





# Old River Lane SPD Consultation Statement

November 2022



 @Eastherts

 EastHertsDC

 easthertscouncil

01279 655261

[www.eastherts.gov.uk](http://www.eastherts.gov.uk)



# Old River Lane Supplementary Planning Document

## Consultation Statement

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the Old River Lane Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as required by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This statement sets out the details of the consultation that has informed the preparation of this SPD.
- 1.2 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) provide guidance to supplement the policies and proposals in the District Plan. SPDs do not have to go through the formal examination process, but consultation with stakeholders and the wider community is still a vital part of the preparation process. The scope of consultation and decision on who will be consulted will reflect the nature of the SPD.

### 2. Town and Country Planning Regulations

- 2.1 SPDs must be produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The relevant regulations relating to the consultation process are explained below.
- **Regulation 12(a)** requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before adoption of the SPD, this must set out who was consulted, a summary of the issues raised, and how these issues were incorporated into the SPD.
  - **Regulation 12(b)** requires the Council to publish the documents for a minimum 4-week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received and identify the address to which responses should be sent.
  - **Regulation 35** requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps:

1. Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate; and
2. Publish the document on the Council's website.

### **3. Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)**

- 3.1 The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) explains how the Council will involve the community in the preparation, alteration and review of planning policy plans and guidance. Community engagement is a key part of the planning system as it ensures that the Council can listen to the views of stakeholders and the community to inform the outcome of planning decisions. This helps local people to become directly involved in place shaping in the district. The Council wishes to involve all sectors of the community in the planning process and is committed to maximising publicity of its planning documents.
- 3.2 In October 2019 the Council adopted a new SCI to replace the previous SCI (adopted in 2013) and take into account changes to legislation and policy. This consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the 2019 SCI.

### **4. Early consultation**

- 4.1 As part of the scoping of the draft SPD, an Old River Lane Steering Group was set up. Membership of the Steering Group includes: Officers from East Herts Council and Hertfordshire County Council; Councillors; representatives from the Cross-party Working Group on Old River Lane; landowner and developer representatives; as well as other representatives from the Town Council, the Neighbourhood Plan Group, the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group, the Bishop's Stortford Business Improvement District (BID) and Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation. Several community representatives also attended the Steering Group meetings.

4.2 The purpose of the Steering Group was to consider all matters relating to the proposed development at Old River Lane with the aim of achieving a high-quality development that meets the Council’s place-making, corporate and community aspirations and objectives for Bishop’s Stortford and its town centre.

4.3 As set out in the table below, the Steering Group met on six occasions between November 2021 and May 2022:

<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
Steering Group Meeting 1	10 November 2021
Steering Group Meeting 2	13 December 2021
Steering Group Meeting 3	7 February 2022
Steering Group Meeting 4	28 March 2022
Steering Group Meeting 5	25 April 2022
Steering Group Meeting 6	16 May 2022

4.4 The Old River Lane Steering Group ‘Terms of Reference’ is attached for information at **Appendix A**.

4.5 The main tasks of the Steering Group included:

- to act as a sounding board for the emerging Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- to receive, review and critically assess emerging master planning and development proposals.
- to identify and highlight issues which need addressing and to identify possible approaches for dealing with these matters.
- to assess the impact of the development proposals in a comprehensive way for the town, identifying town-wide issues which may be best addressed by looking at proposals in combination and to identify solutions to these issues.

4.6 Meeting with stakeholders has ensured a better understanding of the key issues and aspirations that the community have for the Old River Lane site. Alongside this the Council has been able to get feedback on emerging proposals and principles as well as jointly setting a vision and objectives for the site. The discussions that have taken place at the Steering Group meetings have therefore influenced both the scope and content of the SPD.

## 5. Consultation

5.1 The draft SPD was published for consultation for four-weeks between the 5 July and 2 August 2022 (5pm). The consultation was advertised via a press release. Information was also made available on the Council's website and via social media.

5.2 The draft SPD was made available for public inspection at:

- **East Herts District Council (Hertford Office):** Wallfields, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8EQ. The office is open 10am – 4pm every Tuesday.
- **East Herts District Council (Bishop's Stortford Office):** Charringtons House, Bishops Stortford, CM23 2ER. The office is open 10am – 4pm every Wednesday.
- **Bishop's Stortford Town Council:** The Old Monastery, Windhill, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 2ND. The Town Council is open Monday to Friday 9am-5pm.
- **Bishop's Stortford Library:** The Causeway, Bishop's Stortford, CM23 2JE. The Library is open Monday 10am-7pm, Tuesday-Friday 10am-6pm, Saturday 10am-5pm, and Sunday 12pm-4pm.

5.3 All consultation documents and further information on how to submit representations (comments) were made available to view on the East Herts Council website ([www.eastherts.gov.uk/oldriverlaneSPD-consultation](http://www.eastherts.gov.uk/oldriverlaneSPD-consultation)). All statutory and relevant consultees were directly contacted, including those on the planning policy database. A list of consultees is provided in **Appendix C**.

5.4 Representations could be made via the Council's consultation portal – <http://consult.eastherts.gov.uk/portal>. Alternatively, representations could be emailed to [planningpolicy@eastherts.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@eastherts.gov.uk). Hard copy representations should be sent to; Planning Policy Team, East Herts Council, Wallfields, Pegs Lane, Hertford, SG13 8EQ.

## 6. Issues raised in the consultation

6.1 A total of **439** responses were received from **97** consultees. Most of the responses contained several issues. The main issues raised are summarised below:

- Objection to demolition of the URC Hall
- Objection to the demolition of Charringtons House
- Objection to the loss of the Waitrose Carpark
- Lack of commitment to climate change and sustainability
- Objection to loss of trees
- Concern over building heights
- Lack of clarity over leisure facilities
- Lack of clarity over the public square
- Objection to another cinema in the town
- Mixed views on a new Arts Centre
- Key documents need updating

6.2 Officers have considered these issues in full and made amendments where they add value to the SPD. A summary of the consultation responses is set out in the schedule below at **Appendix B**. This table outlines the comments by chapter/section, the Council's response to these issues and any consequential changes to the SPD. A track change version of the draft SPD accompanies this Consultation Statement. If text is to be deleted from the draft SPD it is shown ~~struck through~~. If new text is to be inserted, it is shown underlined.

## Appendix A – Old River Lane Steering Group Terms of Reference

### **Purpose:**

To consider all matters relating to the proposed development at Old River Lane with the aim of working together to achieve a high-quality development and meet the Council's place making, corporate and community aspirations and objectives for Bishop's Stortford and its town centre.

### **Membership:**

- Councillors
- Town Council
- Neighbourhood Plan Rep
- Private sector rep
- Community representatives
- Other
- Supported by officers

### **Tasks:**

- to act as a sounding board for the emerging master planning, Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and development proposals of the development site at Old River Lane.
- to receive, review and critically assess emerging master planning and development proposals.
- to identify and highlight issues which appear to have been inadequately addressed and to identify possible methods for dealing with these matters.
- to assess the impact of development proposals in a comprehensive way for the town, identifying town wide issues which may be best addressed by looking at development proposals in combination and to identify solutions to these issues. This may necessitate balancing and advising on the best outcomes relating to housing, transport, employment opportunities, community and sports facilities, urban design and service provision in order to contribute to the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford.

### **Matters to be considered:**

Including but not limited to:

- Masterplanning approach set out in Policy DES1 of the District Plan
- Supplementary Planning Document

- Sustainable transport and travel choices including links to other parts of Bishop's Stortford and beyond
- Community infrastructure and service provision e.g., community facilities; open space; etc.
- Sustainability
- High quality design and creating a distinctive character
- Integration with wider Bishop's Stortford
- The vitality of proposals
- Energy and resource efficiency
- Landscape, biodiversity, historic features.

### **Procedure and reporting:**

- To meet as required
- For notes of each meeting to be taken and circulated to the Group membership
- To make recommendations to the EHC Executive relating to the purpose and tasks of the Group

### **Independent Chairperson:**

We are pleased to welcome Mehron Kirk to the Steering Group. Mehron will be chairing the steering group meetings; he has considerable experience working as a landscape architect and is also a panel member of the Hertfordshire Design Review Service:

<https://www.bdp.com/en/about/people/f---l/mehron-kirk/>



## Appendix B – Summary of Comments and Council Response

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Parsonage Residents Association (239)	Old River Lane SPD - General		The SPD reads blandly. The focus is on housing development and not on a community destination for retail, relaxation and increasing revenue for businesses struggling through this present financial position.	The SPD focusses on more than housing development. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework seeks to ensure that Old River Lane will be a high-quality, accessible, and sustainable redevelopment of a town centre destination that incorporates a mixture of uses that contribute to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and complements the uniqueness of the historic market town.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr & Mrs Alan Ferris (183)  Mr David Samuels (184)  Ms Pam Gurton (185)	Old River Lane SPD - General		Suggestion that a crescent walkway solution should be reviewed. By curving the proposed footpath between Old River Lane and Northgate End, it will not be necessary to alter the Waitrose car park and the URC Hall could be retained.	The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude a curved walkway if this was the preferred design solution.	Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.
Thames Water (230)	Old River Lane SPD - General		Thames Water support the requirement for a foul sewerage and utilities assessment to be submitted with any application for the site and the acknowledgement of the existence of existing sewers in section 2.28.	Support noted and welcomed.	-

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>To ensure compliance with Policy WAT6 it may be necessary for conditions to be used to phase the delivery of development to allow any necessary infrastructure upgrades to be completed ahead of occupation of development.</p>	Noted.	-
			<p>Developers should be encouraged to discuss their proposals with Thames Water ahead of the submission of any application to enable any wastewater infrastructure requirements to be determined.</p>	Agreed.	<p>Add text to paragraph 9.1.2 to encourage developers to also engage in pre-application discussions with other interested parties:</p>
			<p>It may also be beneficial to add Policy WAT6 to the list of policies under Section 1.11.</p>	Agreed.	<p>9.1.2 Furthermore, in order to ensure that the level of detailed assessment is relevant to any particular planning application, applicants should enter into pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority, and other interested parties, <u>including the County Highway Authority, and other statutory consultees.</u></p> <p>Insert Policy WAT6 into list of policies under paragraph 1.4.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Policy WAT6 – Wastewater Infrastructure</u></li> </ul>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>At the time of the consultation on the Local Plan a high-level review of the site indicated that infrastructure at the wastewater treatment works may be unable to support additional demand and upgrades may be required. This was based on the cumulative impact of developments across Bishop's Stortford. Arrangements have been made for other sites in the north of Bishops Stortford to drain to Stansted Mountfitchet STW and as such there are no current concerns regarding treatment capacity for the development of the site.</p>	Noted.	-
Canal & River Trust (212)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>It is positive to note that the SPD seeks to encourage sustainable and healthy lifestyles, prioritising walking and cycling overuse of the private vehicle. Public realm connections to the Castle Grounds and the River Stort are outlined and there are references to enhancing the cycle path along the Stort to the north of the A1250 and works to convert the existing footway between the river towpath, Link Road and Bridge Street to a shared-use footway/cycleway, including upgrade of the existing signal-controlled crossing to a</p>	Support noted and welcomed.	-

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Toucan crossing, as per the Bishop's Stortford Transport Options report.</p> <p>However, there could be further emphasis on the need for connectivity to the towpath routes, particularly south to the town centre which would support interventions such as those outlined in SM3 by strengthening and improving legibility of key pedestrian/cycle routes, particularly to the station.</p>	<p>Intervention SM3 is referenced in the SPD, and proposals will be expected improve signage and way finding (see Section 8.5 Indicative Planning Obligations Schedule).</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>
Mrs Janice Carpenter (181)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Will the proposed Arts Centre be working alongside our current South Mill Arts Centre or will they be in competition?</p> <p>The artists impression that we are currently seeing is not the proposed new plan, it is the proposal from approximately 5 years ago. When will an updated one be made available?</p> <p>What we are seeing does not have any bearing on the new proposed plans. The first plans included a purpose-built theatre, library and an outdoor area that could be used as an entertainment space. Am I right in</p>	<p>The Council has been in discussion with Rhodes Birthplace Trust and will continue to work with them moving forward to find the best solution for Bishop's Stortford and the Arts Complex.</p> <p>Proposals are indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how they comply with relevant District Plan policies.</p> <p>A new section on the Arts Centre has been added to the SPD.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to these issues.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>thinking these are no longer in the revised plans?</p> <p>EHDC are the owners who are overseeing the planning but who will be running the centre once it opens? Will this all be linked with the Hertford Theatre?</p> <p>What is the reasoning behind the need to have another cinema when the town already has a large complex with 6 screens? and of course South Mill Arts also have facilities for screening films. What does the future hold for the Empire Cinema complex?</p>		
Mr Stewart Marshall (277)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Firstly, I would like to submit my displeasure at the EHDC decision to erect the multistorey car park at Northgate End.</p> <p>Strong objection to the following proposals:</p> <p>1. The United Reformed Church Hall should be spared as it is still used for many different functions and various organisations. Not to mention the historical memories that it holds for a good many people.</p>	<p>Noted, however, this does not form part of the SPD proposals.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of</p>	No amendment in response these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>2. Waitrose car park should be retained because it serves as an excellent position for ease of access to North Street and of course Waitrose itself.</p> <p>3. Further commercial use would distract attention from elsewhere such as South Street and Jackson Square where many a small business have been and gone and outlets remain empty.</p> <p>4. Any development should be no higher than the existing Charringtons building which should remain because there are businesses already established in it and to my knowledge fully occupied.</p> <p>5. We already have a rather nice theatre and multifunction venue at Rhodes Centre South Mill Arts Centre.</p> <p>6. Housing should be aimed mainly for first time buyers and elderly</p>	<p>District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>The Vision and Development Objectives for the site set out how development proposals should complement the wider town centre offer.</p> <p>Noted. Heights and massing are considered in Section 7.6 of the SPD. This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations.</p> <p>Noted. The Council has been in discussion with Rhodes Birthplace Trust and will continue to work with them moving forward to find the best solution for Bishop's Stortford and the Arts Complex.</p> <p>The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>requirements with possibly a GP surgery in close proximity.</p> <p>7. A good many well established trees will be lost and should remain.</p> <p>8. A new cinema is not needed as we already have a multiscreen cinema which now has car parking very nearby. Plus, South Mill Arts on occasion have film shows.</p>	<p>community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>The SPD also states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			9. As it seems council are determined to develop the site; I feel residential is all that is required.	Noted, however, the site is allocated in the District Plan 2018 as a mixed-use development sites which accommodates a range of uses including housing, retail, leisure, community, and office uses.	
Mr Scott Sinclair (182)	Old River Lane SPD - General		Concern that the new development plans raise the prospect of re-providing the 170 car parking spaces used by the Waitrose supermarket chain. My elderly parents' in-law in their 90s frequently use Waitrose and they park outside in the disabled parking bays. They do not have sufficient mobility to be able to cross the road with a shopping trolley and use the new multi-story car park opposite. Please ensure that the Waitrose parking spaces are not reduced or moved.	Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Herts County Council – Property Service (262)	Old River Lane SPD - General		HCC as landowner have no comments to make on the draft Old River Lane SPD.	Noted.	-
Mr John Rhodes (188)	Old River Lane SPD - General		We should say firstly that we welcome the fact that the Council is at last complying with the requirement in policy BISH8 to produce an SPD to inform the master planning of the site.	Support noted and welcomed.	-



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			Having said that, as general observations, we feel that the present draft is too generalised to provide the guidance that is needed to inform the master plan and is probably trying to incorporate too many potentially incompatible forms of development on the site. We would like to suggest some more specific requirements which could enable the SPD to become a more useful document.	Suggestions to improve the document are welcomed.	
Mr Tim White (227)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>There is insufficient justification for expanding housing and retail premises in this area.</p> <p>Strong objection to the removal of the ground level car parking amenity, and I suspect Waitrose have too.</p> <p>Replacing open land with a wall of housing will detract from rather than enhance The Causeway. The character of the area will be significantly and negatively changed.</p>	<p>Noted, however, the proposals form a key part of the Council's District Plan strategy which was agreed in 2018.</p> <p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>The proposals are for a mixed-use development (not just housing) which will both contribute to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and complement the uniqueness of the town. The ambition is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. The importance of enhancing character and appearance is embedded throughout the SPD.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Mr Clive Risby (211)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>We do not think the document is detailed enough to specify the type of development which is envisaged by residents and neither does it specify in detail what the East Herts Council proposes.</p> <p>A proper arts plan needs to be created and should exclude a cinema because there is already a cinema near to the station.</p> <p>The URC hall should be refurbished and not demolished.</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>No more flats are needed in the centre of town but there is a need for a centrally placed surgery to cater for the station area residents and others living nearby.</p> <p>Concern about the access to Waitrose if the existing access is changed and any proposal that utilises the URC hall site (if the hall is demolished) for parking should not go ahead. The existing access to Waitrose is ideal for most residents whereas any alternative using Link Rd will be a disaster.</p>	<p>The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>The SPD also states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>Section 8.3 notes the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.</p> <p>The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site (including Waitrose) and the impact on the surrounding area.</p>	
Mr David Royle (209)	Old River Lane SPD - General		The envisaged ORL development slices off 50 Waitrose parking spaces. It then demolishes the URC hall to replace those 50 car spaces. Do we	The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude a curved	Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			need a straight footpath from Northgate End to Jackson Square? It also makes the development area bigger. Why not curve the path around Waitrose car park, so there is no need to demolish the hall to replace parking spaces? The north part of this curved path goes across the green space, between trees. A crescent path, with new shops and housing following the curve, would be a very pleasant way of walking and cycling through the new development. The URC hall could stay and have a small square in front.	walkway if this was the preferred design solution.	
Historic England (331)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Historic England are pleased to see the production of the SPD document which broadly lays out the principles for this development as defined within the East Herts Local Plan (2018) however, we would like to make the following comments on the draft:</p> <p>Page 9 - The document contains two maps with differing site boundaries. It is understood that the white boundary is that in the site allocation, the red line boundary is larger and contains the URC Hall</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.4.3 of the SPD explains that the inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation,</p>	-  No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>within it. There is no explanation for this and why this is necessary.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.10 - This section contains a small section on the early history of the site which is incredibly important to the early development of the town plan. The former river channel is key to the understanding of the development of the site both now and in the future and this should be given a mention in this section. The first sentence of this paragraph is rather unclear in what it is trying to achieve. The fact that it was water meadows is not "despite" the fact the castle was established adjacent to it. More research should be done on the history of the area and land ownership at this time to establish better what the early significance of the site in question is.</p>	<p>ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location.</p> <p>Agreed. Further research has been undertaken with proposed amendments to paragraphs 2.2.5, 2.2.10 and 2.2.12.</p>	<p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p><del>2.2.5 By 1744 road improvements had resulted in many coaching inns and stables in the town centre as a stop off on the London to Cambridge road. By the 18th century regional road improvements had resulted in the erection of many coaching inns and stables in the town centre as a stop off on the London to Cambridge road.</del></p> <p><u>2.2.10 The Old River Lane site is so named as it was the original route of the River Stort, and the former river channel ran roughly along the route of the existing Old River Lane. In the Roman period woodland in the vicinity of the site was cleared and from then on until the mid-20th century most of the Old River Lane site was open riverside floodplain meadows crossed with drainage channels. Although evidence of Prehistoric activity within the vicinity of the site is limited, it is possible that evidence of activity within the site</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
					<p><u>may survive, masked by alluvial deposits on the terrace of the former river channel. Similarly, there is potential for traces of Romano-British and Medieval activity to survive within the site. Waytemore Castle was erected adjacent to the site in the 11th century and over time the historic core of Bishop's Stortford evolved to the west and south-west of the site. In the late-18th century and early-19th century numerous malshouses were erected along the route of the River Stort, including adjacent to the site, making use of the direct access to the riverbank to transport their produce along the Stort Navigation. To the north-west of the site there was the Hawkes Brewery in buildings which dated from the 18th century, and a cattle sale yard. In 1860 on Water Lane to the west of the site the Congregational Church was built, which was later renamed the United Reformed Church. In 1915 a Sunday School was built within the Old River Lane site for the Congregational Church, a building now known as the United Reformed Church Hall.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Para 2.3.5 - refers to archaeology without referencing what that archaeology might be and how it has constrained the site. We assume that the archaeology referred to is the underground water course, but this needs better description.</p>	<p>Further information has been added to paragraph 2.3.5. See also changes to paragraph 2.2.10.</p>	<p>2.2.12 The Link Road was built between 1969 and 1970, which connected The Causeway to Northgate End, and necessitated the demolition of the cattle sale yard. The landscape of Old River Lane continued its significant transformation in the early 1970's when the original course of the River Stort that ran to the west of <u>through</u> the site was culverted. The culverting is understood to have been <u>was</u> part of wider plans, alongside creating a new course for the River Stort to the east (1968), to help reduce flooding in the town centre and create more land for development in the core of Bishop's Stortford <u>town centre</u>. A new road <u>was built then largely that roughly</u> followed the route of the culverted river as access to the car parks, the road now known as Old River Lane.</p> <p>Amend text as follows:</p> <p>2.3.5 <del>Below ground constraints include archaeology, a 3m easement for Thames Water rising main sewer and a 5m easement as the culvert is classified as a</del></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Page 62 - The Strategic Masterplanning Framework is rather confusing as it presents two options for development. Would be clearer to present the preferred option for development only as it avoids confusion.</p> <p>Section 8.4 - should there be a map here for heritage? About reinforcing key views between heritage assets such as the castle and the church and the castle and the rural verdant</p>	<p>The Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework (TCPF) initially presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane; both are shown in the SPD as they are helpful to understanding the evolution of the final Strategic Masterplanning Framework.</p> <p>Section 2.2. includes a diagram illustrating Heritage Assets. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework takes account of the information presented in the previous chapters and</p>	<p><del>watercourse.</del> <u>Below ground constraints include archaeology, and watercourse and sewer easements. A 3m easement is needed for a Thames Water sewer rising main, and an 8m easement is needed for the culvert as this is classified as a watercourse. In terms of archaeological constraints, known and potential non-designated archaeological remains identified within the Old River Lane site comprise potential paleoenvironmental remains, potential prehistoric and Romano-British remains, and potential medieval remains.</u></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			landscape visible across the valley and over the site.	as such does not need to be repeated in Section 8.	
Natural England (238)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Natural England welcomes the preparation of the Old River Lane SPD to provide guidance on the design of redevelopment within the Old River Lane site.</p> <p>We recognise that there are several opportunities identified within table 5.1.1. to deliver new high quality public spaces within the development and promote sustainability in its widest sense. We would therefore encourage connectivity between any on-site green infrastructure with the River Stort and wider river restoration works for the Castle Park area to the east.</p> <p>Natural England notes the design principle in table 7.2.5. which states opportunities for urban greening through tree planting and soft landscaping should be maximised where possible. We would advise that the use of an Urban Greening Factor is explored for development in this area.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted, although the Council does not currently have policy for calculating an Urban Greening Factor (UGF). The importance of green infrastructure is however embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration. As such there is an expectation that landscape professionals will be involved in the scheme from early in the design and planning process.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>-</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Natural England advise that there could be an opportunity to incorporate green infrastructure through a concept of Green Community Hubs. These could be re-purposed green spaces or greened up local community hubs (such as food banks, libraries, health care estates) that would act as a focal point for nature-based activities and services (such as tree planting, food growing, active travel, green gyms etc) that support peoples mental health and wellbeing, for example through green social prescribing. This could also link in with the walking routes along the River Stort to the east.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.4 states prioritising sustainable transport such as cycling, and walking improves local air quality and encourages healthy communities. Therefore, strong emphasis will be placed on seeking the provision of cycle and pedestrian routes and networks at Old River Lane. We advise that there is recognition of the multi-functional benefits of green infrastructure, including improved mental health from access to natural green spaces,</p>	<p>Noted. The importance of green infrastructure is embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>cleaner air and mitigating climate change.</p> <p>Natural England are currently developing the next version of the GI Standards (v2). The updated standards are due to be released later in the year, but some elements are already available including the new GI principles which may be of interest, such as why green infrastructure is needed and what good green infrastructure looks like.</p>	<p>Noted. Reference to the Green Infrastructure Framework and the benefits of green infrastructure has been added to be SPD.</p>	<p>Add new text to paragraph 8.4.6:</p> <p><u>Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework sets out a series of key principles that should be used to inform emerging proposals for Old River Lane. Embedding green infrastructure has a number of important benefits, including maximising Biodiversity Net Gain, managing the water environment, and creating resilient and climate positive places.</u></p>
Bishop's Stortford Climate Group (305)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>The Climate Group was represented in the masterplan steering group, for the preparation of the SPD, and engaged with the EHDC Planning team to identify and include best practice climate related provisions in the SPD.</p> <p>The ORL site is an important opportunity for the town, and we support exemplary development. As the landowner and developer of the site, EHDC has the opportunity to set for itself exemplary planning requirements, to ensure that this site</p>	<p>The Council welcomes the involvement of the Climate Group on the ORL Steering Group.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to these issues.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>is contributing to the District being carbon neutral by 2030, rather than adding to the need for remedial action in a short space of time. Moreover, the site is important because it provides an opportunity: - to contribute to change beyond the site boundary. Concern, however, that the draft SPD fails to give sufficient site-specific, masterplanning guidance to achieve its objectives, even though this was the premise of the steering group. Amendments are needed: to enable acceptable development; to set parameters to prevent unacceptable development; to enable development to integrate with the economy and the character of the town. The draft broadly encourages development but gives too few planning parameters.</p> <p>Key concerns are that the draft SPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- takes no account of the carbon embedded in existing buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>The Council's Sustainability SPD notes that consideration of embodied carbon is likely to become increasingly important as society transitions to a low/zero carbon society. The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>- sets no specific energy or water use requirements beyond current Building Regulations.</p> <p>- shows no evidence of proper transport planning; and</p> <p>- uses loose language regarding transport, movement and parking provisions which together will totally fail to take the opportunity provided by this scheme to reshape our town centre to achieve modal shift, away from cars to pedestrianisation, cycling and use of public transport.</p>	<p>materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible, and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.'</p> <p>The SPD has to comply with the wording within the District Plan, so cannot exceed the water efficiency standard in Policy WAT4.</p> <p>However, the guidance in the SPD does encourage the developer to improve upon building standards, including water efficient design. This is set out in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The aim of the SPD is to ensure that any development at Old River Lane can complement and understand any transport improvements coming forward that directly effect ORL or the wider-ORL area. Whilst detailed transport assessments and modelling will be required to define detailed matters, the SPD only seeks to ensure that the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
				development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage.  Chapter 4 prioritises active travel and public transport.	
Mrs Carole Scott (178)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>EHDC is keen to destroy the URC hall but what will replace it?</p> <p>We have 2 cinemas Empire and South Mill Arts do we really need another one?</p> <p>Please allow some greenery in the development otherwise its yet more concrete.</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Agreed. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
				consideration, stating at paragraph 8.4.6 that proposals should utilise and incorporate existing green infrastructure, taking account of the large mature trees present across the site; and that planting should be used to reinforce key routes and improve connections.	
Mr David Samuels (229)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>We are impressed by the concern expressed in the document for the development to be sensitive to the existing built and natural environment, both aesthetically and historically; address sustainable transport issues, encouraging walking and cycling within the town; support good environmentally sustainable building practices.</p> <p>However, our main objection is to the way in which the central aim of creating a cultural/arts centre is being side-lined. Although understanding the needs for such a project to be financially sustainable, we feel that the specific arts provision is in danger of disappearing.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has</p>	-  Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
				been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Cllr Mione Goldspink (321)	Old River Lane SPD - General		I believe that the most important consideration for development of the Old River Lane (ORL) site should be that whatever is built there, it should complement and enhance the existing buildings and facilities of the town. Nothing should be built or provided that would compete with existing buildings, retail outlets or facilities.	Agreed. The vision set out in the SPD is that 'Old River Lane will be a high-quality, accessible, and sustainable redevelopment of a town centre destination that incorporates a mixture of uses that contribute to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and <i>complements</i> the uniqueness of this historic market town.'	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Janet Reville (302)	Old River Lane SPD - General		In general, this development should be the decision of the people of Bishop's Stortford and not that of the leader of EHDC.	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to provide a framework for bringing forward appropriate redevelopment at Old River Lane.	No amendment in response to this issue.
North Herts District Council (180)	Old River Lane SPD - General		Thank you for consulting us on the Old River Lane SPD. We do not have any comments to make on this consultation.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Helen Miller (186)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	We need more arts spaces not less. The proposed theatre has morphed into a cinema. In the absence of a purpose-built performance/concert hall, we need more multifunctional spaces that work for arts organisations, not less. If there is any doubt that the adaptable performance space in the new ORL arts centre will not be able to support local arts, then it is essential that the URC hall is kept.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Meanwhile I understand that planning permission to create more community space at the actual URC church is still stuck in the system. When are councillors going to sort his out? Lack of foresight by the council is a missed opportunity.</p> <p>We are on the mainline from London to Cambridge and could easily have attracted major stars to Bishop's Stortford while providing for local theatre, orchestras, and choirs. We could have had a venue to rival Saffron Hall. As it is, there is barely a venue big enough in this town to cater for a choir and orchestra.</p>	been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Ms Janet Shepherd (196)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	<p>Objection to the proposal to demolish the URC church hall as it is a part of the town's history.</p> <p>Objection to any building over 3 storeys as it will lessen the open nature of the area.</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Noted. Section 7.6 of the SPD deals specifically with heights, massing, and grain, setting out a series of principles against which development proposals can be assessed.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Objection to the proposal of a cinema, although any mention is avoided in this document as we already have one in town.</p> <p>I am unhappy that this consultation is on very general plans with detail not being given of the uses for the buildings (aside from housing). Why not make a bold stance and keep the area as an open space with a small cluster of public buildings for social and educational purposes? We have largely lost our town square, and this could be an opportunity to give us back a genuine community hub rather than a commercial area billed as a hub because it has some benches.</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>Objective 4 states that the future development of the site should '...create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all.'</p>	
Ms. Mary Duckworth (198)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	Objection to Option A of the proposed development, as it includes the demolition of the URC	Option A is included for illustrative purposes (reflecting proposals included in the Bishop's Stortford Planning	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>hall. The hall should be retained and upgraded.</p> <p>This would provide a highly suitable community space, which would retain part of the area's historical architecture, and be less costly than creating a new event space. Preserving the hall would comply with District Plan Policy BISH8 (III.e)</p> <p>The mature trees around the hall would also be kept.</p> <p>There would be ample space for disabled parking adjacent to the building.</p> <p>Objection to loss of the Waitrose car park.</p>	<p>Framework). The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>Disabled parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Council's Vehicle Parking at New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - <a href="https://cdn-eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/Vehicle_Parking_SPD.pdf">https://cdn-eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/Vehicle_Parking_SPD.pdf</a></p> <p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Ms Julie Kitchener (201)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	<p>1. We don't need another cinema in Bishop's Stortford.</p> <p>2. We desperately need to keep Waitrose in our town which must have adequate parking and easy access to and from the store.</p> <p>3. To demolish the URC Hall would be an absolute crime. Although it desperately needs renovating it is well placed to accommodate all sorts of gatherings.</p> <p>4. Do we really need more flats, shops and coffee houses? The town is overrun with flats - who are buying</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>these? The shops and flats by the new car park are all empty. How long will it take to sell/rent these? Who is going to use these shops, they are not in the town centre?</p> <p>5. No thought has been given to the new development, only by people who don't live in, work in, or use the town.</p> <p>6. The Council has already lost millions of pounds over this scheme. Please do not let it become another white elephant.</p>	<p>community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town. The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane will be proportionate and complementary to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.</p> <p>Meeting with stakeholders and community representatives during the preparation of the draft SPD ensured a better understanding of the key issues and aspirations that the community have for the Old River Lane site. The discussions that took place at the Steering Group meetings influenced both the scope and content of the SPD.</p> <p>Consultation on the SPD has provided the opportunity for residents of Bishop's Stortford to provide their comments on the SPD.</p> <p>Noted, however this is not a planning matter.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Ms. Janet Harris (232)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>I object to the plans I have seen so far. Especially as Waitrose lose their carpark! This plan that was posted on FB today, seems far better. Would be lovely not to lose the hall! And keep Waitrose car park!</p> <p>Bad enough losing the causeway carpark as it is!</p>	<p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>It is condition of the planning permission for Northgate End (3/18/0432/FUL) that The Causeway car park shall be closed in the interests if the free flow of traffic through the highway network.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.
Ms Deb Roberts (177)	Old River Lane SPD – General		The Coal Authority has no comments to make on the SPD.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Derek Crowther (179)	Old River Lane SPD – General		<p>The SPD is so general in terminology and short on specifics as to defy objective comment.</p> <p>What is written appears to place few restraints on what might be proposed. E.g., the vagueness of the term leisure facilities; no mention of communal facilities; no mention of charging points.</p>	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed. Whilst not detailing specific proposals at this stage (these will be set out in any subsequent planning application), the ambition of the SPD is to ensure a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Hidden in the documents is a comment to the effect that they can move parking provision for some of the flats on this site over to the Northgate End MSCP. This runs contrary to the whole justification for Northgate End.</p> <p>There is a further commitment to give Waitrose more parking spaces - how many - this further erodes the nett gain in spaces.</p>	<p>There will be a requirement for the developer to provide electric motor vehicle charging points (see section 8 of the SPD).</p> <p>Policy BISH8 part (g) states that: "on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters."</p> <p>As such the SPD notes the policy requirement to provide for car parking to meet the needs on the site, but also sets out the access to nearby car parks and the need to prioritise active travel. As such it takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce car parking on ORL particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that there will be a need to re-provide displaced parking for Waitrose.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>There is no reiteration of the limit of 100 dwellings on the site in the original plan.</p> <p>Are there any other pre-existing commercial arrangements that will compromise a decision? E.g., Who will own the extensive commercial space planned for the ground floors, shops etc? If it is to be East Herts Council and the risk of its success falls on the council taxpayers, then the viability of such plans needs to be justified as part of the planning approval process. Please clarify this point.</p> <p>Seeking to imply that the 6-storey height of Jackson Square can be used as a yardstick for appropriate building heights in the development is wrong. This reference should be erased. The quality of the design construction, material choices and modern style in the MSCP should be carried forward to the ORL site, and its bulk restricted to match the height of the brick clad MSCP frontage not the metal clad element behind.</p>	<p>District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.</p> <p>The viability of any scheme would be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The information provided at 7.6.2 is factual. The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets. This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations.</p>	



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>The area dedicated to a public square seems to have shrunk. Am I correct?</p> <p>Vague promises were made about providing an alternative venue to replace the Water Lane Hall which is to be demolished. They do not appear to be enshrined in this SPD. They should be - a section 106 arrangement might be appropriate.</p> <p>Implicit in the SPD is the demolition of Charringtons House which is a retrograde step. Has its conversion to flats been evaluated? This could be achieved much more quickly than building from scratch and would get an early return. The environmental impact, carbon generation, noise nuisance etc caused by the demolition will be considerable.</p>	<p>The SPD doesn't specify the size of a public square. The detail of this will be set out in any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
				contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	
Mr Paul Boreham (199)	Old River Lane SPD - General		There should be an arts space in this new development. i.e., a venue that could be used for theatrical & musical performances (NOT a cinema!). Could the URC hall be refurbished, or even the actual URC church itself be used for this purpose? i.e., the church would be a dual-purpose space both for worship and arts. This needs to be part of the S106 agreement.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Graham Oxborrow (202)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	Expectation that EHDC would wish to set exemplary requirements in the SPD to deliver substantive improvements to the Arts provision and community facilities on the ORL site; to ensure it is not to the detriment of existing well-loved facilities in the town; and to deliver net zero carbon development in accordance with its Climate Change commitment.  The consultation draft SPD is in no way exemplary and EHDC has provided no evidence that it has properly assessed the community's	Agreed. This ambition is reflected in the Vision and Development Objectives for the site (now Section 6 of the SPD), which were developed through discussion with the Old River Steering Group.  Noted.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			needs and desires for the site and that it has modelled or otherwise assessed whether its requirements would take up the opportunities development of the site brings or bring risks to the rest of the town's existing facilities.		
Mr Graham Oxborrow (208)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	This is such an important development for the town and yet the Council has failed to engage with the community to achieve a shared understanding behind the planning brief for the Masterplan for the site. The Council should not abuse its power to impose its will on the town in this way.	The importance of this site is acknowledged. An Old River Lane Steering Group was set up to influence both the scope and content of the SPD. Membership of the Steering Group includes: Officers from East Herts Council and Hertfordshire County Council; Councillors; representatives from the Cross-party Working Group on Old River Lane; landowner and developer representatives; as well as other representatives from the Town Council, the Neighbourhood Plan Group, the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group, the Bishop's Stortford Business Improvement District (BID) and Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation. Several community representatives also attended the Steering Group meetings.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Lyn Farrell (210)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	Bishop's Stortford is sadly lacking anywhere for adult education classes to be held. Hertfordshire County Council's very own Step2Skills organisation has been unsuccessful over the last couple of years in	Noted.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>finding premises to hold regular courses and classes even though the community has been requesting them. A couple of decent sized rooms would suffice and would benefit the community immensely.</p> <p>I cannot see any detailed plans on the document for a town square which has been mentioned. I do hope that this would include plenty of trees to create shade and improve air quality. Once again, the planning is not making the most of our lovely river frontage. Yet another missed opportunity.</p>	<p>The SPD references a public square stating that it 'should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area.' (paragraph 8.4.5 of the SPD).</p> <p>The importance of green infrastructure is embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration.</p>	
Ms Jill Jones (226)	Old River Lane SPD – General		Please note there has been no forum at all for the public to hear officers speak about the latest developments. Calling in the minimum time for consultation at a time when most people are planning a holiday smacks of pushing items through once again without proper	Six meetings of the Old River Lane Steering Group took place before publication of the draft SPD for consultation. Whilst not as public forum the meetings were attended by the Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation and other community representatives.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>discussion and with no forum to air creative ideas (the general assumption being that the public view would be negative).</p> <p>Support the demolition of Charringtons House which is an abomination but leave the mature trees!</p>	<p>Meeting with stakeholders and community representatives during the preparation of the draft SPD ensured a better understanding of the key issues and aspirations that the community have for the Old River Lane site. The discussions that took place at the Steering Group meetings influenced both the scope and content of the SPD.</p> <p>Consultation on the SPD has provided the opportunity for residents of Bishop's Stortford to provide their comments on the SPD.</p> <p>Support for the demolition of Charringtons House is noted.</p> <p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p>	
Mr James Hook (237)	Old River Lane SPD – General		The Council should consider holding an architectural competition or separately engaging architects to maximise the possibility of obtaining outstanding design.	The Council has already appointed Cityheart Ltd as the developer for the Old River Lane site.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Waitrose & Partners (261)	Old River Lane SPD – General		Waitrose would like to confirm its position that proposals to redevelop the Council owned surface level	Noted, however, it is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>public car park to the east of its shop could potentially negatively impact on trade to their store, which would jeopardise the success of the scheme envisaged in the SPD and the health of the wider town centre.</p> <p>Waitrose support the Strategic Masterplan to guide the development of the site at Figure 21 on page 71 of the draft SPD, which shows both areas of the Waitrose car park (east and south) as retained.</p> <p>Whilst Waitrose welcomes the recognition at paragraph 8.3.3 of the draft SPD that there is a need to ensure that circa 170 car parking spaces are retained to service the customer demand, this should be updated to reflect the existing number of spaces within the car park (183) and therefore at least 183 spaces should be retained as part of any redevelopment proposals for Old River Lane.</p> <p>Waitrose also broadly supports the proposed vehicular access route from the Link Road (A1250) to the east as shown on the Strategic Masterplan.</p>	<p>will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town.</p> <p>Support noted and welcomed. Note: Figure 21 is now Figure 20.</p> <p>The commitment in the SPD to re-provide around 170 spaces is consistent with the number of spaces that Waitrose currently lease from the Council (166). In addition, Waitrose own the freehold for an additional 21 spaces which are not part of the redevelopment proposals.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			Waitrose would like to work collaboratively with the Council and Developer to seek to ensure that no existing car parking spaces are lost in order to facilitate the delivery of the access route and in tandem to enhance the provision of car parking spaces, the layout the car park and deliver public realm improvements as part of any forthcoming scheme for the Old River Lane site. This will ensure that the Waitrose store continues to support the vitality and viability of the town centre	Noted and welcomed.	
Jenny McGregor (263)	Old River Lane SPD – General	Object	<p>The car park did not need to be closed. A lot of people, especially the elderly, prefer the one floor area and not having to fiddle with technology in the other car parks.</p> <p>A new Arts Centre is not required. The Rhodes centre does a lot for everyone.</p> <p>A new cinema is not required. There is already a multi-screen cinema in the town.</p>	<p>Noted, although not relevant to the content of the SPD.</p> <p>The Council has been in discussion with Rhodes Birthplace Trust and will continue to work with them moving forward to find the best solution for Bishop’s Stortford and the Arts Complex.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>No more shops are needed, especially located at the other end of town. Existing empty shops need filling and no more cafes or restaurants, just 'Proper' shops.</p> <p>Why knock Carrington's building down when it can be used for offices or other things.</p>	<p>flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town. The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane should be proportionate and complementary to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre. It is expected that new food and beverage opportunities will create a vibrant new area of the town centre.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include</p>	



