

Marshcroft Headline points

- **The proposed scale of the development versus the current size of Tring's 5000 houses.** Tring has evolved from a country market town into a vibrant community of 5000 houses with a healthy local economy as well as a home for London commuters. It is supported by local public services such as Schools and GP surgeries but all are showing signs of strain. Our Residents and Councils are not opposed to new housing and support in-fill developments as well as new estates like Roman Fields within the Town Boundary to cater for new generations. The Marshcroft proposal has been opposed for many reasons but it's sheer scale of 1400 new houses; around 3000 new residents and a further 2000 cars will not promote our Town's continued evolution it will change our small-town and rural community feel and add more pressure on our already strained public services.
- **The proposed development erodes trust in local democracy:**
 - It has no support in the adopted Local Plan.
 - The draft new Local Plan is delayed precisely because of the Local Plan process, not in spite of it, and in large part precisely because of this proposed development: in consultation, it became clear that there was no local support for the inclusion of the Marshcroft site in the Plan, necessitating a pause and re-drafting.
 - For the developer then to argue that their proposed development should be allowed because the Plan is out of date makes a mockery of the whole consultation process.
- [I / we] have seen the **Prime Minister's assurances that the Green Belt should be maintained and enhanced.** Constant applications and approvals are leading to 'death by a thousand cuts'. Hope Government will instead continue developing a more strategic approach nationally on where to build, as has been discussed in recent months.
- **This particular site immediately adjoins the Chilterns AONB.** The proposed development would affect views from both within and outside the AONB and lead to loss of openness in the AONB setting.
- **The developer's case is weak:**
 - The high proportion of **affordable housing** proposed by the developer appears commendable, but social rented accommodation is the overwhelming need and at the public inquiry the developer's witness accepted that **nearly 90% of the "affordable housing" would be out of financial reach of those in need of social rented accommodation.** And in any case at the public inquiry the **developer did not present any viability evidence to accompany the offer of affordable housing.**
 - **The developer at public inquiry did not explicitly consider landscape and harm issues** in their planning balance. There **would be major harm to the character of the area**, including to the agricultural fields, Tring Hills, Aldbury Scarp and for pedestrians on the Ridgeway and Grand Union Canal, and on the views from the Chilterns AONB. The **developer at public inquiry incorrectly argued that there is**

a strong urban influence on the site: the urban edge is only on the western boundary with some scattered development to the south.

- **Considering “very special circumstances” to build on the Green Belt should not be a mechanistic, contrived balancing exercise, especially of supposed benefits that really aren’t special.** Many of the ‘benefits’ that the developer proposed at the public inquiry are simply features that would be expected of any development of this size, were not targeted to this location, and / or were inadequate.