

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
General Issues		
8.01	Flooding is an issue in Sawbridgeworth and in the area of West Road in particular.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The proposed allocation to the north of West Road is in Flood Zone 1. With regards to the site to the south of West Road, only the eastern boundary is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 due to the presence of the brook in that location. Therefore there will not be any development in Flood Zones 2 or 3, meaning that the risk of river (fluvial) flooding is low. With regards to surface water or drainage flooding, the developments will need to include sustainable drainage measures in accordance with the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which will decrease the risk of flooding rather than exacerbate it.</p> <p>In addition, development proposals would need to demonstrate that drainage issues had been adequately addressed at the planning application stage.</p>
8.02	There is not enough school capacity to cope with additional development. Essex County Council indicates that the needs of Lower Sheering will need to be taken account of when considering school capacity.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Hertfordshire County Council throughout the plan making process. HCC is the authority responsible for forecasting demand for school places and ensuring that there is sufficient capacity within a catchment to meet that demand, taking into consideration potential growth in neighbouring areas.</p> <p>With regards to Sawbridgeworth, development to the north of West Road would provide land which would facilitate the expansion of Mandeville Primary school by 1FE. In addition, Leventhorpe School is also able to expand if required. HCC are therefore satisfied that sufficient additional provision can be made in order to cater for the proposed level of growth in Sawbridgeworth.</p>
8.03	There are not sufficient services and facilities in the town to cope with additional people, particularly health care.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Sawbridgeworth is one of the larger settlements in the District, with a number of services and facilities, and is considered a sustainable location for some new development.</p> <p>The Council continues to liaise with NHS England and other health providers in order to understand any capacity issues at GP surgeries and ensure that appropriate provision can be made in relation to patients generated by new development. All new development will be required to make appropriate financial contributions towards services and infrastructure, including</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		<p>healthcare.</p> <p>The Co-operation for Sustainable Development Member Board, of which East Herts is part, has engaged with representatives from Princess Alexandra Hospital. Given the constraints associated with the existing site, the hospital Trust is keen to explore the possibility of relocating the facility to an alternative location. Discussions are currently at an early stage, and a preferred location in the Harlow area has not yet been identified. In addition, the Government will not be making a decision on whether to fund a new hospital until Autumn 2016. However, it is considered that the Gilston Area could provide a suitable location for a relocated hospital, and as such, the District Plan will include this possibility as an option to be further explored.</p>
8.04	<p>The A1184 does not have capacity to cope with extra traffic. Potential options include extending the A414 at Harlow to connect to the A120 thus diverting traffic away from Sawbridgeworth, a bypass around the town as proposed by Mark Prisk MP and others or a new M11 junction at Hatfield Heath. Traffic issues on the A1184 can be considered to be 'severe' in accordance with the NPPF. Proposed cycle paths are not sufficient to ameliorate this impact. People from new developments will need to commute elsewhere for work which again adds to traffic issues.</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council suggests that the combined impact of traffic from the developments could lead to capacity issues on the A1184 at the Station Road / West Road junction, Brook Road junction and in particular long delays at the A1184 / High Wych Road junction, which will require further consideration. Large delays are also forecast at the Station Road /London Road junction. The section of the A1184 Cambridge Road on the northern boundary of Harlow (between Redricks Lane and Edinburgh Way) may also become over capacity due to the combined impact of development in north east Harlow and further to the north in Sawbridgeworth and Bishop's Stortford.</p> <p>Essex County Council also raise concerns regarding the</p>	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following the Preferred Options consultation, Essex County Council has undertaken transport modelling, known as VISUM, which covers the wider West Essex/East Herts area. The modelling assesses the impact of new housing on the strategic road network, including the A1184 through Sawbridgeworth. While this work is still ongoing, the modelling undertaken to date shows that the road network can cater for the proposed level of development, and that the impact of new development would not be 'severe'. In particular, the modelling demonstrates that the provision of a new Junction 7a on the M11 would ease existing pressure on the A1184.</p> <p>The District Plan includes policies that seek to encourage sustainable travel, including walking and cycling. This will also help mitigate the impact of new housing developments.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is currently being prepared which will identify any infrastructure requirements and will include information on how and when specific schemes will be delivered.</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
	impact of increased traffic on the existing crossing into Harlow.	