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>The URC hall needs to stay.</p> <p>Existing trees should be retained. The Government says plant more trees to help air pollution and you want to knock more down!</p> <p>Further thought should be given to the one-way system and the extra traffic on the roads and around the town.</p>	<p>proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>The SPD includes a number of interventions and projects set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. These seek to improve</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>There is no need for any more ugly blocks of homes or buildings at that end of town. The area by the station must be one of the ugliest sites we have in Bishop's Stortford and that is enough.</p> <p>A surgery could be a possibility, but only if there is still a lot of parking spaces left next to Waitrose Car park and it is in the level car park. Or convert some of Charringtons House.</p>	<p>the highway network, encourage modal shift, and prioritise active travel.</p> <p>The ambition of the Council is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. The purpose of the SPD is to ensure that the development is of high-quality design.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p>	
Deirdre Glasgow (269)	Old River Lane SPD - General		Extremely disappointed that there is such lack of information regarding the Art Centre. The plans, since this development was proposed nearly 10 years ago, have gone from a 500+ seater theatre and Art Centre with library, to a 5-screen cinema arts centre now reduced to leisure facilities. No clarification on what leisure facilities mean or will contain. More clarity is needed regarding the leisure facilities and what provision will be offered to complement the work of South Mill Arts and other arts groups across the town. There is a need to involve all these groups.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			Grange Paddocks Leisure has just been completed and is an excellent local authority leisure facility, so do not need more sports facilities at ORL. There are a number of private gyms across the town including Nuffield gym at The Good Yard development.	Noted.	
David Rich (275)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>The Old River Lane development should feature architecture more sympathetic with our old town. The current plans seem to incorporate more shops and domestic housing than that given over to the arts and community building. The hope is that these shops and housing units will be low rise otherwise the way through the pedestrianised street will be like walking through dark canyons of brick and concrete.</p> <p>Are any more shops needed when the present offering includes so many premises boarded up?</p>	<p>The ambition of the Council is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD will ensure that Old River Lane is a high-quality, accessible, and sustainable redevelopment of a town centre destination that incorporates a mixture of uses that contribute to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and complement the uniqueness of this historic market town.</p> <p>It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town. The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane should be proportionate and complementary to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Jan Mccarthy (285)	Old River Lane SPD - General		I would like to see money invested in refurbishing the URC Hall + not building another cinema. We already have a cinema that is never fully utilised, as well as South Mill Arts Centre, which is a great asset to our town. The ORL SPD explains 'the historic significance of Bishop's Stortford + sets out design principles + a framework for prioritising the natural characteristics + cultural heritage of the area'. By keeping the existing Hall, which is a multi-purpose facility, it will save costs by not building a 'leisure centre' on the site. By not touching the Waitrose car park, which is used for disabled and elderly people, it would confirm to protect the ancient oak + the row of ancient trees alongside the Church Hall.	Noted. The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).  The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.	No amendment in response to these issues.
Malcolm Duckworth (303)	Old River Lane SPD - General		My preference for the ORL site is to restrict the development to the large car park only and concentrate on making that a nice space to live and work. Please avoid over development and retain the feeling of openness.  Provide new retail facilities and new housing (100 as suggested is too many, plan for 50 max).	Noted. The ambition of the Council is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area.  District Plan Policy BISH8 requires the delivery of 'around 100 homes' as part	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Leave alone those parts of the proposed red-lined development area that are functioning well (URC Hall, Charringtons House, existing houses adjacent to Coopers, Waitrose car park).</p> <p>The proposal indicates a leisure facility and new office space. These already exist so use some of the funds available to upgrade the existing buildings rather than demolish. The URC Hall is already well used for arts and leisure activities and has room for disabled parking. It could be refurbished and enhanced to a high-quality centre. Regarding Charringtons House, refurbishment and enhancement are not considered an option so please make available your evidence that it is unsuitable for modern day office needs. The assessment of the unsuitability of this building contradicts the content of a letter sent into the local paper a few years ago from someone involved in the building design. Any surveys cited in the report, completed prior to the</p>	<p>of a mixed-use development on the site. The SPD reflects this policy requirement.</p> <p>Noted. However, the principle of mixed-use development has already been established in this location through District Plan Policy BISH8.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>covid pandemic and lock down, should be redone, particularly with regard to the town's need for new office space.</p> <p>Mention is made of maintaining the character of the area, especially building heights, though this has been ignored in the past. New buildings should have heights no higher than Coopers or Waitrose. The new developments at Northgate End (multi-storey car park, offices/apartments) are totally out of character for the area because of their height and should not be used as a reference for new building height proposals.</p> <p>Linking Castle Gardens to the ORL site is a nice idea but clearly a problem because of the importance of Link Road to traffic flow through the town. The siting of the new multi-storey car park on the opposite side of Link Road to ORL has not helped with this problem. If traffic flow on Link Road is continually disrupted by pedestrian crossings and speed</p>	<p>planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets. Section 7.6 has however been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>restrictions, car drivers will always seek other parking options or stay away from the town.</p> <p>On the parking theme, Waitrose will lose custom if it loses the car park outside the store, which will inevitably threaten the future of the store. The existing space should be left alone.</p>	Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.	
Jenette Greenwood (318)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Since the plans were first considered, life has changed for us all and the country's / town's financial position has also changed. We need to reconsider what the town needs and will use, what will bring people and businesses to Bishops Stortford. How can our money be most effectively spent? I don't think the plans as they stand offer the people that live, work, shop and go out in Bishop's Stortford value for money. I really hope you will reconsider how this space can best be reimagined and not just throw good money away on something that doesn't work for the town.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD provides a strategic framework against which more detailed decisions can be made. The aim is to achieve a high-quality development that meets the Council's place-making, corporate and community aspirations and objectives for Bishop's Stortford and its town centre.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Bryan Evans (250)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>Consultation period provides insufficient time for many people to respond, noting that a substantial part of the consultation period was</p>	<p>Noted. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 set out that SPD's should be consulted for a period of not less than</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			during the school summer holidays when many people are likely to have been away. The consultation has been inadequately publicised. It is not mentioned on East Herts Council's consultation webpage.	four-weeks. The consultation was therefore in accordance with regulations. It was advertised via a press release and information was also made available on the Council's website ( <a href="https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-and-building/old-river-lane-supplementary-planning-documents">https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-and-building/old-river-lane-supplementary-planning-documents</a> ) and via social media.	
Mr Bryan Evans (252)	Old River Lane SPD - General		1. Currently Bridge Street is used by a substantial volume of traffic much of which, if it's pedestrianised, would likely seek to use other routes (such as North Street and Bells Hill) to get to Link Road and continue the journey via The Causeway. If it uses Link Road it would need to go through the new signal-controlled MSCP junctions - and I don't think that was allowed for in the MSCP traffic modelling that predicted (very) extensive queues for some scenarios. If those predictions materialise then I would expect extensive queueing and rat running in the northwest of the town that would need mitigation. Some drivers would likely go to other destinations and visit Stortford much less often. There would probably be a combination of drivers being held up by the MSCP signals, re-routeing, re-	Noted. Chapter 4 seeks to set out the high-level intervention options included with the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. These will work alongside existing policy in the statutory development plan documents and also the design principles in Chapter 7.	See various amendments to Chapters 4 and 7 in relation to these comments.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>timing travel or switching to another travel mode, or travelling elsewhere or not at all. Some traffic restriction on Bridge Street might be helpful as I'd expect some drivers would divert to it from Link Road to avoid the delays at the new MSCP junctions.</p> <p>2. Is the Waitrose car park access to be direct from Link Road and if so where, is that also to be signal controlled, has it been modelled, including its interaction with other junctions and how are pedestrians and cyclists to be prioritised at any new junction and on any new highway links.</p> <p>3. What is being done to ensure pedestrians and cyclists using Link Road have as convenient and unimpeded journey as possible to ORL and through the area? Stepped cycle tracks on Link Road may be one suitable way of helping cyclists through the area in line with EHDC and HCC policies.</p>	<p>This SPD seeks to set out a high-level strategic masterplan framework for the development. The current preferred access to the site is the eastern access discussed in Section 8.3 following discussions with HCC highways. The details of junctions and subsequent modelling will need to accompany any detailed proposals.</p> <p>Chapter 4 sets out various packages for interventions, most of these focus on active travel interventions including looking wider than ORL and linking with existing and planned interventions. This also goes together with the design principles on movement in Chapter 7 as well as existing policies in development plan documents such as the East Herts District Plan and the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Revision). Both Chapters have been strengthened in response to various comments on the draft SPD.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>See various amendments to Chapters 4 and 7 in relation to these comments.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>4. Does the scheme provide generous space for walking in groups and for cycling that helps make using those modes a pleasant experience. Often minimum widths are used and without regard for the constraining effect of boundaries and street furniture on effective useable width resulting in low quality and at times hazardous pedestrian and cycling environments.</p> <p>5. What does the latest traffic modelling and assessments show, and does it allow for the build-up and decay of queues over several hours or a whole 12 hours say rather than for a single hour show the dynamic response to queuing (rat running) by drivers rather than a static model and show the interaction of queues at junctions.</p> <p>6. A pre-requisite of the scheme must be to ensure ORL, and the wider town centre can be easily, safely, and conveniently accessed by foot and cycle despite the traffic queues that are predicted.</p> <p>7. Helping public transport on Hadham Road and Rye Street</p>	<p>Chapter 7 sets out design principles to ensure that active travel (Section 7.2) is supported with the necessary design and infrastructure to encourage its implementation. Where possible, existing standards have been referred to also. Likewise, Section 7.7 seeks to ensure that the public realm is designed in a manner that enhances the pedestrian experience and supports active travel.</p> <p>This SPD seeks to set out a high-level strategic masterplan framework for the development. The details of junctions and subsequent modelling will need to accompany any detailed proposals.</p> <p>This SPD focusses on the active travel and connectivity of ORL</p> <p>Given that the focus of this SPD is on the development at ORL itself, the</p>	<p>See various amendments to Chapters 4 and 7 in relation to these comments.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>through the queues on approaches to the MSCP junctions looks very difficult has it been considered?</p> <p>8. Proposals to reduce traffic speeds on Link Road as part of ORL development should be extended to cover all of the town centre including Hockerill St, North Street, The Causeway, Dane Street, Station Road and South Road.</p> <p>9. Any new cycle and pedestrian route should provide a high-quality experience and route for both user groups. ORL is likely to be a busy pedestrian area and any sharing of surfaces, if that's what is in mind, should be very carefully considered and designed including with regard to width, speeds, volumes, gradients.</p> <p>10. How is the ORL site and Waitrose to be accessed by cycle from all directions?</p>	<p>document does not seek to set out any particular interventions involving public transport on Hadham Road and Rye street. The interventions listed in Chapter 4, alongside the newly added Section 4.3 seek to ensure that the ORL SPD seeks to support public transport both directly related to ORL and across Bishop's Stortford.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed. The design principles set out in Chapter 7 - section 7.2 seeks to ensure that any development provides a high-quality approach to supporting active travel. Various amendments have been made to improve and strengthen the principles set out in the draft SPD.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed</p>	<p>See various amendments to Chapter 4 and specifically Section 4.2 in relation to these comments.</p> <p>See various amendments to Chapter 7 and specifically Section 7.2 in relation to these comments.</p> <p>No amendment necessary in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>11. A continuous cycle route should be provided from the ORL site to Sworders Fields. This should include a generous width cyclable crossing on Link Road and providing access to the park and to cycle routes in the park that can be used by all types of cycle including adult/child tag-along, tricycle, cargo and disabled adapted cycles without need to dismount.</p> <p>12. ORL development could be a good location for a cycle hub, especially if it has good cycle access, perhaps including secure covered cycle parking, cycle hire, base for cargo cycle delivery service for use by town centre businesses etc.</p> <p>13. Future proofing for electric scooter access should be considered.</p> <p>14. The one-way system for North Street, Windhill and Bells Hill is interesting, if it progresses, I think allowance for contraflow cycling should be made, at least on Windhill and North Street, and Bells Hill if possible.</p>	<p>development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>Chapter 4 sets out the high-level expectations of a cycle route into the site and across Castle Gardens. This is proposed to then link in with those suggested interventions set out in Section 4.2.</p> <p>Agreed. There has been the addition of various design principles to Section 7.2, including reference to existing cycle standards and non-standard bike types.</p> <p>Agreed. There has been the addition of various design principles to Section 7.2, including reference to existing cycle standards and non-standard bike types.</p>	<p>See various amendments to Chapters 4 and 7 in relation to these comments.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>15. The Town Centre Planning Framework (and the local plan) suggest around 100 residential units for the site why are more than double that being proposed? This intensive land use takes away opportunities for future proofing the site for changing public needs and demands.</p>	District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.	No amendment in response to this issue.
			<p>16. Many people may not want or need to own or park a car at the site. Has provision for a car club and use of the new MSCP been considered to reduce onsite parking at ORL itself? This excessive land demand for car parking again takes away opportunities for future proofing the site for changing public needs and demands as well as takes away space for the enjoyment and use of the public.</p>	Section 7.3 of the SPD sets out that 'development proposals should include car club facilities and incentives' and that 'permitting opportunities for residents in the adjacent multi-storey car parks at Jackson Square and Northgate End should be explored.	No amendment in response to this issue.
			<p>17. Cinemas tend to be large unattractive windowless boxes, and often, other than their facade, are best hidden from view as much as possible. This one would be very prominent, a major feature in the streetscape from all directions and juxtaposed by a scheduled ancient</p>	The SPD sets out that buildings will be high quality, sustainable and of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>monument. How is that to be resolved?</p> <p>18. The dominance of a cinema function at an Arts Centre compromises many other uses. Instead of airy spaces with natural light, dual or multiple aspects and views to the Castle mound and gardens it seems the Arts Centre users within the Centre will have use of dark artificially lit cinema rooms with no meaningful connection or relationship to the outside surroundings.</p> <p>19. How is the ORL site being future proofed for the future growth and needs of the town. It's the last large council controlled town centre site and if it's built out in the intensive way suggested there is no scope for meaningful future expansion of the public uses and public spaces when the financial conditions will be different and the town's population and that of its surrounding area will be far greater than now.</p> <p>20. The inclusion of a multi-purpose outdoor public space is a very valuable feature in principle. Is clear</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of the SPD requires proposals for new uses on Old River Lane to be responsive and demonstrate adaptability to shifting market trends and dynamics.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>-</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>information available on its size, shape, capacity for accommodating events, and relationship how it relates to its surroundings. One idea that has been suggested is winter ice skating how would this be accommodated of sufficient size for Stortford and its surrounding area together with related facilities such as changing, food/drink etc, Christmas market etc whilst still providing space for other public use?</p> <p>21. Gardens and generous public spaces should be provided on the site and shared by both the general public and the residents of the site.</p> <p>22. The site should be future proofed to have space reserved to accommodate the future and needs of the town and its hinterland development and thereby support sustainable development, not be intensively built out now.</p>	<p>A key objective of the SPD is to 'Create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all and establish a civic destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time.'</p> <p>The site is allocated for mixed-use development in the District Plan, with around homes being delivered between 2022 and 2027.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>
Brenda Whitaker (264)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	Objection to the Old River Lane development. This has never been what the majority of people in Stortford wanted, but now that it seems we have to have it, the very	Objection to development at ORL noted. The ambition of the Council is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. The purpose of the	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>least we deserve is a development that is as environmentally friendly as possible, which includes not removing any existing trees.</p> <p>The recommendations of the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group are supported.</p>	<p>SPD is to ensure that the development is of high-quality design. The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
Judith Monaghan (276)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>1. Charringtons House - will this building is to remain? It's an iconic building - plenty of office space. No more needed.</p> <p>2. No building to be more than 3 storeys high so does not 'loom' over the Causeway.</p>	<p>Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings (including offices) of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SPD makes it clear that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets. This section has however been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			3. Homes should include sheltered homes for elderly, as convenient for town centre.	The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.	
			4. There should be disabled parking as Northgate End multistorey is too far from shops.	Disabled parking will need to be provided in accordance with the Council's Vehicle Parking at New Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - <a href="https://cdn-eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/Vehicle_Parking_SPD.pdf">https://cdn-eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/Vehicle_Parking_SPD.pdf</a>	
			5. There MUST be rooms to hire for Pilates, art groups, children's activities to replace those in URC Hall. Some small rooms for language groups, book groups etc.	Noted.	
			6. I'm not sure how access to Waitrose carpark and parking for the new homes will work? Waitrose is important to the town.	The specific details of how to access the Waitrose carpark will be considered through the planning application process.	
			7. A GP surgery would be good.	The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.	
			8. We do not need another cinema.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>9. Wider pavement required alongside Riverside Walk, Coopers side.</p> <p>10. Plenty of trees please.</p>	<p>River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agreed. The importance of green infrastructure is embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration.</p>	
T.P. Kitchener (286)	Old River Lane SPD – General		1. We don't need another cinema.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>2. We need more spaces for meeting rooms, exhibition centre, community groups to meet.</p> <p>3. Criminal to do away with URC Hall, an excellent hall space, meeting room, sports venue (on small scale) all for use of B/S towns people. An iconic building just being knocked down.</p> <p>4. Waitrose needs to remain allowing easy access to and from store.</p> <p>5. No more flats, PLEASE cafes, cafes, shops.</p>	<p>been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Waitrose and associated car parking will be retained on site.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>It is expected that new food and beverage opportunities will create a vibrant new area of the town centre.</p>	
Gary Jones (294)	Old River Lane SPD – General		<p>Table of Contents - spelling errors:</p> <p>2.4 United ReformED Church Hall</p> <p>4.2 Multi-StorEy Car Park</p>	Spelling error noted.	<p>Make spelling corrections to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table of Contents</li> <li>- Section 2.4</li> <li>- Paragraph 2.2.17</li> <li>- Paragraph 2.4.1</li> </ul>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Image 3</li> <li>- Paragraph 2.2.18</li> <li>- Paragraph 3.4.4</li> <li>- Section 4.2</li> <li>- Paragraph 4.2.2</li> <li>- Table below 5.1.1</li> <li>- Box below 7.6.2</li> <li>- Paragraph 8.2.3</li> </ul>
Ms Yvonne Estop (384)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>In presentations that I was privileged to be in, and which the public have not seen, are the slides below, which set out a concept for an arts centre. The shape of the building is reflected in the SPD diagram, but no explanation whatsoever is provided about possible uses and operation.</p> <p>This building shape has been a 'given' throughout discussions, so the absence of any commentary or guidance in the SPD is frankly bizarre. Use of the word 'leisure' is imprecise and obfuscating. I submit the following comments on a leisure use, and an arts centre:</p> <p>A dedicated studio space (second bullet) is the key component for an arts centre. An arts centre should have at its heart a large flexible space for multiple kinds of performance, and different audience</p>	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD at Section 3.4 which provides further information.	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>configurations. It does not need to have a 'stage area' or to be a 'theatre' or a 'concert hall', just a box, that can meet the needs of many arts organisations in this town, including the Choral Society, Sinfonia orchestra, theatre group, comedy club, various music projects and festival organisers. It should accommodate workshops and education. The key points are its size, lighting and sound rigs, an ability to have an audience of at least 200, a get-in and complete flexibility of fixtures.</p> <p>Live performance spaces in a foyer, a gallery, café bar space (as described below) is not a serious provision for live performance, but a secondary possibility. Foyer, gallery, café areas cannot hold theatre, or choral concerts, or chamber orchestras, or rehearsals, or workshops, or education classes. It may be suitable for daytime community events, but some of these will need private and safeguarded spaces.</p> <p>A five screen cinema (fourth bullet below) would seem incompatible with the above needs. Cinema</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>spaces tend to be rigid with raked floors. The town has two cinemas already so this is an inexplicable response to local arts provision. A public realm area is described with various activities, none of which crop up in the SPD. All will require events organiser and annual events programmer, a business commitment that the success of the space will rely on, not referred to in the SPD.</p> <p>The diagrams do not indicate which box is the 'dedicated studio space'. Each box shows a stage, which is inflexible. The largest capacity shown is 150, which is considerably smaller than the URC church hall.</p> <p>The SPD talks about the leisure use 'activating ground floors' but only one frontage can be active, the others will be blank walls. The building will be low and blank-sided. This proposal is not yet acceptable, and the SPD needs to provide real clarity about how arts, community, civic, leisure uses will be approached.</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
Hertfordshire County Council (346)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>The comments from HCC on the SPD reflect the interests of the following HCC services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport (Highways, Network &amp; Travel Planning)</li> <li>- Countryside and Rights of Way</li> <li>- Adult Care Services</li> <li>- Flood Risk Management</li> </ul>	Noted.	-
Melanie Wakeline (319)	Old River Lane SPD - General	Object	<p>Proposal for Charringtons site to be used for local medical centre (GP, nurse-led services, e.g., vaccination and NHS dentist). The Charringtons site would be ideal for this purpose either repurposing the existing building (preferred option) or replacing it with a building no higher than the existing building.</p> <p>The existing Causeway open-air level access carpark should be re-opened for public use.</p> <p>Strong preference is for the Charringtons site to be utilised for the benefit of the local community rather than for housing. Opposition to any housing to be built on the ORL site. No further town centre housing is needed or appropriate as this will</p>	<p>The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>It is condition of the planning permission for Northgate End (3/18/0432/FUL) that The Causeway car park shall be closed in the interests if the free flow of traffic through the highway network.</p> <p>District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>just lead to more congestion, parking issues and probably also more anti-social behaviour in the town centre. Bishop's Stortford has had more than its fair share of new housing, both flats and houses in the last few years.</p> <p>Limit the height of any new buildings to 3 storey. In the last 10-20 years, the town centre (and access to the river) have been ruined by overbearing tall buildings.</p> <p>Leave the existing open-air level-access carpark at Waitrose unchanged.</p> <p>Reinstate the open-air Causeway level access carpark. Many women do not feel safe in multi storey carparks. Please reinstate the Causeway open air level access carpark, so that less mobile residents can also make use of the town centre. This is an equality and diversity issue.</p> <p>Do not demolish the URC Hall. This is a much loved and used space.</p>	<p>Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD.</p> <p>Waitrose and associated car parking will be retained on site.</p> <p>It is condition of the planning permission for Northgate End (3/18/0432/FUL) that The Causeway car park shall be closed in the interests if the free flow of traffic through the highway network.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the</p>	



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>The town does not need another cinema or another theatre.</p> <p>Let's just encourage use of the town's existing facilities by keep car parking free in the evenings and on Sundays! I am concerned that yet again East Herts Council appears to be forcing unwanted developments on Bishop's Stortford residents. Over the last 30 years the town centre has been overdeveloped with tall, ugly flat blocks and multi-storey car parks that are not working for residents. Consequently, access to the river is</p>	<p>demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			now poor, shops are empty and soon the cafes and restaurants will struggle due to the proposed parking changes. The town gets more and more ugly every year. Please put a stop to this overdevelopment of Bishop's Stortford town centre - enough is enough.		
Paul Dean (443)	Old River Lane SPD - General		My personal observations and comments are substantially the same as the two documents sent by Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation.	Noted.	-
Emma Mullhall (370)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Why is the URC Hall being demolished? Surely it could be refurbished and used by the local community, whether as a comedy club or space for community groups. It an age of sustainability it seems counter-productive to demolish a perfectly serviceable building, one that is at the heart of the town and part of the history of Stortford.</p> <p>Similar concerns about Charringtons House. Why are we demolishing a building that is an office block to build more offices? This makes no sense. Why is this happening?</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>There are so many new houses being built across Stortford. Very few are affordable. If new houses/flats are to be built are they affordable? Will the young, on an average salary, for example, be able to afford them?</p> <p>Our GP surgeries are almost at breaking point. We have thousands of new residents, yet there are no additional GP surgeries. Old River Lane should include a health centre so that pressure is relieved from other surgeries.</p> <p>Old River Lane should be for the benefit of the community and it should be built as 'greenly' as possible. What 'green' technology will be used in the construction of Old</p>	<p>SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings (including offices) of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is a policy requirement for up to 40% of the new homes to be affordable.</p> <p>The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>River Lane? We have a responsibility to ensure that it does not negatively impact the environment. The Council should be considering which trees will be kept and whether new ones should be planted. Ultimately, I don't feel that the planning of this has been done well.</p> <p>We have a new cinema, for no apparent reason, as we have one already.</p> <p>We have a new multi-storey car park, when we should be trying to make it easier for people to visit the town centre without cars. There is no network of cycle paths, for example. The car is being prioritised and it shouldn't be.</p>	<p>possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the location of the site on the edge of the town centre, with the Castle Gardens and the new multi-storey car park on the opposite side of the Link Road means that the approach to movement will have wider impacts across the town. Section 7.2 of the SPD sets out key design principles</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
				which will promote modal shift by supporting and encouraging sustainable transport modes of travel and address the current movement constraints on the site.	
Sheila Ballisat (378)	Old River Lane SPD - General		<p>Will all the trees felled be replaced?</p> <p>I think the URC Hall should stay and just be refurbished, as it is used regularly.</p> <p>We don't really need any more shops as there are many in town empty since covid.</p> <p>Charringtons House should not be demolished. It could be used to house a further education college or</p>	<p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>a new Doctors surgery and ancillary requirements. Or it could be changed to house a new theatre.</p> <p>Will all the new housing be affordable or shared ownership?</p> <p>Will they all have solar panels fitted as standard?</p>	<p>presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>There is a policy requirement for up to 40% of the new homes to be affordable.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD encourages proposals to maximise sustainability and sets out several criteria in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5 that need to be considered, including improving current building standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>Will the building heights be no more than the height of the new multi storey?</p> <p>We don't need a new cinema, the one we have is very under used. Also. South Mill Arts show films in much more pleasant surroundings.</p>	<p>to take account of the guidance in the Council's Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>The Council has been in discussion with Rhodes Birthplace Trust and will</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			What will be done to ease the present traffic congestion round the town most days, with all the pollution that causes.	<p>continue to work with them moving forward to find the best solution for Bishop's Stortford and the Arts Complex.</p> <p>A key objective of the SPD is to 'deliver a place which enables active and healthy lifestyles by encouraging sustainable modes of travel that prioritise pedestrian movement over the private car.' The SPD also sets out that 'proposals at Old River Lane must not worsen the pollutant levels within the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).'</p>	
Chantry Community Association (381)	Old River Lane SPD - General		1 No information is provided on the document as to whether there is going to be an art centre and/or a cinema and if not what is planned?	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	No amendment in response to these issues.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>2 Are Charringtons and the URC hall being retained and if they go what is proposed to replace them?</p> <p>3 More shops? There are empty shops in the town. Shopping centres are closing in the United States and what happens there reaches us 5 or 10 years later. If the proposed ORL site is successful shops will move from the other end of town which will then have more empty shops and become even less attractive.</p> <p>4 Bikes - elderly and disabled will not be using bikes. Families on the new estates on the outskirts of town will not be using bikes, commuters from the new estates being built along the Takeley road will not be using bikes. Members of the audience for the new theatre/cinema on a wet night in December will not be riding bikes to get there. Bike use in Bishops Stortford is a recreational "thing" normally at weekends or possibly by retired enthusiasts during the week</p>	<p>The SPD doesn't specifically propose the demolition of either Charringtons House or the URC Hall. If demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, applicants will be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies.</p> <p>It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town. The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane will be proportionate and complementary to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.</p> <p>Noted, whilst not everyone will use a bicycle, the SPD is seeking to send out a clear message that the private car is not the preferred mode of travel. Proposals for Old River Lane have the potential to create new, clear pedestrian and cycle connections between North Street and Castle Gardens (east-west) as well as providing a clear route from the multi-storey car park at Northgate End, through the development to Bridge Street (north-south).</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>when they ride out of town on 20 - 50 mile "wheelies". Planners also appear to have missed that there is a revolution in the way vehicles are being powered taking place and in 10 years most vehicles and certainly new vehicles will be powered by electric.</p> <p>5 Public transport - this will be great if we have a working system but the council are now consulting on bin collections every month to save costs. Public transport running from say 6.30 a.m. to midnight seven days each week to cater for the commuters, daytime shoppers and the night-time economy will be very expensive and with the way the economy is going is very unlikely to happen.</p> <p>6 More housing - the housing at the station looks very un-appealing. Let's hope the design of the housing in the ORL development is a bit more appealing with a maximum height of three stories. Of course, there should affordable housing in the scheme and please give each flat a parking place in addition to their own bike rack place. Of course, all</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>New development will be required to demonstrate high standards of design and architectural quality that enhance the site, the setting of adjoining and nearby Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area. The design principles set out in the SPD will ensure that proposals maximise sustainability at every possible opportunity.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>buildings being erected should be environmentally friendly (and fire safe) but this should be a "given".</p> <p>7 Mill site - on the proposal this is marked down for redevelopment. Allinsons are a very successful business and employer in the town. Have the council discussed taking over their site?</p> <p>Summing-up, there appear to be no concrete plans for the site and the document appears to be a vast amount of waffle. Please can the council provide us with plans of the proposed site including computer generated images of the proposed building so we can see what is proposed, the scale of the buildings and with details of the proposed occupations. If they want a model of a successful art centre created from buildings in the middle of a town the council are recommended to look at the centre in Wells-next-the-Sea.</p>	<p>The SPD notes that this site is not expected to deliver within a particular timeframe but has been allocated to ensure that if it does come forward for development a comprehensive approach is taken across the site.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD is intended to provide a strategic masterplanning framework for the Old River Lane site, rather than provide detailed proposals.</p>	
Jenny Hodges (379)	Old River Lane SPD - General		I am against destroying yet more trees in Bishop's Stortford given that other developments have already led to the felling of many mature trees (2.27)	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>It seems wasteful and unnecessary to demolish the Charringtons Building and replace it with more office space.? Is there no way of recycling the existing modern brick building? (3.3)</p> <p>Given the central location of any housing development associated with the site and the need to avoid using cars in the town the majority of the housing associated with the development should be for older people and key workers and not</p>	<p>Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop’s Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn’t specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>apartments selling at premium prices. Also, the number of dwellings should be limited and managed to ensure that the centre of the town doesn't turn into a housing estate! (3.5).</p> <p>I strongly support the inclusion of a GP surgery and Health Centre on the site again to help avoid car use and for easy access for everyone. (3.4/3.14)</p> <p>With reference to the entertainment facilities, I am strongly against the inclusion of any form of cinema complex on the site given the significant underuse of existing cinema facilities in the town. (3.12)</p>	<p>The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in District Plan Policy BISH8 for 'around 100 homes.'</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	
Environment Agency (444)	Old River Lane SPD - General		We recommend that wording is included in the SPD which promotes the protection and enhancement of the local environment and seeks opportunities to enhance ecology	Paragraph 8.4.6 has been updated to include reference to Natural England's Green Infrastructure Framework which will set out key principles to guide the proposals at ORL. Likewise, the	<p>Amendment to paragraph 8.4.6 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals should utilise and incorporate existing green</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>through biodiversity net gain. Please note that the culvert should be factored into any biodiversity net gain assessment and that daylighting the river on this site would provide significant betterment.</p> <p>The enhancement of biodiversity in and around development should be led by a local understanding of ecological networks, and should seek to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• habitat restoration, re-creation and expansion</li> <li>• improved links between existing sites</li> <li>• buffering of existing important sites</li> <li>• new biodiversity features within development</li> <li>• securing management for long term enhancement</li> </ul> <p>In accordance with national and local policies (specifically Policy NE2 of the East Herts District Plan 2018), future development on this site should avoid significant harm to biodiversity and seek to protect and enhance it, delivering biodiversity net gain. The forthcoming Environment Bill will mandate when enacted, the demonstration of a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 3.1 (or</p>	<p>paragraph includes reference to Biodiversity Net Gain and climate positive places. This should be read in conjunction with the requirements already set out in the policies in the East Herts District Plan and the Bishop’s Stortford Neighbourhood Plan Silverleys and Meads (1<sup>st</sup> Revision). Alongside this the SPD sets out, that as part of its validation requirements, that an application should provide a Sustainability Checklist which will cover topics like biodiversity. An amendment has also been added to the green box following paragraph 7.4.5 to specifically reference biodiversity enhancement.</p>	<p>infrastructure, taking account of the large mature trees present across the site. Planting should be used to reinforce key routes and improve connections. <u>Natural England’s Green Infrastructure Framework sets out a series of key principles that should be used to inform emerging proposals for Old River Lane. Embedding green infrastructure has a number of important benefits, including maximising Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), managing the water environment, and creating resilient and climate positive places.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>subsequent version), even where development proposals do not result in biodiversity loss. We recommend the addition of wording to steer future development on this site to identify and deploy opportunities to incorporate requirements for achieving biodiversity and wider environmental net gains, within this SPD.</p> <p>Please note that the entire Old River Lane site is located within the inner source protection zone (SPZ1) for Affinity Water's Causeway Bishop's Stortford public groundwater abstraction. This is a strategically important groundwater abstraction point and care will be required to avoid polluting this water supply during the redevelopment of the Old River Lane site. This constraint has not been included in the SPD. The presence of the SPZ1 should be included as a constraint for further consideration during the development of proposals for the site. A specific concern will be the likely requirement for piled foundations or deep excavations during the development of the site</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to SPZ1 has been added to the Public Realm/Environment constraint section of Chapter 6.</p>	<p>Amendment to c) under Constraint: Public Realm/Environment:</p> <p>c) A small part of the north-eastern edge of the site is within flood zone 3, most of the site is within flood zone 2 <u>and the whole site is within Source Protection Zone 1</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment to SPD
			<b>General comments</b>		
			<p>that could penetrate deep beneath the water table. Specific groundwater monitoring may be required during these works to allow any groundwater quality impacts that may occur, as a result of these activities, to be managed.</p> <p>We request that you seek the opinion of Affinity Water, who operate the Causeway abstraction, and may also have concerns about potential impacts to their abstraction during the redevelopment of the site.</p>		

