

Row ID	Respondent ID for Main Mods	SBC_ Comment ID for Main Mods	Date	Respondent ID Name	Theme of Comment	Local Plan Policy No.	Comments for Main Modifications to the Local Plan Partial Update	SBC Response
1	SBC_001	1	26/3/2026	National Grid Electricity Transmission	Sites in close proximity to power lines.	Sites HO3, EC1/4 and EC1/7	<p>Policy HO3: North of Stevenage This site has the above listed asset interacting with it through the central part of the allocation. We continue to agree with the inclusion of HO3(o) which makes clear that development proposals must demonstrate that an appropriate buffer around existing power lines is incorporated for development proposals to be permitted. We also agree with provisions at 9.34 which recognises the asset as a constraint and further requires implementation of a suitable buffer. However, we ask that the relevant guidance be referred to within a footnote, as with footnote 68 (previously footnote 57) to ensure consistency in approach to addressing the constraint across numerous sites. The updated link to provide is provided below in relation to Policy EC1.</p> <p>Policy EC1: Allocated sites for employment development (EC1/4 Land west of North Road) and (EC1/7 Land west of Junction 8) Both these sites have the above listed asset interacting with them, to varying degrees. In recognition of this, we support the continued inclusion of the following text, in reference to EC1/4, within Policy EC1: "Development proposals will need to have regard to the constraints on this site and, in particular, ensure appropriate clearances from the</p>	<p>Comments noted and appreciated. These are currently out of scope for this consultation on the Local Plan Partial Update - Main Modifications. Sites within the Local Plan have not changed from the adopted Local Plan (2019). However these will be noted for a new Local Plan, and the Council are keen to collaborate with NGET in all parts of the planning process.</p> <p>Therefore, these comments will be noted because they do not relate to the main modifications the Council are consulting on.</p> <p>Some of the current sites within the plan will have been built out / or are currently underway. The planning permission for EC1/4 is planning application number 21/00529/FPM and Housing site HO3 is 17/00862/OPM. These will show the levels of communication and work regarding the power lines,</p>

						<p>overhead lines” but ask that EC1 be adapted to reference both the above sites, not just EC1/4. For additional clarity, a suitable location for this might be within the site discussion at 6.7 of the policy. We also support the direct reference to National Grid guidance. However the link provided in footnote to the plan (footnote 68 – previously 57) is no longer active and should be updated to the most recent version as follows: https://www.nationalgrid.com/document/345326/download Without appropriate acknowledgement of the NGET assets present within the sites, these policies should not be considered effective as they cannot be delivered as proposed; unencumbered by the constraints posed by the presence of NGET infrastructure and we must continue to object on this basis.</p>	<p>which run through the sites. This level of collaboration is essential to ensure development is carried out accordingly, especially for the sites yet to be completed such as EC1/7.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council will note these comments and ensure these are incorporated in to the future work of planning in the Council.</p>
2	SBC_002	2	19/03/2026	Hertfordshire Gardens Trust	General	We have no comment to make on the proposed modifications which are outside of the area of interest and remit of Hertfordshire Gardens Trust.	Comments noted.

3	SBC_003	3	11/3/2026	Natural England	General	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England has no comments to make on the Main Modifications for the Local Plan, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulations Assessment or Appropriate Assessment for the Stevenage Borough Council. We agree with your conclusions on these screening reports.</p> <p>The lack of comment from Natural England should not be interpreted as a statement that there are no impacts on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may wish to make comments that might help the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to fully take account of any environmental risks and opportunities relating to this document.</p> <p>If you disagree with our assessment of this proposal as low risk, or should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, please consult Natural England again.</p>	Comments noted.
4	SBC_004	4	30/3/2026	Historic England	General	<p>Thank you for inviting us to comment on the Council's Main Modifications, the updated Sustainability Appraisal, and the HRA / Appropriate Assessment. Having reviewed the documents, I can confirm</p>	Comments noted.

