

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
11.1 Introduction	
11.1	<u>Objection</u> 1. Support for Stop Harlow North Campaign.
11.2 Development in the Gilston Area	
11.2	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for development in this location. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Unclear whether Gilston Park House has retained its Green Belt status. 2. The site could provide for a greater proportion of the District's housing needs and ease pressure on other areas.
11.2.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Not clear how a new Junction 7a on M11 will alleviate wider transport issues in this location. 2. Concern over increased traffic use of C161 (Eastwick Road) and surrounding roads, including rat-running through nearby villages. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. This paragraph and Policy GA1, Part III, may need to be updated should further transport modelling demonstrate a need for a Harlow Northern Bypass. This may also lead to a need to review the plan.
Figure 11.1	<u>Objection</u> 1. Other land in this area should be removed from the Green Belt and included as part of the site. 2. Concern that the Green Belt boundary has been drawn around land ownership rather than

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>using NPPF advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The reference to a single neighbourhood centre is not reflective of the approach to create 7 individual villages.
GA1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for reference to provision of indoor and outdoor sports facilities. 2. Support for development in this location. 3. Support for community ownership and stewardship of assets. Suggested additional wording to reflect this principle in the policy. 4. Development could be provided earlier on in this location. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The technical work required to justify changing the site from a Broad Location to an allocation has not been undertaken. 2. The Council has failed to consult on a version of the Plan that includes the Gilston Area as an allocation. 3. Exceptional Circumstances have not been demonstrated to allow Green Belt release. 4. Development will lead to the coalescence of existing villages with Harlow. 5. Development would destroy Gibberd's countryside setting. 6. Lack of detail in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. 7. The proposed infrastructure schemes are unfunded and will not be sufficient/lack of capacity with existing infrastructure such as GP surgeries, schools and hospitals. 8. Infrastructure needs to be provided up front in order to avoid additional pressures on adjacent settlements. 9. There is no agreement in place between the developers and HCC with regards education and transport, or CCG/NHS in terms of health. 10. Lack of contingency planning should key infrastructure schemes not be delivered.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Concern that there is no CIL in place in order to fund infrastructure. 12. The proposals will threaten SSSI's, wildlife sites and the natural environment. 13. Concern regarding the capacity of Rye Meads STW. 14. Proximity to flood zones and strain on the sewerage system may lead to contamination of waterways. 15. The area should be used as an area of actively managed countryside. 16. Concern regarding traffic congestion. 17. Other suitable alternatives have not been explored sufficiently. 18. It is not clear how the development will support the regeneration of Harlow. 19. Princess Alexandra Hospital is already under severe pressure. 20. The houses won't be occupied by East Herts residents. 21. The development will lead to this area and surroundings becoming part of Essex. 22. Concern regarding air quality. 23. Impact on historic assets/need for a Heritage Impact Assessment. 24. Impact on the character of the area generally. 25. School provision for both primary and secondary education needs to be 20FE for each based on 1FE per 500 dwellings. 26. Brownfield sites should be re-developed first in order to avoid building on Green Belt. 27. Insufficient rail capacity. 28. Loss of agricultural land. 29. Concern regarding utilities including water supply/water pressure. 30. Concern regarding ability of police to cover such a large new development. 31. The reference to 7 villages is misleading. 32. Disruption to existing residents during long construction process. 33. Lack of reference to Garden City principles.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>34. Lack of detail with regards to masterplanning and infrastructure planning.</p> <p>35. The developer and the Council rejected the request from Eastwick and Gilston and Hunsdon Parish Councils for professional assistance in order to engage in collaborative working.</p> <p>36. The build out rates proposed by the developer are unrealistic, however if those levels are not reached then there is potential that required infrastructure will not be provided when needed.</p> <p>37. There is badger activity on site.</p> <p>38. Concern about parking at Harlow Town station.</p> <p>39. Potential impact on individual character of Sawbridgeworth.</p> <p>40. Lack of community involvement in draft Concept Framework/concern that the document was only produced shortly before Regulation 19 stage.</p> <p>41. Requirement to provide 40% affordable housing would not be viable. The policy should require 30%.</p> <p>42. Provision of 15 Gypsy and Traveller pitches and 8 Travelling Showpeople's plots is excessive given needs in Plan period will be met elsewhere.</p> <p>43. Part (l) is too prescriptive with regards to the proposed sustainable transport corridor.</p> <p>44. The text should be updated to reflect the fact that the potential re-location of Princess Alexandra Hospital would not form part of the Gilston Area.</p> <p>45. The need for a Harlow Northern Bypass, as mentioned in the Settlement Appraisal, is not accepted.</p> <p>46. The policy should be re-written in order to provide 2,000-3,000 homes spread across the wider Gilston area, including around Sawbridgeworth.</p> <p>47. The Sustainability Appraisal does not consider the full impacts of providing 10,000 homes in this location, only 3,000 in the Plan period.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. HCC, ECC and Harlow Council would like to be involved in the preparation of the Concept</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>Framework.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The development should include purpose built youth facilities. 3. There is a need for cross boundary discussions (Hertfordshire and Essex) in relation to education provision. 4. Pre-school/nursery facilities should be provided as part of new schools. 5. New homes and no-residential buildings should be served by superfast broadband. 6. The wastewater network capacity in the area is unlikely to be able to support the proposed development and upgrades may be required. A detailed drainage strategy should be prepared at the planning application stage. 7. Wording changes suggested to more fully reflect the required highways schemes. 8. The policy should be updated to reflect the fact that development would contribute towards the delivery of off-site infrastructure. 9. It is unclear whether the Plan can lawfully promote development beyond the Plan period. 10. The design should ensure that the Green Wedges maintain their links beyond the Stort Valley. 11. Further discussions are required between East Herts and Harlow in order discuss how the development may help meet some of Harlow's affordable housing needs. 12. A clear transport plan that demonstrates how trips arising from the full 10,000 homes will be accommodated on the network is required. This could include reference to a Harlow Northern Bypass. 13. Further transport modelling is required in order to demonstrate what other mitigation measures are required to deliver the full 10,000 homes.
11.3 The River Stort Crossings	
GA2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about the deliverability of the crossing. The land required is not in the ownership of the developers.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p data-bbox="454 308 943 347">2. Impact on the Stort Valley</p> <p data-bbox="412 347 999 387"><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol data-bbox="454 387 2033 603" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="454 387 2033 475">1. It should be an aspiration to deliver the second Stort crossing as soon as possible to ensure that sustainable transport offer is available at the point of occupation.<li data-bbox="454 475 2033 563">2. The route of the Second Crossing should join with River Way in Harlow and not Elizabeth Way.<li data-bbox="454 563 2033 603">3. It could be helpful to indicate the preferred route of the second crossing on the Key Diagram.