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>1.</b>			<b>Introduction</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (10)	1. <b>Introduction</b>	n/a	<p>The cross-party working group consists of members of the Bishop's Stortford Labour, Lib Dem, and Green parties, sharing a constructive interest in this important site. We respect the planning policy and a collaborative approach to masterplanning. We produced a report in July 2021, making the case for converting Charringtons House to a centre for all-age education, challenging the five-screen cinema</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>idea, which the Council (as landowner) has been proposing. We argued that it is environmentally irresponsible to demolish a building which is in good condition, and adaptable. And that demolishing the URC, while promoting the arts is unacceptable. This group was represented by Yvonne Estop-Wood and Stephen Skinner in the masterplan steering group, for the preparation of the SPD. We trusted the council (as local planning authority) to provide guidance on masterplanning options for land uses, access and building layout. Our concerns with the draft SPD: The SPD fails to give sufficient site-specific, masterplanning guidance to achieve its objectives, even though this was the premise of the steering group. Amendments are needed: to enable specific acceptable development; to set parameters to prevent unacceptable development; to enable workable solutions to constraints.</p>		
Mr Ray Haswell (40)	1. <b>Introduction</b>	Object	<p>No mention of Arts facilities at all. What the town needs is an Arts facility to represent ALL the arts groups in the town. It costs very little to put up four walls and a roof to</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the</p>	<p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>surround a large area which could then be sub divided with partitions as necessary and accommodate audiences as well. All EHDC want to do is build flats which the town does not need. We desperately need Arts facilities, and this is an ideal place for both indoor and outdoor arts spaces. We do not need a white elephant cinema; we need space for Arts.</p> <p>No mention of the Waitrose car park which I use regularly.</p>	<p>flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Waitrose and associated car parking will be retained on site.</p>	
Mr David Anderson (171)	1. Introduction	Object	<p>For such an important re-development that has been 'in the planning' for so long and will make an impact on every resident of Bishop's Stortford, I find a four-week consultation period in peak holiday time is unacceptable to be called reasonable, particularly in view of the sheer size of the amount to read through and its complexity. Also, a consultation should be simple and not complicated so that people of any ability can make their opinions known. Considering the teams of people and time that this document took to create, it is impractical to conceive it possible for the average person to read, understand and</p>	<p>Concerns regarding the consultation process are noted. The Council has received a good response to the consultation with over 400 comments received, each raising several issues.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to these issues.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>comment on it in the time given. It is overwhelming just to look at let alone read. From what I can ascertain so far there is very little substance wrapped up in a whole pile of waffle, ambiguity and sentences which say nothing concrete.</p> <p>Bishop's Stortford is a jewel in the crown of Hertfordshire and should be treated and respected as such. We already have a cinema; we do not need another, unless the plan is to force the current one out of business so that the site can be redeveloped. Where instead we could just upgrade the current one and build the theatre that was promised. If the money is not available, then wait until it is and do the job properly. We have fantastic people living here and amazing schools and we are rich in history. They all deserve better from a council that is meant to be working for THEM. To rush to build a white elephant would be a disaster. A theatre would put Bishop's Stortford on the cultural map on a whole new level and bring commerce and prosperity to the town with all the employment that goes hand in hand</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			with it. If a sign of the standard of planning that can be expected is the new multi storey car park that fails in that primary requisite of a car park, which is to be able to drive in and out without difficulty then things do not bode well. A car park which forces everyone to cross a busy road to get to the town centre, shopping trolleys and all. I love Bishop's Stortford and have lived here 35 years; I currently have both the honour and privilege of being its Mayor and feel it my obligation to repeat the comments that are relayed to me. We have a lovely town that is very special, and I think we should be conservative with its improvements to ensure that they are improvements and not mistakes. To be clear I am making these comments as myself.		
Dr David Middlemiss (320)	1. Introduction	Object	The site will represent an extension of a historic market town. 2.2.4 A market was established in Bishop's Stortford by 1228. Markets are vibrant places but ours is soulless. ORL provides an ideal site to provide a flat, car-free area to enhance and extend our market offering with zero impact on sustainability. In fact, it could be easily trialled immediately	Noted. However, the Old River Lane site is allocated in the District Plan for a mixed-use development and around 100 homes.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>to understand the impact of new commerce and footfall on ORL and the current Town centre. Coopers features quite a lot in the SPD.</p> <p>What is not covered is access to its carpark for customers and deliveries. Access may be possible for cars via Water Lane, but this would be detrimental to minimising traffic flow through the Town and the implementation of the proposed Bell Street - North Street one-way system. It would be impossible for delivery lorries.</p> <p>Vagueness and qualifications. For example: a. Homes. Around 100 homes. Make this specific at the top end no more than 100 or preferably no more than 80!</p> <p>Height. This starts at a reasonable 2-3 storeys quoting neighbouring</p>	<p>Section 8.3 notes the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.</p> <p>The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site (including Waitrose) and the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.</p> <p>Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>buildings but then increases to 6, citing NEC and Jackson Square. The latter should not be used as yardsticks; the maximum should be 3 storeys, and preferably 2 to keep it in line with Coopers and Waitrose. Replication of the Goods Yard must not be on the agenda.</p> <p>Parking. This must be restricted to residential parking for the disabled only. The whole purpose of Town centre accommodation is to reduce the use of cars, and this has been ignored on all the ongoing developments on other sites. And why are we permitting Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters Fig 1. Item III g.</p> <p>Civic, community and Leisure uses. How this has changed. From the flagship Arts Centre to a delusional second cinema to nothing at all. See letters and articles in the Stortford Independent.</p>	<p>expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p> <p>The Council's 'Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development' Supplementary Planning Document sets out the amount of spaces that should be provided in association with any new development. However, on this site, given the high level of accessibility to public transport and facilities, there should be a significantly reduced amount of parking, including residential and other uses.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>Climate Emergency and Sustainability. For example: Exploration of standards above and beyond the requirements of conversant Building Regulations where appropriate and achievable. Specific: standards above and beyond the requirements of conversant Building Regulations must be employed. Building design should prioritise energy efficiency in order to reduce the need and size of heating plants. This will overall minimise the buildings impact on air quality.</p> <p>The use of renewable, zero and low-carbon technology is encouraged. Specific: Building design must prioritise energy efficiency in order to reduce the need and size of heating plants. This will overall minimise the buildings impact on air quality. Renewable, zero and low-carbon technology must be used.</p>	<p>the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>The SPD cannot introduce targets that exceed the policy requirements of the District Plan.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability SPD notes that consideration of embodied carbon is likely to become increasingly important as society transitions to a low/zero carbon society. The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible,</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>Cycling - Currently plans exist to extend and enhance the cycle route that runs north to south through the Green Wedge along the river (4.4.5 Figure 12). This is correct and has been planned for some time but HCC, EHDC and BSTC are not prepared to work together to make this happen.</p> <p>I specifically object to the layout of Figure 21 as it does not fulfil any of the upbeat statements in the SPD. The building footprints are far too large essentially eliminating any open, public space. Five of the active frontages face traffic, which defeats the objective of a car free zone and public areas with reduced pollution (PM 2.5). I object to the main pedestrian route encroaching on the eastern edge of the Waitrose carpark this route should go through the memorial area and then head south with the western facing fronts of the buildings set back to provide more open space and more space for trees/shrubs, before re-joining ORL below the proposed vehicle access</p>	<p>and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.'</p> <p>Noted. Chapter 4 supports this route. Planning obligations could assist with funding and implementation.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplanning Framework Diagram has been updated in response to a number of comments. The building footprints have reduced in size and are shown illustratively. The pathway from north to south would not preclude an alternative walkway if this was the preferred design solution. Reference to active frontages has been deleted, as this is more appropriately covered in the Design Principles (Section 7.5). The Diagram still shows an area for civic, community and leisure use, however, a new section on the arts centre has been added to the SPD (Section 3.4).</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework</p>	<p>Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			point. The civic, community and leisure uses need to be defined and a 3D model of the site needs to be produced so that we, the public, can truly see what is proposed to enable more rational comment, and whether the benefits meet our expectations as well as satisfying the planning permission for the NEC.	against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed. A planning application could include a 3D model.	
N. Easter (8)	1.1 Background	Object	<p>I've not been impressed with how the ORL has progressed so far. The new multi-storey car park and the lane and light configuration has been appalling. The multiple crossings, the danger you've put pedestrians in with the zebra crossing in place with green lights now in place, but no pelican crossing in place to replace the zebra crossing.</p> <p>I disagree with the demolition of URC and the idea of a cinema (which was noted 4 years ago when you presented at Civic Federation meeting. This entire plan is disjointed, block, stick and paste. People respond to open air, low level buildings. The car park replaced gardens many moons ago. There is so much inspiration in the world and this whole plan is lack lustre at best. Capitalise on your views from</p>	<p>Concerns re Northgate End are noted.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			Florence walk. Open and green (even though it's a car park) Buildings should be low and use similar materials to the surroundings such as London mixed stock bricks with pitched roofs. URC is a beautiful building (with a lot of extensions on the exterior). UHR is an asset to the community in its current state as a venue. Capitalise on it and renovate it. Lincoln University renovated a train brick warehouse as the student library and a train shed as student union. This is an old town with character, enhance it, don't Harlow it. Big doesn't necessarily mean better.	that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Mr Kevin Johnson (77)	1.1 Background	Object	-	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Carolyn Matthews (81)	1.1 Background	-	-	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cityheart Homes Ltd.	1.1 Background		Question whether the term "reconfigured" is accurate and appropriate. The scheme supplements, as opposed to reconfigures, the retail, community, and leisure provision in the town centre. Reconfigure is a term that implies more negativity/loss, whereas there is limited such impact.	Use of word reconfigure is intended to convey that the town centre can be configured in a new way.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>1.</b>			<b>Introduction</b>		
Mr Colin Woodward (354)	1.1 Background		<p>1.1.1 East West transport links are very poor by public transport making car ownership almost essential as evidenced by high single and dual car ownership statistics.</p> <p>How is Stortford as a 'thriving town centre' objectively established given EHC public sector jobs moved to Hertford and store closures, (not some units in Jackson Square have never been let since it was built and more have since become vacant).</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 1.1.1 is factual setting out that the town benefits from good transport links including the West Anglia Main Line railway, the M11, the A120, and Stansted Airport.</p> <p>Bishop's Stortford Chamber of Commerce describe Bishop's Stortford as 'a thriving market town, and one which has been an important commercial centre since antiquity.'</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.
Cross-party working group on ORL site (12)	1.2 Purpose and Scope		<p>The ORL site is an important opportunity for the town and we support exemplary development. The Local Plan policy BISH 8 provides the high-level strategy for the site. This site-specific SPD must help shape the development by demonstrating the most suitable land uses and physical arrangement. A key concern is that the draft SPD overall makes no mention of any specific community or leisure uses, including cinema. This consultation is therefore ineffectual because people cannot respond to actual possible uses that might benefit or harm the town. This draft guidance will enable easy planning permission, because nearly any proposal would accord</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			with it. It is a green light for bland and excess.		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (24)	1.2 Purpose and Scope		In 1.2.2 it talks of the 'aspirations of the Council.' What is meant by the Council? The LPA or the property department landowner? Because there needs to be clear separation of Council roles on this site. Amendment requested: Clarify Council as LPA or Council as landowner.	The SPD has been drafted by the Council in its role as Local Planning Authority.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Kevin Johnson (78)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	Object	-	Noted.	-
Stephen Skinner (114)	1.2 Purpose and Scope		1. It is most important consideration for development of the Old River Lane (ORL) site should be that whatever is built there, it should complement and enhance the existing buildings and facilities of the town. Nothing should be built or provided that would compete with existing buildings, retail outlets or facilities.  2. Page 7. I am glad that prominence is given to local Plan Policy BISH. I note particularly point no. 11 that the site will provide about 100 new homes. Please retain this reference.	Agreed. The vision set out in the SPD is that -  "Old River Lane will be a high-quality, accessible, and sustainable redevelopment of a town centre destination that incorporates a mixture of uses that contribute to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and <i>complements</i> the uniqueness of this historic market town."  Agreed.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>3. Page 1.4.13 this states that East Herts is committed to putting Environmental Sustainability at the heart of everything it does. Retain it in the SPD.</p> <p>4. Page 2.4.3 The suggestion that the URC Hall could be demolished must be rejected outright. This Hall is a valuable community asset, very well used by many organisations and community groups in the Town. It should be retained and modernised for its value to the community, and also in the interests of sustainability. This matter is also mentioned on page 35. If the Hall were to be demolished, in spite of reasons against such action, Policy CFLR7 would apply, meaning that the council would have to provide an equivalent or better replacement hall somewhere on the site. Please retain mention of this fact in the SPD. Demolition would result emission of the embedded carbon.</p> <p>5. Any new retail units should be complementary to the existing retail outlets in the Town. They should NOT be in competition with them. It would be a disaster if the new units</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities), as well as other relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.</p> <p>A key objective of the SPD is to - ‘Deliver a mix of town centre uses, including arts and culture, to create a vibrant place that supports and</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>on ORL were to take trade away from the existing units in South Street, North street, Jackson Square, Florence Walk, etc. So, please add another sentence to 3.2.2 something like 'The new retail offer must NOT compete with the existing retail offer.'</p> <p>6. Section 3.4. Civic, Community, Leisure is vague. No reference to arts, culture, performance space. The SPD should refer to the ongoing debate about the leisure usage of this site. The SPD should be explicit. The masterplanning shows a blob marked 'Leisure'. What is its size/ Use? Etc., Please revise this and BE SPECIFIC.</p> <p>7. Cinema? There is no mention of a cinema. Presumably that has now vanished.</p> <p>8. 3.4.2 Key public space. We need a Public Square of which we could all be proud. This Square needs to be far bigger than the present Market Square - it needs to be big enough for several hundreds of people to congregate, and to be beautifully</p>	<p><i>complements</i> the wider town centre offer.'</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2.2 already states that 'The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane should be proportionate and <i>complementary</i> to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.'</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>This issue is expanded upon in paragraph 8.4.5, which states: "Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities,</p>	<p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p> <p>Expand paragraphs 3.4.2 and 7.7.1 as follows:</p> <p>3.4.2 ... The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space, <u>which should be a</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>landscaped. Please strengthen this section. It is also mentioned on page 60, section 7.7.1 strengthen these also.</p> <p>9. 3.4.3 URC Hall - wording ambiguous. The area to be developed should not include the URC Hall which has been added to the original site and is an important Town asset. The Hall is needed.</p> <p>10. 3.4.4. The hall is needed - encourage its upgrading.</p>	<p>generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area." Paragraph 3.4.2 and paragraph 7.7.1 will be expanded to further set out expectations.</p> <p>The inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a</p>	<p><u>welcoming and adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to provide it with a memorable character.</u></p> <p>7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>11. Charringtons House - what is meant by the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs? This is arrant nonsense. The building functions well and is fully occupied. Some minimum upgrading may be needed. Demolition would result in emission of the embedded carbon.</p> <p>12. How would demolition of the URC Hall and/or Charringtons House be in line with the Council's 2019 declaration of putting environmental sustainability at the heart of everything it does?</p> <p>13. 4.3.2 Reduce the number of carriageways on Bridge Street. Definitely do this as the amount of traffic will be hugely reduced.</p>	<p>planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.</p> <p>The SPD doesn't specifically propose the demolition of either Charringtons House or the URC Hall. If demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, applicants will be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD references Intervention PR17 from the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan which</p>	<p>Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).</p> <p><del>e) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>14. 7.6.2 Heights. Provide a diagrammatic plan and model for the public showing acceptable height ranges. The guideline must be 3-4 storeys. Remove all references to Jackson Square and the new Multi-storey carpark at Northgate End. These extra-high buildings are aberrations and have been widely criticised for not being compatible with the conservation area and the majority of buildings in the town centre.</p> <p>15. 8.3.3 SPD should indicate alternatives to existing straight path through the scheme. It must also unequivocally state whether maintaining Waitrose number of parking spaces justifies demolition of buildings.</p> <p>16. S106 Provisions. Housing - delete subject to viability. Add homes for key workers.</p>	<p>is specifically about Bridge Street Improvements.</p> <p>Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude alternative walkways if this was the preferred design solution, when taking account of all constraints.</p> <p>Affordable Housing will be required in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU3. This sets out that lower provision may be permitted if it cannot be achieved due to viability reasons or where it would prejudice the need to secure other infrastructure priorities.</p>	<p>Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			17. Cycling - support.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mr Richard Jones (138)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	Object	This whole document uses the word leisure 4 times without defining this more fully. There is no mention of arts provision or an arts centre. Additionally, Paragraph 1.4 is so vague as to be meaningless. The ORL is a big opportunity to create a further arts space for Bishops Stortford. Could this be a refurbished Water Lane Reformed Church Hall? A space, for example for, but not limited to, rehearsal, performance, exhibitions, workshops and arts fairs. My understanding is that this should also be put into an S106 agreement.	The SPD is intended to provide a strategic masterplanning framework for the Old River Lane site, rather than provide detailed proposals. Section 1.4 is intended to provide a brief overview and summary of the key policy and guidance documents that the SPD will refer to. Weblinks are provided to all of these documents for further information.  A Section 106 is a legal agreement between an applicant seeking planning permission and the local planning authority, which is used to mitigate the impact of the proposals on the local community and infrastructure. If planning permission is granted for proposals at Old River Lane, it will be subject to a Section 106 agreement.	No amendment in response to these issues.
Mr Dermot Eustace (113)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	Object	I moved to Bishop's Stortford in 1979. It was a lovely town with a great deal of character. Where has it gone? The guts of the town have been removed. There is a river that could have enhanced the town has been ignored! The developments that have taken place have been undertaken have successfully	Noted. The ambition is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. The importance of enhancing character and appearance is embedded throughout the SPD.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>increased the income for the councils and not improved the location for the residents. In fact, houses have been built to accommodate rich commuters, so that the only people who can afford to live here are those who work in the city. Making the town a dormitory town! It seems the most important objective of the council is to build carparks. The idea of having useful bus routes, cycle paths, signed routes for pedestrians, have all been tried and discarded never to be reconsidered when a new development appears on the horizon.</p> <p>Have you heard of climate change? The Hockerill lights have been recognised as a pollution hot spot for at least 30 years but it has been ignored. We don't have electric, busses, joined up cycle paths, energy saving houses, not a council encouraged solar panel in sight. This latest development will not do anything for the town and should be reconsidered.</p>	<p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development.</p>	
Cllr Calvin Horner (159)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	Object	1.2.2 - Given the role of East Herts Council as the developer of this site in addition to the local planning	The SPD has been drafted by the Council in its role as Local Planning Authority.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>authority it needs to be made clear that the document reflects the aspirations of 'the Council' as the latter rather than the former. This is not made clear here and the SPD as a whole gives the impression that the local authority's two roles are not sufficiently differentiated, with the planning role being subordinated to that of developer.</p> <p>1.2.3 Whilst I acknowledge that the SPD cannot introduce new planning policies (as stated in para 1.2.1), the SPD as a whole does not provide sufficient detail to fulfil the role outlined here. There remains much that is vague and uncertain in important areas such as land uses, sustainability, design and dwelling mix. The SPD does not provide a robust framework for the assessment of development proposals and needs to be substantially revised as a consequence.</p>	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	
Ms Margaret Connell (176)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	Object	This whole document uses the word leisure 4 times without defining this more fully. There is no mention of arts provision or an arts centre. The Northgate End Car Park was built so that an Arts Centre could be	Policy BISH8 sets out that 'the site will provide for around 100 new homes' and the 'creation of a high-quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a 'civic hub' of other	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			provided. There should be no further car park provision within the development site. On the maps provided at the end of the document, I could see no provision of an arts or leisure centre - just housing and shops. Surely this should have been at the beginning of this document	commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace'.  The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	
Gary Jones (287)	1.2 Purpose and Scope	-	Policy, BISH8 IIa, is hardly built on at all in the draft SPD, especially since the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 identified the key objective of establish an integrated cultural offer for the town centre.  Section 3.4 on Civic, Community and Leisure Uses is less than one page in the 75-page document. This provides insufficient detailed advice or guidance. Almost any masterplan or planning application would be able to fit this advice. As minimum guidance, the community and leisure uses that are acceptable and unacceptable should be identified.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.  The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	No amendment in response to this issue.  Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>1.</b>			<b>Introduction</b>		
Mr Kevin Johnson (79)	1.3 Structure of the Document	Object		Noted.	-
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (57) (53)	1.4 Planning Policy Context	Object	<p>The Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 is in some ways out of date and does not take into account the growth that has happened to the town in the past 6 years.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the Revised Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads 2022, adopted by EHDC 27.07.2022</p>	<p>The Town Centre Planning Framework is material to this SPD as it sets Old River Lane in a wider-context and is also referred to in Policy BISH8 as forming the basis of this SPD. It is agreed that the town and its economy have changed in this period; however, many of the key objectives remain relevant today.</p> <p>Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Update paragraphs 1.4.8, 1.4.9 and 1.4.10 as follows:</p> <p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
					<p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre.</del> <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></li> </ul> <p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates.</del> <u>The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</u></p>
Mrs Andrea Platts (56)	1.4 Planning Policy Context	Object	Para 1.12 please concentrate on providing civic amenities and drop the idea of squeezing 100 homes onto this site, which would need parking spaces, all taking space that is badly needed for community services	District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>1.</b>			<b>Introduction</b>		
Mr Colin Arnott (115)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		<p>1.4.5 BISH8 Policy on ORL parking requirements Policy II(g) clearly states on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters. The Policy requires that development at ORL should provide for its own parking needs and support TC parking without encouraging additional TC travel. The development of the Northgate End Car Park to meet the parking needs of ORL users was clearly contrary to this policy. (see also 2.5.3 below)</p> <p>1.4.6-7 Extension of the red line boundary to include the URC Hall The red line boundary should only be extended to include the URC Hall if it is to secure greater community and other economic benefits for the ORL development not to further expand parking capacity beyond the existing red line in contravention of Policy BISH8 II(g).</p> <p>1.4.8-10 Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan 2015 and emerging update 2022 The</p>	<p>Policy BISH8 II(g) requires on-site car parking to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed on ORL. If, by exploring opportunities with neighbouring car parks the need from the proposed uses is reduced, then it allows a scheme to come forward that can provide less parking whilst still meeting Policy criterion II(g).</p> <p>Noted. The inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location.</p> <p>Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Update paragraphs 1.4.8, 1.4.9 and 1.4.10 as follows:</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>status and policy review coverage of the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022 should be completely redrafted since it is expected that the Review will be 'made' (i.e. adopted) by EHDC before the end of the SPD consultation period and redraft. This should include a review of the Shared Policies as well as the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan particularly the revised transport, climate and town centre policies which now carry the greatest weight of the Development Plan policies.</p>	<p>Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).</p>	<p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p> <p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre.</del> <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>1.4.19-21 Transport and Parking Studies - The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 and the Bishop's Stortford Parking Study 2019 - Neither of these studies have been adopted by the relevant authorities and are now effectively superseded by HCCs Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (EAGTP) which was adopted in July 2022. The EAGTP has prioritised the proposed interventions for Bishop's Stortford in line with LTP4 though with no evidence that the traffic management or mitigation needs of the ORL development have been taken into account. Moreover, the prioritisation principles used in LTP4 and the EAGTP have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022</p>	<p>The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report has now been superseded following the adoption of Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan in July. As such references have been updated throughout the SPD and particularly in Chapter 4 to reflect this update.</p> <p>Likewise, Chapter 4 now incorporates a section relating specifically to the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).</p>	<p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates. The <u>Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</u></del></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			(see above). The EAGTP and the Neighbourhood Plan transport policies should be included in the SPD policy review.		
Mr Kevin Johnson (73)	1.4 Planning Policy Context	Object		Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Emily Farrow (148)	1.4 Planning Policy Context	Object		Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (240)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		Consideration should be given to the Revised NP for Silverleys and Meads 2022, adopted by EHDC 27.07.2022	Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).	Update paragraphs 1.4.8, 1.4.9 and 1.4.10 as follows:  1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u> ; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.  1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			Introduction		
			<p>The Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 is out of date as it does not take into the account of growth above what was expected in the EHDC Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Town Centre Planning Framework is material to this SPD as it sets Old River Lane in a wider-context and is also referred to in Policy BISH8 as forming the basis of this SPD. It is agreed that the town and its economy have changed in this period; however, many of the key objectives remain relevant today.</p>	<p>Old River Lane area. Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre. <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></li> </ul> <p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates. The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</del></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>1.</b>			<b>Introduction</b>		
Cllr Mione Goldspink (323)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		Paragraph 1.4.13 - this states that East Herts is committed to putting Environmental Sustainability at the heart of everything it does. I support this sentiment very strongly. The Sustainability SPD is of the utmost importance.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mr Andrew Munro (172)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		<p>The following policies from the Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) 2021-2033 - should be considered in all planning applications.</p> <p>1. Climate Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CC1 Emissions</li> <li>• CC2 Small scale energy production schemes</li> <li>• CC3 Modifications to Existing Buildings</li> <li>• CC4 Design for the Future Climate</li> </ul> <p>2. Housing and Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HDP1 Residential development and redevelopment</li> <li>• HDP2 Setting and character of buildings, streets and spaces</li> <li>• HDP3 Design standards</li> <li>• HDP4 Dwelling mix strategy</li> <li>• HDP5 Building for the community HDP6 Archaeology.</li> </ul>	Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1 <sup>st</sup> Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).	<p>Update paragraphs 1.4.8, 1.4.9 and 1.4.10 as follows:</p> <p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p> <p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre</del></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>3. Contributions to Community Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CI Contributions to Infrastructure and Community Facilities</li> </ul> <p>4. Green Infrastructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIP1 Utilising Green Infrastructure to mitigate and adapt to climate change</li> <li>• GIP2 Local Green Spaces and other green areas</li> <li>• GIP3 Improve green infrastructure for leisure</li> <li>• GIP4 Green space management and building the green infrastructure networks</li> <li>• GIP5 Protect wildlife and increase biodiversity</li> <li>• GIP6 Enhancement of footpaths, bridleways and cycle paths</li> <li>• GIP8 Flood mitigation</li> </ul> <p>5. Transport:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TP1 Assessing transport impacts and mitigation of development on traffic congestion and resident amenity</li> <li>• TP2 Improving air quality</li> <li>• TP3 Create walking and cycle friendly neighbourhoods</li> <li>• TP4 Develop a connected town for pedestrians and cyclists with</li> </ul>		<p>and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre. <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></li> </ul> <p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates. The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</del></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>priority for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in the town centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TP5 Better Bus Travel</li> </ul>		
Cllr Calvin Horner (160)	1.4 Planning Policy Context	Object	<p>1.4.7 No rationale is given here for the inclusion of the URC Hall or the adjacent houses. This area should not be included except for the enhancement of community facilities of a similar type and function, given the popularity of the hall for community uses and hiring noted elsewhere in the document, rather than for other purposes such as parking.</p> <p>1.4.19-21 The studies mentioned should be supplemented by more recent documents including the recently Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan recently adopted by HCC.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.4.3 of the SPD explains that the inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph 1.4.20 with consequent renumbering to subsequent paragraphs:</p> <p><del>1.4.20 The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 considers broad transport issues and opportunities. It puts forward a wide range of potential options for improving the transport network, including better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, managing traffic congestion and improving access to bus services.</del></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
					<u>1.4.20 The Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan covers Bishop's Stortford, Sawbridgeworth and the surrounding rural areas. The GTP includes several transport improvements packages, aiming to improve the transport network which also includes better facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and bus services. It looks at the current period of the Local Plans and will be subject to review periodically to reflect changes in growth and transport forecasts.</u>
Cllr Mione Goldspink (322)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		Page 7. I am glad that prominence is given to Local Plan Policy BISH. I note particularly point no. 11 that the site will provide about 100 new homes. Please retain this reference.	Noted.	-
Ms Jill Jones (213)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.23 support but please clarify what the proposals consider the elements of good design as specified in the National Planning Policy Framework will apply.	Support noted and welcomed.  The national design guide sets out the characteristics of well-designed places and demonstrates what good design means in practice. The expectation is that the design guide should be used by applicants and their design teams when preparing planning applications.	-



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
Mr Colin Woodward (355)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		<p>1.4.5 SPD/BISH8 mentions 100 homes and yet EHC apparently report, (as in the BS Independent), the possibility of 150. A huge uplift without objective local population growth evidence. Large inward population movement has, and has had, significant implications not addressed in the SPD or, elsewhere by EHC. Experience from similar at Stortford Fields should be evaluated.</p> <p>A civic hub needs to be more than a Drs surgery and offices, but the SPD fails to elaborate. Plans for a new integrated library appear to have been abandoned and as NHS primary care appears to seek to relocate all surgeries to Haymeads, aka Herts &amp; Essex Community Hospital, what is the evidence that a surgery would be included at ORL?</p> <p>Sufficient on-site parking, potentially conflicts with pedestrian areas but what is sufficient in numbers and where would it be? Current EHC Planning policy limits residential space allocation but has the consequential effect of transferring residents (and workers) cars to offsite public roadside/pavement</p>	<p>The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in District Plan Policy BISH8 for 'around 100 homes.'</p> <p>BISH8 sets out that an appropriate community use could be a GP Surgery. The SPD repeats this. Further discussion will be required with health care providers to agree the best way of ensuring that there are appropriate local primary health care resources in place to cope with any increased demand.</p> <p>The Council's 'Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development' Supplementary Planning Document sets out the amount of spaces that should be provided in association with any new development. However, on this site, given the high level of accessibility to public transport and facilities, there should be a</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>parking. A long-standing scourge across Stortford.</p> <p>1.4.14 The EHC Affordable Homes Policy has to date demonstrably failed local people by only using national affordability criteria; hence locally born have had to migrate out of County.</p> <p>1.4.17 An integrated cultural offer is ill defined to the point of concern for the thriving cultural groups in Stortford that form the BS Arts Forum et al. In this context what does integrated mean? One space shared by all i.e., a sub optimal solution for any particular cultural group; a bookable space available only when the proposed cinema doesn't require it; or integrated into the mixed uses for the site as a whole. How would any cultural offer work with residential areas? This has been a problem elsewhere as residents object to noise etc. A (duplicate) cinema and some open air space isn't an integrated cultural offer and what has been mooted falls well short of clarifying how it would meet EHCs own policy CFLR7 if the ORL development involves</p>	<p>significantly reduced amount of parking, including residential and other uses.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to deliver more affordable homes through its Housing Strategy Action Plan.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			demolition of the well-used United Reformed Church Hall which is also an Heritage Asset as clarified in the academic research report of Dr Emily Cole but so far ignored by EHC. It is clearly not, no longer needed nor is there any proposal that outweighs its loss evidenced. As to quantity of replacement, so far ORL proposals are for less provision and of debatable quality i.e., the two other CFLR7 criteria.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (391)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		<p>1.4.7 - For the purpose of this SPD the United Reformed Church (URC) Hall on Water Lane to the west of the allocated site, along with the modern houses to the south of the URC Hall, are also included within the red line boundary (Map 2 below) The para should briefly say why the URC Hall is included in the area (see 3.4.4.&amp; 8.2.3). The red line boundary should only be extended to include the URC Hall if it is to secure greater community and other economic benefits for the ORL development not just to provide parking capacity beyond the existing red line in contravention of Policy BISH8 III(g).</p> <p>Reference should also be made to the URC Hall being a valued</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.4.3 of the SPD explains that the inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location.</p> <p>A new paragraph 2.4.2 has been added to the SPD to reflect the fact that the</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add new paragraph 2.4.2 on ACV status of the URC Hall:</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			community asset (see Ch 5: Constraints and Opportunities table Land Use constraint (c)).	URC Hall has been identified as an Asset of Community Value.	2.4.2 <u>The URC Hall was identified as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on the 16 September 2022. The designation of the Hall as an ACV is a material consideration that will be taken into account when determining any planning application that would affect it.</u>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (393)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.16-18 - Town Centre Planning Framework 2016. BSCF considers the TCPF has significant gaps with respect to ORL, for example it contains nothing about the town centre's economy.	Noted. The Town Centre Planning Framework is material to this SPD as it sets Old River Lane in a wider-context and is also referred to in Policy BISH8 as forming the basis of this SPD. It is agreed that the town and its economy have changed in this period; however, many of the key objectives remain relevant today.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (395)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.19-21 Transport and Parking These transport and parking studies have significant gaps, including options relevant to ORL, and there is no prioritised and costed implementation plan. The Independent Examiner of the new, revised, NPs recommended that NP Policy TP1 b) should require traffic surveys, on which the Options report is based, be no more than 3 years old. To the best of BSCFs knowledge there has been no traffic survey of this part of the town since 2018. The	The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report has now been superseded following the adoption of Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan in July. As such references have been updated throughout the SPD and particularly in Chapter 4 to reflect this update.  Likewise, Chapter 4 now incorporates a section relating specifically to the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).	Update references to the Growth and Transport Plan and updated Neighbourhood Plan throughout the SPD.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>SPD should therefore specify that an up-to-date traffic survey should be available before the start of any masterplanning and planning application(s).</p> <p>Transport and Parking Studies - The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 and the Bishop's Stortford Parking Study 2019. Not only do these studies have significant gaps but also neither of them has been adopted by the relevant authorities and are now effectively superseded by HCCs Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (EAGTP) which was adopted in July 2022. The EAGTP has prioritised the proposed interventions for Bishop's Stortford in line with LTP4 though with no evidence that the traffic management or mitigation needs of the ORL development have been taken into account. Moreover, the prioritisation principles used in LTP4 and the EAGTP have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the NP Review 2022 (see above). The EAGTP and the new revised NPs transport</p>	<p>Detailed proposals will be supported by an up-to-date Transport Assessment which will need to reflect the policies set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			<p>policies should be included in the SPD policy review. (see Annex 2).</p> <p>The Bishop's Stortford Parking Study 2019 focuses upon on and off-street parking within the town with a particular focus on the town centre car parks BSCF considers that the Parking Study 2019 also has significant gaps, including with respect to ORL. For example, it does not include an assessment of the impacts of the Northgate MSCP and the changes to the Link Road car park and other parking in the town. Also, it is more than 3 years old (see 1.4.20). A SPD should require that a new assessment is conducted and is available before masterplanning begins.</p>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (388)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.4 - East Herts District Plan 2018 It would help if the Policies listed here are included as annexes, for easy reference. (see Annex 1)	A weblink to the District Plan is provided in the SPD and so it is unnecessary to repeat these policies in full in the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (390)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.6 It should be noted that this SPD looks beyond the site allocation in the District Plan 2018, taking in the edge of Castle Gardens and the car parks to the north of Link Road, together with Bridge Street to the south, in order to better consider wider connections across the site. It	The SPD seeks to build on existing policies and strategies relevant to Old River Lane. These exist at different scales and as such the narrative set out in the SPD is considered more helpful than seeking to capture the extent of wider connections on one plan.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			would help the masterplanning if the SPD included a map to indicate the approximate extent of the wider connections that should be considered.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (392)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.8-10 – Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan 2015 and emerging update 2022 These paras should be completely redrafted since the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Silverleys and Meads wards (1st Revision) 2021- 2033 was made (i.e. adopted) by EHDC 27 July 2022, i.e. before the end of the SPD consultation and revision period. It should also include a review of the NP Shared Policies particularly the revised transport, climate and town centre policies as they now carry the greatest weight of the Development Plan policies. (see Annex 2 for those considered relevant, either in full or in part).	Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).	<p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p> <p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre. The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</del></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</li> </ul> <p>1.4.10 Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates. <u>The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</u></p>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (394)	1.4 Planning Policy Context		1.4.18 - The Town Centre Planning Framework is material to this SPD as it sets Old River Lane in a wider-context and is also referred to in Policy BISH8 as forming the basis of this SPD. The TCPF is now 6 years old, and the town and its economy have changed in this period (see also below), though many of the key objectives remain relevant. This document therefore needs to be referred to and used judiciously, e.g., in considering the layout Options presented in Chapter 8.	Noted and agreed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cross-party working group on ORL site (11)	1.5 Process of Preparation		In addition to the paragraph about the masterplan steering group, add an appendix with a link to the meeting notes and papers submitted to the group.	The Terms of Reference and the main tasks of the Steering Group are outlined in the SPD Consultation Statement. Notes of the meeting were circulated to	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
				the group in accordance with the Terms of Reference.	
Cross-party working group on ORL site (25)	1.5 Process of Preparation		Para 1.31 says This SPD will help define and add detail about the potential land uses, design and scale of development appropriate for the area. It doesn't. Having been through the whole document, our group considers that the SPD does not add detail about potential land uses. It does not add detail about layout and scale of development appropriate for the area. We pick these up in later comments.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	No amendment on response to this issue.
Mr Kevin Johnson (31)	1.5 Process of Preparation	Object	<p>I think the removal of Waitrose car park is very wrong as so many old people find it hard to walk far, and many more people benefit from this services, the council must leave this car park alone as it benefits lots of towns folk.</p> <p>I think the whole development is a total waste of money. Houses are NOT needed in this development and will be an awful place to live due to the noise and late-night activities.</p> <p>This site was an ideal site for an open-air car park this did massively benefit shops and tradesmen that</p>	<p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.</p> <p>It is condition of the planning permission for Northgate End (3/18/0432/FUL) that The Causeway car park shall be closed in the interests if</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			had to services this area of Bishop's Stortford.	the free flow of traffic through the highway network.	
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (109)	1.5 Process of Preparation	Object	<p>I can see no consideration given to the GAP Analysis created by the Arts Forum which clearly lays out their needs to be able to hire appropriately laid out venues. This document was distributed by Gaille Anderson at the ORL Steering committee and was distributed by EHDC by email Monday, 4th July 9.36am.</p> <p>Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group is called the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group.</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Amend the name of the group at paragraph 1.5.2.</p> <p>1.5.2 ...the Bishop's Stortford Climate <del>Change</del> Group, ...</p>
Carolyn Matthews (83) (90)	1.5 Process of Preparation	Support		Support noted and welcomed.	-
Parsonage Residents Association (241)	1.5 Process of Preparation		We can see no consideration given to the GAP Analysis created by the Arts Forum which clearly lays out their needs to be able to hire appropriately laid out venues. This document was distributed by Gaille	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Subject or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
1.			<b>Introduction</b>		
			Anderson at the ORL Steering committee and was distributed by EHDC by email Monday, 4th July 9.36am.  Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group is called the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group.	outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.  Noted.	Amend the name of the group at paragraph 1.5.2.  1.5.2 ...the Bishop's Stortford Climate Change Group, ...
Gary Jones (289)	1.5 Process of Preparation		Page 16, Figure 2: spelling error in table Preparation ...	Noted.	Make correction to Figure 2.
Mr Colin Woodward (356)	1.5 Process of Preparation		1.5.2 ORL Steering Group, EHC claims a shared vision. This is disputed by representatives of participant groups.	Noted. However, the discussions that took place at the Steering Group meetings have influenced both the scope and content of the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Paul Dean (396)	1.5 Process of Preparation		1.5.4 - Figure 2 - Many people see the SPD as the design process. For the sake of clarity, the table should also include the stages that follow the Adoption of the SPD.	Figure 2 sets out the process of preparation for the SPD only. It is not possible to provide a certain timeframe for future stages beyond adoption of the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>2.</b>			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
Mr Kevin Johnson (76, 80, 74)	2. Site context and Analysis 2.1 Introduction	Object		Noted.	-
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (58)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		The United Reformed Church Hall is recognised by residents as a Community Asset as it is used for a range of well-being and arts activities. It would make sense to retain this property as a Community Asset (possibly an Asset of Community Value - application has been submitted) and have the Arts Forum or a similar group refurbish and run the venue. This would allow the developer more scope to develop an appropriate mixed-use development which would include a Community Hub.	Noted. The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).  A new paragraph 2.4.2 has been added to the SPD to reflect the fact that the URC Hall has been identified as an Asset of Community Value.	No amendment in response to this issue.  Add new paragraph 2.4.2 on ACV status of the URC Hall:  <u>2.4.2 The URC Hall was identified as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on the 16 September 2022. The designation of the Hall as an ACV is a material consideration that will be taken into account when determining any planning application that would affect it.</u>
Ms Yvonne Estop (50)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.10 The landscape context is still river meadows. The whole of the area is the Meads. The only physical development has been the car parks and Charringtons House. The foundations of Charringtons were deeper and more difficult because of	Paragraph 2.2.10 has been redrafted following comments from Historic England.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			the river. Refer to Emily Coles 2022 report.		
Mr Colin Arnott (117)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		<p>2.2.15-16 Heritage Assets - Old River Lane has long been adjacent to the historic core of Bishop's Stortford and so has a key role to play in maintaining this legacy. Most of the town centre is covered by the Conservation Area which includes a significant number of listed buildings and other heritage assets. This is important recognition of the heritage and cultural context of the part of the town centre conservation area which ORL is set. Based on the recent comprehensive study of the cultural and community contribution of the URC Hall now included within in the extended red line area the Hall should be added to the Heritage Assets diagram on page 19.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Draft SPD, the URC Hall is also now the subject of a nomination as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<p>The diagram is based upon heritage assets identified in the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>A new paragraph 2.4.2 has been added to the SPD to reflect the fact that the URC Hall has been identified as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add new paragraph 2.4.2 on ACV status of the URC Hall:</p> <p>2.4.2 <u>The URC Hall was identified as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on the 16 September 2022. The designation of the Hall as an ACV is a material consideration that will be taken into account when</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
					<u>determining any planning application that would affect it.</u>
Mr Kevin Johnson (75)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area	Object		Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (242)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		The United Reformed Church Hall is recognised by residents as a Community Asset as it is used for a range of well-being and arts activities. It would make sense to retain this property as a Community Asset (possibly an Asset of Community Value - application has been submitted) and have the Arts Forum or a similar group refurbish and run the venue. This would allow the developer more scope to develop an appropriate mixed-use development which would include a Community Hub.	Noted. The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).  A new paragraph 2.4.2 has been added to the SPD to reflect the fact that the URC Hall has been identified as an Asset of Community Value.	No amendment in response to this issue.  Add new paragraph 2.4.2 on ACV status of the URC Hall:  <u>2.4.2 The URC Hall was identified as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on the 16 September 2022. The designation of the Hall as an ACV is a material consideration that will be taken into account when determining any planning application that would affect it.</u>
Mr Andrew Munro (173)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		The development should be sympathetic to the aesthetics and the height of other building, taking into account that across from link road there is a park - opposite this park buildings should not appear as	Noted. The ambition is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			towers and not be higher than Jackson Square.		
Cllr Calvin Horner (161)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area	Object	<p>2.2.10 The history of the site as floodplain will cause challenges to construction, as was the case with Charringtons House and initially with Link Road. Engineers who worked on the site during the redevelopment of in the late 1960s have advised that much of the land under the surface car parks is marshy and unsuitable for large scale development without substantial and expensive foundations.</p> <p>2.2.15 I agree that the legacy of Bishop's Stortford's development in a rural setting should be protected and enhanced. As this site was until the relatively recent past part of the meads, there is a strong case for bringing elements of this back to the site along the line of the old river such as with natural water features.</p> <p>2.2.18 The relationship between the ORL site and the 'historic core of the town centre' is an important one and should not be compromised by over-development that is not sympathetic with these heritage assets. I am particularly concerned about the</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed. The SPD sets out that proposals should consider the use of water features (and public art) in the design of the new spaces to reference the former route of the River Stort</p> <p>Noted. The ambition is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. Proposals will be required to demonstrate high standards of design and architectural quality that enhance the site, the setting of adjoining and</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>relationship with the United Reformed Church and Coopers that lie immediately adjacent to the site on the west side and the Castle mound to the east. Consideration must be given to restricting heights to 3 storeys to ensure sympathetic development and to avoid the historic buildings being obscured.</p> <p>2.2.20 There are a number of important vistas across the ORL site between Castle Park and the Town Centre, not just the one highlighted in this paragraph as 'particularly valued'. These should be preserved with the site remaining sufficiently open to enable these vistas to be maintained.</p>	<p>nearby Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Section 7.6 (Heights, Massing, and Grain) of the SPD has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
Mrs Janet Reville (295)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		Paragraph 2.27 All trees should be retained and where possible new ones planted	Agreed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Gary Jones (290)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.20 I am pleased that the view from Castle Gardens towards the Church of St Michael is particularly valued. A photograph of the current view must be included in the SPD	Agreed.	Photograph added following paragraph 2.2.20.



