

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
Sustainability Appraisal	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Sustainability Appraisal only assesses eight general distribution options and doesn't provide a detailed sustainability assessment of each proposed site. 2. There is no justification for discounting land north of the Green Belt. 3. As the SA does not contain a detailed consideration of the historic environment and is not commensurate with a positive strategy for the historic environment 4. The identified negative impacts of the Plan on landscape character will result in negative impacts on the historic environment 5. The avoidance of impacting historic town centres should not be at the expense of historic villages – the significance of rural areas has been afforded less weight 6. The SA does not give sufficient consideration to the natural environment – not based on evidence of ecology – fails to show how impacts can be negatively mitigated 7. A cross-border SA should be undertaken 8. The SA produces arbitrary scores which have no meaning or evidence 9. The SA should list all technical studies used in its consideration 10. The SA does not consider all reasonable alternatives such as meeting the higher Objectively Assessed Housing Need 11. The alternatives considered at earlier stages are not discussed or assessed or why the preferred options were chosen 12. There is no reference to the inter-relationships between effects 13. The methodology does not enable the reader to understand the assessment 14. The SA does not explain how it has been taken into account in decision making

Sustainability Appraisal

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p><u>Site Specific Comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No alternatives that do not include the Gresley Park option were tested, other settlements can accommodate homes instead of this site 2. The SA supports the inclusion of sites that have been discounted such as land to the west of Buntingford, Dicker Mill in Hertford and land to the south-west of Sawbridgeworth <p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for the positive endorsement of land to the south of Bishop's Stortford within the SA
Part 1 Assessment	
	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SA would benefit from better signposting of Schedule 2 of the Regulations 2. The SA would benefit from the inclusion of a table/graphic illustrating the SA and Local Plan processes and the main alternatives considered at each stage 3. The relationship of the Local Plan with other relevant plans or programmes (East Herts or otherwise) is not clear from the SA 4. There should be a section on mitigation to illustrate how mitigation has been considered where there are identified potential negative impacts 5. The SA should also consider the possible impacts of any proposed mitigation/infrastructure required to facilitate development 6. The cumulative impacts of development should be given greater prominence in the SA 7. A comprehensive description of the current baseline and an assessment of this baseline with and without the Plan is required 8. The Baseline should be updated in the light of recent assessments – 2016 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment cited 9. The relationship between the SA and site appraisals should be clearer – should show how the

Sustainability Appraisal

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	SA has informed the selection or rejection of alternatives
15.3.1	<u>Support</u> 1. Endorsement of the phrase ‘historic environment’ rather than ‘heritage asset’
Appendix II	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. The baseline focuses on impacts on heritage assets rather than the historic environment more broadly in line with the NPPF definition
Appendix III	
	<u>Objection</u> 2. There should be a traffic light assessment of the historic environment impacts – an assessment based on distance is not sufficient
Appendix V	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Historic environment experts have not been involved in the site selection process 2. Concern about the number of red and amber flags for the historic environment in Table C
Page 105	<u>Site Specific Objections</u> 1. Discounting land to the south-west of Sawbridgeworth ignores the proposed retention/enhancement of the Local Wildlife Site