							that we have no specific comments on the modifications themselves, and we agree with the conclusions of the SA and the Appropriate Assessment that the previous assessment remains valid.	
5	SBC_005	5	31/3/2026	Environment Agency	MM37	FP2	<p>Main Modifications MM37 – Policy FP2 We do not agree with MM37. First, we disagree that the policy language is softened from must to should. It is a requirement to ensure flood risk is appropriately managed and therefore it is not unreasonable to expect that new developments must adhere to the policy. In addition to this, we are particularly concerned with the removal of ‘provide an 8m undeveloped buffer zone from the top of the bank of main rivers’ from the policy wording. We strongly recommend that it is reincorporated into the modified wording. We’ve set out a recommendation for this below: “Provide an undeveloped buffer zone of 8m from the top of the bank of any adjacent main rivers or 3m from the top of the bank of adjacent ordinary watercourses;” We also disagree with the change of wording to an all-encompassing ‘All development proposals will be assessed against national planning policies for flood risk’.</p> <p>We strongly encourage local authorities to have their own local policy requirements for flood risk. We therefore suggest that the original specific policy points (a, b, c, d, g, i and j) are reinstated, to go alongside the modified ‘new’ list of a, b and c. Our concerns about MM37’s alterations to the policy wording for FP2 are further amplified by the fact that the SFRA is out of date and no new SFRA has been submitted in support of the Local</p>	<p>The comments from the Environment Agency are noted and much appreciated with their level of expertise. The changes were made due to lengthy discussions held at the Examination at Public Hearing Sessions in December 2025 with the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The changes were agreed to bring the wording in line with national guidance, particularly the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and The Flood Risk & Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>Flood risk is an important consideration in planning and these changes were made to be flexible in language with the PPG and NPPF. This is to ensure consistency and avoid duplication at a local level.</p> <p>The Council will work closely with the Environment Agency on our new Local Plan for Stevenage and this policy approach can be reviewed</p>

						<p>Plan.</p> <p>Other Main Modifications We have no comments on the rest of the main modifications proposed.</p>	<p>with them to ensure consistency with National Policy.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

6	SBC_005	6	31/3/2026	Environment Agency	Evidence Base - Strategic Flood Risk Assessment	Evidence Base In our response to the Regulation 19 Consultation, we highlighted the need for an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This has not been completed. We expect that if the Local Plan is adopted, you must begin work on an updated SFRA within 6 months. If it is not adopted, an updated SFRA should be produced as part of any revised Local Plan consultation.	<p>Comments are noted on the Council's evidence base. As responded at Regulation 19, flood risk mapping is sent annually to the Council and is uploaded on to our GIS web mapping to ensure we are using the most up to date data and ensure the Council is using the most up to date data.</p> <p>We agree with the age of the SFRA, but due to the Local Plan Partial Update not changing any of its allocated sites or housing numbers, the Sustainability Appraisal, and Appropriate Assessment concluded that an updated SFRA was not necessary for this partial update of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It was agreed that a new Local Plan will need an updated SFRA to ensure flooding is considered and kept up to date and in line with electronic documentation. This will be a priority when we commence work on the new Local Plan and the Council are keen to work collaboratively with the Environment Agency at all stages.</p>
---	---------	---	-----------	--------------------	---	--	--

7	SBC_006	7	31/3/2026	National Highways	General		Many thanks for consulting National Highways on the proposed Main Modifications for the Local Plan Partial Update. Having reviewed the proposals, National Highways would wish to make no comments on the amendments.	Comments noted.
8	SBC_007	8	31/3/2026	NHS HWE ICB	MM9	CC1	<p>Thank you for consulting the NHS HWE ICB on the Local Plan Partial Update Main Modifications. I have reviewed main modification 9 (MM9) relating to the proposed changes to Policy CC1: Energy Efficiency. The HWE ICB raised concerns with Policy CC1 at the Regulation 18 and 19 consultation stages on the grounds that any major development proposals for Stevenage brought forward by the NHS from 2026 onwards would likely to be contrary to Policy CC1, due to the Council's locally set and earlier net zero target dates when compared to the NHS' later set targets . As such the NHS was duly concerned that this will may impact on the delivery of capital projects and the provision of adequate health services and infrastructure to meet housing growth in the borough.</p> <p>The proposed changes to Policy CC1 now allow for the policy to be applied flexibly, recognising that it may not always be appropriate to achieve zero emissions; covering instances where it may not be technically feasible, financially viable, or would otherwise compromise the delivery of sustainable development. This clarity, allowing the Council to apply Policy CC1 to decisions on planning applications flexibly is welcomed and supported by the NHS HWE ICB.</p>	Comments noted and support welcomed.