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			with a requirement that this is retained.		
Cityheart Homes Ltd (333)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		Presence of E-W view (lost) to / from Castle and Church: A dotted line and annotation refers to "lost views of church". This is neutral i.e., not implying that one exists (and accordingly should be retained / protected), nor necessarily that one should be created. Indeed, reference to the term "lost" confirms that it does not exist. Any scheme will however see to be responsive to this factor. 2.2.20 - Key views - As 2.2.14 above.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Woodward (357)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.12 Link Rd - a road that was illegally built given that the former BSUDC were selling to Herts County Council land that was in trust to the Brazier trust Charity without seeking approval from the Charity Commission. This is recorded in subsequent Minute books of BS Town Council who now administer the Brazier Trust. (This may also apply to Link Rd car park, Green Belt occupied by EHC).  2.2.14 URC Hall not mentioned among the heritage assets although mentioned later in the SPD.	Noted. Paragraph 2.2.12 is a matter of fact setting out that Link Road was built between 1969 and 1970.  The diagram is based upon heritage assets identified in the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area Appraisal.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>2.2.15 &amp; 2.2.16 The objective evidence to date in BS from the destruction of the wharves, terminal basin, open air pool, the pocket park at Riverside; demolition of much of the historic heart of BS for Jackson Sqs Mk1 &amp; later Mk2 with its monolithic Sainsbury watch tower looming over Causeway; the increases in permitted heights from mostly two and some three storeys to c. six, and the canyonisation of the Stort with high rise Riverside flats; loss of riverside access where once there was a waterway festival each year; the total Conservation Area officers disregard for the protection of the Dane St c15 Century Woodford Butchers shop (long covered in plastic sheeting), and the unchecked growth of internally illuminated signage, (as reported many times to EHC), and other CA breaches beg the question of any chance EHC (or City Heart) having any meaningful regard (or resource allocation) for the built and natural assets of Stortford Town centre that must be protected and enhanced.</p> <p>As to public open space we have the example of the vaunted (by EHC</p>	<p>Noted. The ambition is to create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area. Proposals will be required to demonstrate high standards of design and architectural quality that enhance the site, the setting of adjoining and nearby Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that 'high quality new streets will be created and public spaces</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>during development) of the public Riverside Piazza, only in fact delivering a small concrete open triangle, now totally inaccessible to the public as EHC have authorised colonisation by Wetherspoons only for paying customers and the adjacent loss of Stort public and boat access gate and facilities by the outward expansion of Skew.</p>	<p>will be provided in strategic locations alongside key frontages and buildings, including Coopers and along Bridge Street.'</p> <p>The SPD sets out that proposals for a public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area.</p>	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (397)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.10-11 Old River Lane - A brief history - Despite all the historic information in these two paras, and the rest of the section, the site's place in the Conservation Area and its historic importance in the town does not come across strongly elsewhere. This needs to be improved; for example, by cross-referencing to relevant paras elsewhere, quotations, etc., so that it is not lost sight of during the masterplanning.	The SPD should be read as a whole and this section, as it sets the context and provides an analysis of the area, has influenced the subsequent Chapters of the SPD. Paragraph 2.2.10 has been updated to reflect a more detailed history of the site, and the Heritage Assets diagram under paragraph 2.2.14 has also been updated to make it clear that these are assets identified in the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area Appraisal.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			URC Hall - Neither paragraph mentions the URC Hall, its architecture, history, significance and current users & uses. The building should be mentioned here, with a reference to its own section (see 2.4).	Reference now made to URC Hall in paragraph 2.2.10, and 2.4.1 has been expanded to include reference to the history of the hall.	<p>Add detail to paragraphs 2.2.10 and 2.4.1.</p> <p>2.2.10 ...<u>In 1860 on Water Lane to the west of the site the Congregational Church was built, which was later renamed the United Reformed Church. In 1915 a Sunday School was built within the Old River Lane site for the Congregational Church, a building now known as the United Reformed Church Hall.</u></p> <p>2.4.1 ... <u>The URC Hall was built in 1915 as a Sunday School for the Congregational Church, now known as the United Reformed Church on Water Lane. It was extensively altered and extended in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1990s.</u></p>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (399)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.20 In addition to the buildings themselves, there are other factors such as the relationships of the buildings with each other, the quality of the spaces between them and the vistas and views that unite or disrupt them. There are also a number of key views across Bishop's Stortford. The view from Castle Gardens towards the Church of St Michael is particularly valued. The SPD should	<p>The SPD sets out that views from within the site to the Church of St Michael and the motte mound of Waytemore Castle and open green spaces should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In particular paragraph</p>	Add the following sentence to paragraph 7.6.3:

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			require these views to be retained by making every effort to have no homes/keep to no more than around 100 homes, and preferably less, to limiting heights, massing, etc. (see 6.2) Also, any homes should be located where their visual impact is least, e.g., the south of the site, close to Jackson Sq. (to be included as part of Ch 8).	7.6.3 has been updated to specifically refer to the 'retention of views'.	7.6.3 ... <u>Building heights, massing, and grain should relate well to the adjacent built form, green infrastructure and streetscenes surrounding the site. Building heights should be broadly reflective of the predominant building heights of Bishop's Stortford town centre, whilst allowing for the retention of views and with careful consideration for how the built form proposed will relate to the public spaces being created.</u>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (398)	2.2 Historical Development of the Area		2.2.15-16 - Old River Lane has long been adjacent to the historic core of Bishop's Stortford and so has a key role to play in maintaining this legacy. Most of the town centre is covered by the Conservation Area which includes a significant number of listed buildings and other heritage assets. These paras are important for recognising the heritage and cultural context of this part of the town centre conservation area in which ORL is set. They need to be emphasised elsewhere in the SPD, e.g. strengthening 5.1 - Constraints and Opportunities table;	Noted. The wording in the constraints and opportunities table has been updated.	Update the constraints and opportunities table, now in section 6, as follows:  a) <u>To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and to protect and enhance the setting of Listed Buildings, <del>the Conservation Area</del> and other important heritage assets, including the Coopers building and views to the Church of St Michael and of the motte mound of Waytemore Castle</u>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>7.5 Layout and Edges Based on the recent comprehensive study of the cultural and community contribution of the URC Hall  <a href="https://usercontent.one/wp/www.stortfordcf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Report_UR_C-Hall_Bishops-Stortford_E-Cole_Final_Feb-22_p-7.pdf?media=1657443771">https://usercontent.one/wp/www.stortfordcf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Report_UR_C-Hall_Bishops-Stortford_E-Cole_Final_Feb-22_p-7.pdf?media=1657443771</a>) now included within in the extended red line area the Hall should be added to the Heritage Assets diagram on page 20.</p> <p>Since the publication of the Draft SPD, the URC Hall is also now the subject of a nomination as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<p>The source for the heritage assets identified within the diagram is the adopted Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area Appraisal from 2014.</p> <p>A new paragraph 2.4.2 has been added to the SPD to reflect the fact that the URC Hall has been identified as an Asset of Community Value.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add new paragraph 2.4.2 on ACV status of the URC Hall:</p> <p><u>2.4.2 The URC Hall was identified as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) on the 16 September 2022. The designation of the Hall as an ACV is a material consideration that will be taken into account when determining any planning application that would affect it.</u></p>
Mr Luke Hayes (4)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		Regarding the existing underground river, will there be any investigations into the possibility of re-opening this stretch of river? I hope the planners and developers and restrain themselves and use the minimum	The SPD recognises that development at Old River Lane presents an opportunity to consider the use of water features and public art in the design of the new spaces to reference the former route of the River Stort.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			amount of concrete, tarmac as possible. I believe this area could be a fantastic new natural/green leaning completely pedestrian area to complement the existing shopping areas. I understand that the town needs more accommodation and a proper market/public space area, this can all be done with a view to keeping the town as green as possible and re-imagining and bringing back to the life the existing water course.	The importance of green infrastructure is embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration.	
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (59)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		<p>Mature trees on the site should be maintained and protected during any development.</p> <p>BS Neighbourhood Plan Silverleys and Meads Ward 1 Revision 2021 - 2033 - CC1 &amp; CC3, should be considered where buildings could be retained and refurbished, rather than demolished and rebuilt. Any new building should be designed for the future climate and for the flexibility of need of the prospective occupants and users.</p>	<p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the</p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
					<p>former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p> <p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre.</del> <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></li> </ul> <p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates.</del> <u>The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</u></p>
Ms Yvonne Estop (49)	2.3		In section 2.3 Site and surroundings, as well as the diagrams showing flooding, trees and underground	Chapter 6 already acknowledges the requirement to re-provide around 170 spaces. It is the quantum of spaces to	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
	Site and Surroundings Today		constraints, please add a diagram showing Waitrose existing parking in detail so that each space can be seen. This is the most pressing site constraint.	re-provide that is the constraint rather than the location of the existing carpark.	
Mr Colin Arnott (116)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		2.3.1 Old River Lane site represents a major opportunity to extend and reconfigure the retail, community, and leisure provision in the town centre. Note that this acknowledges that the major development opportunity in this location is for retail, community, and leisure uses rather than the residential development led approach adopted at other town centre sites.	Agreed. This is a mixed-use development and not a residential led scheme.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (110)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today	Object	<p>What evidence have you that cars drive faster along the Link road due to limited build frontage, there are so many junctions already leading onto the Link Road that it is impractical to drive above the speed limit and highways will not consider making this a 20mph zone.</p> <p>I agree that the western edge of the site needs to be carefully considered given the many listed buildings in the area and therefore height of buildings should be kept to a maximum of 3 storeys reducing the cannon affect created by Jackson</p>	<p>Street features and human activity can have an influence on the speed at which people choose to drive. Features likely to slow traffic include, inter alia, the close proximity of buildings to the road.</p> <p>The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			Square and its multi-storey car park and the overwhelming new multi-storey car park at the junction of Rye Street and Link Road.	Section 7.6 (Heights, Massing, and Grain) of the SPD has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Carolyn Matthews (85)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today	Support	-Important to retain visual access to these buildings from various aspects- so any new construction should be kept to a minimum height. -Far less than the new multi-storey car park.	Support noted and welcomed. The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets.  Section 7.6 (Heights, Massing, and Grain) of the SPD has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (243)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		We should lock in as much carbon as we can on the site. Mature trees on the site should be maintained and protected during any development.	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>BS Neighbourhood Plan Silverleys and Meads Ward 1 Revision 2021 - 2033 - CC1 &amp; CC3, should be considered where buildings could be retained and refurbished, rather than demolished and rebuilt. Any new building should be designed for the future climate and for the flexibility of need of the prospective occupants and users.</p>	<p>retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>Agreed. The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan. The SPD has been updated to reflect the fact that the Revision document has now been 'made' (adopted).</p>	<p>1.4.8 Bishop's Stortford has two adopted Neighbourhood Plans; the Bishop's <u>Stortford Neighbourhood Plan</u> for Silverleys and Meads <u>Wards Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (1st Revision) 2022</u>; and the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan for All Saints, Central, South and part of Thorley Neighbourhood Plan (2017(1st Revision) 2022). Together both plans cover the entirety of the town, with the former covering the north-east and the latter the south-east of the town.</p> <p>1.4.9 For this SPD, the Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan is the relevant plan as it covers the Old River Lane area. <del>Of particular importance is Policy BP6 – Future development of the town centre and Policy BP7 – Prosperity and character of the existing town centre.</del> <u>The Neighbourhood Plan includes the following site-specific objective:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>To provide a balanced mix of residential, cultural, leisure and</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>The western edge of the site needs to be carefully considered given the many listed buildings in the area and therefore height of buildings should be kept to a maximum of 3 storeys reducing the cannon affect created by Jackson Square and its multi-storey car park and the overwhelming new multi-storey car park at the junction of Rye Street and Link Road.</p>	<p>The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets.</p> <p>Section 7.6 (Heights, Massing, and Grain) of the SPD has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p>	<p><u>business uses within the Old River Lane Site</u></p> <p>1.4.10 <del>Both Neighbourhood Plans are currently being updated and the final Old River Lane SPD will reflect any relevant updates. The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan for East Herts.</del></p>
Ms Jill Jones (214)	2.3	Support	2.3.4 support the plans to retain existing tree planting and existing green spaces	Support noted and welcomed.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
	Site and Surroundings Today				
Amanda Anderson (265)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		In a time of climate emergency, and the quality of the air in Stortford this is no time to lose more trees - we need them for shade and for air quality.	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jenette Greenwood (311)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		I am concerned that yet more trees will be lost. Every development in Stortford seems to involve removing trees and green areas. We need more of these, not less.	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cityheart Homes Ltd (334)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		2.3.1 Mix of uses: As point 1 earlier - use of term 'reconfigure' is not considered representative and appropriate.  2.3.3 Flood risk extent & classification - Recent flood investigation/modelling work that has been undertaken indicates a better and improved (lesser) classification of the site. Need to	Use of word reconfigure is intended to convey that the town centre can be configured in a new way.  Noted. A Flood Risk Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			caveat the content of the SPD accordingly to qualify that based on current evidence only.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (401)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		<p>2.3.5 Below ground constraints include archaeology, a 3m easement for Thames Water rising main sewer and a 5m easement as the culvert is classified as a watercourse. These constraints should be mentioned in the Constraints and Opportunities table (5.1)</p> <p>It would be more technically appropriate to refer to the rising main sewer as a sewer rising main. The culvert is presumed to be the watercourse shown on Figure 7. It would be better to refer to it as culverted watercourse.</p>	<p>The constraints have now been included in the constraints and opportunities table in Section 6.1</p> <p>Note: paragraph 2.3.5 has been amended following comments from Historic England.</p>	<p>Add the following constraints to the table in Section 6.1:</p> <p>d) <u>A 3m easement is needed for a Thames Water sewer rising main, and an 8m easement is needed for the culverted watercourse</u></p> <p>f) <u>There are known and potential non-designated archaeological remains within the Old River Lane site</u></p>
Lynne Garner (371)	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		The wildfires of the last few months prove we need to think about how we treat our landscape. Trees soak up CO2 and provide homes for our wildlife. They also provide shelter which helps keep temperatures down. Rather than cut down plant MORE!	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation	2.3 Site and Surroundings Today		2.3.1 - The Old River Lane site represents a major opportunity to extend and reconfigure the retail, community, and leisure provision in	Agreed. This is a mixed-use development and not a residential led scheme.	Amend the Constraints and Opportunities table in Chapter 6 as follows:

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>2.</b>			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
(400)			the town centre. This acknowledges that the major development opportunity in this location is for destination retail, community, and leisure uses rather than the residential development-led approach adopted at other town centre sites. This needs to be recognised and/or referred to in the chapters, etc. that follow, e.g., 5.1. Constraints and Opportunities.	This is already reflected as an Opportunity in Chapter 6. However, to strengthen this, the word destination has been incorporated.	b) To create a high quality mixed use <del>development of</del> <u>destination including</u> retail, leisure uses, along with a civic hub of other commercial and community uses
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (60)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		As previously stated, the URC Hall should be retained and the community should be allowed to refurbish and retain for Art use. Monies should be earmarked in an S106 agreement to support the refurbishment. The URC Hall is at the end of Old River Lane and in the midst of the development, ideally placed to be an Arts Forum rather than perched at the corner of the Causeway and Bridge Street. The developer would benefit by retention of the hall as this would release the corner plot for retail, food, offices, a community hub to include medical facilities with dentists (in short supply in BS) If this is not possible then the developer should provide an affordable space for rehearsal, performance, exhibitions,	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).  The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			workshops, and craft fairs. which complement the present entertainment venues and meet the needs of those who require these spaces, i.e., in layout, backstage entrance, dressing rooms, refreshment areas and bar space which can optimise the affordability to promoters to use the space. The stage space would be bigger than South Mills Art Centre and could seat a bigger audience.	been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Mr James Tatchell (32)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Object	2.31 The URC Hall should be removed from the scope of this document and considered separately. Any move towards demolishing and losing this heritage and community asset must be removed - in line with the recommendations of the Bishop's Stortford Arts Forum.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (118)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		2.4.3 Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR7 (Loss of Community Facilities). (see 2.2.15 above). Goes on to make clear that the primary objective of extending the SPD redline boundary to include the URC Hall was to consider how the contribution of an existing significant community asset can be maximised and that its loss	Noted.	Change the policy reference from CFLR7 to CFLR8 at paragraphs 2.4.3 and 3.4.4.  2.4.3 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR <del>7</del> 8 (Loss of Community Facilities):



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			would be refused under Policy CFLR7 unless demonstrably no longer required for community use or its replacement by enhanced or alternative community provision on the site weighed greater in the planning balance.		3.4.4 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR78 (Loss of Community Facilities).
Carolyn Matthews (91)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Support	Introduce speed limits to 5/10 mph throughout the town centre and roads leading into it e.g., Apton road, Newtown Road.	Noted. However, the purpose of the SPD is to specifically provide a framework for development of the Old River Lane site.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Marguerite Rapley (105)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Object	The United Reformed Church Hall should not be lost. It is a valued asset to our community and historically significant.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Miss Mary Epworth	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Object	Water Lane Church hall is purpose built as a community venue for performance and entertainment. Why demolish such a space that could easily be repurposed as a fantastic venue/arts centre? I tour the UK and Europe as a performer and have played at many venues that have a similar history and design, and with some investment, consultation with artists and performers, you could give Stortford an incredible asset.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>2.</b>			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
Mrs Helen Lednor (233)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		The URC Church Hall is the equivalent of Bishop's Stortford Village Hall. It is the only rentable community hall in the centre of Stortford with kitchen and bar facility. To take this away would be to take away one of the central points of community meet ups and small gigs. I would be very against any plan which removed such a facility.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (244)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		As previously stated, the URC Hall should be retained, and the community should be allowed to refurbish and retain for Art use. Monies should be earmarked in an S106 agreement to support the refurbishment. The URC Hall is at the end of Old River Lane and during the development, ideally placed to be an Arts Forum rather than perched at the corner of the Causeway and Bridge Street. The developer would benefit by retention of the hall as this would release the corner plot for retail, food, offices, a community hub to include medical facilities with dentists (in short supply in BS) If this is not possible then the developer should provide an affordable space for rehearsal, performance, exhibitions, workshops, and craft fairs. which complement the present	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			entertainment venues and meet the needs of those who require these spaces, i.e., in layout, backstage entrance, dressing rooms, refreshment areas and bar space which can optimise the affordability to promoters to use the space. The stage space would be bigger than South Mills Art Centre and could seat a larger audience.		
Mrs Jill Wade (256)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		<p>URC Church Hall Section 2.2 should include reference to the history of the URC Hall. This is available in a report by Dr Emily Cole on the Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation website.</p> <p>Section 5 identifies the URC Hall as a valued community asset and its demolition would be contrary to para 7.11 (maximise sustainability at every opportunity) and policy CFLR8 (loss of community facilities). This should therefore be included as an opportunity not a limitation. The URC Hall is currently well-used by local groups as well as providing an additional performance space at the opposite end of town from the SMA Centre. Therefore, it is still needed. It is not demonstrated that it would be replaced by enhanced</p>	<p>Information on the URC Hall in paragraphs 2.2.10, and 2.4.1 has been expanded to include reference to the history of the hall.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities). Applicants will also be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.</p>	<p>Add detail to paragraphs 2.2.10 and 2.4.1.</p> <p>2.2.10 ...<u>In 1860 on Water Lane to the west of the site the Congregational Church was built, which was later renamed the United Reformed Church. In 1915 a Sunday School was built within the Old River Lane site for the Congregational Church, a building now known as the United Reformed Church Hall.</u></p> <p>2.4.1 ... <u>The URC Hall was built in 1915 as a Sunday School for the Congregational Church, now known as the United Reformed Church on Water Lane. It was extensively altered and extended in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1990s.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			provision of greater or equal size in any other location and the SPD does not propose a facility which would outweigh the loss. Demolition of the URC Hall should not be considered and reference to this possibility should be removed from the SPD. Although policy BISH8 makes no reference to arts and culture, it is included as Objective 3 in section 6. The main arts and culture offer is provided at the southern end of the town at the SMA Centre and Empire Cinema. Any arts offer on ORL should complement and not compete with the existing provision and should focus on refurbishing and modernising the URC Church Hall to enhance its current performance space.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Mr Andrew Munro (174)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		The URC should be retained and refurbished as an Art Centre, allowing Charringtons House to be refurbished and extended - trapping carbon and giving developers additional funds to design and build a sustainable hub for mixed use.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities). Applicants will also be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
				to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.	
Mrs Julia Walsh (156)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Object	It appears to me that the alternative provision currently envisaged in the overall plans for Old River Lane does not enhance the overall community facility in terms of provision for staged performance events. The hall is well used and some user organisations will find alternative provision in the town, including in the planned redevelopment of the Water Lane United Reformed Church building for wider community use. However, this will not provide a performance space to replicate the various gigs and shows that the Church Hall currently accommodates with its stage and side rooms. At the time the council acquired the Hall, the envisaged plans for performance space in the Old River Lane development were more ambitious and, in my view, appropriate to a town of Stortford's size with a thriving professional and amateur Arts scene. There now appears to be a mismatch in terms of what we are losing and what we stand to gain in terms of performance facilities.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities) setting out how the loss resulting from the development would be replaced by enhanced provision in terms of quantity and/or quality in a suitable location.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			(PS There is a typo - it is the United Reformed Church Hall).	Spelling mistake has been corrected.	Amend Section 2.4 and paragraph 2.4.1 to read United Reformed Church Hall.
Cllr Mione Goldspink (324)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		Page 28. 2.4.3 - there are suggestions that the URC Hall could be demolished. I think that this possibility should be rejected outright. This Hall is a valuable community asset, very well used by many organisations and community groups in the Town. It should be retained and modernised for its value to the community, and also in the interests of sustainability. This matter is also mentioned on page 35. If the Hall were to be demolished, in spite of reasons against such action, Policy CFLR7 would apply, meaning that the council would have to provide an equivalent or better replacement hall somewhere on the site. Please retain mention of this fact in the SPD.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Janet Reville (296)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		Paragraph 2.4 The URC hall should be retained, refurbished and altered to provide a performance space and arts centre together with facilities for the many groups that hire the hall at present to continue.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			We do NOT need another multi-screen cinema.	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Ms Jill Jones (219)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall	Object	2.4.3. object to removal of United Reformed Church Hall. This should be incorporate into any new design and be made a feature of to enhance the varied and historic character of the area. Additionally, this size facility might address the need for an optimal family gathering size space - none of the current proposals for BS seem to acknowledge not everyone needs a 500-seater auditorium or a 70-space meeting room, but we do need facilities where families can have parties and celebrations. Also, how does this fit with any community access the Northgate End YC might revert to providing (as	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).  The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			it used to for local residents about 20 years ago!)	required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Jenette Greenwood (312)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		<p>2.4 I don't understand the need or expense of demolishing the URC Hall. The people that use it, like Paddy Lennox, believe it works well as a performance space as it stands. The plans to replace it seem vague and changeable - are we having a cinema that no one seems to want or a theatre or what? I don't think anything should be done to the hall without a fully considered and costed plan of what will replace it, what it will be used for and why that will deliver better value for the money spent than what we already have. If one cares about the community of Stortford URC Hall should be retained.</p> <p>I like the idea Yvonne Wood suggested on the BSCF Facebook page suggesting a crescent path across the site from Northgate End to Jackson Square, between the existing Waitrose car park and any new buildings / Charringtons House</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities) setting out how the loss resulting from the development would be replaced by enhanced provision in terms of quantity and/or quality in a suitable location.</p> <p>The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude a curved walkway if this was the preferred design solution.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			and removing the need to demolish URC Hall for a new car park.		
Amanda Anderson (266)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		If one cares about the community of Stortford URC Hall should be retained. This place is a hub and brings people together, surely one should know this by now.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Gary Jones (288)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		Spelling error:  2.4 United ReformED Church Hall;	Noted.	Make corrections to the following: - Table of Contents - Section 2.4 - Paragraph 2.2.17 - Paragraph 2.4.1 - Image 3 - Paragraph 2.2.18 - Paragraph 3.4.4 - Table below 5.1.1 - Box below 7.6.2 - Paragraph 8.2.3
Cityheart Homes Ltd (335)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		2.4.3 - Loss of community facilities (URC Church Hall) It should be noted that Planning Permission and Conservation Area Consent has previously been granted for the demolition of this facility (as part of the approval of the earlier outline planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site). Need as such to clarify that it is the 'use' of this facility that	Planning permission was previously granted on the 14 January 2013 for the demolition of the URC Hall. This permission was never implemented. Any new proposals for development at Old River Lane will be considered on their merits and circumstances	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			needs to be assessed for loss / compensation, as opposed to its physical presence and merit per se (not listed / not considered suitable for listing / planning permission and conservation area consent previously approved for its demolition). 3.4.4 - Loss of community facilities (URC Church Hall) - As point above.		
Lynne Garner (372)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		(2.4) Keep costs down, reduce the need for new materials by keeping the URC Hall and turn into something which will benefit the community. Surely that's a more sustainable option. Also, this is part of the towns heritage which many wish to keep.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (402)	2.4 United Reformed Church Hall		2.4.3 It is Policy CFLR8 - Loss of Community Facilities that applies here, not CFLR7 (end of para). Policy CFLR7 should be annexed for easy reference (see Annex 1). There should be a statement about how these 2 policies particularly apply to the site, especially the URC Hall on Water Lane; which is used by many different groups for a variety of activities. The para should also refer to the recent study of the halls architecture, history and significance and its findings and conclusions,	Agreed. Policy CFLR7 has been updated to correctly state CFLR8.  It is Policy CFLR8 that is potentially relevant to the URC Hall, and this Policy is repeated in full in Chapter 2 of the SPD. It is not considered necessary to repeat CFLR7.  Information of the URC Hall in paragraph 2.2.10, and 2.4.1 has been expanded to include reference to the history of the hall.	Change the policy reference from CFLR7 to CFLR8 at paragraphs 2.4.3 and 3.4.4.  2.4.3 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR7 (Loss of Community Facilities):  3.4.4 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>which was sent to members of the SPD Steering Group 05 April 2022 (see link below).</p> <p>Also, the SPD should make it clear that the primary objective of extending the white line boundary to include the URC Hall is to consider how the contribution of an existing significant community asset can be maximised and that its loss should be refused under Policy CFLR8 unless it can be demonstrated that it is no longer required for community use or its replacement by enhanced or alternative community provision on the site weighs greater in the planning balance. Feasibility, structural and embedded carbon studies need to be specified in the SPD, to be available before master planning starts. In addition to its existing uses, the hall could, for example, be part of the development's retail offer, e.g., a covered market. Note: The report on the hall's architecture, history and significance can be found at: <a href="https://usercontent.one/wp/www.stortfordcf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Report-URC-Hall-Bishops-Stortford-Dr.-">https://usercontent.one/wp/www.stortfordcf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/Report-URC-Hall-Bishops-Stortford-Dr.-</a></p>	<p>The Council's Sustainability SPD notes that consideration of embodied carbon is likely to become increasingly important as society transitions to a low/zero carbon society. The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible, and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.'</p>	<p>CFLR78 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Add detail to paragraphs 2.2.10 and 2.4.1.</p> <p>2.2.10 ...<u>In 1860 on Water Lane to the west of the site the Congregational Church was built, which was later renamed the United Reformed Church. In 1915 a Sunday School was built within the Old River Lane site for the Congregational Church, a building now known as the United Reformed Church Hall.</u></p> <p>2.4.1 ... <u>The URC Hall was built in 1915 as a Sunday School for the Congregational Church, now known as the United Reformed Church on Water Lane. It was extensively altered and extended in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1990s.</u></p>

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<a href="#">Emily-Cole-Final-Feb-22_p.pdf?media=1652777025</a>		
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (61)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford	Object	The three sites quoted are all too tall for the ORL development to be aligned too. If a developer is allowed to build to 6 storeys the area will mask the older buildings in the area and any visual access to Castle Gardens, Waytemore Castle, St Michael's Church and other historic buildings within the conservation area and on the fringes of the development.	Noted. Heights and massing are considered in Section 7.6 of the SPD. This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (119)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford		2.5.3 Northgate End Car Park: Northgate End is a multi-storey car park - has been included as part of plans to redevelop Old River Lane for a number of years. This development not only has a link in terms of providing a wider-parking offer, but also has a strong physical link with the site. As noted above, DP Policy BISH8 II(g) clearly states on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed so it is unclear why this Car Park should have been included as part of plans to redevelop Old River Lane for a number of years but has never been suggested that it should be included within the red line boundary (as is	It is agreed that Northgate End Carpark has a strong relationship with the Old River Lane site, and this is set out in the SPD. Including the carpark within the red line could be misleading given that the development is complete.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			now proposed for the URC Hall). In fact, the car park's financial link with the ORL site - in order to release additional commercial and housing development capacity on the red line site appears to have been more important than its physical link. The release of development capacity for this purpose was clearly contrary to Policy BISH8 II(g). Moreover, the use of £6million of LEP funding intended to support ORL investment in non-revenue generating community uses was also contrary to this policy. The planning gain secured should be recognised by including the car park within the ORL red line boundary and used to leverage greater community and other economic benefits for the ORL development.		
Carolyn Matthews	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford	Object	2.32 policy CFLR8 loss of amenity- must consider the environmental cost of 'embodied carbon' if buildings are demolished and in the replacement of 'enhanced provision'. In light of the Climate emergency and insurmountable waste is replacement the viable option?	Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of the URC Hall, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, applicants will be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply not only with Policy CFLR8, but also with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>2.</b>			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
Parsonage Residents Association (245)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford		The three sites quoted are all too tall for the ORL development to be aligned too. If a developer is allowed to build to 6 storeys the area will mask the older buildings in the area and any visual access to Castle Gardens, Waytemore Castle, St Michael's Church and other historic buildings within the conservation area and on the fringes of the development.	The heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site. The SPD sets out at paragraph 7.6.2 that 'the main consideration outside of the site which needs to be reflected in the heights, massing, and grain of any proposal is the impact on heritage assets.' This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Andrew Munro (175)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford	Object	The sites mentioned in the ORL SPD - Northgate End Car Park forced on the residents by the landowner. The Goods Yard and the Mill Site, neither are a community hub, there is no doctor's surgery, or mixed use just flats and parking - definitely not a destination.	Noted. Old River Lane will be a mixed-use development, including around 100 homes, retail, leisure uses, along with a 'civic' hub of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and office floorspace. It will perform a number of functions - it will be destination, a home, a retail/ employment area and a route which people will pass through on a longer journey to somewhere else.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Gary Jones (291)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford		2.5.2 Spelling: The Goods Yard	Spelling mistake has been corrected.	Amend spelling of Goods Yard at paragraphs 2.5.2 and 2.5.4.
Deirdre Glasgow (270)	2.5 Other Developments		The document states that any development at Old River Lane also needs to be considered in the wider context of Bishop's Stortford, and	This section refers to new planned development in Bishop's Stortford. Chapter 3 sets out that proposals for Old River Lane should complement the	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
	in Bishop's Stortford		<p>particularly its town centre. As such Old River Lane should complement and contribute to the town-wide development framework which means not just relating with the existing town centre, but also with planned future developments. Changes: South Mill Arts theatre and museum to be included in the town centre development, including ORL, as South Mill Arts is linked to the Town, by the Millennium Bridge at the Goods Yard development. Figure 9: The Goods Yard site allocation to the south of Old River Lane, clearly shows that part of the Goods Yard development is in the Town Centre. Ensure that the arts/leisure facilities provided at ORL compliment the work at South Mill Arts and other art groups around the town.</p> <p>The Mill Site Interested to see the future development of the Mill site on the River Stort. Changes: To include the idea of north and south cultural areas across the town. These would be developed along the River Stort. ORL, northern cultural centre and South Mill Arts at the South cultural centre, with the future</p>	existing offer. The Council has been in discussion with Rhodes Birthplace Trust and will continue to work with them moving forward to find the best solution for Bishop's Stortford and the Arts Complex.	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			central to the offerings along the River Stort.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (403)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford		<p>2.5.2 Bishop's Stortford currently has a number of development sites either under construction or being considered through the planning process. Whilst Old River Lane will share some relationship with all of them, the key emerging developments relevant to Old River Lane are those within the town centre which include: Northgate End Car Park, The Goods Yard, The Mill Site. Other town centre developments with a potential impact on the site and are not included area: Jackson Square including moving the step-free access to/from Bridge St to the north-east corner Castle Gardens &amp; Sworders Field  <a href="https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/sports-leisure-and-parks/local-parks-and-open-spaces/parks-open-spaces-bishops-stortford/castle-park">https://www.eastherts.gov.uk/sports-leisure-and-parks/local-parks-and-open-spaces/parks-open-spaces-bishops-stortford/castle-park</a>  Northern and north-eastern cycle routes through Grange Paddocks  The impact of these needs to be assessed before master-planning starts. The section also makes no reference to the effects of developments completed, under</p>	<p>The SPD refers to new development within the immediate area. Reference has been made throughout the document to other developments including Section 4.5 of the SPD which includes details about the plans to upgrade and improve Castle Gardens.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.1. will be updated to reflect the District Plan housing</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Update Paragraph 4.4.1 as follows:</p>



Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			construction and planned outside of the town centre, which could result in around 6000 homes by 2033, compared to around 4500 in the District Plan.	requirement, and also to state that this is a minimum figure for clarity.	4.1.1 Bishop's Stortford is undergoing significant levels of growth with <del>approaching at least 4,426</del> 4,500 new homes planned in the District Plan 2018 (including committed development) by 2033, which will substantially increase the town's population.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (404)	2.5 Other Developments in Bishop's Stortford		2.5.3 - Northgate End is a multi-storey car park - has been included as part of plans to redevelop Old River Lane for a number of years. This development not only has a link in terms of providing a wider-parking offer, but also has a strong physical link with the site. This statement is contrary to DP Policy BISH8 III(g) which states: on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, so it is unclear why this car park should have been included as part of plans to redevelop Old River Lane for a number of years but has never been suggested that it should be included within the red line boundary (as is now proposed for the URC Hall). In fact, the car parks financial link with the ORL site - in order to release additional commercial and housing development capacity on the red line	It is agreed that Northgate End Carpark has a strong relationship with the Old River Lane site, and this is set out in the SPD. Including the carpark within the red line could be misleading given that the development is complete.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>site appears to have been more important than its physical link. The release of development capacity for this purpose was clearly contrary to Policy BISH8 III(g). Moreover, the use of £6 million of LEP funding intended to support ORL investment in non-revenue generating community uses was also contrary to this policy. The planning gain secured should be recognised by including the car park within the ORL red line boundary and used to leverage greater community and other economic benefits for the ORL development. Some justification/explanation is therefore needed to support the SPDs statement and remove DP Policy BISH8 III(g).</p>		
Environment Agency (444)	Site Context and Analysis		<p>We note that the document references that the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Because of these constraints, we suggest that an additional sub-section is added to Section 3.6 which specifically highlights the importance of flood risk.</p> <p>We recommend including additional wording to ensure that the sequential approach is applied in line with the relevant flood risk vulnerability classifications. The</p>	<p>The importance of flood risk is noted in the SPD already in Sections 1.4.4. and 2.3.3. Section 9.1.2 notes that as part of a planning application there is a requirement for a Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Assessment. The East Herts Local Validation list already sets out details that are required as part of that FRA including reference to vulnerable classifications and the sequential test.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>sequential approach should be applied within the site to direct development to the areas of lowest flood risk (Flood Zone 1 first, followed by Flood Zone 2). If it is not possible to locate all of the development within Flood Zone 1, then the most vulnerable elements of the development should be located in the lowest risk parts of the site. This could be included within Section 2.3.3 or within an additional specific sub-section under Section 3.6.</p> <p>Additionally, it is unclear if the site includes a small amount of Flood Zone 3b. Flood Zone 3b is land classed as the 'functional floodplain' and is land defined by LPA's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment's (SFRA) as having the highest probability of flooding. Please be aware that we will object in principle to any development that is deemed not compatible with Flood Zone 3b in line with tables 1, 2 and 3 of the Flood Zones and Flood Risk Tables of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). It would be useful to clarify the presence/absence of Flood Zone 3b on this site within the SPD</p>	<p>The majority of the allocated site (83.24%) is located within Flood Zone 2. 3.51% is located within Zone 1, with 13.25% in Flood Zone 3a. No part of the site is located within Flood Zone 3b.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
2.			<b>Site Context and Analysis</b>		
			<p>document, as part of Sections 2.3.3 and 5.1.1.</p> <p>We note and welcome that it has been specified within Section 9.0 that a Flood Risk Assessment and Surface Water Drainage Assessment will be required as a part of any future planning application. Please make sure this document is detailed, site-specific and uses the most up-to-date data available.</p> <p>Reducing and managing flood risk and requiring sustainable drainage measures in this area is a must-do and should be strongly reflected in this SPD. There should be a sentence within the SPD which requires all development to utilise the guidance within the existing SFRA to design layouts, mitigate and make space for water to help with the reduction of flood risk, preferably within a new sub-section dedicated to flood risk.</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Mr Graham Oxborrow (205)	3. Policy BISH8 Old River Lane	Object	Set out specific use requirements based on proper evidence and	Meeting with stakeholders and community representatives during the preparation of the draft SPD	No amendments in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>engagement with the residents of the town.</p> <p>Section 3 - The SPD should be specific on the Arts requirement, rather than providing loosely for leisure, which could be anything from a casino/nightclub to a bowling alley. There has been no significant support for the Council's idea of a 5-screen cinema on the site, as the supposed consultation was risible, addressing only theoretical attendance levels and types of seats rather than the principle of the case for the cinema against other alternatives. There has been no engagement between EHDC and the Arts community in Bishop's Stortford to identify how to address their needs.</p>	<p>ensured a better understanding of the key issues and aspirations that the community have for the Old River Lane site. The discussions that took place at the Steering Group meetings influenced both the scope and content of the SPD.</p> <p>Consultation on the SPD has provided the opportunity for residents of Bishop's Stortford to provide their comments on the SPD.</p> <p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			There is no supporting evidence on the amount of floorspace to be given to retail and commercial outlets and the potential impact this would have on retail and commercial provision elsewhere in the town.	<p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	
Mr Colin Woodward (358)	3. Policy BISH8 Old River Lane		The public should see evidence that recent built developments and also emerging retail trends are actually improving retail and that ORL would enhance this. On the ground observation would suggest that for some time retail spend has long been leaching from BS to other towns or, channels, and as such there is little to support independents or, the introduction of national brands aside from a possible TK Maxx at Jacksons Square. Despite any attempt to zone retail Stortford is switching to cafes, nail bars and hairdresser/barbers thus	It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			limiting its attraction as a thriving retail centre.		
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (62)	3.1 Introduction		The site should support 100 homes as stated in BISH8. The development should be sustainable taking into the account of experience gained from change in trends due to pandemics such as COVID. Any design of development should offer a community hub with doctors and dentist. There should also be opportunities for the building of homes to be 'built for life' and built to incorporate the aim of 'Designing Out Crime' is to reduce the vulnerability of people and property to crime by removing opportunities that may be provided inadvertently by the built environment. It also aims to reduce fear of crime and, in doing so, helps to improve people's quality of life.	<p>The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in District Plan Policy BISH8 for 'around 100 homes.'</p> <p>Homes should be provided in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU7 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) to ensure they are accessible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, and to support independent living.</p> <p>The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>The District Council supports the 'Secured by Design' initiative and as such will expect proposals at ORL to incorporate crime prevention measure in accordance Policy DES5 (Crime and Safety) of the District Plan.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Susan Swan (64)	3.1 Introduction		The use of the term 'leisure' is vague and misleading. The original plan for this area included an Arts centre. This should be referred to specifically in the document and should be defined as to include	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			concert halls and rehearsal space in addition to space for live performance.	design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Cross-party working group on ORL site (26)	3.1 Introduction		The whole of Section 3 is wafty and imprecise about land uses. No detail is given about possible appropriate or inappropriate uses. Amendment required: Provide a table of acceptable and unacceptable uses.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (120)	3.1 Introduction		This sets out the key District Plan policy on the future type of uses expected for ORL that the site will provide for around 100 new homes and the creation of a high-quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a civic hub of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace. The SPD supports a degree of flexibility around the precise mix of land use but requires justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to property market demand and opportunities. The following sections then briefly cover the retail, office, civic and community	Community and arts groups were represented on the Old River Steering Group and a GAP Analysis created by the Arts Forum has been submitted to the Council. With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.  Further consultation with the community will be undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application.	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			uses and housing needs of the area, but the SPD should provide broad guidance on the type of commercial and community uses and range of floorspace which is needed in each in each of these areas. I strongly support the policy principle of a civic hub of other commercial and community uses but does not believe that the justification for the uses should rely only on property market demand. The need for community uses such as the arts and culture, civic and other open spaces should be tested through public consultation and evidence from community and arts groups.		
Mr James Tatchell (33)	3.1 Introduction	Object	3.1.1 - This paragraph needs to be made more specific - "about 100" is not good enough and risks creep towards higher numbers. According to the Civic Federation, the suggestion is already 137 apartments and 90m senior living units - this needs to be dramatically reduced to a maximum of 120 in total if the "about 100" figure is to be respected.	Noted. The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in the District Plan (Policy BISH8), which states that 'the site will provide for a mixed-use development and around 100 new homes...'	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (246)	3.1 Introduction		The site should support 100 homes as stated in BISH8. The development should be sustainable taking into the account of experience gained from	The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in District Plan Policy BISH8 for 'around 100 homes.'	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			change in trends due to pandemics such as COVID. Any design of development should offer a community hub with doctors and dentist. There should also be opportunities for the building of homes to be 'built for life' and built to incorporate the aim of 'Designing Out Crime' is to reduce the vulnerability of people and property to crime by removing opportunities that may be provided inadvertently by the built environment. It also aims to reduce fear of crime and, in doing so, helps to improve people's quality of life.	<p>Homes should be provided in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU7 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) to ensure they are accessible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, and to support independent living.</p> <p>The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>The District Council supports the 'Secured by Design' initiative and as such will expect proposals at ORL to incorporate crime prevention measure in accordance Policy DES5 (Crime and Safety) of the District Plan.</p>	
Cllr Calvin Horner (162)	3.1 Introduction	Object	3.1.2 There is a lack of precision in this section, that is epitomized by the support given for a 'degree of flexibility'. There should be a clearer idea of those uses that would be acceptable on the site and the degree of flexibility. For example, it would be helpful for an indication on the extent to which development proposals could stretch the phrase 'around 100 homes', as there have instances of substantial increases	The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in District Plan Policy BISH8 for 'around 100 homes.'	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			over the indicated amounts elsewhere in Bishop's Stortford.		
Ms Jill Jones (221)	3.1 Introduction	Object	3.1.1 Object in that this was pushed forward as a cultural quarter - what has happened to this idea? There is no mention of it at all, and whilst in principle we do not object to mixed use and a civic hub, it is hard to get completely supportive of this without understanding where the cultural element has gone. Needs more clarity.	The SPD provides guidance on the requirements set out in Policy BISH8 of the District Plan. This sets out that around 100 homes will be provided on site, alongside the creation of a high-quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a 'civic hub' of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace. 'Culture' isn't specifically mentioned in BISH8.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Jill Jones	3.1 Introduction	Object	3.1.1 Object to proposed 100 dwellings without clarity on precisely how many and in what format. Previous proposals have suggested this will be for many more dwellings e.g., 160+ and tailored to elderly living, but this is now unclear. It is also unclear how any changes to residential dwellings needed post covid (e.g., mandatory outdoor space whether this be on a balcony or terrace) are covered, nor how the parking for visitors and for deliveries accommodated.	Noted. The SPD reflects the policy requirement set out in the District Plan (Policy BISH8), which states that 'the site will provide for a mixed-use development and around 100 new homes...'. Housing on Old River Lane is expected to be delivered in accordance with policies HOU1 (Type and Mix of Housing) and HOU3 (Affordable Housing) of the District Plan 2018. A mix of residential accommodation should be provided to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.  Section 7.3 of the SPD sets out principles for parking and servicing.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford	3.1 Introduction		3.1.1 - Policy BISH8 sets out that: the site will provide for around 100 new	Community and arts groups are represented on the Old River	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Civic Federation (405)			<p>homes; and that the Old River Lane masterplan will address the: creation of a high-quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a civic hub of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace. The SPD also supports a degree of flexibility around the precise mix of land use but requires: justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to property market demand and opportunities. BSCF strongly supports the policy principle of a civic hub of other commercial and community uses but does not believe that the justification for the uses should rely only on property market demand. The need for community uses such as the arts and culture, civic and other open spaces should be tested through public consultation and evidence from community and arts groups.</p> <p>The importance of around 100 homes is discussed elsewhere, as well as the other uses listed. The paras that follow need to therefore need to address these adequately and appropriately. For example, each of the sections on retail, office,</p>	<p>Steering Group and a GAP Analysis created by the Arts Forum has been submitted to the Council. Further consultation with the community will be undertaken prior to the submission of any planning application.</p> <p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			civic and community uses and housing needs should include evidence-based broad guidance on the type of commercial and community uses and range of floorspace and the number and type(s) of homes that each of them needs their respective importance/priority with respect to ORL being a place of destination vs a place for residence		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (15)	3.2 Retail	Object	<p>Comments: Retail - Section 3.2 gives no specific guidance on unit size parameters, on convenience or durables shopping, or physical servicing access. Para 4.2.1 says The Old River Lane development will bring forward notable substantial increase in retail floorspace which is anticipated to enhance the town's retail offer in addition to new leisure uses which could increase the town centre's attractiveness, not only in retaining trips within the town, but attracting trips in from surrounding areas that might otherwise travel to other towns. This bold statement is not reflected or explained in the guidance in 3.2 and 3.4.</p> <p>Amendments requested: The SPD needs to provide specific guidance on convenience shops, durables</p>	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability,</li> </ul>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			shops, eating and drinking. It should provide limits on unit sizes. It should exclude trade counters or retail warehouses.	including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.	
Mr Colin Arnott (121)	3.2 Retail		Section 3.2 I agree that any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs should be considered given the significant changes in the last 5-10 years as a result of catchment population growth, online shopping and changing reasons for visiting town centres. However, I believe the SPD itself should give clearer guidance on this particularly on the mix of types of shopping, food & beverage and other retail services required (see paper on Overview of Changing Town Centre Retail Needs and Opportunities submitted by BSCF). A full quantified retail demand update should be included at the masterplan stage on which the applicant's retail impact assessment can be based.	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	No amendment in response to these issues.
Carolyn Matthews (104) (88) (82)	3.2 Retail	Object	Provision of new homes - at least one parking space per household. This will exacerbate the ongoing problem of traffic congestion to the Linkside road.	The Council's 'Vehicle Parking Provision at New Development' Supplementary Planning Document sets out the number of spaces that should be provided in association	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			Policy BISH8 Old River Lane		
			<p>Height restriction of new builds to avoid the 'Brutalist' look of the Goods Yard development which is out of character and lost opportunity to enhance the built environment.</p> <p>GP surgery- poor location, unless there is parking access for those who cannot walk far e.g., elderly, unwell babies. GP surgeries should be</p>	<p>with any new development. However, on this site, given the high level of accessibility to public transport and facilities, there should be a significantly reduced amount of parking, including residential and other uses.</p> <p>The SPD states that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets.</p> <p>Section 7.6 (Heights, Massing, and Grain) of the SPD has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD is not prescriptive but sets out that health care facilities that complement the existing offer</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			provided on the new St James Park and Stortford field sites to better meet needs of local people.	across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.	
Mrs Marguerite Rapley (106)	3.2 Retail	Object	We don't need more shops. Landlords of many shop premises in Bishop's Stortford town centre have been unable to find tenants. Most have had to have change of use from retail to other services such as restaurants and coffee shops.	It is expected that the continued growth of Bishop's Stortford will boost existing retail and support the case for new retailers in the town. The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane will be proportionate and complementary to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Mione Goldspink (325)	3.2 Retail		3.2.2 Retail matters. Please stress that any new retail units should be complementary to the existing retail outlets in the Town. They should NOT be in competition with them. It would be a calamity and disaster if the new units on ORL were to take trade away from the existing units in South Street, North street, Jackson Square, Florence Walk and all the other little streets in the Town. Please add another sentence to 3.2.2 something like 'The new retail offer must NOT compete with the existing retail offer'.	Paragraph 3.2.2 already states that 'The scale of the retail offer on Old River Lane should be proportionate and <i>complementary</i> to ensure the continued vitality of Bishop's Stortford town centre.'	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Calvin Horner (163)	3.2 Retail		3.2.2. Retail proposals for ORL need to complement those of the town and an indication of what would be an acceptable mix of retail uses should be given by the Council within	Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, <i>inter alia</i> .	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			the SPD rather than left to the developers to provide evidence of what is 'proportionate and complementary'. 3.2.3 There have been major changes to demand for retail in the recent past and the way in which these have been assessed needs to be included in any development proposals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	
Mrs Jill Wade (257)	3.2 Retail		Para 3.2 recognises that any retail offer at ORL should complement and support the town's existing retail offer, although para 4.5 states that the development will bring a notable substantial increase in retail floorspace. I am concerned that a need for a substantial increase has not been demonstrated. As Jackson Square, has never been fully let, there must be a fresh analysis of demand for more retail space before the extent of any extra provision at ORL is decided. Given the continuing trend towards online shopping and the ever-increasing conversion of retail units to food outlets in the town, I am not convinced there is demand for additional retail space, particularly if this would encourage existing retailers to relocate to ORL, to the detriment of other parts of town.	<p>The SPD sets out that the Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to market demand and opportunities.</p> <p>Proposals should contribute towards a thriving and sustainable town centre; applicants must therefore consider any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Mrs Janet Reville (297)	3.2 Retail		Paragraph 3.2 The town has empty shops in Jackson Square, Riverside and the centre of town. There are also more being provided in the Goods Yard development. There is no need for even more. The town does not attract shoppers due to the appalling traffic problems together with the car parking charges which would only be acceptable if used to subsidise public transport in the town.	<p>The SPD sets out that the Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to market demand and opportunities.</p> <p>Proposals should contribute towards a thriving and sustainable town centre; applicants must therefore consider any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Jill Jones (222)	3.2 Retail	Object	3.2.1 Object as this needs much more clarity and some numbers. What is the p and I proposal for retail given the massive shift to online and changes in shopping habits? How will any mixed use generate income to cover costs and management of the site? Without a financial projection, just building retail is not specific enough. What sort of retailers? What sort of contractual obligations?	<p>The SPD sets out that the Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to market demand and opportunities.</p> <p>Proposals should contribute towards a thriving and sustainable town centre; applicants must therefore consider any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (406)	3.2 Retail		3.2 - Retail BSCF agrees that any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs should be considered given the significant	With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			changes in the last 5 -10 years as a result of catchment population growth, online shopping and changing reasons for visiting town centres. However, it believes the SPD itself should give clearer guidance on this particularly on the mix of types of shopping, food & beverage and other retail services required (see paper on Overview of Changing Town Centre Retail Needs and Opportunities submitted by BSCF). A full quantified retail demand update should be included at the masterplan stage on which the applicant's retail impact assessment can be based. The requirement for needs assessments for F&B and Leisure should be included in this section, not 3.4 (see also 3.4).	<p>the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (408)	3.2 Retail		3.2.4 - provision of mezzanine floors will be supported. Reason(s) and justification for this are needed, especially with respect to their effect on building heights and disabled access.	<p>A mezzanine floor can provide additional space without increasing building heights. However, it is acknowledged that a mezzanine floor may not always be appropriate. Amendment made to SPD to reflect this.</p> <p>When a mezzanine floor of any size is installed, Part M of the Building Regulations which concerns disabled access must be adhered to.</p>	<p>Add the words 'where appropriate' to paragraph 3.2.4.</p> <p>3.2.4 ... Units should be capable of amalgamation and, sub-division, and the provision of mezzanine floors will be supported <u>where appropriate</u>.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (22)	3.3 Office Floorspace		<p>Charringtons House is currently in office use. Para 3.9 of the SPD in this section seeks proposals for office floorspace which includes a range of units from large operators to single tenants, to more flexible co-working spaces. This is an accurate description of the existing Charringtons House building. To demolish it would be completely irrational. The existing office use and all potential alternative uses could take advantage of the existing high density of Charringtons House.</p> <p>Amendment requested: Add to paragraph 3.9 an explicit guidance that Charringtons House should remain in office use and be updated where necessary to meet future needs. In addition, state all the acceptable uses for Charringtons House over the long term, including healthcare, education, library, workspace, housing.</p>	<p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (122)	3.3 Office Floorspace		<p>Section 3.3 I agree that there is an opportunity to provide office space in the town particularly in more flexible co-working spaces which have wider local economic benefits and contribute to the vibrancy of town centres. The SPD should</p>	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			consider and update the recommendations of the 2013 Employment Study including the expected loss of an office business park at Bishop's Stortford South. This also provides a strong economic (as well as environmental) case for retaining and incorporating Charringtons House within ORL.	<p>the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>It is a requirement of Policy BISH8 to provide office floorspace. Any proposals should take account of the latest available evidence.</p>	
Carolyn Matthews (87)	3.3 Office Floorspace	Support	<p>Currently the main High Street has witnessed the recent closure of Trespass due to high rent. How is this going to be mitigated to encourage new retail uses?</p> <p>Leisure uses - need to look closely at use of current cinema. I recently attended a blockbuster and it was not even half full.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out that the Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to market demand and opportunities.</p> <p>Proposals should contribute towards a thriving and sustainable town centre; applicants must therefore consider any new retail evidence and changes in economic circumstances and their associated impact on retail floorspace needs.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.
Mr John Rhodes (190)	3.3 Office Floorspace		Charringtons House provides a significant amount of office space in an ideal central location. We believe that the building was refurbished in the early years of the present	Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.	Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Stewart Marshall (383)			<p>century and that it is fully occupied. Among the constraints listed in section 5 it is alleged that it is unsuitable for modern day needs. No evidence has been provided to support this assertion, and the space would have to be re-provided if the building were to be demolished. In section 3.3 it is claimed that a vacancy rate in 2020 of 2% implies that more office space is needed. Since then we have had the Covid pandemic, leading to a significant amount of home working which is likely to be a continuing feature of office employment in the future. Innovation House in London Road has never been fully occupied since its completion and is currently advertising units available of 3k to 6k square feet. The station goods yard site is also scheduled to receive an office block if access issues from the east side of town can be resolved. An up to date needs assessment of the demand for office space therefore should be undertaken. In the meantime, there should be no commitment to altering the current status of Charringtons House.</p>	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p>	<p><del>c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	3.3 Office Floorspace		Office Space demand: Charringtons House provides a significant amount of office space in a good location which BSCF understands is virtually fully occupied. Among the constraints listed in Chapter 5 though it is stated that the building is unsuitable for modern day needs, but with no evidence to support this. Section 3.3 says the tow's office vacancy rate in 2020 was 2%, which implies that more office space is needed. Also, since 2020, the Covid-19 pandemic, home-based working has substantially increased, and seems likely to remain, at least in part. The space lost by demolishing Charringtons House would therefore have to be re-provided either on ORL or elsewhere in the town. The SPD should therefore require an office-demand and availability assessment, preferably to be available before the start of masterplanning.	Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.  With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported.  This section seeks to highlight in ongoing requirement for office floorspace. The Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to property market demand and opportunities.	Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).  <del>e) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del>
Mrs Jill Wade (254)	3.3 Office Floorspace		I am concerned that, although not explicitly stated in the consultation, Charringtons House appears to be earmarked for demolition as being unsuitable to meet modern day needs (Section 5). As the premises	Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			appear to be currently occupied, this cannot be true. To demolish functioning office space is contrary to para 7.11, which says the development should maximise sustainability at every possible opportunity. Therefore, all existing buildings should be retained, refurbished and/or re-purposed to reduce the carbon footprint of the development. The SPD would need to make clear that any office space provided should be in addition to that existing at Charringtons House.	included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings (including new office space) of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	
Cllr Calvin Horner (164)	3.3 Office Floorspace		3.3.2 Whilst I agree with the assessment that more rather than less office space is required, this does question the rationale for demolition of Charringtons House, which will remove office space. Any proposals should therefore either retain Charringtons House or provide additional space for office purposes. In the case of the latter the issue of the release of embedded carbon involved in demolition should also be addressed.	Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings (including new office space) of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area. Applicants will also be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.	
Mrs Janet Reville (298)	3.3 Office Floorspace		Charringtons House should be retained rather than demolished and provide offices and possibly a medical centre which includes doctors, dentists and other health services. Also, spaces which can be hired for meetings, etc should be available.	Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	
Ms Jill Jones (223)	3.3 Office Floorspace	Object	3.3.2 object as it is unclear what would be a reasonable rate of office space given the well-documented shift to hybrid and/or remote working. Needs clarity and evidence. Also need to understand how the office space underneath the Northgate End MSCP impacts these calculations as this seems to be omitted? Is the vision for co-working space/council offices/community offices? What is the office space vision? Again, hard to be supportive when there is not enough detail.	This section seeks to highlight in ongoing requirement for office floorspace. The Council will require proposals to provide a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses in relation to property market demand and opportunities.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jenette Greenwood (313)	3.3 Office Floorspace	Object	What is the need to demolish Charringtons House? As with URC Hall, I am not at all convinced that what will replace it will deliver value for money to local taxpayers and the people that use the town. Why can't we do better with what we have already?	Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	
Lynne Garner (373)	3.3 Office Floorspace		Again, why rip down a perfectly good building (Charringtons House) to build new offices? Are offices even needed? Has a study taken place? Many small companies no longer want to be in town due to the rising costs for parking the council are imposing upon us. Also, it means more cars will come into the centre of town increasing the already high pollution levels in the area. It's not a sustainable option. So, reduce the costs by reusing what we have.	Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford	3.3 Office Floorspace		3.3.1 - In 2020, there was around 160 office properties in the Bishop's	With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Civic Federation (409)			Stortford market area. These data are from before lockdown. The SPD needs to commission an up-to-date study, even if it's only to assess the need for and benefits of office space and the type(s) of office space required. This needs to be available in time for the master-planning (The owners of the new office space at Wickham Hall report overdemand for places.)	<p>appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>It is a requirement of Policy BISH8 to provide office floorspace. Any proposals should take account of the latest available evidence.</p>	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (411)	3.3 Office Floorspace		3.3.5 - Proposals should also take into account the Town Wide Employment Study for Bishop's Stortford 2013 and any subsequent updates. This study is nearly 10 years old and working practices and arrangements have changed considerably during this period. SPD needs to commission an up-to-date study, even if it's only to assess the need for and benefits of office space and the type(s) of office space required. This needs to be available in time for the master-planning	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>It is a requirement of Policy BISH8 to provide office floorspace. Any proposals should take account of the latest available evidence.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (410)	3.3 Office Floorspace		3.3.3 BSCF agrees there is an opportunity to provide office space in the town particularly in more flexible co-working spaces ... which have wider local economic benefits and contribute to town centre's vibrancy. The SPD should consider	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			and update the recommendations of the 2013 Employment Study including the expected loss of an office business park at BISH5. This also provides a strong economic (as well as environmental) case for retaining Charringtons House even though the draft SPD says it should be demolished, though no justification is given.	<p>the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>It is a requirement of Policy BISH8 to provide office floorspace. Any proposals should take account of the latest available evidence.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	
Mrs Elizabeth	3.4 Civic, Community		I would like the United Reformed Church Hall to remain and be	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Deborah Munro (6)	and Leisure Uses		<p>refurbished by the Arts Forum to use a as Arts Venue. This would allow for more varied opportunities for use on the land. It would allow the public to have a community hub for arts.</p> <p>I would like to see open spaces for performances that would attract all age groups - maybe stepped seating surrounding 2 sides. I would like an open-air market with a roof to allow sellers to trade in autumn/winter months.</p> <p>I would like to see a medical centre we are very short of medical centres in the town centre - presently town-based centres are moving to the hospital.</p>	<p>If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>The SPD sets out that high quality new streets will be created, and public spaces will be provided in strategic locations alongside key frontages and buildings, including Coopers and along Bridge Street.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p>	
Cross-party working group on ORL site (13)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses	Object	<p>Section 3.4, Civic, community and leisure is completely vague. There is no reference to any specific uses suitable for this site, apart from 3.4.3 healthcare. There is no reference to the arts, culture, performance space, shared space or community use.</p> <p>Amendment requested: The SPD should state what civic, community and leisure uses the LPA wants to</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence</p>	<p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>explicitly support, as well as the possible location, size, function and access for each use. In particular it should be crystal clear about what arts and community uses / accommodation will be accepted / encouraged.</p> <p>There is no reference to a cinema. The absence of any reference to a cinema is welcome, as we challenged a cinema in our report: There is no express support in any of the adopted or emerging development plan policies for the development of a multi-screen cinema on the ORL site (page 9 of our report). Clearly this consultation omits consideration of a cinema. To write 'leisure' and not mention a cinema is obfuscation. Amendment requested: A cinema development is harder to support in a planning application due to its absence from the consultation draft. Add specific reference to arts spaces serving the existing arts activities in Stortford (choral, orchestral, comedy, drama, art and photography exhibitions, etc. Add enabling of arts activity in the suggested s106 subjects.</p>	<p>how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>Leisure is hazardedly vague. The SPD provides no planning guidance on leisure use. In property development, leisure includes nightclubs, casinos, ten pin bowling, escape rooms, etc, none of which are acceptable here. Leisure development also covers cinema, gyms, climbing centres, sports halls. If any of these are to be seen as acceptable they should be explicitly stated.</p> <p>Amendment requested: Explicitly state civic, community and leisure uses that would be acceptable (subject to size, location, operation), including arts performance space, library, learning centre, art and craft studios, children’s nursery, soft play, and Council services. Explicitly state civic, community and leisure uses that are not acceptable. This should include casino, nightclub, sports hall, escape rooms, amusement centre.</p> <p>Para 3.4.3 says: Health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at Old River Lane.</p>	<p>With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.</p> <p>This level of detail is not known. Further discussion will be required with health care providers to agree the best way of ensuring that there are appropriate local primary health</p>	



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>Amendment requested: The SPD should say what type and scale of health care this means in the light of access requirements.</p> <p>Para 3.4.4 says Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR7 (Loss of Community Facilities). This falls short of clear guidance. Amendment requested: State encouragement to repair and upgrade the hall into a flexible community, arts and market space. Encourage a new entrance on the east side to link directly with the ORL scheme.</p>	<p>care resources in place to cope with any demand.</p> <p>The inclusion of the URC Hall within the SPD red line boundary presents an opportunity for proposals to consider the future use of this community facility alongside the BISH8 site allocation, ensuring a comprehensive approach to development in this location. Detailed matters will be considered through the planning application process.</p>	
Mr Peter Lemer (9)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		<p>Para 3:12: I fully agree that there is a strong tradition of civic, community, and leisure activities in Bishop's Stortford. I want to see how these impact the town centre offer. I am especially concerned that any proposals are properly presented as structural and business plans. If any such plans fail to demonstrate profitability, I would want to know what they will cost the community in years to come.</p>	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (123)	3.4 Civic, Community		<p>Section 3.4 on civic, community and leisure uses confuses the needs for important but very different civic,</p>	<p>Chapter 3 reflects the requirements of Policy BISH8 rather than the Use Class Order. Reference to F&amp;B is</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
	and Leisure Uses		cultural, social and community and uses on the one hand and commercial uses such as leisure and food & beverage (F&B) on the other. F&B and Leisure are now grouped together as Class E Commercial, Business and Service uses together with shops and offices while civic and cultural uses and local community uses are now Class F1 and F2. Needs assessments for F&B and Leisure should be included with the section 3.2 retail assessments (see BSCF paper on changing town centre retail needs which includes consideration of F&B). The needs for appropriate civic, cultural and local community uses at ORL, including most arts uses, should be considered separately since they are usually non-revenue generating and/or in a mixed-use development - their facilities can be leveraged by the value created by commercial and housing development or by external capital funding sources such as the LEP.	included in Section 3.4 to reflect the clustering of uses around a key public space.	
Carolyn Matthews (92)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses	Support	Will be increasingly important if home working continues with the occasional need for shared office space. Perhaps opportunities for adult education /training facilities.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Mrs Marguerite Rapley (107)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.14 Will a new health care facility at ORL be affordable for a GP surgery?	The viability of any scheme would be considered at the planning application stage.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Chris Wilson (149)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.15 - This paragraph should include reference to the fact that the replacement of the URC Hall, if it is to be demolished, should only be sited in a central location in the town, or it is not a true replacement and does not conform to the policy cited. The leisure facilities should be specified. There have been endless meetings and consultations over a course of years with respect to what type of leisure facility was viable - to leave it vague as it is here is to give carte blanche to any developer to then build something that has not been discussed over these many years in various fora.	If the URC Hall is proposed for demolition, then CFLR8 requires proposals to demonstrate how the loss would be replaced by enhanced provision in terms of quantity and/or quality <u>in a suitable location</u> .  CFLR8 is provided in full in Section 2.4 and there is no need to repeat here.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (247)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		I would like the United Reformed Church Hall to remain and be refurbished by the Arts Forum to use as an Arts Venue. This would allow for more varied opportunities for use on the land. It would allow the public to have a community hub for arts.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>I would like to see open spaces for performances that would attract all age groups - stepped seating surrounding 2 sides I would like an open-air market with a roof to allow sellers to trade in autumn/winter months.</p> <p>I would like to see a medical centre we are very short of medical centres in the town centre presently town-based centres are moving to the hospital.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out that high quality new streets will be created, and public spaces will be provided in strategic locations alongside key frontages and buildings, including Coopers and along Bridge Street.</p> <p>Noted. The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p>	
Mr David Samuels (228)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses	Object	<p>We understand that the purpose of the SPD is to give site-specific guidance on how the scheme is to be planned and developed. It should clarify what land uses would be acceptable or unacceptable. It should set out the Masterplanning principles: the layout of paths, buildings, spaces, and road connection based on the constraints of site shape and adjoining land uses. We consider this document to be too vague and thus not fit for purpose. Its generalised terms could result in planning permissions which are subject to too few constraints. This document refers to civic, community and leisure uses but with no activities specified. The</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	<p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>Masterplanning diagram on page 70 simply shows a disconnected area marked leisure. There have been months of discussion about a theatre, cinema, arts centre, but there is no specific statement here about what accommodation for the arts, culture or community life is envisaged. To recap, Para 3.4 on page 35 provides guidance on civic, community and leisure uses, but makes no reference to any specific activity, no mention of the arts, no mention of cinema or performance space, and no reference to previous proposals and consultations. As originally proposed and widely welcomed within the community, an arts centre should be specifically encouraged in this guidance. This would ideally be a flexible arts space that can be used for performance, rehearsals, exhibitions, classes and meetings. There has been much talk about a five-screen cinema but there is no mention of it here. The absence of any reference to a cinema is welcome, as we do not believe having a third cinema is desirable, nor is there evidence that it would attract sufficient audience numbers to make it commercially viable. In</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>fact, a third cinema might prejudice the financial viability of the other two. In view of this, the SPD might explicitly preclude a cinema.</p> <p>The guidance should make it clear that the URC hall is a well-used community building and the guidance should strongly encourage its retention and updating. This useful building, as well as being part of the character of Water Lane and Old River Lane, provides flexible space for small and medium-sized cultural, leisure and theatrical events. There is evidence that its loss without replacement could be to the detriment of the community. Even if a replacement forms part of the eventual scheme, building works could take a lengthy period of time and we would urge that the current hall remain in use while any building work is ongoing. We are pleased to note that Par 8.23 on page 63 refers to an option of retaining this hall. Its retention has become all the more necessary following the budgetary changes which have prevented the proposed theatre from being included in the overall scheme.</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>The idea of converting Charringtons House for educational use is excellent. The profile and life of the town could be greatly enhanced by having a FE/skills college. It also has the potential for greatly increasing the footfall in the area. There is no sensible environmental or economic argument for Charringtons House to be demolished indeed, the very opposite. However, if it is decided that converting it for educational purposes is not feasible, it could continue as an office building or be converted for housing.</p> <p>Much more specific guidance is needed on the kind of housing and businesses under consideration. The plan envisages major retail development, but the diagram on page 70 refers only to mixed use. This could mean any combination of housing, office and/or ground floor businesses. This is far too vague.</p>	<p>The SPD does not include proposals for converting Charringtons House for educational use.</p> <p>Housing is expected to be delivered in accordance with policies HOU1 (Type and Mix of Housing) and HOU3 (Affordable Housing) of the District Plan 2018. A mix of residential accommodation should be provided to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			We are also concerned that any planned housing should fully accord with policies HOU3 and HOU7 as set out in District Plan 2018. More research and much more planning detail is needed at this stage.	As above. Any planning application would need to accord with the requirements of District Plan Policies HOU3 and HOU7.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cross-party working group on ORL site (155)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		Comments: The site currently contains offices for East Herts DC, and a public counter service which gives Stortford residents direct contact with staff. The cross-party group see this service as essential for the town and wants it to stay. Since Covid, the severely reduced counter service has remained one day per week only. We want to see the counter service increased again to be more accessible and helpful for residents. Amendments requested: We ask that the SPD notes the fact that the East Herts Council offices are an existing use on the site. We ask that Council offices and a public counter service is stated as a specific requirement in any new development. This could be in Charringtons House or in a new building.	The Council will continue to offer a face-to-face service in Bishop's Stortford, with specific details still to be agreed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Helen Lednor (234)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		Whilst I am pleased to see that proposals for ORL should seek to complement AND EXTEND THAT OFFER AS PART OF THAT	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>DEVELOPMENT, I am also disappointed not to see The Arts appearing specifically. The Arts need specialised facilities and there is no acknowledgement of that or their needs being considered in your planning stages. For example, were you to decide an outdoor amphitheatre a good idea for the flood zone 3 area because it would be resilient, complement the heritage aspects and also fit with the environment risks identified, then you would also need consider structures for off-loading large scenery delivery along with off-view cast and production areas.</p> <p>Consideration of how to include The Arts and its facility needs must happen at the planning and design stage. And inclusion of The Arts must not be confused by culture, community, or leisure: The Arts are about developing awe and wonder. Where is the awe and wonder in your plan? A tree-filled, picnic tabled outdoor amphitheatre would also be a fab place for office workers to go and have their lunch; residents to sit outside in; for parents to sit mid shopping trip and give their children a bit of freedom to play; for</p>	<p>could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			adolescents to gather in an open, well-used and well-lit public space rather than a dark park; it can be used for formal or informal play activities; it can be a gathering place for large scale town or public celebrations; its centre can form connecting walkways in different directions. Best of all, it could be designed so that flood, should it occur, wouldn't leave it permanently damaged. But the awe and wonder part happens when you sit in an amphitheatre and watch the sun rise, or you witness a piece of music that makes you cry or makes you dance with sheer joy or you experience a piece of theatre and it makes you think deeply and it changes you. That's the USP of The Arts. Because The Arts have not been identified or their cruciality in our daily lives understood, no vision has been put forward to embed their future development. Why not?		
Cllr Mione Goldspink (326)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.4.2 key public space. Please could more details be added to this section. I think that the development of ORL site offers a fantastic opportunity to do something really good for Bishop's Stortford. It would be marvellous if we could have a	This issue is expanded upon in paragraph 8.4.5, which states: "Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail	Expand paragraphs 3.4.2 and 7.7.1 as follows:  3.4.2 ... The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space, <u>which should be a welcoming and adaptable</u>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			Public Square of which we could all be proud. This Square needs to be much bigger than the present Market Square - it needs to be big enough for several hundreds of people to congregate, and to be beautifully landscaped. Please strengthen this section. It is also mentioned on page 60, section 7.7.1 strengthen these also.	opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area." Paragraph 3.4.2 and paragraph 7.7.1 will be expanded to further set out expectations.	<u>space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to provide it with a memorable character.</u>  7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility</u>
Mrs Jill Wade (253)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		Civic Hub I had understood that a significant purpose of re-developing this site was to achieve an Arts Centre. Initially this was to have provided a larger theatre but, due to funding issues, a cinema complex was proposed. I am therefore wholly confused that I can find no mention of this cinema complex in the consultation (3.4). Policy BISH8 calls for a civic hub including a GP surgery and B1 office floorspace. There is no mention of any Arts Centre so it would seem its inclusion would be	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>contrary to that policy of the District Plan.</p> <p>Earlier suggestions of including the Library and even Police Station would seem to fit within the terms of this policy, although I would not support such moves as their current facilities seem adequate for their needs. I would support the inclusion of a Job Centre in this civic hub. It is incomprehensible that the unemployed are expected to travel to Hertford on a regular basis for appointments, particularly when getting there is so difficult, time-consuming and is an unwanted cost for people on benefits.</p> <p>I support the inclusion of a new GP surgery as a good way of encouraging footfall (3.14).</p> <p>Another useful facility that would encourage people to the ORL site would be a children's soft play centre, which is no longer provided elsewhere in the town. In any event, given that the town already has a cinema complex, I cannot see the logic behind adding a competing</p>	<p>section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The SPD states that health care facilities that complement the existing offer across the town will be looked on favourably at ORL.</p> <p>Noted. The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			screening facility nor understand who would operate it. I would therefore object to the inclusion of any reference to a cinema complex in the SPD.	indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Ms Jill Jones (215)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses	Support	3.4.3 Support the proposal for Health Care facilities especially GP or other clinical provision, as this appears to be getting to an overloaded state in the town.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Deirdre Glasgow (271)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		4. Health Care Facilities mentioned in the plan sounds like a positive idea if it means a doctor/health facilities, however, during the developing of ORL when this idea was raised, the issue of was lack of NHS funding for staffing was the challenge not the cost of the building itself. Changes: To clarify what is meant by health facilities and confirm if there is funding for a health centre building that can house Health Facilities as part of the development and the NHS will fund the staffing of the centre.	BISH8 sets out that an appropriate community use could be a GP Surgery. The SPD repeats this. Further discussion will be required with health care providers to agree the best way of ensuring that there are appropriate local primary health care resources in place to cope with increased demand.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jenette Greenwood (314)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.4 Is the proposed GP surgery new, or simply a relocation of an existing surgery? The town has expanded hugely but the infrastructure hasn't. I find it very difficult to get through to	It is currently anticipated that this would be a new facility.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			my surgery, we need more doctors that are easy to access.		
Angela Marshall (282)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		I would welcome more GP provision in town, some kind of further education resource, an Arts Centre, a children's soft play centre - there is a long list, but I realise these things depend available funding.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Woodward (359)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.4 It is encouraging that co-working space is mentioned as Launchpad seems to have been a successful EHC venture.  So far there is insufficient substance in the SPD that ORL will compliment and extend civic, community and leisure activities with the library removed from proposals, the potential loss of adequate and appropriate in door performing arts space with the demolition of the URC Hall.	Noted.  The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (413)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.4.4 - Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR7 (Loss of Community Facilities). CFLR8 is the relevant policy, not CFLR7.	Agreed, correction made.	Change the policy reference from CFLR7 to CFLR8 at paragraphs 2.4.3 and 3.4.4.  2.4.3 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR <del>7</del> 8 (Loss of Community Facilities):

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
					3.4.4 ... Proposals that will result in the loss of the URC Hall will need to address the requirements of Policy CFLR78 (Loss of Community Facilities).
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (412)	3.4 Civic, Community and Leisure Uses		3.4 - Civic, Community and Leisure Uses. This section confuses the needs for important but very different civic, cultural, social and community uses on the one hand and commercial uses such as leisure and food & beverage (F&B) on the other. The Planning Use Classes Order (2021) now groups F&B and Leisure together as Class E Commercial, Business and Service uses together with shops and offices. Civic, cultural and local community uses are now Classes F1 and F2. The civic, cultural and local community uses/needs at ORL, including most arts uses, should be considered separately from funding other parts of the whole development, since they are usually non-revenue generating and/or in a mixed-use development funding the facilities they need can be leveraged by the value created by commercial and housing development or by external capital funding sources such as the LEP. The section also mentions: the strong tradition of civic, community,	Chapter 3 reflects the requirements of Policy BISH8 rather than the Use Class Order. Reference to F&B is included in Section 3.4 to reflect the clustering of uses around a key public space.  With ever shifting market trends and dynamics, it would not be appropriate for the SPD to be overly prescriptive, as such a flexible approach is supported, as long as a clear narrative and justification for the proposed mix of uses is provided.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>and leisure activities in Bishop's Stortford which continue to have a positive impact on the town centre but then fails to provide details against which to assess the scale of their impact, and what the effect of moving them to another place in the town would be, if they are able to move. This assessment needs to be specified in the SPD, to be available for the master planning.</p> <p>Chapter 2 discusses the area's history, but there is no discussion of its influence on this section, both on the site and the adjacent areas. This needs to be part of this section or referenced.</p> <p>The demand for and feasibility of 16-19 years and vocational teaching and training should also be assessed, probably established in a repurposed Charringtons House. The courses offered should complement those available at Harlow and Stansted Airport colleges and other local learning institutions</p>	<p>Chapter 3, like the rest of the document, is influenced by the contextual information in Chapter 2. It should also be noted that Section 7.7, for example, directly references the connection of history to public art and the public realm.</p> <p>Education is a use that could be accommodated on the Old River Lane site; however, relevant providers have not approached the Council to discuss this.</p>	
Cross-party working	3.5 Housing	Object	Housing size mix and the market need Section 3.5 defers to existing policy with no additional guidance. It	In accordance with District Plan Policy HOU1 (Type and Mix of Housing), an appropriate mix of	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
group on ORL site (14)			<p>seeks an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups. There is no reference to specific needs household sizes, older people, extra care, sheltered housing.</p> <p>Amendment requested: While limited by existing policy, use the SPD to encourage desirable housing outcomes: homes affordable for local key workers; homes for households on the waiting list who do not drive; homes designed for business / workspace, lifelong homes, wheelchair homes, extra care, etc.</p>	<p>housing tenures, types and sizes will be expected to create mixed and balanced communities appropriate to local character and taking account of the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment and any additional up-to-date evidence, including local demographic context and trends; local housing need and demand; and site issues and design considerations.</p> <p>Homes should be provided in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU7 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) to ensure they are accessible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, and to support independent living.</p> <p>Adult Care Services officers have been engaging with the Council to agree the inclusion of some extra care housing on the Old River Lane site</p>	
Mrs Susan Swan (63)	3.5 Housing		The loss of the URC Hall will be detrimental to the character of this area. It has been a key building in the area.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	
Mr Colin Arnott (124)	3.5 Housing		(Section 3.5) On housing development, Policy BISH8 is clear that the site will provide for around 100 new homes. This may be a little higher or lower than 100 and should include any provision for homes for all age groups such as care home or similar provision. These allocations were made in the current District Plan's Housing Needs Assessment but have consistently been exceeded in developer's applications in Bishop's Stortford. The SPD should be clearer that housing development should be kept strictly within these limits since it makes little or no contribution to the vision for ORL as a vibrant town centre destination.	District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement. The actual number of houses delivered on site will be agreed through the planning application process. The policy wording in the District Plan does allow some flexibility for proposals to slightly exceed the identified capacity.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Miss Leigh Corleone (39)	3.5 Housing	Support	We need affordable family homes (under £1000 rent a month) that are available to rent through HA and not private or to buy More 4 bed properties are needed to accommodate larger families that are on low income and cannot afford to rent privately If more 4 bed properties were available this would free up more 3 bed properties As EHC should know on the home options there are many families that	Noted. Affordable Housing will be required in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU3 (Affordable Housing).	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			require 4 bed properties whom have been waiting many years on list waiting list		
Mrs Sarah Ashton (44)	3.5 Housing	Support	Require M2 and M3 in planning decisions (by condition). Provide C2 (including affordable C2) in sustainable locations.	Homes should be provided in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU7 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) to ensure they are accessible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, and to support independent living.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (111)	3.5 Housing		The developer should be required to ensure in their design of the mix use on site EHDC Policy EQ2.	A Noise Impact Assessment will be required to support any planning application.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Murray White (154)	3.5 Housing	Object	States "The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space.", presumably referring to a Town Square with F&B outlets around, the absence of which has been noted in Neighbourhood Plans to date as contributing to the lack of community cohesion. However, for such a critical facility, there is no clarity in this document about what exactly the "key public space will be, how big it should be or where it will go. Given the vagueness of this document generally and the failure to provide such a facility in the past there is every likelihood it will	The SPD sets out that 'Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area.'	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			disappear from the final reality. As a very minimum it should describe the public space as "an open pedestrian only area without permanent buildings containing suitable public realm features such as trees and seating, with a broadly rectangular shape of no less than 1000 sq metres and no side less than 20 metres long". For reference: Parliament Square in Hertford, a far from ideal example, because of its irregular shape, in a smaller town is a little more than 1000 sq. metres. Given that almost every picture gallery presented with this document shows such a public space, as I have described, it seems a very serious omission from this document at this stage.		
Carolyn Matthews (93)	3.5 Housing	Object	Health care facilities as previously stated access without nearby parking would contradict the vision of a car free area. Would an unwell person whether elderly or a parent struggling with a child want to be walking through a new public space / vibrant new area of the town.	Policy BISH8 requires parking to be provided sufficient to meet the needs of the used proposed. Section 7.3 of the SPD provides further details.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Parsonage Residents Association (248)	3.5 Housing		The developer should be required to ensure in their design of the mix use on site EHDC Policy EQ2.	A Noise Impact Assessment will be required to support any planning application.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			The development should include homes for local people and EHDC must create a policy to ensure local young people can access housing in the town centre.	The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.	
Cllr Calvin Horner (158)	3.5 Housing	Object	3.5.1 This section does not provide any indication of the types of housing that would be favoured in a planning proposal, especially as ORL being a location close to services and the town centre has great advantages for those who lack the means to travel, either because of low income or disability.	The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups. Homes should be provided in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU7 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) to ensure they are accessible and adaptable to meet the changing needs of occupants, and to support independent living.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Jill Wade (259)	3.5 Housing		Housing Section 2.5 should include reference to the amount and type of housing provision at other sites.  Section 4 (Transport) refers to 4500 new homes, which is likely to be out-of-date and substantially underestimated due to other developments being allowed to go over their originally proposed	These sites are referenced to ensure that development at Old River Lane complements and contributes to the town-wide development framework which means not just relating with the existing town centre, but also with planned future developments. The section isn't intended to provide full details about these sites.  Paragraph 4.1.1. will be updated to reflect the District Plan requirement, and also to state that this is a minimum figure for clarity.	No amendment in response to this issue.  Update Paragraph 4.4.1 as follows:  4.1.1 Bishop's Stortford is undergoing significant levels of growth with <del>approaching at least 4,426</del> 4,500 new homes planned in the District

