBN2: Community Garden	The last line of para 4.15 will now read – <i>'The proposal to create a community garden received almost 100% approval at the March 2019 exhibition and, comments on it included: 'Great use of this unused space' and Excellent initiative'. The community garden proposal is included in the Action Plan in Appendix H.'</i>	The Examiner recommended deletion of the Community Garden policy. The policy, Figure 12 map, and inset map 5 have been removed from the Plan. Subsequent policies in this section will be renumbered accordingly. The text in paras 4.14 and 4.15, which describes the aspiration for a community garden on the corner of Duncombe Road and Tower Street, will be retained. Reference to the policy will be removed. This section will be retitled 'Naturalistic Planting Areas'.
Para 4.21, line 3.	New sentence after <i>'brow of the hill towards Ware.'</i> <i>'Ware Park is of considerable local historic interest, including ancient hornbeam, oak and lime pollards, and earth works relating to the early deer park and later ornamental park.'</i>	Inserted in response to Reg. 16 consultation feedback from Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.
Para 4.22, lines 5 & 6	The final sentence has been deleted and replaced with <i>'Parts of Beane Marshes are owned and managed by the Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust.'</i>	The deleted Regulation 15 sentence referred to the 2020 community fundraising campaign to purchase sections of Beane Marshes.

Para 4.23, lines 2-3	<i>'which is designated as a Local Green Space in Policy HBN1'</i>	To replace – <i>'which is proposed for designation as Local Green Space in Policy HBN1'</i> .
Para 4.31, line 4	After <i>'built environment'</i> new text – <i>', including the aim to create a community garden on the corner of Duncombe Road and Tower Street.'</i>	As the Community Garden policy has been removed, an additional reference to the garden is inserted here. It's also within the Action Plan.
Para 4.36, last line	New line, after last line. <i>'Folly Island Allotments and Bengoe Allotments are much valued by the local community and are included on the list of community facilities in Appendix E.'</i>	The Examiner recommended deletion of the Assets of Community Value policy. As both allotments were proposed for ACV registration, attention has been drawn to them here.
Paras 4.37	Lines 2 & 3 will now read – <i>'three buildings and two allotment sites were identified as suitable for registration'</i>	In the Reg. 15 draft, paragraph 4.37 was the supporting text for the now deleted Assets of Community Value policy. The ACV policy and accompanying appendix has been deleted. The paragraphs will be retained but do not refer to a policy.
Page 26		Policy HBC2: Enhanced Community Facilities' will be relabelled HBC1. The reference within the Policy to Appendix F will be amended to Appendix E.
Para 4.40, line 9	<i>'which will'</i> to be replaced with <i>'to'</i>	Text updated.
Para 4.48, after last line	New line. <i>'Ten of these are included in Policy HBN4; Non-designated Buildings and Structures and more information on each is in Appendix F.'</i>	The examiner recommended that the reference to the appendix was moved from Policy HBC4 (to be relabelled HBC3) to the supporting text.
Page 31, Chapter Title	The chapter title 'Hertford Arts Hub' has been relabelled 'Cultural Facilities in the Plan Area'	To reflect the more generic policy and more generic supporting text.
Paragraph 4.49	Will now read – <i>'Cultural facilities within the Plan Area include Courtyard Arts in Port Vale, the Company of Players Theatre in Balfour Street, the Hertford Arts Hub in Hartham Lane, and Hertford Theatre (the majority of which falls within Castle Ward).'</i> Some of the text in para 4.49 will move to 4.50.	Given the Examiner's revisions to the 'Cultural Facilities' policy, and the deletion of the ACV policy, paragraphs 4.49-4.52 have been modestly revised to give this section a broader base.
Para 4.50	Now reads - <i>'The Hertford Arts Hub, within the Old Hertford Brewery, is a gallery space and not-for-profit arts organisation. Their website www.hertfordartshub.org refers to 'concept plans to convert the Old Hertford Brewery and Old British School into a high-quality public gallery'. During the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process, the majority of residents who responded to questions about a possible expansion of the Hertford Arts Hub, were supportive of the proposal.'</i>	The text is virtually the same as before but in a different para.