8.05	Development would have a negative impact on wildlife and the environment.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Neither of the proposed allocations would impact on County Wildlife Sites or Sites of Special Scientific Interest. Ecological surveys would be required at the planning application stage in order to assess the presence of wildlife on site and any mitigation measures that maybe required.</p>
8.06	West Road is too narrow for additional traffic and the junction with London Road is of particular concern. Putting traffic lights at this junction would make the situation worse. There needs to be clarification as to whether the proposals include a plan to widen West Road. Also concern regarding existing rat-running along West Road and beyond.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding the impact of additional traffic on West Road are recognised. It is the view of Officers that the amount of development proposed for the site to the south of West Road should be reduced, partly in response to these concerns. However, the transport modelling undertaken to date demonstrates that the impact of development in this location would not be 'severe' providing that mitigation measures, including signalisation of the West Road/A1184 junction, are delivered. The quantum of development to be provided in this location will be considered through the Settlement Appraisal for Sawbridgeworth which will be presented to Members in August.</p> <p>In addition, the site to the north of West Road would include provision of 20 additional off-road car parking spaces for Mandeville School, meaning that existing pressures will be reduced at peak times. Due to the nature of the road and the location of existing development, it is not possible to widen West Road.</p> <p>The District Plan includes policies that seek to encourage sustainable travel, including walking and cycling. This will also help mitigate the impact of new housing developments.</p>
8.07	There are already air quality issues in the town and additional development would exacerbate this.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>District Plan policy EQ4 prescribes how issues of air quality should be considered as part of specific development proposals.</p>
8.08	There would be additional strain on train services. The station is inadequate and trains are already overcrowded.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Discussions have taken place during the plan making process with the relevant Train Operating Companies and Network Rail and are ongoing. Hertfordshire County Council is currently in the process of updating its Rail Strategy which will also influence how train services can adapt to growing demand.</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		<p>The need for additional capacity on the Liverpool Street line has been highlighted through several mechanisms and the four-tracking of the line between the Tottenham Hale and Broxbourne areas has been included in Network Rail's recently published Anglia Route Study, March 2016. This currently anticipates potential commencement within Control Period 6 (i.e. between 2019-2024).</p>
8.09	<p>Development at this scale would impact negatively on the character of the town.</p>	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The design of new developments is an important consideration and this will be addressed by policy wording in the District Plan. However, It is not considered that the provision of a limited number of additional dwellings would have a significant impact on the character of Sawbridgeworth.</p>
8.10	<p>The population statistics show that there is not a need for 400 new homes in Sawbridgeworth by 2021.</p>	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The NPPF states that local planning authorities should seek to meet their objectively assessed housing needs. The Council, and neighbouring local authorities within the housing market area, previously commissioned independent consultants to undertake a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. This technical study, which is available to view on the Councils website, identifies that the housing need in East Herts is 745 dwellings up to 2033 (16,390 new homes in total).</p> <p>In order to help meet this challenging level of need, some development will be required in Sawbridgeworth, which is one of the more sustainable settlements in the District.</p>
8.11	<p>There is currently a clearly defined Green Belt boundary to the west of Sawbridgeworth; Sawbridgeworth Brook. This should not be breached. Green Belt should not be used for development.</p>	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has always sort to bring forward brownfield sites wherever possible. This includes the Goods Yard in Bishop's Stortford and the Mead Lane area in Hertford which are proposed for allocation within the District Plan. However, being a predominantly rural district, there are very few brownfield sites available. Therefore development on greenfield sites, including Green Belt, is required.</p> <p>The proposed allocation to the north of West Road does not go beyond the route of Sawbridgeworth Brook. However, it is not considered that the brook currently forms a strong Green Belt boundary - a stronger boundary can be created as part of the proposed development. It is considered by Officers that the number of dwellings proposed to the south of West Road should be reduced, partly in order to avoid development of the more sensitive areas of Green Belt.</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
8.12	The land proposed for development is Grade 2 agricultural land which should not be used for development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The majority of the land proposed for development in Sawbridgeworth is Grade 3 agricultural land, although much of the site to the south of West Road is Grade 2. The NPPF does encourage local planning authorities to avoid development of good quality agricultural land wherever possible. However, much of the agricultural land in East Hertfordshire is regarded as being of high quality. It would therefore not be possible for the District to meet its substantial level of housing need without some carefully planned development on higher quality land.</p>
8.13	Development to the north of Leventhorpe School would be more suitable for development, either side of the A1184.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Having undertaken further technical work following the Preferred Options consultation, it is the view of Officers that land to the north of Sawbridgeworth on the eastern side of the A1184, should be identified within the District Plan as an allocation.</p> <p>The quantum of development to be provided in this location will be considered through the Settlement Appraisal for Sawbridgeworth which will be presented to Members in August.</p>
8.14	Affordable housing should be for local people and that this principal should be included within policy.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This District wide issue is not a matter of detail for a settlement specific chapter, and has been dealt with within the housing chapter.</p>
8.15	If there is a need for this level of development in the town then sites should be more dispersed to ease pressure on the road network.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. It is the view of Officers that a site to the north of the town, east of the A1184, should be identified as an allocation within the District Plan, partly in response to local concern regarding traffic congestion.</p>
8.16	The proposed development area lies immediately under the flight path for Stansted where planes pass at 5,000 feet.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Sawbridgeworth lies outside the area of concern as defined by noise contour maps. The area is also outside flight safety zones. Recent changes to flightpath navigation systems have greatly reduced the area of land overflown during take-off and landing.</p>
8.17	Sawbridgeworth should cater for more than 456 dwellings.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Advice from Hertfordshire County Council indicates that provision of development beyond an approximate figure of 500 dwellings would require a bypass. In addition, development in other locations could lead to Green Belt concerns, and in a particular the issue of coalescence with</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		Harlow and High Wych.