9	SBC_008	9	31/3/2026	Hertfordshire County Council	General	<p>SP11, CC3, TC4, HO10, HO11</p> <p>Thank you for consulting HCC on the Stevenage Local Plan Partial Update & Review Main Modifications. HCC has the following comments to make.</p> <p><u>MM8 - Policy SP11</u> No comments.</p> <p><u>MM11 – Policy CC3</u> Welcome changes to para 6A.26 and 27</p> <p><u>MM18 – Policy TC4</u> Welcome the requirement for a comprehensive strategic masterplan for the entire allocation. HCC would like to be involved in the creation of this masterplan, particularly consultations associated with this work. HCC welcomes the re-use of the good work produced for the AAP in this replacement masterplan process.</p> <p><u>MM32 - Policy HO10</u> HCC welcomes the support for sheltered and supported housing schemes.</p> <p><u>MM33 - Policy HO11</u> No comments.</p>	Comments noted.
---	---------	---	-----------	---------------------------------	---------	---	-----------------

10	SBC_008	10	31/3/2026	Hertfordshire County Council	Flooding	FP1, FP2	<p><u>MM36 – Policy FP1</u></p> <p>No issues with the changes to the first paragraph</p> <p>We would see the updating of “SuDS proposals must” to “should” as a step backwards. If SuDS proposals do not ensure that peak discharge rates from the site will not increase, then that is likely to increase flood risk, as it not achieving greenfield run-off rates on greenfield sites, etc.</p> <p>We would see the removal of the sentence seeking to refuse the discharge of surface water to foul sewers as a downgrade. Foul sewer networks are not designed to accommodate surface water flows and would never normally accept “clean” surface water runoff. Discharging surface water runoff to foul sewers is likely to increase flood risk, is not in accordance with PPG in which the foul sewer is not listed as a viable discharge location, and is contrary to paragraph 1.10 of the National Standards for SuDS (2025), which states “Surface water runoff from the development shall not discharge to a foul drainage system.” It is understood if the LPA considers the above (regarding PPG and the National Standards for SuDS) as sufficient national guidance, and because it is not included in Table 4 (page 183) of the Local Plan, that it is not necessary to stipulate this in the Local Plan itself – however it does make this aspect less robust.</p> <p>Removal of the paragraph “proposals reliant on underground attenuations... will be refused” is reasonable provided the SuDS hierarchy is shown to be explored and there are no scope to provide SuDS attenuation in above-ground features.</p>	<p>As per SBC's response to the Environment Agency (Row ID 5), the comments from HCC are noted and much appreciated with their level of expertise. The changes were made due to lengthy discussions held at the Examination at Public Hearing Sessions in December 2025 with the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The changes were agreed to bring the wording in line with national guidance, particularly the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and The Flood Risk & Coastal Change Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>Flood risk, SuDS and watercourses (not limited to) are an important consideration in planning, and these changes were made to be flexible in language with the PPG and NPPF. This is to ensure consistency and avoid duplication at a local level.</p> <p>The Council will always closely with HCC's Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) in all areas of planning from applications to policy.</p>
----	---------	----	-----------	---------------------------------	----------	-------------	--	---

						<p>Removal of the paragraph “At the application stage, development proposals involving SuDS...” is reasonable as this is covered by NPPF / PPG.</p> <p>MM37 – Policy FP2</p> <p>The updated wording is less robust for flood risk management, however much of what has been removed is covered by national legislation/guidance.</p> <p>FP2 part C regarding watercourses is in accordance with the draft NPPF which includes new policy on re-naturalisation of watercourses where flood risk would not be increased as a result.</p> <p>A 3m undeveloped buffer from ordinary watercourses is a local LLFA requirement that we will be seeking at application stage – this is to ensure that watercourses can be accessed for maintenance by the relevant landowner(s).</p> <p>The removal of “must” in favour of “should” with regards to protecting existing flood defences including allowing space for maintenance access etc is less robust.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

11	SBC_009	11	31/3/2026	Hertfordshire County Council	Trees	NH5	<p>MM38 – Policy NH5</p> <p>Part ‘b’ states “replacement trees or planting are provided which are; i Of equal or better quality than the trees which are lost...”. How is quality to be defined. Clarity on this term should be provided (size, condition, suitability of species for location etc). This term is too open for interpretation.</p>	Comments noted. The Council will consider this point closely when embarking on its new Local Plan.
12	SBC_010	12	31/3/2026	McCarthy Stone and Churchill Living	Sheltered housing	HO10 and HO11	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Stevenage Local Plan main modifications consultation.</p> <p>McCarthy Stone (MS) and Churchill Living (CL) are independent housebuilders specialising in specialist housing for older people. Together, they are responsible for delivering approximately 90% of England’s specialist owner-occupied retirement housing. Both operators are therefore well placed to provide comment on the policy barriers that may have the potential to restrict supply within the sector.</p> <p>With respect to MM32 and MM33 we support the flexibility introduced by the main modifications.</p>	Comments noted.