

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
5.1 Introduction	
5.1.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inadequate healthcare facilities to accommodate existing and new population 2. Princess Alexandra Hospital in Harlow cannot accommodate new growth – should be a new hospital provided in Bishop's Stortford 3. Should be a new GP surgery in the town centre 4. No Green Belt development while brownfield sites exist 5. Development will result in harm to wildlife and loss of agricultural land 6. Loss of infrastructure over time despite growth
5.1.4	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for relocation of the Bishop's Stortford High School to Bishop's Stortford South in order to facilitate expansion of the secondary school to accommodate additional demands and to facilitate the expansion of Thorley Hill Primary School. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficient educational capacity to accommodate new development at primary and secondary level 2. As expansion of Thorley Hill Primary is reliant on the relocation of the Bishop's Stortford High School, the Plan may need to make additional provision for a 2fe primary school 3. No rationale for additional secondary school demands 4. Plan does not take account of cumulative growth and demands from neighbouring authorities 5. Success of local schools result in large numbers travelling from outside town – more provision is required to provide for this

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
5.1.5	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic congestion, already bad, will be exacerbated by new development causing a worsening of air quality. 2. Lack of parking in the town centre 3. Lack of road capacity in the town centre and around the station 4. Urban extensions are poorly served by public transport 5. A south-eastern bypass is required 6. Junction 7a will create more traffic 7. Inadequate cycling and pedestrian infrastructure
5.1.6	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No need for new employment land
5.1.7	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further expansion will destroy the town's character 2. Historic environment needs to be given greater consideration.
5.3 Development in Bishop's Stortford	
BISH1	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bishop's Stortford has taken too much development and should take no more 2. Growth in homes has not been supported by growth in services 3. Development should not occur on Green Belt land while brownfield sites exist 4. No release of Green Belt should occur 5. Urban extensions are detached from the historic town and community 6. Growth will cause coalescence 7. Several additional sites are advocated to assist in meeting housing needs (Sunset Cottages at Thorley Lane, land at Hallingbury Lane, land at Dolphin Way and land at Bishop's Stortford College)

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
BISH2	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for reference to the town centre planning framework
BISH3	<u>Objection</u> 1. Land at Bournebrook House should not be prejudiced by this policy, nor be bound to the preparation of the masterplan. 2. Policy over-estimates rate of delivery in first five years – 600 homes is more realistic 3. Allotment off Rye Street should be retained – home for particular bee species 4. Objection to the omission of requirement for indoor and outdoor sports facilities as part of off-site infrastructure 5. Insufficient infrastructure to support development 6. Loss of Green Belt 7. Area has badger activity <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Strategic drainage infrastructure likely to be required. 2. The approved planning application has agreed the provision of a six-form entry secondary school, so an amendment is necessary. 3. Amendment suggested for more mention of additional demand on Junction 8 of the M11 and that the Plan should secure funding from developers to improve junction capacity. This issue is repeated for each proposed site allocation. 4. Concern about access to the town for new residents
BISH4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to requirement for open space on this land as the whole site needs to be developed for housing to pay for the secondary school at Bishop's Stortford North. 2. Objection to the lack of engagement on this site prior to the allocation

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
5.3.14	<u>Objection</u> 1. Countryside object to requirement to create an SPD from the detailed masterplan.
BISH5	<u>Support</u> 1. Support the requirement to provide indoor and outdoor sports facilities 2. Support for the relocation of the school to facilitate the delivery of a new fit-for-purpose educational facility of asset to the town. Current school site does not enable expansion and will contribute enabling development. <u>Objection</u> 1. Countryside object to requirement to provide self-build plots, stating viability as an issue. 2. Loss of Green Belt – no exceptional circumstances proven. 3. Several developers dispute ability of the site to deliver its proposed numbers within the first five years. 4. Impact on congestion and subsequent impact on air quality 5. Allocation is under the flight path for Stansted Airport 6. Dispute need for a school in this location 7. Impact on the natural environment 8. Loss of arable farmland 9. Impact on the Hertfordshire Way public footpath 10. Relocation of the secondary school will not provide additional provision 11. Site comprises flood zone 12. As this land is within Thorley parish and Thorley is designated a Group 3 Village, this scale of development is not acceptable. 13. Insufficient healthcare to support the site. 14. No rationale for scale of employment land required