8.18	Historic England welcomes reference to the historic nature of Sawbridgeworth and the need for new development to the west of the town to respect its character.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed. The policy for the proposed allocation to the north will contain similar wording.</p>
8.19	HCC suggests that it would be helpful if Reedings Junior School was removed from the Green Belt in order to assist with any potential future expansion plans. The removal of the developed area of Leventhorpe from the Green Belt is welcomed.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Leventhorpe School buildings (but not the playing fields) are proposed for removal from the Green Belt as it is considered to be part of the built up area of the town. However, in general, the Council has not sought to remove school sites from Green Belt. The potential need to expand schools, such as Reedings Junior, is considered to represent the 'very special circumstances' required to allow development within Green Belt areas. Such proposals should therefore be pursued through the planning application process.</p>
8.20	The design of new housing should reflect the character of the town better than the recent Scholar's Walk development. In particular, the Plan should state that development should be built at a density which reflects that existing town. The current proposals do not do that.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Policy HOU2 states that proposals should demonstrate how the density of new development has been informed by the character of the local area and contributes to the design objectives of Policy DES3.</p>
8.21	The soil type in the area is clay which means that the use of SuDs would be unsuitable.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The design of SuDs can be adapted depending on the type of soil and bedrock in any given area. Overall, new development should reduce the risk of surface water and drainage flooding, rather than exacerbate it.</p>
8.22	The developer suggests that 500 dwellings is the trigger point for the requirement of a bypass. Is this the case?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council have identified that a bypass would be required following the provision of approximately 500 dwellings in Sawbridgeworth.</p>
8.23	The proposed development does not meet the demands of the Council's own SA in that it would not provide any sustainability benefits	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The proposed developments in Sawbridgeworth would provide new housing to meet local needs without having a significant negative impact on the character of the town or the natural environment. In addition, development of the site to the north of West Road would provide land</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		which would facilitate the expansion of Mandeville Primary school by 1FE.
