

ESSENTIAL REFERENCE PAPER 'J': CHAPTER 4 - BISHOP'S STORTFORD

Question 24: Growth Options for Bishop's Stortford

Please rank the growth options for Bishop's Stortford in order of preference, and comment on their suitability. Are there any other options we have not considered?

339 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 24. These included:

- 315 Individuals
- 7 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 11 Stakeholders/organisations including:
 - Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation
 - Environment Agency
 - Epping Forest District Council
 - Essex Country Council – Environment, Sustainability and Highways
 - Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre
 - Hertfordshire County Council – Passenger Transport Unit
 - Parsonage Residents Association
 - Stop Stansted Expansion
 - Thames Water Property Services
 - Thorley Manor Residents Association
 - Uttlesford District Council
- 6 Town and Parish Councils
 - Birchanger Parish Council (Essex)
 - Bishop's Stortford
 - Farnham Parish Council (Essex)
 - Stansted Parish Council (Essex)
 - Thorley
 - Walkern

Q24 - Summary Comment	Q24 - Detailed Comment
BS Civic Federation Standard response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “In the case of Bishop’s Stortford, none of the options is suitable. The strategy proposals for at least 4,000 homes, with most on the Area of Special Restraint, is unacceptable” (145)
Option 1 Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None of the options is suitable (non-standard response) • Support growth option 1. • Certain areas of Option 1 fall within Flood Zones 3 and 2. Incorporate reliance measures; • Restrict surface water run-off to green-field rates; 8m river buffer • Options 2-5 are in Flood Zone 1 but SUDS and 8m buffer strip should be incorporated. • Options 2 and 5 are supported as they are contained within the A road network surrounding Bishop’s Stortford • Need to speak to Thames Water about implications of development scenarios • Need to refer to Old River Lane site in the Core Strategy • Option 1 likely to be unsuitable due to lack of land • Option 1 – take care not to build on open spaces/green space
Option 2 Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Option 2 for employment because of its highly accessible location. E. Herts and Uttlesford should work together on this site. • Threat to Birchanger Wood from Option 2 • Threat to character of Birchanger village from Option 2 • Object to Options 2 and 4, which lie outside East Herts and are within the Uttlesford Local Planning Authority area. • Option 2. Whilst the site is located in Uttlesford District, due to its proximity to Bishop’s Stortford town centre and its retail parks (and existing employment allocations) , it is considered that the proposals are of equal if not greater relevance to Bishop’s Stortford and East Herts as a district, although of course it of course it would also be of considerable benefit to Uttlesford being an employment use along the A120 corridor. • Option 2 Supported: A new employment provision within Stansted Road would assist the delivery of the work/homes balance and the creation of a sustainable settlement. • Option 2 supported – extremely accessible from the A120 and M11 such that it would be highly attractive to commercial occupiers • Option 2 – site capacity estimated to provide for around 1,500 new jobs. The site is supported by the East Herts Employment Land and Policy Review (October 2008) and could help to address the identified critical shortage of employment land in the town. • Option 2 – development of this option would help to meet the ‘challenging’ ambitions for job creation in the district set out in paragraph 3.4.6 of the issues and Options consultation document • Option 2 is a prime example of how collaborative working with neighbourhood authorities to maximise economic benefits, as stated in paragraph 3.4.13 of the Issues and Options consultation document. • Option 2. Green belt aims would not be undermined as A120 is a firm, defensible boundary. • Option 2 is in the ownership of a single landowner and is highly deliverable.
Option 3 Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option 3 area of surplus land west of the golf course would not be visible from or physically adjoining the M11. • Option 3 west of golf course would not extend urban sprawl into the countryside, and would help to support the golf club • Option 3 would increase congestion at M11 Jnct 8 and B1383, which links numerous Uttlesford villages. • Option 3 meets all the criteria for the development strategy set out in paragraph 3.7.8 of the issues and options consultation document.

Q24 - Summary Comment	Q24 - Detailed Comment
Option 5 Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Option 5 landscape impact affecting the setting of the town.
Options Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Danger of coalescence with Sawbridgeworth from Options 4 and 5. Concerns about visual impact from M11 of options 3 and 4. Noise and pollution near M11 Fill space west of M11 subject to topographical restrictions. Aircraft noise – Options 3, 4 and 5, not just Option 5. Avoid development in areas over 60 dBA Leq. Option 5 should be under 60, whereas options 3 and 4 would be over 60. 1, 3 and 4 are most likely to restrict ‘sprawl’
Alternative development locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider small-scale Green Belt releases in locations other than the directions of growth outlined Build 2-3 storeys on the Goods Yard Build new towns near established transport links using brownfield sites Prioritise brownfield sites Future growth should be outside the bypass with Park and Ride Promoting USS’s properties at Myson Way and Raynham Close as employment locations Try Watton-at-Stone or Stanstead Abbots as they both have rail links Buntingford and Sawbridgeworth North of Harlow Hertford Extend towns around the perimeter of each. Dunmow/ Takeley Use empty properties Use Olympic Stadium after 2014 Has the redevelopment of Anchor Street/South Street been considered South of Royston area Spread a sensible number of homes amongst every town, village and hamlet
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target of 8,500 homes is spurious. Ignore targets and build according to local needs and budgets Increasing housing supply does not increase affordability but does fuel demand. No need for new homes Town has reached its natural capacity Infrastructure cannot cope. Need appropriate infrastructure Concentrate on social housing where car use/travel is not the priority and rebuild communities Too much housing growth in Bishop’s Stortford in the recent past; too many flats built in recent years; no flats above three storeys; no demand for flats This has to be the prerogative of the inhabitants of these towns Do not build on the Green Belt Need agricultural land for food production Expand bypass to M11 Town centre residential development should be car-free due to area having good public transport accessibility Stansted Airport has planning permission to grow to 35 million passengers per years and 274,000 total aircraft movements. These levels are expected to be reached during the plan period We don’t need more executive houses that only the rich can afford. Schools are full Damage to character of the town Traffic congestion e.g. Hockerill

