

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
15.2 Economic Development	
15.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dispute growth of Stansted Airport – on 35 million passengers per annum growth by 2030 with only additional 5000 jobs created 2. No clear evidence of jobs growth increasing housing need 3. Contrary to para 51 of NPPF to approve change of employment to residential – this would reduce need for Green Belt development
Policy ED1 Employment	
ED1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General support for policy <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employment land should be designated for residential development 2. Retail uses should be included in permissible changes of use 3. Requirement for 12 months marketing evidence unreasonable – should consider market condition reports 4. Landlords are preventing local businesses from operating and applying for residential use 5. Policy is superseded by Permitted Development Order 6. Policy is contrary to HERT2 Mead Lane Area 7. Hertford Holdings consider sites on the edge of Hertford would be more attractive to businesses, existing Hertford Industrial Estate/ Caxton Hill should be allowed to convert to residential.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>8. Policy should be explicit about role of public/private partnerships in delivering employment opportunities</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stort Valley Industrial Estate should be considered for alternative uses including residential 2. Plan should refer to amount of floorspace needed 3. No reference to East of England Forecasting Model's job estimates 4. Promoted high order activities but not clear on implementation of this
Policy ED2 Rural Economy	
ED2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy is superseded by Permitted Development Order 2. Is inflexible and will lead to rural decline 3. Policy should be amended to recognise site allocation policies (i.e. should not apply where sites are allocated which are currently in agricultural use) 4. Policy should be amended to add more restrictions in terms of impact on rural traffic and road network 5. Lack of consultation