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>numbers. This figure should be re-calculated.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.2 seeks to allow flexibility which will no doubt allow for the revision upwards of the number of homes on the site. I cannot support flexibility for this purpose or any greater provision than the 100 earmarked in Bish8 (despite its reference to around 100).</p> <p>I do not believe this site is suitable for residential development (although it could be appropriate for homes for the elderly, particularly if a GP surgery is included on the site).</p> <p>I object to any proposal to concentrate residential development on parts of the site where it would result in the general public being deprived of the best views, e.g. of Castle Mound. All buildings with views onto the park should be publicly accessible.</p>	<p>District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that ‘around 100 new homes’ will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.</p> <p>Noted. However, this is a policy requirement of the District Plan. A mix of residential accommodation will be provided to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.</p> <p>The SPD makes it clear that the heights and massing of any development proposal at Old River Lane should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site, with consideration given to the impact of any proposal on heritage assets. Section 7.6 has however been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council’s expectations.</p>	<p>Plan 2018 (including committed development) by 2033, which will substantially increase the town’s population.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add the following sentence to paragraph 7.6.3:</p> <p><u>7.6.3 ... Building heights, massing, and grain should relate well to the adjacent built form, green infrastructure and streetscenes surrounding the site. Building heights should be broadly reflective of the predominant building heights of Bishop’s Stortford town</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
					<u>centre, whilst allowing for the retention of views and with careful consideration for how the built form proposed will relate to the public spaces being created.</u>
Mrs Janet Reville (299)	3.5 Housing		Paragraph 3.5 - Any new housing should be for the over 60's. The area is not suitable for families who need houses rather than flats. We have too many buy to let flats in the town already being bought by people/ businesses from out of town.	Noted. However, the SPD reflects the District Plan policy requirement which is to provide for a mix of residential accommodation in order to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jenette Greenwood (316)	3.5 Housing		3.23/7.15 Where new houses are built, there should definitely be a requirement for the developer to include renewable energy/zero-carbon technology such as solar panels or ground source heating or whatever is deemed most appropriate to lower the carbon footprint of our town. And for a high % to be affordable for people wanting to get on the housing ladder.	Agreed. A key objective of the SPD is to deliver a place that is increasingly resilient, with climate change with environmental sustainability embedded throughout. Section 7.4. of the SPD deals specifically with Sustainability and Energy Efficiency.  There is a policy requirement for up to 40% of the new homes to be affordable.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Deirdre Glasgow (272)	3.5 Housing		Positive to see that there is a diverse spectrum of uses proposed however, issues have been raised concerning noise pollution from a night-time economy in what will be mainly a residential area.	A Noise Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			To indicate what options will be available for children to get to school, particularly if the nearest Primary schools to ORL are full and families have to travel a distance to get to their schools. If driving is involved then there will be more congestion.	The County Council's 'Home to School Transport Policy' is available to view here: <a href="https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/media-library/documents/schools-and-education/admissions/transport-policies-and-documents/home-to-school-transport-policy-2022-2023.pdf">https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/media-library/documents/schools-and-education/admissions/transport-policies-and-documents/home-to-school-transport-policy-2022-2023.pdf</a>	
Angela Marshall (278)	3.5 Housing		I think it is a pity that so much housing needs to be included on this site. It is so central to the town that it should be kept for community use. Looking at the plans, 2/3 of the site is for housing should people live on a site which will be noisy, both from traffic and the night-time use which is planned? Also, the air quality there could not be good with so much traffic using the Link Road and the stop-start effect of the new traffic lights.	District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jenette Greenwood (315)	3.5 Housing		3.5 I'm not against building more houses per se, but there are so many housing developments in the town and the infrastructure is not there - the roads are jammed, the doctors and dentists overwhelmed, schools oversubscribed, the bus service is patchy, cycling and walking routes not complete. We can't keep building	District Plan Policy BISH8 sets out that 'around 100 new homes' will be provided. The SPD repeats this policy requirement. Planning obligations will be sought to mitigate the impact of the proposals on the local community and infrastructure.	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			houses without addressing these issues.		
Mr Colin Woodward (360)	3.5 Housing		3.5 Housing, how will local people be prioritised if indeed that is even permissible? Stortford is relatively cheap to those inwardly migrating from London and the south which has a housing shortfall, but too expensive to retain its own locally born and bred.	The Council maintains a Housing Register for people wanting access to affordable rented housing provided by registered providers operating in the district.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Hertfordshire County Council (352)	3.5 Housing		Adult Care Services officers have been engaging with (EHDC) and City Heart to agree the inclusion of some extra care housing on the Old River Lane site, which is welcomed. HCC therefore support the reference to the need for extra care housing within the Old River Lane site at paragraphs 3.5.1 and 3.5.2. HCC ACS look forward to continuing engagement.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Lynne Garner (372)	3.5 Housing		Yes, new homes are needed but surely build for those who need to be near the amenities that are there within walking distance. Namely the elderly and young families. This again will be more sustainable by reducing the number of cars which need to come into the town for those who can't walk from the estates dotted around the town.	The SPD requires a mix of residential accommodation to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (414)	3.5 Housing		As part of achieving East Herts District's allocated housing number the current District Plan allocates around housing numbers to the various development sites. However, to date, developers in Bishop's Stortford have consistently applied for more than the allocated numbers. In this respect Policy BISH8.II says: The site will provide for around 100 new homes between 2022 and 2027. The SPD should be clearer that all housing of whatever kind that is developed on the site should be kept strictly within this limit, especially as it makes little or no contribution to the vision for ORL as a [vibrant] town centre destination. Care home facilities should particularly be ruled out because they make no contribution to the destination element of the development and they have additional support, service and on-site parking demands for such things as catering, housekeeping and emergency vehicles.	Noted. However, the SPD reflects the District Plan policy requirement which is to provide for a mix of residential accommodation in order to create an inclusive community by providing homes for all age groups.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mrs Susan Swan (65)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements	Support	It is vital that the development includes genuinely affordable homes. Bishop's Stortford is an area of increasing house prices and young	Agreed. Affordable Housing will be required in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU3 (Affordable Housing).	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			people cannot get on the property ladder.		
Carolyn Matthews (94)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements	Support	Who is going to oversee that best practice in design and construction is adhered to? Again, the concept of 'embodied carbon' (recognised by The Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors RICS) in the construction process is paramount. Solar panels to provide lighting and air conditioning in both private and public areas would help to reduce the wider carbon footprint.	<p>The Council's Sustainability SPD notes that consideration of embodied carbon is likely to become increasingly important as society transitions to a low/zero carbon society. The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible, and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.'</p> <p>The ORL SPD also requires that proposals incorporate high quality, innovative design, new technologies and construction techniques, including low carbon energy and water efficient design and sustainable construction methods.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Chris Wilson (150)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements	Support	I agree that this development has to take account of the AQMA area and promote sustainable transport. The problem is, as with many developments in Stortford, there is no joined-up thinking. You have cycle routes and paths that just cater for the few hundred yards within the development.	<p>Paragraph 7.2.6 recognises the need to improve cycling connections, wayfinding and legibility from the site to the surrounding area.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that S106 funds could be used to help fund the wider cycle network provided that proposals meet the relevant tests:</p>	<p>Add the following text to the bullet points in the Indicative Planning Obligations Schedule after paragraph 8.5.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian <u>and cycling network</u> improvements</li> <li>• Improved pedestrian <u>and cycling</u> connectivity particularly east-west and north-south and with surrounding green spaces</li> </ul>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			S106 money should be used to help fund cycle routes that go into the town from different areas so that we have a network. This should be added into this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms</li> <li>directly related to the development, and</li> <li>fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, reference to cycle network improvements will be added to the indicative Planning Obligations Schedule in Chapter 8.5 Delivery and Phasing.</p>	
Mark Doran (139)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements	Object	I support the proposal that Hockerill AQMA should not be adversely affected. However, I would go further and require that air quality in the immediate area including down to the junctions with Rye St and North St should not be adversely affected. To help achieve net zero, any proposals should take account of embodied carbon in existing buildings. Any new buildings should be built to the highest standards for insulation (e.g. passive house) and also be net zero in operation with renewable energy generated on-site (e.g. solar and heat pumps etc).	<p>Given the designation, it is relevant that the SPD specifically refers to the Hockerill AQMA.</p> <p>However, section 3.6 also refers to the wider policy framework (the District Plan Policy EQ4 and the Sustainability SPD), which require that the impact of new development on local air quality be assessed. District Plan Policy EQ4 expects development to minimise air quality impact and include measures to avoid any negative impacts. The Sustainability SPD (2021) provides further guidance to manage and prevent deterioration of air quality and to ensure new</p>	<p>Insert the following text into the end of paragraph 3.6.3:</p> <p><u>The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan Policy TP2 (Improving Air Quality) expects developments to comply with the District Plan Policy EQ4, whilst taking into account policies 19 and 20 of the Local Transport Plan 4 and the guidance in the Sustainability SPD.</u></p> <p>Insert the following paragraph after paragraph 3.6.5:</p> <p><u>3.6.6 At the planning application stage, the development will need to demonstrate how air quality impact has been addressed by submitting the</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>	<p>development is 'air quality neutral', or where possible, improves air quality. The Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan Policy TR2 requires that applications comply with District Plan Policy EQ4, LTP4 and the Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>Applications for ORL will be required to submit the Sustainability Checklist (including the air quality section) and an Air Quality Impact Assessment (which includes an air quality neutral assessment). Details of the assessments are included in the Council's validation checklist and the Sustainability SPD. The Council's Environmental Health team will advise on air quality considerations at the application stage.</p> <p>Additional text will be added in section 3.6 to outline the requirement for assessments and to reference Neighbourhood Plan Policy TP2.</p>	<p><u>Sustainability Checklist and an Air Quality Impact Assessment (which includes an Air Quality Neutral Assessment). More detailed advice is set out in section 6 of the Sustainability SPD (2021).</u></p> <p>For consistency the planning application requirements listed in the box following paragraph 9.1.2 should be amended as follows so that terminology reflects the Council's validation checklist:</p> <p>Air Quality <u>Impact</u> Assessment</p>
Bishop's Stortford Climate Group (306)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		Policy requirements set out in Section 3 are extremely limited and do not pave the way for exemplary development of the Council's own site by its contracted developer. On Air Quality the policy discussion	The policy framework requires that the impact of a development on local air quality is assessed. Policy EQ4 expects development to minimise air quality impact and include measures to avoid any negative impacts.	<p>See additional text about air quality added to section 3.6, as referenced in response to comment 139.</p> <p>Amend the heading 3.6 as follows:</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			<p>references existing policy and the need to consider any impact on the Hockerill AQMA. We agree but would suggest the policies should also specifically require air quality measurement at locations closer to the site, including the Rye Street/Hadham Road junction and on Link Road.</p> <p>Sustainability and Climate Change are not referenced at all in Section 3, except in relation to Air Quality. In Constraints and Opportunities, the reference in Land Use to promote sustainability in its widest sense is meaningless without detail. The recent excessive heat has shown how crucial it is that urban design and building design take into account the need for shade and air circulation to minimise the risks from excessive heat. Exemplary performance in this regard also requires the Council to make a commitment to it and the developer to propose designs which go beyond Building Regulations.</p> <p>We recognise that climate change and environmental sustainability are given a key part in the Objectives in</p>	<p>The Sustainability SPD (2021) provides further guidance to manage and prevent deterioration of air quality and to ensure new development is 'air quality neutral', or where possible, improves air quality.</p> <p>Applications for ORL will be required to submit an air Quality Impact Assessment (which includes an air quality neutral assessment) as set out in the Sustainability SPD (2021).</p> <p>Air quality is specifically referenced in this section 'Policy BISH8 Old River Lane' because it relates to District Plan Policy BISH8, which refers to the need to avoid further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).</p> <p>It is agreed that climate change and environmental sustainability are a key consideration. However, to avoid repetition, it is not necessary for this section to repeat all the sustainability requirements. The SPD should be viewed in its entirety and sustainability is addressed in Section 7.4. Likewise, other policy considerations relevant to the site,</p>	<p><del>3.6 Other Policy Requirements Air Quality</del></p> <p>Delete the sub-heading <del>Air Quality</del>.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			Section 6. But Section 3 also needs amending to take into account the key importance of specific policies on sustainability and Climate Change (mitigation and adaptation). We would expect as a minimum, statements of the importance of design securing space and buildings adapted to future climate change; and the commitment to zero carbon on the development, in line with the Council's Climate Change motion.	<p>such as heritage, design and transport are outlined in other sections of the SPD.</p> <p>However, the 'Other Policy Considerations' heading is misleading as it implies all other policy considerations for the site will be listed. It should be replaced with 'Air Quality'.</p>	
Cllr Calvin Horner (166)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		<p>3.6.1 I welcome the emphasis on air quality at Hockerill AQMA and the impact any proposals for ORL will have at that site. However, the SPD should require any proposals to address air quality at other locations near the site such as Northgate End junction and around the multi-storey car park in addition to Hockerill, with similar requirements for mitigation.</p> <p>3.6.4 I also welcome the reference to cycling and walking provision, but proposals for ORL need to be developed in such a way as to contribute to improved active travel routes across Bishop's Stortford.</p>	<p>The proposal will need to address wider impacts on air quality (beyond the AQMA) as this is required by District Plan Policy EQ4 and the Sustainability SPD (2021). Paragraphs 3.6.2- 3.6.5 of the SPD set out the policy context and the need to prevent a negative impact on air quality in the local area. However, for clarity additional text has been added to explain how the proposal will need to demonstrate how the impact of the development on air quality has been addressed via the Sustainability Assessment and the Air Quality Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The SPD includes a number of interventions and projects set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area</p>	See additional text about air quality added to section 3.6, as referenced in response to comment 139.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				Growth and Transport Plan. These seek to improve the highway network, encourage modal shift, and prioritise active travel.	
Ms Jill Jones (216)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements	Support	3.6.1 Support the need for air quality with a positive impact. However, as the town expands, more monitoring should be done for example at Northgate End as well as at Hockerill (c.f. past reports on NO2 etc)	<p>Noted. The Council has a duty to monitor the air quality across East Herts and any area not meeting National Air Quality Standards is declared as an Air Quality Monitoring Area (AQMA).</p> <p>The Council monitor around 38 locations throughout the district, many of which are outside the AQMAs. The junction at Northgate End can be added to the list when the diffusion tube locations are next reviewed.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Deirdre Glasgow (273)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		<p>6. Air Quality With more cars driving to and from Northgate End car park on Link Road, carefully consideration needs to take place to ensure that there are safer walking and cycling routes and public transport, from the outskirts of the town to the town centre.</p> <p>Well-lit and safer routes to enable people to walking/cycling or use public transport, from within the town and outer areas, to take advantage of the ORL and town</p>	<p>The shift to more sustainable modes of transport is a key aspiration of the SPD. The objective is to encourage pedestrian movement over private vehicles. Paragraphs 7.2.5 and 7.2.6 identify design principles to enhance the experience of the pedestrian and cyclist, both within and through the Old River Lane site.</p> <p>S106 funds could be used to help fund wider network improvements provided that proposals meet the relevant tests:</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
			facilities, thus helping to boost the daytime and night time economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms</li> <li>directly related to the development, and</li> <li>fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development</li> </ul> <p>Reference to pedestrian improvements and public transport contributions are outlined in the indicative Planning Obligations Schedule in Chapter 8.5 Delivery and Phasing. As set out in response to comment 150 reference to cycle network improvements will be added.</p>	
Mr Colin Woodward (361)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		3.6 Air Quality - an aspiration not backed by any action by EHC/HCC at Hockerill other than and a few EV charging points for the few who own one and monitoring a now historically small area vs real time regular congestion beyond the AQMA.	<p>The Council has acted to address air quality by introducing requirements in District Plan Policy EQ4 and guidance in the Sustainability SPD (2021) and this SPD, that expect developments to assess air quality and introduce a range of measures to ensure it does not lead to a further deterioration of existing poor air quality, and, where possible, improves local air quality.</p> <p>There is an action plan for Hockerill AQMA: <a href="https://cdn-">https://cdn-</a></p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
3.			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				<p><a href="http://eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/East_Herts_Air_Quality_Action_Plan_2017-18_-_2019-20_3_final.pdf">eastherts.onwebcurl.com/s3fs-public/documents/East_Herts_Air_Quality_Action_Plan_2017-18 - 2019-20_3_final.pdf</a>. A new action plan is currently being prepared, which will update measures to address air quality in the AQMA.</p> <p>The Council monitors air quality in around 38 locations around the district, many of which are outside AQMAs.</p>	
Lynne Garner (375)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		(3.6 7.15) This is the chance to do something different and build something which is sustainable and will help reduce the negative impact of any new development. High quality builds (not the cheap builds that have been thrown up around the town) which include living walls (helps to reduce the pollution and filters CO2), solar panels (to help reduce our dependency on fossil fuels), water saving toilets etc. (to keep our water consumption down and perhaps even help save our local chalk streams), green roofs (again to soak up CO2 and support local insect populations).	<p>Agreed. Proposals for Old River Lane should seek to provide a development that maximises sustainability at every possible opportunity.</p> <p>Applicants will be required to submit a Sustainability Checklist which address the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy and carbon reduction</li> <li>• Climate change adaptation</li> <li>• Water efficiency</li> <li>• Air quality and light pollution</li> <li>• Biodiversity</li> <li>• Sustainable transport</li> <li>• Waste management</li> </ul> <p>The checklist should demonstrate how the development complies with District Plan policies that seek to</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>3.</b>			<b>Policy BISH8 Old River Lane</b>		
				improve the environmental sustainability of new development and the sustainable design and construction guidance set out in the Council's Sustainability SPD.	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (415)	3.6 Other Policy Requirements		3.6.1 - Proposals at Old River Lane must not worsen the pollutant levels within the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The SPD should specify maximum AQ targets for Hockerill AQMA so the masterplanning can propose measures for the ORL to contribute effectively to achieving them.	The Council's overarching aim for all development to be 'air quality neutral' in operation, not to lead to further deterioration of existing poor air quality, and, where possible, to improve local air quality ('air quality positive') through additional measures on and off site. The Council's Sustainability SPD (Section 6.1.2.2) sets out recommended minimum standards that apply to all new development.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
Mr John Rhodes (194)  Stewart Marshall (383)	4. Transport		We have a number of concerns about the transport implications, and it may well be that the SPD may need to be revised once a proper transport assessment has been carried out. We see the main issues as being the following:	Noted.	-

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>Section 4 of the SPD notes that approaching 4500 new homes were approved for Bishop's Stortford in the District Plan. This figure is hopelessly out of date, Planning permissions already granted and applications in the pipeline, suggest that the total is likely to well in excess of 5000 dwellings. Any transport assessment therefore needs to be based on the housing total realistically to be expected, rather than the Plan figure. We hope incidentally that, as the developer itself, EHDC will respect the Plan figure of around 100 as the total for the residential component of ORL.</p> <p>Among the constraints identified is the need to replace around 170 Waitrose parking spaces. This is about half the total size of the Waitrose car park and no explanation has been provided as to why so many will be relocated. The illustrative layouts in the SPD show a much smaller loss of parking spaces.</p>	<p>Agreed. Paragraph 4.1.1. will be updated to reflect the District Plan requirement and will state that this is a minimum figure for clarity.</p> <p>Waitrose currently have 166 car parking spaces under the EHDC lease. As such the constraint is reasonable as it notes that the reprovision of those spaces forms a key consideration for any development on the site. As noted, the layouts in the SPD are purely indicative/illustrative and do not preclude the ability for a smaller/larger car parking space to come forward.</p>	<p>Update Paragraph 4.4.1 as follows:</p> <p>4.1.1 Bishop's Stortford is undergoing significant levels of growth with <del>approaching at least 4,426</del> 4,500 new homes planned in the District Plan 2018 (including committed development) by 2033, which will substantially increase the town's population.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>We doubt whether a single new access road from Link Road through the middle of the site will be capable of servicing the Waitrose car park, existing premises (such as Coopers) and all the new uses on the site (whatever they turn out to be). It would cause severe congestion in Link Road and a significant barrier to north-south pedestrian movement across the site. If it were to be introduced, it would create a major new source of congestion on Link Road. Given that the Bridge Street entrance to Jackson Square is to be relocated, the case for the pedestrian north-south boulevard seems dubious and the existing vehicular access arrangements along Old River Lane should be preserved. It would then not be necessary for Waitrose to surrender any parking spaces and the cost incurred in their compulsory acquisition would be saved.</p>	<p>Section 8.3 notes the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.</p> <p>The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site and the impact on the surrounding area.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	4. Transport		<p>BSCF has a number of concerns about the transport implications of any development on the site, and certainly a proper transport assessment of the agreed masterplan will be required. In the meantime we consider some</p>	Noted.	-

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>preliminary modelling would be advantageous. It will need to be based on various use types, building densities access arrangements and pedestrian movements options, and not just limited to those shown in the Town Centre Planning Framework 2016.</p> <p>This is because, inter-alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4 of the SPD notes that the District Plan allocates approx.. 4500 new homes for Bishop's Stortford. This figure already appears to be out of date, with possibly as many as 6000 homes being provided by 2033. Any transport assessment conducted therefore needs to be based on about 6000 homes and not 4500.</li> <li>• EHDC should respect the District Plan's figure for ORL of around 100 homes maximum</li> <li>• Alternative ways to compensate Waitrose for parking spaces lost need to be considered, especially with the new Northgate car park so close by and the implications of trying to provide them on the ORL site.</li> </ul>	<p>Agreed. Paragraph 4.1.1. will be updated to reflect the District Plan requirement and will state that this is a minimum figure for clarity.</p> <p>The SPD reflects the policy requirement.</p> <p>Agreed. Options have been set out in the Parking and Servicing section of the Design Principles Chapter.</p>	<p>Update Paragraph 4.4.1 as follows:</p> <p>4.1.1 Bishop's Stortford is undergoing significant levels of growth with <del>approaching at least 4,426</del> 4,500 new homes planned in the District Plan 2018 (including committed development) by 2033, which will substantially increase the town's population.</p> <p>No amendment in response to these issues.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the Bridge Street entrance to Jackson Square being relocated to that development's north-east corner, the case for the straight pedestrian north-south boulevard shown in the Town Centre Planning Framework now seems questionable. The appropriateness of providing a single new access road from Link Road through the middle of the site rather than via Old River Lane, or another road needs to be examined, in association with the effect(s) of relocating the open space currently shown for the south of the site more centrally. The impact of any congestion on Link Road associated with this should be tested, as well as the impact on north-south pedestrian (and cycling?) movement across the site. The aim should be to determine the scale of the congestion on Link Road by 2033 and find ways to minimise it.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 8.3 notes the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.</p> <p>The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site and the impact on the surrounding area.</p>	
Mrs Jill Wade (260)	4. Transport		Transport Section 4 states around 4500 new homes were approved in the District Plan, but the total is likely to be more than 5000. A revised transport assessment must be carried out, based on the expected housing total not that stated in the Plan.	Agreed – paragraph 4.1.1. is to be updated to reflect the District Plan requirement, and the fact that further growth has come forward since its adoption.	Update Paragraph 4.4.1 as follows:  4.1.1 Bishop's Stortford is undergoing significant levels of growth with <del>approaching at least 4,426</del> 4,500 new homes planned in the District Plan 2018 (including committed development) by 2033, which will

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>A new access road from Link Road through the site could create an extra point of congestion on Link Road, particularly if it has a signal-controlled junction. Paragraph 4.8 proposes a new crossing point for MSCP users. There would be too many traffic lights in close proximity. This road already attracts high volumes of traffic and thus congestion at peak times. A transport assessment must clearly demonstrate that all these traffic lights/crossings will not increase congestion and add to the potential for gridlock in this area. Reference needs to be included as to how the pedestrian boulevard would work with the proposed relocated Bridge Street entrance to Jackson Square. It is unclear if this has already been taken into account.</p> <p>8.10 states further discussion has also been held with Waitrose, specifically around re-providing around 170 spaces to service their demand. This requirement and how this provision is configured will have</p>	<p>Section 8.3 notes the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.</p> <p>The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site and the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>Waitrose currently have access to 166 car parking spaces on the land owned by EHDC. As such, under any redevelopment it is expected that the car park for Waitrose will need to be re-provided.</p>	<p>substantially increase the town's population.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>



Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>implications for the proposals, yet no explanation has been given for why Waitrose needs to relocate 170 parking spaces. Greater transparency is needed in the SPD and generally.</p> <p>Lack of adjoining cycle routes make any cycle route through the site a nonsense. There is no connectivity with other cycle routes and, despite previous efforts, very little has ever been achieved to make this possible. It is time for the Council to make serious progress with a connected cycle network for the town.</p>	<p>Section 4.4 sets out how cycling and pedestrianised routes could link with future enhancements across Castle Gardens and beyond. Likewise, the Transport chapter is designed around Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan options which take a strategic view of Bishop's Stortford and the wider area.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>
Mr Bryan Evans (251)	4. Transport		<p>Parking Section 4 misrepresents the history of the development of the Northgate End Multi-Storey Car park by saying that there is a further opportunity to consider and explore the potential for utilising town centre car parks for proposed uses on Old River Lane. The Northgate End car park was built specifically for that purpose. So it is not a matter for exploration of whether it can be used for that, but a question of requiring that to be delivered. Hence, the statement in Section 5 of rationalise and reduce car parking</p>	<p>SPD's do not form part of the statutory development plan – as such they cannot introduce new planning policies. The approach to parking set out in this SPD is therefore designed to build upon and detail existing policies and guidance.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 part (g) states that: <i>“on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion</i></p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>and improve servicing arrangements/facilities should not be opaque, but should be spelled out, particularly as elsewhere in Section 7.3 the policies are framed in enabling terms. Likewise it is unacceptable for the SPD to provide for some level of on-site parking, sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed when the new Multi Storey Car Park was designed and built to meet public parking needs, fully replacing the parking provided for shoppers and workers. The statement alongside that there should be a significantly reduced amount of parking (7.3.2) does not prevent the site attracting and providing for additional parking in this town centre site. As regards residential parking, the weak words in the following boxes, are not sufficient to limit provision of private parking. Weak statements about travel planning arrangements, building design for facilitating car free living, including unspecified amount or length of time for car clubs and exploring permitting opportunities are not strong enough to necessarily deliver on the Council commitment to doing everything it</p>	<p><i>and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters."</i></p> <p>As such the SPD notes the policy requirement to provide for car parking to meet the needs on the site, but also sets out the access to nearby car parks and the need to prioritise active travel. As such it takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce car parking on ORL particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>can to meet its Climate Change commitment. There should be a clear limit on the amount of parking provision allowed per residential unit. Even if a higher proportion and eventually all cars are electric, the space requirement for private vehicles impacts on all other users. So, from an active travel, community space perspective, private car use needs to be designed out of town centre developments.</p> <p>Public Transport: There is no statement regarding the expectations for public transport users access to the site, including the provision of suitable bus stops. Actions requested The SPD should be paused while a full transport planning and modelling piece of work is undertaken to assess how best to use the opportunity of developing this site to improve the town centre for active travel and public transport users. Without this, there need to be, as a minimum, granular suggestions for improving access to the site from all directions North Street, Hadham Road, Rye Street as well as Castle Park. The Council's policies in relation to</p>	<p>The transport section has been updated to include a new section (4.3) on public transport and reflect a similar approach to that proposed for active travel.</p> <p>The SPD sets out all relevant policies and highlights interventions from the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. This allows the SPD to direct S106 contributions and prioritise transport interventions towards those projects that form part of a wider-strategy, which contribute to the enhancement of Bishop's Stortford and the wider-area.</p>	<p>Insert additional section at <a href="#">4.3 Public Transport</a> covering introductory paragraphs and relevant interventions in Growth and Transport Plan.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>movement and parking, need to be exemplary to deliver real change in behaviour and show that active travel areas, without ready access to all buildings in the town centre by all cars, are the way forward. The parking requirements on the site need to be made more restrictive. The new Multi-Storey Car Park provided for parking for the current shops, leisure and office use of the site. The site will already retain some parking in accordance with Waitrose's lease. The SPD should clearly set out that parking for public and business uses on the site should be restricted to enabling disabled access, servicing and drop-off. It should be clear what the expectations are for public transport access to the site and how developers are expected to provide for it, through space on site and/or s106 commitments. Limited parking for residential units should be set out in a specific limit of not more than 0.6 parking spaces per unit and s106 commitments to support public transport and car clubs should be required to be for the long-term.</p>		

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
Hertfordshire County Council	4. Transport		<p>HCC Highways welcomes the prioritisation of sustainable transport and better management of demand for car parking to achieve mode shift.</p> <p>References to schemes in the consultation document rely on the Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Study (the Study). On July 18th HCC Cabinet adopted the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (the GTP) which supersedes the Study (though the Study influenced the GTP). Therefore, where the consultation document refers to the Study it should be amended to refer to the GTP. This should also allow flexibility for future active travel improvements likely to arise out of the forthcoming Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan being scoped with East Herts District Council (EHDC).</p> <p>Comments on specific matters are as follows:</p> <p>Northgate End Car Park: HCC agrees with EHDC that a suitable crossing point should be provided to cater for pedestrians (and potentially cyclists)</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. Amendments made to update references to documents in response to this issue.</p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Replace all references to 'Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Study' with reference to 'Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan'.</p> <p>Update Figure 11 to replace image of Transport Options Study with Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan.</p> <p>Subsequent changes to supporting text also identified for clarity (4.1.3 – 4.1.4).</p> <p>-</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>coming from Northgate End to Old River Lane and the wider town centre. This aligns with some of the considerations made by HCC in the Eastern Area GTP.</p> <p>Parking Permits: HCC is pleased to see EHDC considering options to better manage demand for parking in the town centre. This is an important tool to also encourage modal shift.</p> <p>Intervention's list: PR17, PR48, PR49, PR61, SM3, SM16. Though HCC broadly agree the principles of this scheme, the scheme description should be updated to reflect the Eastern Area GTP, which has a more generic description to allow flexibility in the approach taken for this area. PR48, PR61 - Reference should also be made to HCCs Speed Management Strategy.</p> <p>PR60 - This should be updated to reflect the text from the Eastern Area GTP.</p> <p>SM2 - The future arrangements for this junction have largely been delivered alongside the Northgate</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Agreed – all descriptions will be updated as necessary alongside inclusion of reference to the Speed Management Strategy where relevant.</p> <p>Agreed – the text will be updated as requested.</p> <p>Noted and agreed – SM2 will be removed from the table to reflect the implementation of this intervention.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Update all interventions to reflect the descriptions contained in the Eastern Area GTP. Footnote 17 also updated. Inclusion of reference to Speed Management Strategy included under interventions PR48 and PR61.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>End Car Park. As such it has not been adopted as part of the GTP and should not be referred to in the SPD.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.7 Eastern Area GTP - this should be updated according to the adopted revision of the GTP.</p> <p>Public Transport: the importance of suitable public transport connections to enable sustainable travel to Old River Lane and the wider town centre appears to have been overlooked solely in favour of walking and cycling. HCC recommends that a holistic view is needed to ensure the sustainability of this site, as such this should be revisited in line with the GTP and Bus Service Improvement Plan.</p> <p>Prioritising Walking &amp; Cycling/Parking: it is positive to see what EHDC have recommended in terms of prioritising sustainable travel, including in relation to parking. However, as above it would be useful to include guidance on how public transport can support the development.</p>	<p>Agreed – text updated.</p> <p>Agreed - additional section added.</p> <p>Agreed - additional section added.</p>	<p>Delete paragraph 4.2.7 due to reworked paragraphs in section 4.1 covering issue raised.</p> <p>Insert additional section at <u>4.3 Public Transport</u> covering introductory paragraphs and relevant interventions in Growth and Transport Plan.</p> <p>-</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>Countryside and Rights of Way - HCC officers have had previous engagement with EHDC on the Castle Park project which is welcomed. HCC welcomes the SPDs emphasis on active travel and improved access to the castle and Castle Park.</p> <p>The Castle Park development will provide enhancement for walking and cycling to the east of the development, linking into existing provision as far as Grange Paddocks leisure centre. A well-waymarked, off-road, and direct active travel route through the site would serve to reconnect the town to these features.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to what this site can contribute to longer distance routes. This includes links from the Bishop's Stortford North (BSN) development to the station and from Stansted airport to the town. There remains severance on the north-south river corridor from BSN to the Old River Lane site via Grange Paddocks, between Grange Paddocks and BSN. HCC has a preferred scheme to close this gap</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Noted. Wayfinding and legibility towards Castle Gardens and other adjacent areas forms a key part of the Design Principles (Chapter 7) which should integrate with the proposals and interventions highlighted in this section.</p> <p>Noted. An additional sentence has been added clarifying which project the cycle path relates to, as well as the wider package of measures designed to improve the accessibility and connectivity of the River Stort across the town.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add the following sentence to paragraph 4.4.5:</p> <p>4.4.5 Currently plans exist to extend and enhance the cycle route that runs north to south through the Green Wedge along the river (<b>Figure 12</b> below). <u>This forms part of project PR60 in the Growth and Transport Plan and the wider package of measures PK5 designed to make the River Stort more accessible and connected.</u> This would</p>



Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			and establish a through route. This would link residents to the Grange Paddocks leisure complex and green infrastructure to the north and open up opportunities for e-cargo delivery. However, this requires additional funding of approximately £450,000 to begin delivery.		allow cycling access along the river for residents to the north, including the new development being delivered at Bishop's Stortford North. Once the cycle route is completed, access points into the town centre would still be challenging, but Old River Lane presents an opportunity to provide the infrastructure and connections necessary to encourage cycling access into the town.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (416)	4. Transport		4.0 - Transport Options - The section lacks any public transport proposals, especially for late-night users. Some objectives are needed to support the masterplanning of public transport, especially as the site is some distance from the bus interchange at the station and buses heading south of the town. A feasibility of a circular shuttle bus from the interchange up South St to North St then back to the interchange via Link Road, The Causeway and Dane Street should be examined.	An additional section has been added to support the provision of public transport.	Insert additional section at <u>4.3 Public Transport</u> covering introductory paragraphs and relevant interventions in Growth and Transport Plan.
Mr Colin Arnott	4.1 Introduction		4.1.3-4 cites the relevance of the Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 which aligns with HCCs LTP4 to recognise and balance the needs of residents and workers who travel and park their private vehicles with increased sustainable transport	The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report has now been superseded following the adoption of Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan in July. As such references have been updated	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			opportunities which encourage modal shift and reduce traffic congestion. As noted above re para 1.4.19, the prioritisation principles used in LTP4 to tackle congestion have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022 and which now form the relevant Development Plan transport policies for Bishop's Stortford. Specifically, the Examiner did not share the views of (the) highway authority that there is not an appropriate balance between concerns over congestion, and the objectives for sustainable modes of transport. Instead, he endorsed the NPs policy TP1 on the need to Assess transport impacts and mitigation of development on traffic congestion and resident amenity.	throughout the SPD and particularly in Chapter 4 to reflect this update.  Likewise, Chapter 4 now incorporates a section relating specifically to the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1 <sup>st</sup> Revision).	
Mrs Elizabeth Deborah Munro (112)	4.1 Introduction	Object	ORL may have high expectations of delivering an increase in walking and bike use in the town, unfortunately the promised improvements in infrastructure have not materialised therefore leaving poor transport links for cyclists. It is possible to walk into the town centre but if you intend to purchase invariably you	The Transport Options Chapter, alongside the movement section in Chapter 7 Design Principles, aims to prioritise active travel and also introduce potential interventions to support these objectives.  The importance of the relationship between documents is noted and	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>will take a car as there is little public transport. The town requires up to date Transport Modelling which any potential developer could refer to. The Independent Examiner Christopher Lockhart-Mummery QC (May 2022) Bishop's Stortford TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR SILVERLEYS AND MEADS WARDS (1st REVISION) 2021-2033 Bishop's Stortford TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR ALL SAINTS, CENTRAL, SOUTH AND PART OF THORLEY (1st REVISION) 2021-2033 stated an alteration to TP1 b) would require traffic surveys more than 2 years. I find that this is somewhat onerous and out of line with normal practice and Recommend that a period of 3 years be substituted. Therefore, quoting Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 and the Bishop's Stortford Parking Study 2019. Of particular relevance to this SPD is the Transport Options report which aligns with Hertfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) 2018 is unacceptable as the developer could be misled in to believing these relevant when 2 out</p>	<p>agreed. The Transport Options Chapter has been updated to include reference to the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (which supersedes the Transport Options Report) and the updated Neighbourhood Plan for Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			of the 3 are out of date in regards to the Revised BSNP's.		
Mark Doran (140)	4.1 Introduction	Support	<p>The prioritisation of sustainable modes is essential for minimising carbon emissions and impact on air quality. However, I would ask the council to consider working with Herts CC to pedestrianise South St and North St to strengthen the vibrancy of the town centre and make it a destination where people want to spend time (and therefore increase spending in local retail/restaurants), as happens when the roads are closed for special events. I would also support the extension of the proposed 20mph zone to cover all of the town centre and the Link Rd, Hadham Rd etc to improve pedestrian access from surrounding areas including the new developments to the town centre. Finally, cycle links should be prioritised from all the new developments around the town, as it's essential these new residents walk/cycle into town rather than drive (otherwise congestion will increase further, with more carbon emissions and worse air quality).</p>	<p>HCC has recognised the benefit of a pedestrian friendly South Street and North Street as set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. Despite some of these interventions being outside the SPD's area of focus, the SPD still seeks to ensure it supports wider interventions where it can.</p> <p>The improvement of pedestrian access to the surrounding areas is one of the key outputs of the SPD, specifically a focus on Bridge Street and the Link Road and therefore access improvements for pedestrians to the town centre and Castle Gardens across ORL.</p> <p>Agreed – the SPD seeks to prioritise active travel opportunities in Chapter 7 Design Principles.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
Parsonage Residents Association (249)	4.1 Introduction		<p>The ORL may have high expectations of delivering an increase in walking and bike use in the town, unfortunately, the promised improvements in infrastructure have not materialised therefore leaving poor transport links for cyclists. It is possible to walk into the town centre but if you intend to purchase invariably you will take a car as there is little public transport. The town requires up to date Transport Modelling which any potential developer could refer to. The Independent Examiner Christopher Lockhart-Mummery QC (May 2022) Bishop's Stortford TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR SILVERLEYS AND MEADS WARDS (1st REVISION) 2021-2033 Bishop's Stortford TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN FOR ALL SAINTS, CENTRAL, SOUTH AND PART OF THORLEY (1st REVISION) 2021-2033 stated an alteration to TP1 b) would require traffic surveys more than 2 years old. I find that this is somewhat onerous and out of line with normal practice and - Recommend that a period of 3 years be substituted. Therefore, quoting Bishop's Stortford Transport Options</p>	<p>The transport section, alongside the movement section in Chapter 7 Design Principles, aims to prioritise active travel and also introduce specific interventions to support these aims.</p> <p>The relationship between documents is noted and agreed. The updated Transport Options chapter has been updated to include reference to the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the updated Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			Report 2018 and the Bishop's Stortford Parking Study 2019. Of relevance to this SPD is the Transport Options report which aligns with Hertfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) 2018 is unacceptable as the developer could be misled in to believing these relevant when 2 out of the 3 are out of date in regards to the Revised BSNP's		
Cllr Calvin Horner (168)	4.1 Introduction		4.1.2 Whilst the following section includes references to the Transport Options Report and Parking Study for Bishop's Stortford, I believe the SPD should include a more detailed consideration of pedestrian and cycle links to the town Centre. There are challenges in making these links given the steep and narrow nature of the western section of Bridge Street, the steps in Devoils Lane and the narrowness of Water Lane and Barretts Lane.	The SPD sets out a series of principles and interventions that prioritise active travel in relation to the ORL development site. The chapter also sets out opportunities at ORL to interact with cycle and pedestrian-specific plans in relation to Castle Gardens. The SPD ensures that wider-town centre interventions, as set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan are supported.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (417)	4.1 Introduction		4.1.3-4 - Cites the relevance of the Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report 2018 which aligns with HCCs LTP4 to recognise and balance the needs of residents and workers who travel and park their private vehicles with increased sustainable transport opportunities which encourage	The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report has now been superseded following the adoption of Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan in July. As such references have been updated throughout the SPD and particularly in Chapter 4 to reflect this update.	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			modal shift and reduce traffic congestion. As noted above re para 1.4.19, the prioritisation principles used in LTP4 to tackle congestion have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the Bishop's Stortford Neighbourhood Plan Review 2022 and which now form the relevant Development Plan transport policies for Bishop's Stortford. Specifically, the Examiner did not share the views of (the) highway authority that there is not an appropriate balance between concerns over congestion, and the objectives for sustainable modes of transport. Instead, he endorsed the NPs policy TP1 on the need to: <p>~ Assess transport impacts and mitigation of development on traffic congestion and resident amenity.</p>	Likewise, Chapter 4 now incorporates a section relating specifically to the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1 <sup>st</sup> Revision).	
Mr Colin Arnott (126)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.5 says The ORL development has the opportunity to explore the potential for utilising town centre car parks, including Northgate End, to provide capacity for proposed uses on ORL, (including) arrangements with new residents to help limit the number of spaces needed on the Old River Lane site itself. This makes clear that the development of	Paragraph 4.2.5 doesn't conflict with Policy BISH8 II(g) by referring to the potential for utilising neighbouring car parks. Policy BISH8 II(g) requires on-site car parking to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed on ORL. If, by exploring opportunities with neighbouring car parks the need from the proposed uses is reduced, then it allows a	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>Northgate End CP was designed to provide additional capacity for residential and other proposed uses on ORL. As noted above, this clearly conflicts with Policy BISH8 II(g) which states that on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed. Having utilised funding from the LEP at Northgate End intended to support the mixed community, commercial and town centre vitality objectives of ORL, this principle should also be recognised in section 4.2. to justify contravening Policy BISH8 II(g).</p> <p>4.2.7 cites emerging (now adopted) HCC Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (EAGTP) improvement packages including Package PK18 which deals with Town Centre Traffic Congestion Management particularly relevant to any proposals at Old River Lane. Whilst the principle of dealing with the expected Town Centre traffic congestion impacts of ORL is essential, consideration of traffic management and other mitigation measures should not be limited to the EAGTP packages. As noted above, these Packages (taken</p>	<p>scheme to come forward that can provide less parking whilst still meeting Policy criterion II(g).</p> <p>The aim of this section in the SPD is to ensure that any development at Old River Lane can complement and understand any transport improvements coming forward that directly effect ORL or the wider-ORL area. Whilst detailed transport assessments and modelling will be required to define detailed matters, the SPD only seeks to ensure that the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage. As details evolve and discussions continue, the most relevant</p>	



Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			originally from the Transport Options report) were never adopted by EHC, BSTC or the Shaping Stortford group and the prioritisation principles used in the EAGTP have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the current Neighbourhood Plan Review. It is essential that off-site mitigation needs of traffic impacts are identified by a comprehensive Transport Assessment (TA) of the ORL development on all relevant town centre junctions and links which must be carried out at the Masterplan stage (as informed by the SDP), with the participation of HCC Highways and not left to the planning application process.	interventions and can then be utilised.	
Mrs Sarah Aldred (197)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		Whilst I would support a one-way south system for Bells Hill, we would need to keep the current parking for the residents in Bells Hill. Parking is extremely stretched, and removal of these parking spaces would just push the problem elsewhere e.g., Regency Close and Windhill which are the only other option in our parking permit area. The council just seems to keep issuing parking	Noted. The SPD does not set out to remove or alter parking in Bells Hill, but it does seek to provide a balanced approach to transport that prioritises active travel.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			permits without taking into consideration how many cars are trying to park in a very limited number of spaces. There is already increased frustration from the residents in the above areas about parking in their roads especially Regency Close which is cul-de-sac. We pay a lot of money for our parking permits (which I am happy to do) but we do need somewhere to park. We all have to benefit from the new proposals, car owners, cyclists and pedestrians alike. We could also benefit from electric car charges being installed in some of the Windhill parking bays for those without drives that wish to purchase an electric car.		
Mr John Rhodes (192)  Stewart Marshall (383)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		Section 3.2 recognises that the scale of any retail offer at ORL should complement and support the existing retail offer in the town. This is somewhat at variance with the statement in para 4.2.1 that the ORL development will bring forward a substantial increase in retail floorspace. Even at the time of the Henderson proposal for the site, the trend towards online shopping was weakening the case for additional retail floorspace, and since then the	There is currently no retail use on the site of ORL. Policy BISH8 sets out a requirement for the inclusion of retail. Therefore, there will be a notable increase in retail use on the site – a change has been made to this paragraph for additional for clarity.  Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that any retail offer complements and doesn't compete with Bishop's Stortford	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			<p>Covid pandemic has accelerated that trend substantially. Bearing in mind that our most recent retail development, Jackson Square, has never been fully let, there needs to be an up-to-date reassessment of the demand for additional space before the extent of any extra provision at ORL is confirmed. The last thing the town needs is the degradation of South Street because existing retailers are tempted by the developer to relocate to ORL. Any retail provision should be located as closely as possible to Jackson Square to reinforce rather than deplete the existing retail offer.</p>	<p>Town Centre. As such it is not at variance with paragraph 4.2.1.</p> <p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		<p>Retail demand: Section 3.2 recognises that the scale of the development's retail offer should complement and support the town's existing retail offer. However, this contradicts para 4.2.1, which says the ORL development will bring forward a substantial increase in retail floorspace.</p> <p>The case for additional retail floorspace needs to be tested, e.g. via a 'lite' retail demand study, especially since Covid-19 has led to an increase in online shopping</p>	<p>There is currently no retail use on the site of ORL. Policy BISH8 sets out a requirement for the inclusion of retail. Therefore, there will be a notable increase in retail use on the site – a change has been made to this paragraph for additional for clarity.</p> <p>Section 3.2 seeks to ensure that any retail offer complements and doesn't compete with Bishop's Stortford Town Centre. As such it is not at variance with paragraph 4.2.1.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			compared to footfall shopping. Also Jackson Square has never been fully let and vacancy rates on South St and elsewhere seem to be increasing. ORL should therefore offer retail options that complement South St and Jackson Square rather than challenge and compete with them.	<p>Section 9 of the SPD sets out that a Retail Impact Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application. This will need to address, inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the catchment of the proposal.</li> <li>• The impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider retail catchment area.</li> </ul>	
Cllr Calvin Horner (167)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.6 This section requires updating, in particular with regard to the relevance of SM2 where some of the alternative approaches have already been adopted or discarded following the completion of Northgate End MSCP. The reference to Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan is also in error as following its adoption the quote is from Package PK19 rather than PK18 as stated. There is requirement to strengthen the references to those packages and interventions promoting active travel and that this should not be restricted to consideration of the site. For instance, there are references to	<p>The Bishop's Stortford Transport Options Report has now been superseded following the adoption of Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan in July. As such references have been updated throughout the SPD and particularly in Chapter 4 to reflect this update.</p> <p>Likewise, Chapter 4 now incorporates a section relating specifically to the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Revision).</p>	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			providing routes between the Northgate End car park and the Town Centre via ORL, but ORL has a role to play in promoting active transport routes to the north beyond the MSCP and thereby reducing congestion and improving air quality in the Northgate End area.		
Ms Jill Jones (224)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park	Object	4.2.2. Northgate End MSCP – in order to support the mixed-use transport vision, could some of this space be reserved for cycles and a cycle route joined through the park to the MSCP? Additionally, for an integrated approach, there is no mention of drop off and pick up spaces to alleviate pressure on the MSCP from visitors to the residential dwellings on the ORL site, or for deliveries.	<p>The prioritisation of connectivity and a focus on active transport is central to this SPD. The SPD notes the various strategies and policies that exist to support active travel. In particular Policy TP4 of the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Revision) and in regard to cycle parking, Policy TP7. Figure 12 sets out a potential route for cycle and pedestrian routes into the ORL site to and from Castle Gardens across the Link Road. This should work in conjunction with greater accessibility to the MSCP through the ORL site.</p> <p>The overall strategy is to reduce vehicular movement and prioritise walking and cycling as the preferred method through the site. However, it is noted that servicing and deliveries will be required for residential and commercial aspects of the site. As</p>	No amendment is response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
				such section 7.3 Parking and Servicing covers a number of these aspects.	
Gary Jones (292)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.6 The transport interventions table is taken from a 2018 document. Intervention SM2 has already been substantially implemented from one of the alternative approaches listed. It would be helpful to state the current position i.e., B Replace existing small roundabout with a signal-controlled junction linked to signal-controlled car park entry/exit	Agreed. This section has been updated to reflect the adoption of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and SM2 has been deleted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Woodward (362)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.5 Explore employee and worker provision? As EHC own/operate most BS car parks and Charringtons House and set residential development parking criteria then EHC should know fairly precisely now how many spaces could be lost to the public in Northgate or other paid parking in its car parks by designating spaces for displaced Charringtons House tenants, residents and workers required by the ORL site.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cityheart Homes Ltd (336)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.1 - Quantum of retail floor space This risks overstating the provision of retail floor space, and by association the possible highway and transportation trips and impacts.	There is currently no retail use on the site. Policy BISH8 sets out a requirement for the inclusion of retail. Therefore, there will be a notable increase to retail on the site.	Amend text as follows:  4.2.1 Proposals for Old River Lane will increase the demand for travel in Bishop's Stortford and place additional

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
				Change made for clarity.	strain on the existing road network. The Old River Lane development will bring forward a notable <del>substantial</del> increase in retail floorspace which is anticipated to enhance the town's retail offer in addition to new leisure uses which could increase the town centre's attractiveness, not only in retaining trips within the town, but attracting trips in from surrounding areas that might otherwise travel to other towns.
Jenette Greenwood (317)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2 I think the traffic flow in town needs to be reviewed with serious consideration to pedestrianising the town centre. It was not built to accommodate all the cars that drive through it. A pedestrianised south street / potter street would allow cafes and restaurants to put more seating outside.	Noted. South Street and Potter Street largely fall outside of the scope of this SPD. However East Herts Council will continue to work with HCC to ensure that transport plans seek to enhance Bishop's Stortford Town Centre, including those interventions already identified in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Lynne Garner (376)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		Employ specialists who really understand traffic flow, who can look at the infrastructure we have and improve it. Not the hodgepodge approach that seems to have taken place over the years, to the detriment of the local area. Perhaps make South Street pedestrian, which will improve the air quality and with	The measures and opportunities that this SPD highlights are derived from the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (GTP) and other relevant policies including the Neighbourhood Plan. The GTP is a document prepared by transport specialists from Hertfordshire County Council and sets out a	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			seating, planted containers make people want to visit the town centre and stay longer, therefore supporting local shops and businesses.	strategic view covering both Bishop's Stortford and Sawbridgeworth as well as the surrounding rural area.	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (419)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.5 - says the ORL development has the opportunity to explore the potential for utilising town centre car parks, including Northgate End, to provide capacity for proposed uses on ORL, (including) arrangements with new residents to help limit the number of spaces needed on the Old River Lane site itself. This makes clear that the development of Northgate End CP was designed to provide additional capacity for residential and other proposed uses on ORL. As noted above, this clearly conflicts with Policy BISH8 II(g) which states that on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed. Having utilised funding from the LEP at Northgate End intended to support the mixed community, commercial and town centre vitality objectives of ORL, this principle should also be recognised in section 4.2. to justify contravening Policy BISH8 II(g).	Paragraph 4.2.5 doesn't conflict with Policy BISH8 II(g) by referring to the potential for utilising neighbouring car parks. Policy BISH8 II(g) requires on-site car parking to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed on ORL. If, by exploring opportunities with neighbouring car parks the need from the proposed uses is reduced, then it allows a scheme to come forward that can provide less parking whilst still meeting Policy criterion II(g)	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (418)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.3 - Interventions table - reference to the Hertfordshire EAGTP (see 4.2.7 and elsewhere) is needed, to show this is not a list of interventions dreamed up by the SPD. Clarity is also needed to say whether this is a prioritised list, and the extent to which funding for each of them relies on the development s106 agreement(s).	Clarity has now been provided in paragraph 4.2.6 which sets out that the interventions list is derived from the Growth and Transport Plan.	Update to paragraph 4.2.6 as follows:  4.2.6 The <del>Other interventions are also included in the Transport Options report and the Council will also</del> require proposals for development at Old River Lane to consider the <u>prioritised</u> list of schemes set out below <u>which are derived from the Growth and Transport Plan</u> . Further information on Bridge Street is set out at Section 4.34.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (420)	4.2 Old River Lane and Northgate End Multi-Story Car Park		4.2.7 - Cites emerging (now adopted) HCC Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (EAGTP) improvement packages including Package PK18 which deals with Town Centre Traffic Congestion Management as particularly relevant to any proposals at Old River Lane. Whilst the principle of dealing with the expected Town Centre traffic congestion impacts of ORL is essential, consideration of traffic management and other mitigation measures should not be limited to the EAGTP packages. As noted above, these Packages (taken originally from the Transport Options report) were never adopted by EHC, BSTC or the Shaping Stortford group and the	The Transport Options Chapter has now been updated to reflect the adoption of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. A section has also been added to the Chapter regarding the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1 <sup>st</sup> Revision).  The aim of this section in the SPD is to ensure that any development at Old River Lane can complement and understand any transport improvements coming forward that directly effect ORL or the wider-ORL area. Whilst detailed transport assessments and modelling will be required to define detailed matters, the SPD only seeks to ensure that	Chapter 4 updated to reflect the adoption of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan and also the Bishop's Stortford Silverleys and Meads Neighbourhood Plan (1st Revision).

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			prioritisation principles used in the EAGTP have themselves been reviewed and in some cases superseded by the revised transport policies in the current Neighbourhood Plan Review. It is essential that off-site mitigation needs of traffic impacts are identified by a comprehensive Transport Assessment (TA) of the ORL development on all relevant town centre junctions and links which must be carried out at the Masterplan stage (as informed by the SDP), with the participation of HCC Highways and not left to the planning application process.	the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage. As details evolve and discussions continue, the most relevant interventions and can then be utilised.	
Mrs Susan Swan (66)	4.3 Bridge Street		It was a great idea to build a car park first, but then to leave the car park near Waitrose empty and to increase the charges at the new Northgate end car park. I can see that you are encouraging people to walk and use public transport, but until the bus service improves and the cost of fares decreases many people will continue to use their car.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (127)	4.3 Bridge Street		4.3 Bridge Street / 4.4 Link Road these sections reference EAGTP Package 17 on Bridge Street interventions and potential S106 contributions on vehicle and	The aim of the SPD is to add detail to the various policies in the development plan. As such the identification of possible	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			pedestrian access options from and across Link Road. Again, while the improvement objectives can be broadly supported, specific mitigation measures must be identified based on a comprehensive TA of the alternative ORL development and access options which should be carried out at the Masterplan stage. The specific solutions suggested here are premature and should be deleted.	<p>interventions and proposals fits with this objective.</p> <p>Whilst detailed transport assessments and modelling will be required to define detailed matters, the SPD only seeks to ensure that the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage. As details evolve and discussions continue, the most relevant interventions and can then be utilised.</p>	
Carolyn Matthews (89)	4.3 Bridge Street	Object	PR17 by reducing to single lane would mean traffic turning right towards Hockerill would compound congestion. Have you witnessed the chaos of the 'school run'?? St Mary's as the only Catholic secondary school in the area has a wide catchment area, The College and primary schools all use this area.	The adoption of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan (GTP) now supersedes PR17 set out in the Transport Study. PR17 in the GTP now seeks to increase walking mode share through improved pedestrian facilities on Bridge Street, as such it does not directly propose to reduce Bridge Street eastbound to one lane. Whilst this may still be an option in terms of improving pedestrianisation of Bridge Street, there will be other options explored.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Mione Goldspink (327)	4.3 Bridge Street		Page 44, 4.3.2 Reducing the number of carriageways on Bridge Street. I am not sure that this would work as	Section 4.3 (now 4.4.) - This section has been updated to refer to the more flexible language used in PR17	Update 4.3.2 as follows:

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			some vehicular access to Coopers will need to be maintained. Please put a question mark over PR17.	of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. The updated wording in the SPD now refers to working through detailed options in conjunction with HCC.	4.34.2 Reducing the number of vehicular carriageways on Bridge Street and widening the footways achieves two goals; firstly, the improvement of the poor pedestrian environment along Bridge Street by making best use of the opportunity to integrate Bridge Street directly with any public square or public building to the south of Old River Lane; and secondly, it will support the key objective to increase active travel to, and from, and through the Old River Lane site. Old River Lane provides a key opportunity for the site to interact with and enhance Bridge Street and maximise opportunities for pedestrians. PR17 is flexible in its approach to increasing walking mode share and improving pedestrian facilities on Bridge Street. Applicants should discuss with Hertfordshire County Council how their proposals meet the expectations of PR17.
Ms Jill Jones (217)	4.3 Bridge Street	Support	4.3 PR17 support PR48 support 20mph however this should be extended and should run from Grange Paddocks into town. PR49 support PR60 see comments in objections below, could this be to the Northgate end MSCP? PR61 support	Support noted and welcomed.	-

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
<b>4.</b>			<b>Transport Options</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (421)	4.3 Bridge Street		4.3 - 4.4 These sections on Bridge St and Link Road reference EAGTP Package 17 on Bridge St interventions and potential S106 contributions on vehicle and pedestrian access options from and across Link Road. Again, while the improvement objectives can be broadly supported, specific mitigation measures must be identified based on a comprehensive TA of the alternative ORL development and access options which should be carried out at the Masterplan stage. The specific solutions suggested here are premature and should be deleted. Bridge St There is no specific mention of the need for improvements to the western end of Bridge St, and determining the best way for the traffic to flow, i.e. west east or east west, especially with respect to pedestrian focussed changes to Potter Street, Market Street and North Street and air quality. For example, traffic going up Bridge St (east west) will have to wait at the traffic lights and make a hill-start, whereas traffic going down Bridge St (west-east) can almost coast into Bridge St. Some guidance	<p>Section 4.3 (now 4.4) - This section has been updated to refer to the more flexible language used in PR17 of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. The updated wording in the SPD refers to working through detailed options in conjunction with HCC.</p> <p>Section 4.4 - The clear position in Policy BISH8 (c) meant that it was pragmatic for the SPD to look for opportunities to direct links across Link Road between Castle Gardens and ORL. It is also a good opportunity to capture the other strategies, such as PR60 and the Castle Garden upgrades in order to deliver a strategic picture to any opportunities. All crossings and diagrams are indicative only and will be subject to the detailed work undertaken.</p>	<p>Update 4.3.2 as follows:</p> <p><del>4.3.2 Reducing the number of vehicular carriageways on Bridge Street and widening the footways achieves two goals; firstly, the improvement of the poor pedestrian environment along Bridge Street by making best use of the opportunity to integrate Bridge Street directly with any public square or public building to the south of Old River Lane; and secondly, it will support the key objective to increase active travel to, and from, and through the Old River Lane site.</del> Old River Lane provides a key opportunity for the site to interact with and enhance Bridge Street and maximise opportunities for pedestrians. PR17 is flexible in its approach to increasing walking mode share and improving pedestrian facilities on Bridge Street. Applicants should discuss with Hertfordshire County Council how their proposals meet the expectations of PR17.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			is needed on what traffic needs to remain on Old River Lane, e.g., can access to deliveries and parking to Coopers be provided in any other way, including us of Water Lane? Any transport assessments for the site need to compare to the benefits of creating a pedestrian, cycling, leisure-& arts friendly street scene on ORL vs retaining vehicle access. Link Road and Castle Gardens As an introduction to Chs 5 & 7 (7.6) this sub-section should include discussion of building heights their influence on the streetscape, especially on these two streets		
Mr Colin Arnott (128)	4.4 Link Road and Castle Gardens		4.3 Bridge Street / 4.4 Link Road - these sections reference EAGTP Package 17 on Bridge Street interventions and potential S106 contributions on vehicle and pedestrian access options from and across Link Road. Again, while the improvement objectives can be broadly supported, specific mitigation measures must be identified based on a comprehensive TA of the alternative ORL development and access options which should be carried out at the Masterplan stage. The specific	<p>Section 4.3 (now 4.4) - This section has been updated to refer to the more flexible language used in PR17 of the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. The updated wording in the SPD refers to working through detailed options in conjunction with HCC.</p> <p>Section 4.4 - The clear position in Policy BISH8 (c) meant that it was pragmatic for the SPD to look for opportunities to direct links across Link Road between Castle Gardens and ORL. It is also a good opportunity to capture the other</p>	<p>Update 4.3.2 as follows:</p> <p><del>4.34.2 Reducing the number of vehicular carriageways on Bridge Street and widening the footways achieves two goals; firstly, the improvement of the poor pedestrian environment along Bridge Street by making best use of the opportunity to integrate Bridge Street directly with any public square or public building to the south of Old River Lane; and secondly, it will support the key objective to increase active travel to, and from, and through the Old River Lane site. Old River Lane provides a</del></p>

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			solutions suggested here are premature and should be deleted.	strategies, such as PR60 and the Castle Garden upgrades in order to deliver a strategic picture to any opportunities. All crossings and diagrams are indicative only and will be subject to the detailed work undertaken.	key opportunity for the site to interact with and enhance Bridge Street and maximise opportunities for pedestrians. PR17 is flexible in its approach to increasing walking mode share and improving pedestrian facilities on Bridge Street. Applicants should discuss with Hertfordshire County Council how their proposals meet the expectations of PR17.
Carolyn Matthews (95)	4.4 Link Road and Castle Gardens	Support		Support noted and welcomed.	-
Angela Marshall (281)	4.4 Link Road and Castle Gardens		d. Cycle Routes Section 4.4.5/6 - As a pedestrian walking into town along the towpath from the North several times a week, I would like to know that cyclists, if they are to be encouraged to use the towpath, should be given a separate lane as happens in other cities e.g., York. It could be very dangerous to families walking, dogs and the elderly/infirm as cycles often cannot be heard if they are approaching from behind bells do not seem to be used so much these days. Also, joggers and people using the Leisure Centre make this a busy footpath.	Any upgrade to the tow path will be in relation to Project PR60 set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan. Also relevant is Package PK5, which notes that; "Upgrade to the tow path alongside the River Stort, wide enough to accommodate both pedestrians and cyclists as well as seating and other landscape improvements".	No amendment in response to this issue.
Angela Marshall (280)	4.4 Link Road and Castle Gardens		c. Bus Stop on Link Road, near to the Charringtons building Section 4.4 Could this be given its own lay-by off	This SPD includes a number of interventions and projects set out in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed Amendment
4.			<b>Transport Options</b>		
			the Link Road? I should have thought this would have been done years ago, there is plenty of space.	<p>Growth and Transport Plan. The GTP does not include any plans to accommodate a lay-by for bus services along the Link Road and as such, the SPD does not set this out either.</p> <p>A new Section 4.3 on Public Transport has however been added to the SPD which include reference to the Hertfordshire County Council's Bus Service Improvement.</p>	
Cityheart Homes Ltd (337)	4.4 Link Road and Castle Gardens		4.4.6 - Section 106 Heads of Terms. Need to establish the precise package of such provision in due course. Need to determine whether these "Heads of Terms" meet the necessary tests of being necessary / reasonably required etc. Need to determine effect on overall scheme viability, and provision of other matters as part of the overall Section 106 package.	Noted.	-



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>5.</b>			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (20)	5. Constraints and opportunities		<p>There is no guidance on the options for Charringtons House. No reference to options for retention, adaptation or demolition. There is no reference to the points we raised in our report. No reference to the carbon cost of demolition.</p> <p>Amendment requested: Put Charringtons House in land use constraints, saying as follows: 'An existing large building in good condition, fully occupied, good covenants, easy to let, earning reliable, risk-free rental income for Council revenue. It is the location of the Council's public counter service.'</p>	<p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (129)	5. Constraints and opportunities		<p>As noted below, section 5.0 on Constraints and Opportunities is followed by the Vision and Development Objectives for ORL in Section 6.0. It is normal for the vision and objectives to precede constraints and opportunities. Reversing these sections implies that the aspirations for the development have been set by these limitations.</p>	Agreed.	Reverse Sections 5 and 6, with consequent amendments to the Table of Contents and paragraph 1.3.1.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			It would also be more positive to present Opportunities before Constraints in the Schedule at 5.1.1. This would also allow the Constraints and Opportunities to be organised by objectives. The logic for the present division and ordering of the schedule into four topic areas Traffic & Transport / Public Realm & Environment / Land Use / Heritage & Landscape is not explained. I believe it would be better organised either by objectives or expected intervention areas such as the Arts, Climate Change and Protection of the Environment and Project Delivery. There is also a tendency to describe opportunities as more detailed objectives for specific topic areas particularly for topics such as Heritage and Landscape. I recommend that these amendments are made in the Final SPD	Noted. However, both are presented in a tabular form which doesn't prioritise one over the other.  The present division in topic areas is considered an appropriate approach and provides a clear reference for readers.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Climate Group (308)	5. Constraints and opportunities	Object	Land use (and buildings use) (Section 5) In Opportunity land use it says e) To consider the benefits of including the United Reformed Church Hall in proposals to ensure a comprehensive redevelopment of the area. This understates the considerable benefit to retaining the	This is covered by f) to promote sustainability in its widest sense.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>carbon embedded in the existing building.</p> <p>On page 49 it says of Charringtons House c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs. There is no evidence to support this and to say that it would not be possible to retain the building in amended form. The SPD suggests there is a need for office space, so there is no case for pulling down office space to be rebuilt elsewhere on the site. The Sustainability and energy use section addresses the carbon embedded in construction, but this misses the point that to reduce carbon from construction the best approach is to refurbish existing buildings, unless compelling evidence can be provided that it is simply incompatible with the new use cases. In contrast to building operational energy needs, we are not yet in a position where the processes for steel and cement production are being decarbonised and reliance on these in construction will necessarily result in a pulse of emissions now which will be much more significant than the operational emissions even in a do nothing case.</p>	<p>Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.</p> <p>Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House or the URCH Hall, if demolition of either is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).</p> <p><del>c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<p><b>Constraints and Opportunities</b></p>		
			<p>The Climate Group analysed the emissions from refurbishing Charringtons rather than demolition and rebuild and it is clear in emissions terms that refurbishment is preferential. The same would apply to a comparison of refurbishment and reuse of the United Reformed Church Hall against a new build alternative.</p> <p>Actions requested The URC can be retained, once refurbished for its value as a useful community facility, contributing to the character of the Conservation Area and surrounding listed buildings, to be used as a flexible community, arts and market space.</p> <p>Charringtons House can be retained for office use and refurbished for other uses such as health care. State that the LPA will strongly discourage demolition of URC and Charringtons House, because of the embedded carbon in them and state encouragement to repair and upgrade them, working at the entry points to both to ensure that they are integrated into the redeveloped site. The SPD should require a life</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			cycle assessment of proposals for the site, taking account of loss of embedded carbon as well as the additional carbon in any proposed new builds, using existing tools, for example London Plan One-click, or FCBS Carbon.		
Mr Graham Oxborrow (203)	5. Constraints and opportunities	Object	Show a requirement to keep and re-use well-loved and well-used existing buildings (URC Hall and Charringtons), so that the uses are not lost and to minimise carbon emissions in construction. Over the lifetime of a building the carbon in new construction is much more significant than the carbon emissions from its use.	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities), Applicants will also be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 of the District Plan was informed by the Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework. This presented two illustrative options for the redevelopment of Old River Lane. Both options included the demolition of Charringtons House. It has therefore always been the case that Charringtons House could be</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
				demolished. Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (422)	5. Constraints and opportunities		5.0 - Constraints and Opportunities As noted below, this section, on Constraints and Opportunities is followed by Section 6 - Vision and Development Objectives for ORL. Rather, in documents such as a SPD it is normal for the vision and objectives to precede an evaluation of constraints and opportunities. In fact, by presenting them in their current order implies that the aspirations for the development have been set by these limitations. This chapter should therefore follow Ch 6, not precede it, as it sets out opportunities to achieve the vision and objectives and constraints to achieving them. (see also 6.0).	Agreed.	Reverse Sections 5 and 6, with consequent amendments to the Table of Contents and paragraph 1.3.1.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>It would also be more positive if the Schedule/table that is part of 5.1.1 presented Opportunities in the LH column and Constraints in the RH column.</p> <p>This would allow the opportunities and the constraints to achieving them to be organised by objectives. Also, the logic for the present arrangement and ordering of the schedule into [only] four topic areas Traffic &amp; Transport / Public Realm &amp; Environment / Land Use / Heritage &amp; Landscape is not explained. BSCF believes it would be better if the schedule/table was organised either by Objectives or expected intervention areas such as the Arts, Climate Change and Protection of the Environment and Project Delivery, etc. With respect to the opportunities already presented we find there is a tendency to describe/detail them as more detailed objectives for specific topic areas particularly for topics such as Heritage and Landscape rather than be action-oriented.</p> <p>Additionally, the table is missing topics such as: Leisure and Arts;</p>	<p>Noted. However, both are presented in a tabular form which doesn't prioritise one over the other.</p> <p>The present division in topic areas is considered an appropriate approach and provides a clear reference for readers.</p> <p>Leisure and Climate Change (sustainability) are both referred as an opportunity under land use. It is</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add reference to housing under b) as follows:</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			Climate Change and Carbon Footprint, as well as dwellings (part of Land Use?). BSCF recommends that these amendments are made in the Final SPD, the comments that follow though are reviewed as the constraints and opportunities are presented in the draft SPD.	agreed that reference to housing should be added to b).	b) To create a high quality mixed use <del>development of</del> <u>destination</u> including retail, leisure uses, along with a civic hub of other commercial and community uses, <u>and new housing</u>
Cross-party working group on ORL site (19)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		On page 49, in Heritage /landscape constraints, it says c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs. This is the only discussion of Charringtons House in the entire SPD. It is completely false. The building continues to function with various covenants and lets well. Amendment requested: Delete c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.	Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.	Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).  <del>c) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del>
Cross-party working group on ORL site (28)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		Constraint public realm / environment. There is an existing electricity sub-station next to the road.  Constraint land use. The number of Waitrose spaces for relocation is incorrect. Looking at the possible options, the number of spaces	Agreed, bullet point added.  It is the quantum of spaces to re-provide that is the constraint rather than the location of the existing spaces.	Add a new bullet point to the constraints table under public realm/environment:  <u>d) There is an existing electricity sub-station next to Old River Lane</u>  No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			needing to be relocated is either about 8, or about 15 or about 40+.		
Mr James Tatchell (35)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities	Object	The Waitrose car park should be left as it is, which will remove the need to demolish the important URC Hall. Any pedestrian link to the new MSCP can be to the side of the existing Waitrose Car Park.	Noted. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude alternative walkways if this was the preferred design solution, when taking account of all constraints.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (130)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		<p>Traffic and Transportation: If lack of cycle parking and pedestrian/ cycling/vehicular conflict are constraints, it is not clear why prioritising walking and cycling is an opportunity.</p> <p>High pollution levels in the nearby Hockerill Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is an important constraint on open area activities and would be better included in a Climate Change and the Environment topic area.</p> <p>Public Realm/Environment Securing long term stewardship of public spaces within the development is an important project delivery requirement but the current lack of stewardship mechanisms is a constraint.</p>	<p>Redevelopment of the site offers the opportunity to improve the current situation by prioritising walking and cycling within the site and to improve permeability for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The constraint is appropriately listed as the main source of pollution is from road transport.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site offers the opportunity to secure the long term stewardship of public spaces within the development.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>Land Use - The Land Use topic is rightly presented almost entirely in terms of the opportunities which a largely undeveloped site in a key town centre/conservation area location offers. The only constraints are around competing aspirations/ requirements for use of the site including: Waitrose own a lease on the portion of car parking to the south of their store and they require to retain all the at grade/storefront walk-in parking which forms part of their offer. That the loss of any of the existing 170 storefront spaces as part of reorganisation of the site layout should be on a like-for-like basis.</p> <p>That meeting the around 100 homes requirement of Policy BISH8 II at appropriate height and density standards means that most of the built space will be for housing crowding out the key objectives of delivering the sensitive development of a new town centre destination with a mix of commercial and community and high-quality public spaces. I would support the Land Use opportunities identified but note that opportunities (b) on mixed use</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>development and (f) on promoting sustainability simply repeat the development objectives.</p> <p>The list would benefit from more clearly identified existing and new use opportunities including: Recognising that The United Reformed Church Hall is a valued community asset is clearly an opportunity not a constraint for a development with a stated objective to provide and improve community assets and having extended the red line boundary to include the hall.</p> <p>As well as constraining use of part of the site, the Waitrose store located in a sympathetically designed building at the northern entrance to the site - should be acknowledged as the principal existing and future anchor opportunity for retail and related development at ORL. Waitrose is a recognised destination brand with a wide, dedicated catchment across East Herts and surrounding districts. The closest Waitrose stores are at Saffron Walden and Buckhurst Hill - 14 and 20 miles away respectively - in neighbouring counties. There is a locally unique opportunity for</p>	<p>The benefits of including the United Reformed Church Hall in proposals is recognised as an opportunity.</p> <p>Agreed. Opportunity added within the land use section of the Constraints and Opportunities Chapter.</p>	<p>Add new d) to Opportunity: Land Use section of Chapter 4:</p> <p><u>e)d) To capitalise on the location of Waitrose as an anchor store in Bishop's Stortford</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>complementary F&amp;B, retail and business service, markets, events and similar destination uses to locate at ORL.</p> <p>Coopers of Stortford (the town's only nationally eponymous business) is a prominent anchor business/retail occupier at the key southern entrance to the site. Coopers have successfully transitioned from a physical to an online retail business by repurposing their existing listed building space. Their parent company, Damart UK, are headquartered in Bowling Green Mills, Bingley, one of West Yorkshire's leading listed mill conversions and should be encouraged to participate in heritage management at ORL.</p> <p>Charringtons House provides existing office business accommodation including managed workspace meeting identified office use needs (see section 3.3) and adaptable for other retail, service and community needs sustainably by reusing carbon locked up in existing buildings.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted – however the SPD doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>Uniquely, the ORL site provides the opportunity to reuse the historic centre's only open but continuously actively used space the former cattle market and large enough to accommodate a growing range of destination activities, markets and events. Open space at the heart of ORL provides flexible capacity for a mix of built, covered, pop-up and open spaces which complements the destinations established and new retail, hospitality, local arts and community space. With the support of the Town Council, to extend the use and exploit the brand of Bishop's Stortford's historic Market Charter - delivering on the Vision of the uniqueness of this historic market town.</p> <p>Heritage/Landscape - There is a particular problem in this topic with Opportunities being described as Constraints including for example: The importance of heritage assets and the contribution they make to the town centre and The site has a very attractive historic edge to the west are clearly opportunities for ORL not constraints (unless the overriding objective is to redevelop</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD includes proposals for a public space. New sentence has been added to paragraph 7.7.1 to strengthen the Council's expectations.</p> <p>Heritage Assets are a potential constraint on development. The opportunity for proposals to preserve and enhance the conservation area has been included in the table.</p>	<p>Add new sentence to paragraph 7.7.1:</p> <p>7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility.</u></p> <p>Update the constraints and opportunities table, now in section 6, as follows:</p> <p>a) <u>To preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and <del>To</del> to protect and enhance the setting of Listed Buildings, <del>the Conservation Area</del> and other important heritage assets, including <u>the</u> Coopers building and</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>the whole area in an unsympathetic way).</p> <p>The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs would be a constraint if it was clearly demonstrated but, until it is, its current office business use is an opportunity to meet identified future requirements and reuse carbon locked up in the building.</p> <p>The number of mature trees including Category A (significant value) and the protection of the triangle of trees and green space towards the northern edge of the site are also clearly important natural assets and therefore an opportunity to retain. Similar assets such as the setting of Listed Buildings, the Conservation Area and other important heritage assets (Coopers, St Michaels, the URC) are described as opportunities.</p>	<p>Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.</p> <p>The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. As such their inclusion as a constraint is appropriate.</p>	<p>views to the Church of St Michael and <u>of</u> the motte mound of Waytemore Castle</p> <p>Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).</p> <p><del>e) The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>
Mrs Susan Swan (67)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities	Support	Vital to maintain the parking at Waitrose for those who have limited mobility. Similarly, URC needs to be retained.	<p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
				proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	
Mr John Rhodes (191)  Stewart Marshall (383)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		The constraints listed in section 5 identify this as a valued community asset. Far from being a constraint, it should be treated as an opportunity, and a building which should also be retained for sustainability reasons. Although policy BISH8 makes no reference to arts and culture, this is now included as the third objective in section 6 of the SPD. The main arts and culture offer is provided at the southern end of the town with the Southmill arts centre and the Empire Cinema. Any arts offer on ORL should complement and not duplicate the provision which exists already and should be focussed on the URC church hall, refurbished if necessary. Any additional provision, if not adjacent to the hall, should be as close as possible to the car park to minimise disturbance to any residential development on the site.	Noted. Objective 3 sets out that proposals should deliver a mix of town centre uses, including arts and culture, to create a vibrant place that supports and complements the wider town centre offer.	No amendment in response to this issue.
CLlr Calvin Horner (165)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities	Object	5.1.1. (Table) With regard to Charringtons House the 'unsuitability' of the building to 'meet modern day needs' is asserted	Reference to the unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs has been deleted.	Delete the following text from the table following paragraph 5.1.1 (now 6.1.1).