8.24	Reference to provision of green space is laughable given that the proposals will reduce that which already exists.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has always sort to bring forward brownfield sites wherever possible. This includes the Goods Yard in Bishop's Stortford and the Mead Lane area in Hertford which are proposed for allocation within the District Plan. However, being a predominantly rural district, there are very few brownfield sites available. Therefore development on greenfield sites, including Green Belt, is required.</p> <p>Where development does take place, the Council seeks the provision of new public open space wherever possible.</p>
8.25	The issue of water supply and sewage disposal should be investigated further.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has liaised with Thames Water throughout the plan making process. Thames Water has advised that Rye Meads STW has capacity to cater for all known growth in the wider sub-region up to, and beyond the end of plan period in 2033. In addition, the Council has also engaged with the relevant water providers and other utilities providers in order to ensure that the proposed level and location of growth can be provided for.</p>
8.26	A noise assessment which looks at the impact of 400 homes in this location should be undertaken.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not considered that the provision of a limited amount of residential development would have any substantial impact in terms of noise issues.</p>
8.27	The impact on services and facilities should be assessed before development takes place.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has worked closely with service providers, including Hertfordshire County Council, NHS England and utilities companies, throughout the plan making process in order to ensure that the level of growth proposed can be catered for.</p>
8.28	The development could be located in the Gilston Area (in addition to the development already identified) rather than Sawbridgeworth which would put less pressure on the town.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council must identify sufficient sites to provide for 16,390 new homes by 2033. As part of this, the Council must meet identified needs in the first 5 years, taking into account previous undersupply and the inclusion of a 20% buffer, brought forward from later in the plan period. Given the size and complexity of the Gilston Area, only a certain number of homes could be</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		<p>provided within the plan period, and it is highly unlikely that any development could take place within the first five years.</p> <p>Proposed allocations are therefore required elsewhere in the District in order to meet objectively assessed housing needs, both within the first five years of the plan period and beyond.</p>
8.29	Consideration should be given to potential development around Lower Sheering as this would also impact on the town.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. The Co-operation for Sustainable Development Board, a group which comprises East Herts, Epping Forest, Uttlesford and Harlow Councils, was established in 2014 in order to discuss strategic cross boundary issues. While Epping Forest Council will not be publishing their draft Local Plan until Autumn 2016, they have advised this Council that it is very unlikely that any significant development will be proposed in the Lower Sheering area.</p>
8.30	Infrastructure should be delivered before or alongside new development not after it has taken place.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council is fully aware that, in order to ensure the delivery of sites within the Plan, any necessary mitigating infrastructure must be identified and provided at the most appropriate time in the development process. The District Plan should therefore seek to provide a suitable balance between conveying the requirement for infrastructure to be phased appropriately, without introducing unrealistic expectations about advance provision. Consequently, infrastructure delivery may not always be achieved prior to the commencement of development.</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is currently being prepared which will identify any infrastructure requirements and will include information on how and when specific schemes will be delivered.</p>
8.31	There would be a great deal of disruption during the construction phase which would impact on existing residents.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is noted that construction can cause disruption for local residents. However, when approving planning applications, the Council includes conditions in order to ensure that this disruption is kept to a minimum, including limiting work to certain times of day.</p>
8.32	An application for development in the West Road area was refused in January 2006 on the grounds of poor access. Nothing has changed since.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is unclear what planning application the representation is referring to. Details such as access would need to be addressed at the planning application stage. However, Hertfordshire County Council, as Highways Authority, have not objected to the principle of development in this location.</p>



Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
8.33	A new town in a different location would be more appropriate.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Supporting Document, which is available to view on the Councils website, did assess a number of potential locations for a new settlement in East Herts. However, these options were ruled out, either due to sustainability issues, or the fact that they would not be deliverable within the plan period.</p>
8.34	Development along West Road would pose a road safety danger to children given the proximity to schools.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>While it is acknowledged that new development would increase traffic flows along West Road, the provision of 20 new off road parking spaces for Mandeville School would help to improve pedestrian safety in this location.</p> <p>In addition, the District Plan policies for the sites to the south and north of West Road will both include a requirement to provide an enhanced public footpath along West Road.</p>
8.35	Any development should include provision for specialist supported housing as well as affordable housing.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This District wide issue is not a matter of detail for a settlement specific chapter, and has been dealt with within the housing chapter.</p>
8.36	The plan is unsound as it has not considered all reasonable alternatives, particularly in terms of the exclusion of areas of search at an early stage via the Green Belt Review.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Site options have continued to be assessed in light of emerging evidence (including an updated Green Belt Review) and consultation responses to the Preferred Options version of the District Plan. As a result, it is the view of Officers that a site to the north of the town, east of the A1184, should be identified as an allocation within the District Plan. In addition, it is also the view of Officers that the number of homes to be delivered on the site to the south of West Road should be reduced.</p>
8.37	The proposals will reduce the buffer zones between towns and will not prevent urban sprawl.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A number of proposed sites in Sawbridgeworth have been ruled out during the assessment stage due to the potential to impact on strategic Green Belt gaps with nearby settlements, particularly Harlow and High Wych. The three sites that are proposed for allocation would not have a significant impact in this regard.</p>
8.38	Development should be directed to areas where there is a sufficient employment offer.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Sawbridgeworth is one of the larger settlements in the District, with a number of services and</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		facilities which provide local job opportunities, and is considered a sustainable location for some new development. Sawbridgeworth is also located in close proximity to larger settlements such as Bishop's Stortford and Harlow, including the Enterprise Zone.
