**Objection Points For ETF 2**

**Case reference:17/01543/1**

**Comments must be made in writing to NHDC by August 3rd.**

**Planning Control, North Herts District Council, PO Box 10613, Nottingham, NG6 6DH.**

**Or by email to:**

**planning.control@north-herts.gov.uk**

Please note below are just points for you to use in your own way. The PPC planning advisor says it is also important to say in whatever way you wish, WHY the village is important to you and WHY this is just one application too far. It doesn’t have to be elegant or complex – just your own words about what you think.

1. **Development Boundary**

This development is outside of the current development boundary, and it is outside of the development boundary in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Local Plan.

1. **A Further 99 Houses Constitutes Over-development**

On the east side of Pirton village, the combination of both ETF1 (78 houses) and ETF2 (99 houses) would expand Pirton by nearly 34% in housing terms. This surely can’t be deemed appropriate for a village which currently has only about 530 houses! What with development already finished since 2011 (or currently approved or being built) this makes a total development expansion of **38%.** This is more in percentage terms than is planned for Hitchin (11%) or Letchworth (15%) or Royston (25%) in the emerging Local Plan, with no corresponding expansion in services, or infrastructure*.*

1. **Adverse Impact on the Entrance to the Village and Landscape**

As you enter the village from Holwell currently you look over to the Chiltern Hills, a designated area of outstanding natural beauty. This is one of our iconic views placing Pirton in its setting in the countryside. This development will have an adverse impact, on the setting of the village with reference to the Chilterns, and the Neighbourhood Plan and its attendant Character Assessment.

1. **Number of Cars will more than Double**

The number of cars exiting at the Y junction and on the narrow rural roads, will more than double if this development is approved. No assessment has taken place, combining the impact of traffic from both Phase 1 and Phase 2 which will all exit on to the highway, from one just one junction. What assessment has taken place regarding emergency situations.

1. **Inadequate Access**

The only access to the development is down a small side street within ETF1 – involving the destruction of an ancient hedge and crossing the proposed new pedestrian footpath.

1. **No Emergency Exit**

There is no emergency exit from ETF 2. The site borders the bridleway. The only exit other than the main Y junction would be through the ETF 1 emergency exit. What happens if the narrow access road through to ETF is blocked?

1. **Cumulative Impact of ETF1 & ETF2**

The cumulative impact of two large adjacent developments on the character and well-being of a small rural village MUST be considered.

1. **Development is in Breach of NHDC Emerging Policies**

The development breaches the emerging Local Plan Policy HSD4 on density.

1. **Adverse Impact on Hambridge Way**

The development will have an adverse impact on Hambridge Way which is part of Icknield Way and Chilterns Cycleway much used by walkers and cyclists who often stop at the village pubs and shop for refreshment. The suburban impact on the peaceful rural setting will be off putting to visitors and therefore detrimental to the rural economy.

1. **Development will Create an Isolated and Peripheral Estate**

ETF 1 and 2 will create a peripheral, and isolated estate on the edge of the village of Pirton, which will be very difficult to integrate with the existing village – every other section of the existing village is accessible to every other section. These developments are isolated carbuncles, and have no link footpaths or direct route into the rest of the village.

1. **Cumulative Adverse Impact**

The cumulative impact of both developments on the village infrastructure has not been taken into account, e.g. Roads, School. Buses, Sewage et al.

1. **No Construction Management Plan**

The Construction Management Plan for phase 1 is not yet finalised. With the problems this has caused, and the unresolved position on the route for construction traffic, a CMP must be in place before this application is considered. The cumulative effect and routing of construction traffic from an even larger development that ETF1 must be taken into account and dealt with, at the time of the outline application.

1. **NPPF does not Support the Transport Assessment**

The NPPF nor the emerging Local Plan provide any support for the Transport Assessment, which is absurd in its assessment of needs of a rural village, 4 miles from the nearest town.

In 5.7.2 of the Transport Assessment, Gladman state that *‘A key theme of national and local policy is that development should be located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.’*

*‘It can be concluded that the proposed development accords to this NPPF guidance ---- it is located and designed to give priority to pedestrian, cycle and public transport movements’*

The Assessment mentions there is a regular bus service: *‘It has been demonstrated that the site location will conform with the LTP3 goal to improve transport opportunities for all and achieve behavioural change for everyone ---- and encouraging physically active travel!’*

The Transport Assessment is not fit for purpose and in reality, it most certainly does not comply with the NPPF Section 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport.

1. **Archaeological Investigations and Assessment**

There have been important archaeological findings in the ETF1 assessment which it is thought most likely extend into the field of ETF2. There must be archaeological field evaluation over the whole field BEFORE the outline application is considered by councillors.