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site should be developed with sensitivity to its historic context, and should reference historic assets such as Wallbury Camp in neighbouring Uttlesford. 2. The policy may need amending depending upon the relocation of the secondary school and expansion of Thorley Hill Primary School. 3. Clarification sought on the types of green infrastructure connections being requested and suggest amendments to assist clarification and to minimise and mitigate recreational pressure on the Thorley Flood Pound SSSI. 4. Agreement has been reached with Natural England to focus connections to Southern Country Park to the west, rather than towards the SSSI to the east. 5. Land covers mineral reserves which need consideration
BISH6	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The policy does not reference the proposed expansion of Thorley Hill Primary School 2. Objection to the requirement for playing pitches as these will be provided at Bishop's Stortford South, and seek clarification of the amount of land to be used for this purpose. 3. Poor quality of the existing school should not influence decision <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendment suggested to link the delivery of the open space to the development at Bishop's Stortford South to ensure an adequate provision of open space is made for both sites. 2. Concern that emergency services cannot access the site
BISH7	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 400 homes does not optimise the development potential of the site. 2. Objection to the requirement for self-build homes as it will not optimise development potential

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>and are not suitable for an urban site.</p> <p>3. Objection to the land use restrictions and suggest greater flexibility of use should be included.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site needs better pedestrian and cycling connections 2. Policy should reflect the current application 3. Current application should not influence creation of the policy 4. No certainty of permission due to flooding issues 5. Sufficient parking is required for all uses including neighbouring leisure complex
BISH8	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>Sufficient evidence is provided to support the allocation – request enhancing the policy to ensure the sequential approach informs site layout and a site-specific flood risk assessment forms part of the masterplanning.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to masterplanning being through the town centre planning framework 2. Objection to the lack of clarity in terms of parking spaces, the idea of a new car park to the north of Link Road, and question its delivery as it is beyond the site allocation boundary. 3. Creation of a multi-storey car park on the current Council car park suggested 4. Development is within the floodplain
BISH9	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of healthcare to serve this development 2. Proposed layout should be a through road not two separate parts which will lead to a segregated community if all affordable homes are located within one part of the site. 3. New roads will be too narrow, have insufficient sight lines, will be hazardous and prevent

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>service vehicles accessing the whole road. Parking restrictions will be required.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Loss of Green Belt. 5. The site will be expanded in the future. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amendments suggested to make the proposed mitigation more site specific – such as upgrades to the localised sewerage network <i>in order to serve the development</i>. 2. Traffic calming measures are required given proximity of the site to Birchwood School and the inappropriate use of the road for school related traffic.
BISH10	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A strategic flood risk assessment is required to provide evidence. 2. Certainty over potential housing number is required to enable proper infrastructure planning including education. 3. A number of amendments are needed to make policy requirements such as pedestrian routes towards the town centre and station, including river frontage access and mooring points subject to tests of feasibility and viability. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy should make it clear that residential uses on part of the site would not be appropriate if the mill is still in operation. Amendments suggested to this effect.
5.4 Employment in Bishop's Stortford	
5.4	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Growth in the town has not been matched by growth in jobs
BISH11	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to requirement for employment land at Bishop's Stortford South as part of wider

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>objection to the site allocation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The current Bishop's Stortford Community Football Club grounds should be allocated for employment uses. 3. Remove employment land designation at the Stort Valley Industrial Estate or enable changes of use. <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggested amendment to the policy to introduce flexibility in terms of how the site could come forward in parts, provided it does not undermine continued operation of the mill.
5.5 Retail Leisure and Recreation in Bishop's Stortford	
BISH 12	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>The policy is supported but concern is raised that new emerging evidence will not have been planned for appropriately.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to the inclusion of land at Bishop's Stortford College within the Green Wedges in Bishop's Stortford and by definition, the allocation of college land for local green space. 2. Objection to the allocation of their land at Bishop's Stortford College under Policy CFLR 1. 3. Plan fails to allocate land for new sports facilities and pitches, including rugby and football.