8.39	Land at Thomas Rivers has been submitted as a suitable alternative to the draft proposals, the combined effect of which would lead to significant transport issues at West Road and the junction with the A1184. The Town Council wish to ensure that the Orchard and Wildlife site is protected and enhanced – this could be achieved by allowing some enabling development in this location.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Concerns regarding the impact of additional traffic on West Road are recognised. Officers consider that the amount of development proposed for the site to the south of West Road should be reduced, partly in response to these concerns. However, the transport modelling undertaken to date demonstrates that the impact of development in this location would not be 'severe' providing that mitigation measures, including signalisation of the West Road/A1184 junction, are delivered.</p> <p>Development of land at Thomas Rivers Hospital has been ruled out during the site assessment process, largely due to the potential impact on the County Wildlife Site in that area, but also because development would further erode the strategic Green Belt gap between Sawbridgeworth and High Wych. Financial contributions from the proposed development sites could be used towards enhancing access to the Orchard and Wildlife site, however this would need to be addressed at the planning application stage.</p>
8.40	A safe cycle link should be provided from the development along West Road. The proposed development is located beyond the recommended distance from public transport links.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>District Plan policies for the sites to the south and north of West Road will both include a requirement to provide sustainable transport measures, including the encouragement of walking and cycling to the town centre and railway station.</p> <p>West Road is directly served by the 'SawboBus' service which provides transport to locations around the town. In addition, there are bus stops on the A1184 which provide services to areas including Bishop's Stortford and Harlow.</p>
8.41	The number of parking spaces to be provided should be explained.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The District Plan will include parking standards. Any development proposal will be required to adhere to these standards unless it can be clearly demonstrated why doing so would not be appropriate/feasible.</p>
8.42	The proposals will set a precedent for further development on adjoining land.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The District Plan seeks to allocate sufficient sites to meet housing needs up to 2033. No further development is proposed in Sawbridgeworth and other locations on the edge of the town will</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		remain within the Green Belt.
8.43	Will rear access for parking be provided for Brickwell Cottages in West Road to reduce existing parking issues?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>There are no such proposals.</p>
8.44	Will the Little Hadham bypass be completed to reduce pressure on roads through Sawbridgeworth?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A planning application for the Little Hadham bypass has been submitted and it is anticipated that construction will be complete in 2019.</p>
8.45	There should be an enforced 20mph speed limit on West Road.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This is a matter for the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority.</p>
8.46	The Esbies Estate is promoted for development as flooding issues have now been resolved.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Esbies site is considered to be unsuitable in Green Belt terms. Development would have a tangible effect on openness by obstructing the continuity of the riverside landscape. There would also be coalescence issues with Lower Sheering.</p>
8.47	Persimmon Homes suggests that further sites should be identified to provide development in Sawbridgeworth post 2021.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Site options have continued to be assessed in light of emerging evidence and consultation responses to the Preferred Options version of the District Plan. As a result, it is the view of Officers that a site to the north of the town, east of the A1184, should be identified as an allocation within the District Plan.</p> <p>Further development has been ruled out, largely in response to Hertfordshire County Councils advice that provision of development beyond an approximate figure of 500 dwellings would require a bypass. In addition, significant development in other locations could lead to Green Belt concerns, and in a particular the issue of coalescence with Harlow and High Wych.</p>
8.48	The revised Green Belt would have weak boundaries which would be artificially defined by field boundaries.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Through careful design and landscaping, the three proposed site allocations could provide similar or stronger Green Belt boundaries than currently exist. In particular, the Green Belt Review (2015) notes that the boundary to the north of the town, east of the A1184, is 'poorly defined along the</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
		edge of unscreened development’.
8.49	Small scale development to the north of Sawbridgeworth has not been sufficiently considered through options appraisal. Only a development of around 2,800 dwellings has been considered, including land to the west which is clearly disproportionate to the scale of the town.	Noted. It is the view of Officers that a site to the north of the town, east of the A1184, should be identified as an allocation within the District Plan.. This area was noted in the Green Belt Review (2015) as having ‘high’ suitability as an area of search for development.
