

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
23.2 Flood Risk	
WAT1	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for policy wording. <u>Objection</u> 1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted. 2. The policy may not ensure that there is no increased risk of flooding downstream of development sites.
23.3 Water Quality and the Water Environment	
23.3.2	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. It would be useful to re-insert the text from the Preferred Options Plan concerning the Water Framework Directive.
WAT2	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for policy wording. <u>Objection</u> 1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted.
WAT3	<u>Support</u> 1. Support from Environment Agency and Lee Valley Regional Park Authority for policy wording. <u>Objection</u> 1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted. 2. The policy should not say 'unless there is clear justification for doing so'.
23.4 Efficient Use of Water Resources	
23.4.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Concern regarding water pressure in Ware and the impact of new development

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
WAT4	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for policy wording. <u>Objection</u> 1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted. 2. The water efficiency standard is not ambitious enough. 3. Reference to grey water recycling should be removed.
23.5 Sustainable Drainage	
23.5.5	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Clarity required with regards to who is responsible for future maintenance of SuD's.
WAT5	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for policy wording. <u>Objection</u> 1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted. 2. Consideration should be given to the potential of SuD's to increase bird populations and therefore the potential for bird strikes near Stansted Airport.
23.6 Wastewater Infrastructure	
23.6	<u>Objection</u> 1. Concern regarding the capacity of Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works and whether the Council is reliant on advice from Thames Water in this regard.
23.6.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. Suggested wording amendment regarding need for developers to engage with Thames Water.
23.6.5	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to the insinuation that fuel discharges from Stansted Airport could compromise water quality.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
WAT6	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Support for policy wording. <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The policy adds nothing to the NPPF and therefore should be deleted.2. The wording does not meet the requirements of Habitat Regulations Assessment.3. Adequate sewerage infrastructure should be in place prior to development.