Q24 - Summary Comment	Q24 - Detailed Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep pressure off town centres • Teenagers need something to do • Opinions should not be restricted to simple preferential ranking ticks in boxes • Avoid coalescence and ribbon development • Suitable options must be near major roads • Ring Road sets a clearly definable boundary and is more easily defended against future expansion. • Town Council will not sell its allotments • General approach should be high density with some medium • None of the options are perfect but development is necessary
Areas of Special Restraint (ASRs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining Local Plan allocations, including the ASRs, should be carried forward as an allocation even if a planning application is not forthcoming. • Development of the ASRs will be necessary to address the shortage of housing land across the district • ASRs should be renamed as they are no longer 'reserve', but are now development sites following the Council's 2008 decision to release the sites for development. • Object to development of ASRs

Comments received to Q24 in respect of other Chapters

Chapter 3: Development Strategy

Q24 - Summary Comment	Q24 - Detailed Comment
General – East of England Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.2.19 of the Issues and Options document states that the number of homes East Herts must provide may be reduced following the revocation of the East of England Plan. However, this does not affect the clear position set out in the draft document with regard to the ASRs, a position which has been long established. It is vitally important that the local authority urgently comes to a view on total housing numbers.

Question 25: Approach to Development in Bishop’s Stortford

Please rank the approaches to development in Bishop’s Stortford in order of preference. Is there another approach we have not considered?

31 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 25. These included:

- 19 Individuals
- 6 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 4 Stakeholders/organisations including:
 - Bishop’s Stortford Civic Federation
 - Environment Agency
 - Hertfordshire County Council – Passenger Transport Unit
 - The Thatching Information Service
- 2 Town and Parish Councils including:
 - Bishop’s Stortford
 - Thorley

Q25 - Summary Comment	Q25 - Detailed Comment
High Density	• Higher density development is likely to be more commercially viable for passenger transport provision
	• High density causes noise and pollution
	• Prevent cramped accommodation
	• Prefer quality town house/terrace style approach to higher densities, rather than flats
	• Redress current imbalance away from flats towards family housing on appropriate sites
	• Too many flats; high density flats have changed the town’s character
Medium density	• Infrastructure and roads unable to cope with increased density
Low density	• Medium density to the east
Depends	• Development should be low to medium density – we have far too many flats
	• Cannot ask about density at this stage
	• Density can only be considered on a site-by-site basis; a mix of all three.
	• Density should be considered in terms of flood risk. Consider building on stilts
Do not develop	• Need to build communities not dormitories, not ugly boxes.
	• No further land-take
Miscellaneous	• Do not develop
	• Use the boys school land

Question 26: Bishop's Stortford Vision

Do you agree with the emerging LDF vision for Bishop's Stortford?

29 people/organisations provided comments in relation to Question 26. These included:

- 13 Individuals
- 7 Developers/landowners/agents/businesses
- 6 Stakeholders/organisations including:
 - Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation
 - Environment Agency
 - Jehovah's Witnesses
 - Natural England
 - Sport England
 - Stansted Airport Ltd
- 3 Town and Parish Councils including:
 - Bishop's Stortford
 - Farnham Parish Council (Essex)
 - Stansted Parish Council (Essex)

Q26 - Summary Comment	Q26 - Detailed Comment
Support vision	• Support the vision
	• Support development of the ASRs
	• Support strengthening of town centre viability and vitality
	• Support set-back from river front
	• Support flexible employment approach
Object to the vision	• Support Civic Federation's Vision – no need for another vision
	• More housing will add to dormitory effect
	• Concerned that the development will not meet housing need but rather demand, which will stimulate further demand
	• Need more emphasis on economic sustainability to prevent export of jobs
	• Need to look at maximum population and housing requirement for the town
	• Why is there no mention of Stansted Airport in the draft vision? E.g. employment and transport opportunities, and the need to mitigate impacts of noise and traffic
	• Oppose development on the ASRs
Question deliverability	• Vision is too vague/idealistic – how will these goals be achieved?
Other comments	• Concerned about access to Farnham village through the ASRs
	• Do not redevelop the Mill Site with flats – we were promised a green open space
	• Object to any spread into Uttlesford District