8.50	The Green Belt boundary should be revised in order to exclude the rear gardens at Bluebell Walk this land does not serve a clear Green Belt purpose.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Green Belt in this location plays an important role in helping to prevent the coalescence of Sawbridgeworth with High Wych. It is not considered necessary or appropriate to undertake a small scale review of the Green Belt in this location.</p>
8.51	How will the widening of the pavements on West Road be achieved – by taking part of owners’ front gardens?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not proposed to widen existing pavements. However, pavements can be extended, for instance along the southern side of West Road in order to serve the new development in that location.</p>
8.52	Existing homeowners on West Road should be offered compensation if the proposed development goes ahead.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Blight of property prices is not an issue which can be considered through the plan-making process.</p>
8.53	It is misleading for the paragraph to refer to a need ‘to provide for the housing needs of Sawbridgeworth’. There is no guarantee that the houses would be bought by Sawbridgeworth residents.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>There is housing need emanating from Sawbridgeworth and the proposed level of development will help to address this. However, the District Plan has been prepared having had consideration to the most appropriate and sustainable strategy for the District as a whole.</p>
8.54	People will continue to use their cars and will not use more sustainable transport alternatives.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The District Plan as a whole seeks to encourage a modal shift away from car use by improving provision and access to sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Paragraph 29 of the NPPF.</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
8.55	If Green Belt is lost then a commensurate amount of new Green Belt should be designated in the Plan.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The NPPF is clear that new Green Belt should only be proposed in exceptional circumstances, for instance where a new settlement or major urban extension is planned. In the case of limited growth in Sawbridgeworth, creation of new Green Belt could not be justified.</p>
8.56	HCC indicates that there may be mineral reserves which could be extracted for use on site during development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. This can be addressed through conditions as part of the planning application process.</p>
8.57	Thames Water has concerns about waste water services in relation to this site. Specifically, the sewerage network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated. Site specific policies should require developers to demonstrate that there is adequate wastewater capacity both on and off site.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. The Council has consulted Thames Water throughout the plan making process and it is noted that further investigations are required in order to understand whether on site works are required in order to increase capacity of the network locally. However, this is highly unlikely to be a barrier to development. With regards to off-site capacity, Rye Meads STW has sufficient capacity to cater for all proposed growth in the wider sub region within the plan period.</p>
<b>Land North of West Road</b>		
8.58	The land proposed for development could be used for the expansion of both schools and the football club.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The site to the north of West Road will include provision for the expansion of Mandeville Primary School. There is already adequate space for Leventhorpe School to expand. The football club has not indicated to the Council that it wishes to expand.</p>
8.59	Support from Taylor Wimpey for this proposed allocation.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted</p>
8.60	Support from HCC with regards to proposals to provide land for the expansion of the primary school.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p>
<b>Land South of West Road</b>		
8.61	Historic England suggests that the policy should require the development to protect and enhance the setting of listed buildings adjoining the site.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted and agreed. While it is the view of Officers that the amount of development in this location should be reduced, thereby limiting the potential for harm to the setting of listed buildings, a requirement will be included within the policy which reflects the representation.</p>

Issue Number	Issue raised through consultation	Officer Response
8.62	Barratt Homes supports the proposed site and has submitted further information in support of it. However Part II (j) of the policy should be amended to remove reference to community facilities as a development of this size would not require such facilities, and in any case, the site is well located to existing facilities. For the same reason Part II (k) of should not refer to the provision of neighbourhood shops.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted and agreed in light of the view of Officers that the proposed level of housing in this location should be reduced.</p>
8.63	The proposals would impact on the play area on West Road.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>There are no proposals to remove or reduce the size of the play area.</p>
8.64	Consideration should be given to accessing the south of West Road site from Gilders.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The proposed allocation does not adjoin the cul-de-sac on Gilders.</p>
8.65	It needs to be demonstrated how the emergency access for land to the south of West Road would be for emergency vehicles only. Further consideration should also be given to width of roads and visibility splays when accessing the site.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>These detailed design issues would be addressed through the planning application process, rather than the District Plan.</p>
8.66	Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust suggest that opportunities to secure biodiversity enhancement should be taken including restoration or enhancement of the brook if appropriate.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. The policy for land to the south of West Road will include a requirement to preserve and enhance on site assets such as Sawbridgeworth brook.</p>
<b>Sports Pitch Provision</b>		
8.67	Sport England supports this policy in principle although there are concerns regarding deliverability given that the site was allocated in the 2007 Local Plan.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>There is a need for further sports pitches in Sawbridgeworth and therefore this allocation has been carried over from the adopted Local Plan 2007. However, it is acknowledged that deliverability maybe an issue.</p>
8.68	Sports pitches should be provided on the proposed SAWB2 housing allocation rather than in this location.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is unlikely that the topography of this site would enable the provision of sports pitches. Land to the north of Leventhorpe school is more suited to this proposed use.</p>