Para 4.51	All the text in paragraph 4.51 will be deleted. The text in paragraph 4.52 will move to paragraph 4.51.	The Regulation 15 text explained why the policy title had been changed from 'Hertford Arts Hub' (in the Reg 14 draft) to 'Cultural Facilities' (in the Reg 15 draft). This explanation is no longer needed.
Para 4.52	Will now read – <i>'Proposals to improve or increase cultural facilities within the Plan Area, and to promote parts of the area as a regional cultural centre, will be supported where consideration is given to the amenity of nearby residents, where the benefits to the community outweigh any disadvantages, and when the proposals are consistent with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.'</i>	This text combines some of the text that was previously in the Cultural Facilities policy with some of the text that was in the Reg. 15 draft.
Para 4.58	New text - <i>'The urban environment envisaged by the Neighbourhood Plan requires supportive highway measures that give priority to pedestrians and cyclists on all roads that are essentially residential, whether designated A, B or C roads or not. The highways environment needs to encourage walking to school, to the shops, and indeed, walking and cycling for most local journeys. The Neighbourhood Plan will support traffic calming measures, including, but not restricted to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>20 MPH speed limits on Bengoe Street</i> • <i>20 MPH speed limits on Sacombe Road from the Wadesmill Road/Sacombe Road mini roundabout up to the Wick</i> • <i>increased compliance with, and enforcement of, access restrictions"</i> 	The Reg. 15 para about the submission of a Sustainable Travel Town proposal has been deleted and replaced. Some of the revised text was suggested by Cllr. Andrew Stevenson and some of it has, at the Examiner's recommendation, been moved from Policy HBT1 to the supporting text.
Para 4.59, line 1	Deletion of 'proposed'	The Regulation 15 text said <i>'the proposed HERT4 development'</i>
Para 4.63, line 3	<i>'The HERT4 development site is around....'</i>	To replace <i>'will be around 400m from the Bengoe Street bus stop.'</i>
Para 4.65, lines 6 & 7	Deletion of <i>'to increase parking availability near Bengoe School'</i> . Insertion of <i>'promote walking and cycling'</i>	As the Examiner has removed the <i>'parking for Bengoe School'</i> criterion from Policy HBT2, it's no longer appropriate for the supporting text to refer to the requirement for development proposals to include strategies to increase parking availability near Bengoe School.
Para 4.67,	After the last word on the last line, new text – <i>'Planning consent was granted in July 2020.'</i>	To update the HERT4 text.
Para 4.69, line	All the text after <i>'but'</i> at the end of line 1 has been replaced with - <i>'small sites have come forward for development and are likely to continue doing so.'</i>	The Regulation 15 draft referred to the planning approval for 6 dwellings on Bengoe Street. As a number of sites have now come forward, it no longer makes sense to refer to just one in 2019.

Para 4.75, lines 6 & 7	Replacement text: <i>'District wide vehicle parking standards are contained within East Herts District Plan Policy TRA3 Vehicle Parking Provision and the District Council's Supplementary Planning Document Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development.'</i>	As the Examiner has removed the reference to parking standards in Policy HBH2, the supporting text has been deleted.
Para 4.76, line 5	The line <i>'By requiring developments'</i> will be replaced with <i>'By encouraging developers'</i>	To ensure consistency with revised Policy HBH3.
Para 4.77	<i>'Where feasible, development proposals should aim to include wildflower meadow planting areas, the retention of rough grass edges to encourage and support wildlife, and bird and bee nesting boxes or nesting areas.'</i>	The Regulation 15 text referred to the Waterford Wick planning application. The original application has been supplanted by another, which may not have the same environmental aims. The text has been retained but the reference to Waterford Wick removed.
Para 5.3, lines 2-3		The last two lines of this para have been deleted as the Sustainable Travel Town proposal didn't get through the first tranche.
Appendix B	<i>'/cycle'</i> will be added to No. 2. 'Recreational' column	To reflect Regulation 16 consultation feedback from the Civic Society.
Appendix G, The Greyhound Pub	The second sentence will be deleted and replaced with <i>'The adjacent site, previously a garage and car wash, has been developed for housing.'</i>	Updated text.
Appendix H	The two deleted policies will be removed, and the policies relabelled accordingly.	
Appendix I: Action Plan, Section 4	New text: <i>'Support initiatives to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>increase walking and cycling routes</i> • <i>improve road, foot, cycle and pavement surfaces (a request will be made to Hertfordshire County Council to resurface Bridleway 14/15 to improve the cycle route from HERT4 (former Bengo Nursery site) to the town centre)</i> • <i>introduce a 20 MPH speed limit on Bengo Street and on Sacombe Road from the Wadesmill Road/Sacombe Road mini roundabout to the Wick</i> • <i>increase compliance with and enforcement of access restrictions</i> • <i>introduce traffic calming and road and pavement safety measures on the lower Bengo roads to the town Centre.</i> • <i>increase the provision of secure, covered, cycle parking.'</i> New text under 'Funding': <i>'S106 Agreements, local grants and other funding streams.'</i>	Will be relabelled as Appendix H. All the text in item 4 will be deleted (it referred to the Sustainable Travel Town proposal).