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>without any discussion of the reasons why this view is held or of the current use of the building.</p> <p>Similarly, the inclusion of the URC Hall is assumed without a full discussion here or elsewhere of the merit of doing so. The inclusion of both as 'constraints', rather than 'opportunities' indicates that the document is being drawn up on the basis of decisions or assumptions having been made by the Council as the developers of the site. For neither of these buildings has the issue of sustainability and mitigation for the release of embedded carbon been referenced or considered.</p>	<p>Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House or the URC Hall, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, applicants will be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.</p>	<p>c) <del>The unsuitability of Charringtons House to meet modern day needs.</del></p>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		<p>The constraints listed in Chapter 5 identify the URC Church hall as a valued community asset. It's much-used for many performing arts purposes as well as other community uses – though SPD does not acknowledge any of them. Therefore, rather than being a constraint, the building should be seen as a potential opportunity for retention and repurposing, if only for sustainability reasons.</p>	<p>Reference now made to URC Hall in paragraph 2.2.10, and 2.4.1 has been expanded to include reference to the history of the hall.</p>	<p>Add detail to paragraphs 2.2.10 and 2.4.1.</p> <p><u>2.2.10 ...In 1860 on Water Lane to the west of the site the Congregational Church was built, which was later renamed the United Reformed Church. In 1915 a Sunday School was built within the Old River Lane site for the Congregational Church, a building now known as the United Reformed Church Hall.</u></p>



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>Therefore, in developing the site's performing arts and other arts and leisure offer the SPD should</p> <p>i) In addition to the other assessments specified in the letter, require an architectural and structural feasibility and cost-benefit assessment for retaining and repurposing the hall, versus providing the required facilities via a total new build.</p> <p>ii) Compare the scope and type of the 'offer' that can be provided with that offered by the town's main arts and culture venues of the Southmill Arts Centre and the Empire Cinema, so they are mutually beneficial to each other and not in competition. Also, generally, BSCF considers the leisure and arts 'offer' should be as close as possible to the north of the site, close to Northgate car park, to minimise disturbance to any residences built on the site.</p>	<p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).</p> <p>Objective 3 sets out that proposals should deliver a mix of town centre uses, including arts and culture, to create a vibrant place that supports and complements the wider town centre offer.</p>	<p>2.4.1 ... <u>The URC Hall was built in 1915 as a Sunday School for the Congregational Church, now known as the United Reformed Church on Water Lane. It was extensively altered and extended in the 1930s, 1960s, and 1990s.</u></p> <p>No amendments in response to these issues.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>5.</b>			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
Mrs Helen Lednor (235)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		We all recognise that in many towns and cities it is the vibrant arts quarter of a town that people most want to live alongside because it gets a buzz going or want to visit and see if anything's happening; it becomes financially very active because of its thriving local economy. Why isn't there more vision about the contribution and opportunities of The Arts within this ORL SDP?	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.
Cityheart Homes Ltd (338)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		5.5.1 (Table): Public Realm / Environment Constraint bullet point c) Recent flood investigation/ modelling work that has been undertaken indicates a better and improved (lesser) classification of the site. Need to caveat the content of the SPD accordingly to qualify that based on current evidence only.  5.5.1 (Table): Land Use Constraint bullet point c) It should be noted that Planning Permission and Conservation Area Consent has previously been granted for the demolition of this facility (as part of the approval of the earlier outline	Noted. A Flood Risk Assessment will need to be submitted with any planning application.  Planning permission was previously granted on the 14 January 2013 for the demolition of Charringtons House. This permission was never implemented. Any new proposals will be considered on their merits.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site). Need as such to clarify that it is the 'use' of this facility that needs to be assessed for loss / compensation, as opposed to its physical presence and merit per se (not listed / not considered suitable for listing / planning permission and conservation area consent previously approved for its demolition).</p> <p>5.5.1 (Table): Traffic &amp; Transportation bullet point f) A dotted line and annotation refers to "lost views of church". This is neutral i.e., not implying that one exists (and accordingly should be retained / protected), nor necessarily that one should be created. Indeed, reference to the term "lost" confirms that it does not exist. Any scheme will however see to be responsive to this factor.</p>	Noted.	No amendment in response to these issues.
Mr Colin Woodward (363)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		<p>5.1 Water features perhaps consider what exists in Letchworth town centre.</p> <p>Waitrose re-provision of 170 spaces: are these to move or not? Recent Press comment from EHC seems to</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Parking for Waitrose will continue to be provided on site.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			indicate that the SPD has already been over-ridden and the 170 are not moving. Therefore, undermining EHC case to demolish the URC Hall as necessary and unavoidable.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (423)	5.1 Identification of Constraints and Opportunities		5.1.1 - Constraints and Opportunities table. Where relevant, references to preceding sections and paras should be added, to help masterplanning. The table could also summarise relevant information from sections 2-4, such as parts of the BISH8 policies, relevant NP policies (see Annex 2); thereby introducing Section 7 - Design Principles Examples of items to include are the position of the new Bridge St entrance into Jackson Square as both a constraint, and an opportunity evidence that Charringtons House does not meet modern-day needs, including assessment of the embedded carbon implications of demolishing it vs repurposing it (Heritage constraint (c)) Traffic and Transportation: If lack of cycle parking and pedestrian/cycling/vehicular conflict are constraints, it is not clear why prioritising walking and cycling is an opportunity. High pollution levels in the nearby Hockerill Air Quality	The SPD should be read as a whole and there is no need to repeat information from other sections.  The opportunities and constraints as presented and updated are considered an appropriate approach.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>Management Area (AQMA) is an important constraint on open area activities and would be better included in a Climate Change and the Environment topic area. Public Realm/Environment - Securing long term stewardship of public spaces within the development is an important project delivery requirement but the current lack of stewardship mechanisms is a constraint. Land Use This topic is rightly presented almost entirely in terms of the opportunities which a largely undeveloped site in a key town centre/conservation area location offers. The only constraints are around competing aspirations/requirements for use of the site, including: Waitrose owns a lease on the portion of car parking to the south of its store and requires all parking spaces to be at grade/storefront walk-in as part of its offer. The loss of any of the existing 170 storefront spaces as part of reorganisation of the site layout should be on a like-for-like basis. (though with Northgate MSCP so close is this still non-negotiable? - parking for Sainsburys in Jackson Square is not at grade, it also has a</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			scheme to compensate shoppers for the cost of parking). Meeting the around 100 homes requirement of Policy BISH8.II at appropriate height and density standards means that most of the built space will be for housing crowding out the key objectives of delivering the sensitive development of a new town centre destination with a mix of commercial and community and high-quality public spaces.		
Environment Agency (444)	Section 5		<p>River Stort - Main River</p> <p>We note that the document references the presence of a culverted stretch of the river Stort running through the site and the history as to why it was constructed. However, there is little reference as to what constraints this has on the site. Specifically, within Section 5.1, there is no mention of the culvert and how this may be a constraint when developing the site. Because this is a complex site constraint, we feel that the main river should be given its own section or sub-section within the SPD to allow for the inclusion of further guidance relative to this specific constraint.</p> <p>We firstly recommend that wording is included within the SPD which</p>	<p>An additional constraint has been added to the Public Realm/ Environment Constraint section in Chapter 6 which relates directly to the culverted watercourse. Reference to the 8m easement has been included throughout the document to reflect this comment, and the East Herts District Plan Policy WAT3.</p> <p>The option of de-culverting the river has been added to both the opportunity section as a separate point d); and a further reference has been made within Chapter 7 - section 7.4. Given that this SPD sets out a Strategic Masterplanning Framework much of the further detail regarding the culverting can't</p>	<p>Add an additional constraint under Public Realm/Environment as follows:</p> <p><u>d) To explore the benefits that de-culverting the River could have on the Old River Lane development</u></p> <p>Add an additional point under Section 7.4 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>The benefits of de-culverting the River could be explored;</u></li> </ul>

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>requires any future planning application to include a thorough investigation into options to de-culvert the watercourse on this site, in line with Policy WAT3 of the East Herts District Plan. Please note that the River Stort is chalk stream, which is a globally rare species rich habitat. There is therefore the potential for huge gains on this site from re-naturalising this stretch of river. Some of these gains are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourages the future enhancement of the channel.</li> <li>• Removes future culvert capacity.</li> <li>• Supports Water Framework Directive objectives and biodiversity net gain requirements, in line with the Thames River Basin Management Plan and the Stort Catchment Management Plan.</li> <li>• Less maintenance required (for the lifetime of the development).</li> <li>• Improved access to the channel for maintenance and emergency purposes.</li> <li>• Removes the risk of culvert failure or blockage.</li> </ul> <p>Whether or not this can be achieved, we note that Section 2.3.5 calls for “a 5m easement as the culvert is classified as a watercourse” which is</p>	<p>be included at this stage, however it will form part of the discussion at the pre-application stage.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>smaller than the standard area of exclusion for building adjacent to a main river. Please note Policy WAT3 (part II) of the East Herts District Plan which states: "Unless there is clear justification for not doing so, an undeveloped buffer strip at least 8 metres wide should be maintained alongside all main rivers". If sufficient justification is submitted to show that the river cannot be re-naturalised, we wish at the very least to see an 8-metre-wide buffer zone provided from the outer edge of each side of the culvert for both the design of the development and during the construction process. Detailed supporting evidence and justification would need to be provided in the event that this is not possible. We advise that the wording within the SPD is altered to reflect this.</p> <p>Other points of concern that should be considered and could be included within the SPD for further guidance prior to the submission of any planning application are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to the culvert should be maintained or improved - considering access to manhole covers and access chambers. Access</li> </ul>		



Rep No.	Section/ Para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
5.			<b>Constraints and Opportunities</b>		
			<p>for future replacement/upgrade of the culvert and also for maintenance/emergency purposes should also be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The condition of the culvert will be required to be investigated to show that it is currently in fair to good condition and will be maintained for the lifetime of the development. If the culvert is found to be below its required condition grade, repair works will be required before the proposal can be considered acceptable. The maintenance regime must ensure that the culvert will remain in acceptable condition for the lifetime of the development.</li> <li>• It must be demonstrated that there will be no adverse effects on the culvert. This can be demonstrated through loading calculations, vibration monitoring information and foundation/piles drawings.</li> <li>• Following the construction of the development, a post-works condition survey must be carried out on the culvert to ensure no damage has occurred. If damage has occurred, repairs must be carried out within a time frame set out by the Local</li> </ul>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>6.</b>			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
Carolyn Matthews (96)	6. Vision and Development Objectives	Support		Support noted and welcomed.	-
Cllr Mione Goldspink (328)	6. Vision and Development Objectives		Section 6 – Vision and Objectives All 6 objectives are supported, but please strengthen Nos 1 and 3 by saying that nothing should be done which would be in competition with existing assets or activities.	Support noted and welcomed.  Objectives 1 and 3 are already both clear that any development should complement local assets / the wider town centre offer.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Woodward (364)	6. Vision and Development Objectives		Vision - not as 'shared' as perhaps EHC implies	The Vision and Objectives were both discussed with the Old River Lane Steering Group.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (424)  Mr Colin Arnott (132)	6. Vision and Development Objectives		The SPD presents the Vision and Development Objectives for ORL in Section 6.0, following the Identification of Constraints and Opportunities in Section 5.0. It would be normal for the vision and objectives to precede them such that the constraints and opportunities are identified based on their potential to constrain or facilitate the delivery of the vision and objectives. To reverse these sections implies that the aspirations for the development have been set by these limitations. Recommendation that Sections 5 and 6 of the SPD are reversed.	Agreed.	Reverse Sections 5 and 6, with consequent amendments to the Table of Contents and paragraph 1.3.1.

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			<p>Also, although it is challenging to set a Vision for a complex mixed-use development in a short statement, BSCF believes that the most important aspirations for ORL are captured in the Vision statement proposed.</p> <p>We believe that the establishment of ORL as a town centre destination is a key objective and that the word destination should be highlighted.</p> <p>BSCF also believes the description of the ORL project as redevelopment is limiting and use of the broader term development implies broader objectives of economic and social as well as physical development of the town centre and would not preclude retaining some areas and/or buildings.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Redevelopment is appropriately used, meaning the action or process of developing something again or differently.</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Highlight the word 'destination' in the Vision:</p> <p>"Old River Lane will be a <b>high-quality, accessible, and sustainable</b> redevelopment of a town centre <b>destination</b> that incorporates a <b>mixture of uses</b> that contribute to the <b>vibrancy</b> of Bishop's Stortford and <b>complements the uniqueness</b> of this historic market town."</p>
Mr John Darley (7)	6.1 Vision	Object	<p>There has been mention of cinema screens, but now the use is termed as 'mixed'. What are the intended or hoped for leisure activities? Is education being included in this? If more specific uses are not given, this leaves the detailed plan open to including inappropriate or unwanted occupants.</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any</p>	<p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
				<p>subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>The SPD does not include proposals for educational use.</p>	
Cllr Chris Wilson (151)	6.1 Vision		This is a very vague statement. As with my previous comments, I feel that given the number of hours dedicated to meetings with respect to the future of ORL, there should be more detail as to what should be at the site.	This is intended to be a short statement which captures the aspirations for the site. Minor amendments have been made following comments from the Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Luke Hayes (3)	6.2 Development Objectives		Regarding the existing underground river, will there be any investigations into the possibility of re-opening this stretch of river? This could be a fantastic new natural/green leaning completely pedestrian area to complement the existing shopping areas. I understand that the town needs more accommodation and a proper market/public space area, this can all be done with a view to keeping the town as green as possible and re-imaging and bringing back to the life the existing water course. Look at the cinema	There are no plans to re-open this stretch of the river. However, the importance of green infrastructure is however embedded throughout the SPD as a key consideration. The SPD also sets out that proposals should consider the use of water features and public art in the design of the new spaces to reference the former route of the River Stort	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			development on Anchor St, the housing + Weatherspoon's on Riverside and Jackson's square as good examples of exactly what not to do when you have a watercourse at the centre of your town. Maybe this development could in some way be used to counteract those disastrous developments?		
Mr James Tatchell (36)	6.2 Development Objectives	Object	6.2 We do not need any more mixed housing types in this town. A few flats ("around 100"), including affordably priced units and units for senior living would be acceptable, but no more than that.	Noted. The SPD reflects the policy requirement	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Arnott (133)	6.2 Development Objectives		Objective 1: Deliver a sensitive development which enhances Bishop's Stortford's historic setting and complements local assets. [replacing redevelopment with development].  Objective 4: Establish a new town centre destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time by creating new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all. [Reversing the object of the statement to the establishing of a new destination by creating new	Redevelopment is appropriately used, meaning the action or process of developing something again or differently.  Agreed. Objective 4 updated as suggested.	Amend Objective 4 as follows:  <del>Create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all and establish a civic destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time.</del>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<p align="center"><b>Vision and Development Objectives</b></p>		
			<p>high quality public spaces which I believe is as important as the mix of uses.]</p> <p>Also, while the ordering of objectives should not imply any prioritisation of them, it is usual with strategic objectives such as these to order the what before the how as far as possible. I would recommend that the first 5 objectives be reordered as follows: 3/4/1/5/2.</p> <p>Objective 6: Support a sustainable community by providing a mix of housing types, and a range of employment opportunities that meet the local need. appears somewhat out of place in terms of delivering the Vision. It is clear that the provision of housing at ORL is in response to DP Policy BISH8 II to provide round 100 new homes. This in turn derives from DP Policy DPS3 on Housing Supply specifically to provide around 1,100 houses in East Herts on brownfield sites, 850 of which are in 3 sites in Bishop's</p>	<p>The Objectives are not in order of priority. To bring forward the vision for ORL, all the objectives are equally relevant and so it doesn't matter which order they are presented in.</p> <p>Not agreed. This is a mixed-use development which will include new homes in accordance with District Plan Policy BISH8. Policy DPS3 sets out the minimum supply to meet projected housing need over the Plan-period. 850 is therefore not a target.</p>	<p><u>Establish a new town centre destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time by creating new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all.</u></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<p align="center"><b>Vision and Development Objectives</b></p>		
			<p>Stortford the smallest of which is ORL. In practice, approved masterplans and consents on the other two Bishop's Stortford sites already significantly exceeds 850 on housing development led sites. It is BISH III which makes clear that ORL is a mixed use led town centre site which will represent an extension of a historic market town with the creation of a high-quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a civic hub of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace. ORL has never provided town centre housing and any mix of homes on the site will detract rather than add to the site as destination. Objective 6 appears to justify providing a mix of housing types (unquantified) in order to create a sustainable community collocating homes and jobs in the town centre. If any objective is included to justify housing development, it should more specifically address a continuing need to meet the brownfield housing targets set for Bishop's Stortford in policy DPS3.</p>		

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
Mrs Susan Swan (68)	6.2 Development Objectives	Support	This is the first mention of Arts and Culture in the whole document - it is vital for the soul of Bishop's Stortford that Arts - including theatre, live concerts etc are included in this development.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mark Doran (141)	6.2 Development Objectives	Object	<p>Objective 2: this should prioritise all sustainable modes including bus and cyclists (as well as pedestrians) over the car.</p> <p>Objective 3: this is the first mention of arts and culture, which is essential for a vibrant town centre and community, so should also be referenced throughout the document.</p> <p>Objective 5: should be strengthened to refer to minimising carbon emissions (achieving net zero in operation), improving biodiversity, not worsening water scarcity and not worsening surface water run-off.</p>	<p>The objective already refers to 'encouraging sustainable modes of travel' which would include travel by bus and cycling.</p> <p>A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information on the Arts Centre.</p> <p>Agreed. Objective 5 has been strengthened.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.</p> <p>Amend Objective 5 as follows:</p> <p><del>Deliver a place that is increasingly resilient to variable conditions resulting from climate change with environmental sustainability embedded throughout.</del></p> <p><u>Deliver an environmentally sustainable place that minimises carbon emissions, is resilient to the variable conditions resulting from climate change, reduces pressure on</u></p>



Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
					<u>resources such as water and, enhances biodiversity.</u>
Mrs Jill Wade (255)	6.2 Development Objectives		<p>I support the inclusion of Objective 5. However, the Checklist at 7.15 recommends the exploration of standards above and beyond the requirements of conversant Building Regulations where appropriate and achievable. This should not be diminished in response to developer claims of unviability, as has been seen with previous local developments. This is the opportunity to create a flagship development something which demonstrates the Council recognises this community's commitment to and desire for the most modern technology in response to our changing climate and the need to control global warming. I am confident that a large proportion of residents feel strongly about this. As stated above, all existing buildings should be retained, refurbished and/or re-purposed to reduce the carbon footprint of the development.</p> <p>I would support the requirement for use of renewable, zero and low-</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst the SPD cannot introduce targets that exceed the policy requirements of the District Plan, Objective 5 has been strengthened.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 5 as follows:</p> <p><del>Deliver a place that is increasingly resilient to variable conditions resulting from climate change with environmental sustainability embedded throughout.</del></p> <p><u>Deliver an environmentally sustainable place that minimises carbon emissions, is resilient to the variable conditions resulting from climate change, reduces pressure on resources such as water and, enhances biodiversity.</u></p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			<p>carbon technology to fulfil the requirements of Policy DES4 (Design of Development) rather than mere encouragement. This section should therefore be strengthened.</p> <p>Proposals should utilise and incorporate existing green infrastructure, taking account of the large mature trees present across the site. Planting should be used to reinforce key routes and improve connections. I object strongly to the removal of any trees on the site. This Council has already been responsible for environmental vandalism on a huge scale to make way for the new MSCP.</p>	<p>As above, the SPD cannot introduce targets that exceed the policy requirements of the District Plan.</p> <p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible. Furthermore, the Strategic Masterplanning Framework set out in the SPD embeds green infrastructure as a key consideration.</p>	
Mr James Hook (236)	6.2 Development Objectives	Object	<p>The Objectives in para 6.2.1 do not emphasize sufficiently the need for some outstanding architectural design in Bishop's Stortford. New buildings constructed in the town over the last several decades have been of mediocre to poor design quality. Much of the development currently underway will be the same. Some of the existing buildings (the leisure centre on Anchor Street, for example, and the recently added car park opposite it) are a blight on the</p>	<p>Agreed. The vision for Old River Lane is to deliver a high quality, mixed-use scheme of exceptional design that contributes to the vibrancy of Bishop's Stortford and complements the uniqueness of our historic market town.</p>	<p>Amend Objective 1 to include reference to 'exceptional design':</p> <p>Objective 1 - Deliver a sensitive redevelopment of <u>exceptional design</u> which enhances Bishop's Stortford's historic setting and complements local assets.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			town. Bishop's Stortford's historic setting will not be enhanced by building more of this. Just the opposite. Objective 4 is to Create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all and establish a civic destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time. High quality is not strong enough for a brief for this site. It is such a ubiquitous term for design briefs these days that it has become meaningless. In the context of Objective 4 it could easily be limited in interpretation to accessibility and inclusivity. Whilst these aspects are important, the Objectives need to be rephrased so that it is clear that what is being sought is architectural excellence that will provide an exciting and inspiring built environment. This is probably the last sizable plot in the town centre that isn't overshadowed by a mish mash of poor-quality buildings. We must make the most of it.		
Hertfordshire County Council (348)	6.2 Development Objectives		HCC support the Objective 2 as it accords with LTP4 Policy 1. However, this should be extended to include travel by cycles and e-cycles. There	Support noted and welcomed.  Noted. It is considered that 'sustainable travel' would cover	-

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			<p>are opportunities for active travel through the Grange Paddocks corridor that when completed, will enable cycle travel south to the town from BSN. This development should further enable this both through financial contributions but also through the provision of appropriate mass cycle permeability and parking at the location for retail (important given the reduction in private car parking) and also for the residential use (private cycle storage). This will also enable access to the leisure and cultural features located at Castle Park and also Grange Paddocks centre by residents of the new housing stock.</p> <p>Achievement of Objective 4 should be sensitive to existing and new facilities being developed in the Castle Park area so as not to detract or duplicate.</p>	<p>travel by cycles and e-cycles. Reference to e-bikes and other matters have been added/ strengthened in the Design Principles at Section 7.2 and 7.3.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	-
Mr Colin Woodward (365)	6.2 Development Objectives		6.2 Public space - previous EHC planning aspirations demonstrably failed the town and so why would this be any different?	A key objective of the SPD is to create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all. This is supported by a series of design principles in Chapter 7.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (425)	6.2 Development Objectives		<p>Objective 1: replace redevelopment with development.</p> <p>Objective 4: Reverse the object of the statement to the establishing of a new destination by creating new high quality public spaces which we believe is as important as the mix of uses, i.e. Establish a new town centre destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time by creating new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all. Also, while the ordering of objectives should not imply any prioritisation of them, it is usual with strategic objectives such as these to order the what before the how as far as possible.</p> <p>We would recommend that the first 5 objectives be reordered as follows: 3; 4; 1; 5; 2.</p> <p>We also consider Objective 6: Support a sustainable community by providing a mix of housing types,</p>	<p>Redevelopment is appropriately used, meaning the action or process of developing something again or differently.</p> <p>Agreed. Objective 4 updated as suggested.</p> <p>The Objectives are not in order of priority. To bring forward the vision for ORL, all the objectives are equally relevant and so it doesn't matter which order they are presented in.</p> <p>Not agreed. This is a mixed-use development which will include new homes in accordance with District</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Amend Objective 4 as follows:</p> <p><del>Create new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all and establish a civic destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time.</del></p> <p><u>Establish a new town centre destination where people can meet and enjoy spending time by creating new high quality public spaces and public realm that are accessible and inclusive to all.</u></p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<b>Vision and Development Objectives</b>		
			<p>and a range of employment opportunities that meet the local need is out of place in terms of delivering the Vision. This is because, while DP Policy BISH8.II allocates 850 new homes on the town's brownfield sites, plus a share of 43 homes on SLAA sites across the whole District there are already about 350+ homes approved on brownfield sites. They include: 73 extra homes on BISH6, 24 homes at 1-5 Priors, London Rd, 15 associated with the Northgate MSCP; total 112; plus 118 committed in the South Street &amp; Southmill Road area. In addition there are about 66 windfall homes approved in the vicinity of the town centre, i.e. walking distance, compared to a target of 73 for the town as a whole in the period 2017-22. They are all on brownfield sites. The town's brownfield target for the period 2011-2033 has therefore already been well exceeded BSCF also notes that while BISH8.III states that ORL is to be a mixed use-led site that will represent an extension of a historic market town, with the creation of a high quality mixed-use development of retail, leisure uses, along with a</p>	<p>Plan Policy BISH8. Policy DPS3 sets out the minimum supply to meet projected housing need over the Plan-period. 850 is therefore not a target.</p>	

Rep No.	Section/ Para. number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
6.			<p align="center"><b>Vision and Development Objectives</b></p>		
			<p>civic hub of other commercial and community uses such as GP surgery and B1 office floorspace; to date, the original ORL site, shown on Map 1, has never provided town centre housing. BSCF therefore considers any homes on the site, of whatever mix, will detract from it as a destination, rather than add to it. Objective 6 appears to justify providing a mix of unspecified housing types simply to create a sustainable community, by co-locating homes and jobs in the town centre. Therefore. if there is to be any objective to justify housing development it should more specifically address a continuing need to meet the town's brownfield housing targets in DP policy DPS3. (see 8.2) Criteria and timescales are also needed to objectively measure and monitor the extent to which effective/successful realisation of each objective is being achieved and sustained, and any changes needed in this respect.</p>		

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (21)	7. Design Principles		<p>Comment: Within the whole of this section 7, there is no reference to the existing Charringtons House - the biggest existing asset on the site, an income generator for the Council, a purpose-built office building with large and small businesses. This is an extraordinary omission. There are options to retain or demolish, or to modify or to retain and update the building. Amazingly, none of this is discussed.</p> <p>Amendment requested: Within Design principles, describe the options for Charringtons House. Explicitly state that the LPA would accept retention of the building, and adaptation, or conversion, or extension, including possible replacement lift and stair towers, updated glazing, conversion of the ground level to undercroft parking (if office users insist), conversion of the ground floor to part of an arts centre, or retail, or library. State that it would be fine for Charringtons House to remain in office use. In addition, state all the acceptable uses for Charringtons House over the long term, including healthcare,</p>	Chapter 7 sets out high-level Design Principles to ensure that the redevelopment of the site can meet the objectives and vision set out in Chapter 6. Whether or not Charringtons is retained as part of this development, the Design Principles will inform the detailed proposals.	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>7.</b>			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			education, library, workspace, housing.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (426)	7. Design Principles		7.0 - Design Principles. Except for climate change (see 7.4) relevant design principles in the town's new NPs need to be included here. (see Annex 2 for a list of policies considered relevant or partly relevant)	The Neighbourhood Plan for Silverleys and Meads Wards (1 <sup>st</sup> Revision) now forms part of the Development Plan and as such would be considered in the determination of any planning application. There is no need to repeat the policies in the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (428)	7.1 Introduction		7.1.2 - The development of the site should create high quality streets, spaces and buildings. New development will be required to demonstrate high standards of design and architectural quality that enhance the site, the setting of adjoining and nearby Listed Buildings and the Conservation Area. Criteria and timescales are needed to objectively measure and monitor the successful realisation of the objectives listed.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cllr Calvin Horner (169)	7.2 Movement		7.2.6 In the context of prioritising cycling the reference to Northgate End Car park is singularly inappropriate, as it is unlikely to be either a source or destination for journeys by bicycle even with cycle parking and charging for e-bikes installed there. Whilst a north-south cycling route across the ORL site	It is prudent to include cycling connections, wayfinding and legibility across the site towards Northgate End Car Park. Access to the link road and also to the cycling facilities and infrastructure contained within the Car Park allows cyclists to have clear connections rather than being diverted elsewhere	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			<p>should be included any route needs to look beyond the car park to improving cycle links between the north/north-west of Bishop's Stortford and the Town Centre/Station.</p> <p>Cycling routes around Bishop's Stortford are still lamentably absent, despite previous studies, and ORL should be used as a catalyst for the development of routes beyond the ORL site. The wording of the second bullet point therefore requires re-wording.</p> <p>In the fourth bullet point, reference should be made to the provision for charging facilities for e-bikes as they constitute another 'non-standard bike type' that should be encouraged in order to promote active transport.</p>	<p>or on a less favourable path, therefore not prioritising cycling.</p> <p>The second bullet point is sound as it relates to the site itself. Chapter 4 sets out opportunities for how the wider-cycle network can be accommodated by development at ORL alongside identifying interventions which in some cases relate to the improvement of the wider-cycle connections.</p> <p>Partially agreed. E-bikes have been specifically referenced in bullet five of the cycling design principles.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>Addition at bullet point 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle-parking and infrastructure should seek to accommodate non-standard bike types (e.g., cargo bikes) <u>and e-bikes.</u></li> </ul>
Mr Graham Oxborrow (206)	7.2 Movement	Object	<p>Ensure that the ORL development contributes to the reworking of town centre streets to support active travel and keep private cars away from community space. Section 7.2 The draft SPD:</p>	Noted.	

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Raises lots of possibilities in relation to North Street, Bridge Street and the ORL site, but does not set requirements.</li> <li>- Provides for permeability by pedestrians and cyclists but does not provide routes for them to the site from all directions.</li>   <li>- Enables the provision of new public parking spaces on the site, despite having already replaced the car parking provision in the Northgate End Multi-Storey car park. Office, shop, arts use will require servicing and disabled access but should not require additional private parking.</li> <li>- Does not limit the parking provision for residential buildings on the site.</li> </ul>	<p>The SPD provides a strategic masterplanning framework against which more detailed proposals can be assessed. Chapter 4 sets out that there are specific interventions in place for these areas and for wider-routes as part of the Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 part (g) states that: <i>“on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters.”</i></p> <p>As such the SPD notes the policy requirement to provide for car parking to meet the needs on the site, but also sets out the access to nearby car parks and the need to prioritise active travel. As such it takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce car parking on ORL</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p> <p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			- Is silent on public transport users' access to the site	particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities. The 1st bullet point of the walking and cycling principles has been updated to include and recognise 'public transport infrastructure'.	Update 1 <sup>st</sup> Bullet point (also applies to cycling): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals should improve walking connections, wayfinding, and legibility from and to <u>the following</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Castle Gardens;</li> <li>Northgate End Car Park;</li> <li>Bishop's Stortford Town Centre;</li> <li><u>Grange Paddocks Leisure Centre</u>;</li> <li><u>Other green spaces</u>;</li> <li><u>Public transport infrastructure</u>;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Mr Colin Woodward (366)	7.2 Movement		7.2.6 Prioritise Cycling, the new Grange Paddocks has three large and 95% unused empty cycle rack sites. BS town centre already has some 40, (as counted by BSTC), that have now been clearly marked. Why add space for what is demonstrably already over provided and in a town where a former committed cyclist and Chief Executive publicly stated to Chantry Residents AGM (and was Minuted) that Stortford was too dangerous for cycling? Any provision needs to be segregated from walkers/children/the elderly. (Three instances observed of serious i.e.,	Infrastructure improvement should aim to enhance the cycling experience for both cyclists and pedestrians. This will in turn encourage more active travel to and from key locations.  An updated bullet point has also been added to Prioritising Cycling to recognise existing cycle infrastructure standards. These documents recognise, amongst other things, mixed streets and cycle friendly spaces.	Addition of bullet point in Prioritising Cycling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Cycle infrastructure should consider the standards set out in Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN1/20) and, Standards for Public Cycle Parking June 2021.</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			lycra/helmeted cyclists in one afternoon riding through the red light on new Northgate car park ped crossing as people attempted to cross. Not unusual unfortunately).		
Hertfordshire County Council (349)	7.2 Movement		<p>3.8 Movement 7.2.6: HCC recommend reference to the need for improved wayfinding to Grange Paddocks Leisure Centre and green spaces. The consultation document should also consider the need for safe storage and charging of e-cycles, which will also need to be integrated into the residential property to encourage take up. The likelihood of deliveries to residential in this setting by e-cargo bike should be part of the planned servicing strategy.</p> <p>3.9 When setting out requirements for cycle/e-cycle parking these facilities should be established at scale, closer to the retail than the car parking, considerate of the requirements to recharge, and using structures that demonstrate best practice.</p>	<p>Agreed – the first bullet point of the ‘Prioritising Walking’ and ‘Prioritising Cycling’ principles has been updated to include Grange Paddocks and ‘other green spaces’. Likewise, the addition of reference to e-bikes has now been included in the penultimate bullet point of the cycling principles.</p> <p>Addition of reference to e-bikes in the penultimate bullet point of Prioritising Cycling. Bullet point also added in Servicing and Vehicular Access section of the Design Principles Chapter.</p>	<p>Update 1<sup>st</sup> Bullet point (also applies to cycling):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals should improve walking connections, wayfinding, and legibility from and to <u>the following</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Castle Gardens;</li> <li>○ Northgate End Car Park;</li> <li>○ Bishop’s Stortford Town Centre;</li> <li>○ <u>Grange Paddocks Leisure Centre</u>;</li> <li>○ <u>Other green spaces</u>;</li> <li>○ <u>Public transport infrastructure</u>;</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>5<sup>th</sup> Bullet point addition in Prioritising Cycling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle-parking and infrastructure should seek to accommodate non-standard bike types (e.g. cargo bikes) <u>and e-bikes</u></li> </ul> <p>Addition of bullet point in Servicing and Vehicular Access in section 7.3:</p>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			3.10 This section should reference the standards set out LTN1/20 or Standards for Public Cycle Parking or subsequent.	Agreed – final bullet point added to include reference to standards suggested.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>The accommodation and location of e-cargo bike infrastructure should be considered at the design stage;</u></li> </ul> Addition of bullet point in Prioritising Cycling: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Cycle infrastructure should consider the standards set out in Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN1/20) and, Standards for Public Cycle Parking June 2021.</u></li> </ul>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (430)	7.2 Movement		<p>"7.2.1 - The location of the site on the edge of the town centre, with the Castle Gardens and the new multi-storey car park on the opposite side of the Link Road means that the approach to movement will have wider impacts across the town. Any new development should therefore contribute to creating active and pedestrian friendly streets and public spaces that help to form a legible and attractive pedestrian network in the town centre."</p> <p>The development of Sworders Field and Grange Paddocks needs to be acknowledged (also applies elsewhere in the document), along with the opportunities for active</p>	<p>Partially agreed. Reference to Grange Paddocks and other green spaces has been included in the first bullet point of the 'Prioritising Walking' and 'Prioritising Cycling' design principles.</p> <p>An additional bullet point has also been added to recognise existing cycle infrastructure standards. These documents recognise, amongst other things, mixed streets and cycle friendly spaces.</p>	<p>Update 1<sup>st</sup> Bullet point (also applies to cycling):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals should improve walking connections, wayfinding, and legibility from and to <u>the following</u>:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Castle Gardens;</li> <li>Northgate End Car Park;</li> <li>Bishop's Stortford Town Centre;</li> <li><u>Grange Paddocks Leisure Centre;</u></li> <li><u>Other green spaces;</u></li> <li><u>Public transport infrastructure;</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			movement, recreation, etc., it is going to offer. This is also relevant to the way it will interact with ORL and vice versa. The SPD should provide for this. Cycle-friendly/mixed-use streets are not mentioned here and should be, with reference to section 7.2.6 Cycling		<p>Addition of bullet point in Prioritising Cycling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Cycle infrastructure should consider the standards set out in Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN1/20) and, Standards for Public Cycle Parking June 2021.</u></li> </ul>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (429)	7.2 Movement		7.2 - Movement - This section has nothing about public transport and improving bus linkages. This is very important, not only for movement considerations, especially to the town's south and west, but also as contributing to its sustainability and energy efficiency	Reference to public transport has now been added to the first bullet point. This should be read together with the, more intervention-based, additions in Chapter 4 regarding Public Transport.	<p>Update 1<sup>st</sup> Bullet point (also applies to cycling):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposals should improve walking connections, wayfinding, and legibility from and to <u>the following</u>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Castle Gardens;</li> <li>○ Northgate End Car Park;</li> <li>○ Bishop's Stortford Town Centre;</li> <li>○ <u>Grange Paddocks Leisure Centre</u>;</li> <li>○ <u>Other green spaces</u>;</li> <li>○ <u>Public transport infrastructure</u>;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (431)	7.2 Movement		7.2.6 - Prioritising cycling - There is no reference to the towns cycling strategy by Sustrans (applies to earlier sections too).	The Bishop's Stortford Walking and Cycling Strategy is referenced as a source in the Hertfordshire Eastern Area Growth and Transport Plan	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			E-bike requirements need to be included.	<p>references and as such is incorporated into the SPD.</p> <p>Addition of reference to e-bikes has now been included in the penultimate bullet point of the cycling principles.</p>	
Mrs Sarah Ashton (42)	7.3 Parking and Servicing	Object	<p>Earlier in the SPD it is stated: g) on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters. How does this fit with incentivising car free travel? There needs to be residential parking as a minimum of 1 for 1. Public car parks may be available for evenings but there generating permit fees however there needs to be a balance for public car parking to support the local economy and therefore this needs to be available for visitors to the town centre. You need to get car clubs in the multi storey for use by anyone in town centre and not just new development residents. Developers providing less parking</p>	<p>Policy BISH8 part (g) states that: <i>“on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters.”</i></p> <p>As such the SPD notes the policy requirement to provide for car parking to meet the needs on the site, but also sets out the access to nearby car parks and the need to prioritise active travel. As such it takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce car parking on ORL particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			standards need to subsidise public transport for new residents (e.g., train season ticket/bus fares/car parking permits) for a minimum of 1 year to support a modal shift and encourage 1 car households. But there needs to be realism as people in Bishops Stortford will own a minimum of 1 car per household. Less than this is not feasible. Get prescriptive with what you want rather than travel plan which set targets which may/may not be achieved.		
Carolyn Matthews (97)	7.3 Parking and Servicing	Support	<p>7.7 Urban greening- opportunity to incorporate greening at different levels- roof gardens /balcony Consider plants that are drought resistant and attractive to wildlife. Materials - incorporate swift, bat boxes especially on East facing buildings towards Castle Gardens.</p> <p>Solar panels to reduce energy consumption as well as the carbon footprint.</p>	<p>The Council recognises the importance of integrating biodiversity into new development. District Plan Policy NE3 Species and Habitats requires development to enhance biodiversity and create opportunities for wildlife, including the integration of bird and bat boxes for sites adjacent to open space. As such the support for species will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD encourages proposals to maximise sustainability and sets out several criteria in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5 that need to be considered, including</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			<p>There are a lot of dog owners in Bishop's Stortford - Dog waste bins that can generate energy for ambient lighting- where suitable.</p> <p>Waste collection - as there will be more eateries etc perhaps consider those operations take back litter (this scheme is encouraged in Mevagissy, Cornwall to reduce rubbish and associated problems with seagulls). Or at least facilitate separate bins for cans/paper etc.</p>	<p>improving current building standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Council's Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	
Mark Doran (142)	7.3 Parking and Servicing	Support	Residential parking: car use should also be discouraged by the provision of less than one car parking space per dwelling (given proximity to town centre).	The SPD sets out that given the proximity of the site to public transport and facilities, there should be a significantly reduced amount of parking, including residential and other uses.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Ms Helen Miller (187)	7.3 Parking and Servicing	Object	We need more arts spaces not less. The proposed theatre has morphed into a cinema with the council blaming lack of funds (why didn't	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			they make developers, who are raking it in all over Stortford, contribute?). In the absence of a purpose-built performance/concert hall, we need more multifunctional spaces that work for arts organisations, not less. If there is any doubt that the adaptable performance space in the new ORL arts centre will not be able to support local arts, then it is essential that the URC hall is kept. Meanwhile I understand that planning permission to create more community space at the actual URC church is still stuck in the system. When are councillors going to sort his out? Lack of foresight by the council is a missed opportunity. We are on the mainline from London to Cambridge and could easily have attracted major stars to Bishop's Stortford while providing for local theatre, orchestras and choirs. We could have had a venue to rival Saffron Hall. As it is, there is barely a venue big enough in this town to cater for a choir and orchestra.	could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.	
Hertfordshire County Council (350)	7.3 Parking and Servicing		Servicing 7.3.2: The Servicing and Vehicle Access section should consider the opportunity at the design stage to enable/	Agreed. New bullet point added in the Servicing and Vehicular Access section to reflect this comment and	Add new bullet point: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The accommodation and location of e-cargo bike infrastructure</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			accommodate a retail e-cargo bike delivery service to the town's residential areas.	the consideration of e-cargo bike infrastructure.	<u>should be considered at the design stage;</u>
Mr Colin Woodward (367)	7.3 Parking and Servicing		<p>7.3.2 Allocating parking see above please i.e. the numbers that will remove public spaces should be evidenced now.</p> <p>Travel Planning - a much-touted EHC basis for the Stortford Fields development though neither TP nor Smarter Choices have been delivered and it was many months after occupations that the 311 bus was added, (usage??). That development also generates frequent complaints by new residents of lack of ability to park and allocated car spaces being occupied by others.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.</p> <p>It is prudent to set out principles to guide the approach to parking and servicing on this site as well as sign posting the best opportunities to reduce the use and reliance on the car.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Cityheart Homes Ltd (339)	7.3 Parking and Servicing		7.3.2 - Parking provision - expectations regarding (reduced) level. The level of provision (and the expectation that this will be significantly reduced) will need to be balanced against the commercial and operational needs of the development.	Noted.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (432)	7.3 Parking and Servicing		7.3 - Parking and Servicing - If a care home is included in the site (which has been talked of), this would generate a lot of service traffic. The	Noted. The Servicing and Vehicular Access design principles would cover the expected servicing needs of any care home. As such, there is an	No amendment in response to this comment.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			negatives of this are considered to significantly outweigh the positives of not only with respect to parking and serving, etc., but also ORL as a destination.	expectation that these principles are considered by all proposed uses and contribute towards the site as a whole.	
Cross-party working group on ORL site (23)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		<p>The Council (as a corporate whole) made a climate statement in 2019: 1.4.13 East Herts Council made a declaration on Climate Change in 2019 and is committed to putting environmental sustainability at the heart of everything it does. There is no articulation of how this statement can be realised on this Council-owned land, with the Council's direct power to insist on net-zero-carbon development.</p> <p>Amendment requested: The LPA must explicitly press the Council (as landowner) to do this, to go way beyond planning policy. It is not sufficient to defer to climate-change planning policy because it has been cut away by the government scrapping mandatory targets.</p> <p>Comment: Charringtons House and climate change - There is no reference at all to the embodied carbon in the existing buildings and foundations. We made the case for</p>	<p>Legally the SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement. The checklist and statement are a validation requirement and require the developer to demonstrate how the scheme's design, construction and operation are minimising carbon emissions from the site.</p>	No amendment in response to this comment.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			<p>retaining Charringtons House for environmental reasons in section 7 of our report. Building owners and architects now commonly prefer to retain and adapt buildings to save embodied carbon. The greenest building is the one that already exists (The Times June 2021). Embodied carbon emissions can't be reduced later they have already happened (Building Research Establishment / BRE). The Pritzker Prize the highest honour in the architecture world has been awarded to. whose most impressive projects are all refurbishments (Guardian March 2021). Kier Construction (Cityheart) retrofitted and refurbished Gloucestershire County Council's 1960s Shire Hall and won a BRE award. Glenn Howells Architects (Cityheart), are a one of the signatories of Architects Declare <a href="https://www.architectsdeclare.com/">https://www.architectsdeclare.com/</a> This includes: Upgrade existing buildings for extended use as a more carbon efficient alternative to demolition and new build whenever there is a viable choice.</p> <p>Amendments requested: The SPD should strongly encourage retention</p>	<p>Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design.</p>	

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			and adaptation of Charringtons House. Make plain the carbon cost of demolition, as a planning policy consideration and site constraint. The demolition of any building should be justified against the carbon cost, the public interest of the proposed redevelopment and the Council's climate declaration. The SPD should require a life cycle assessment using existing tools - for example London Plan One-click, or FCBS Carbon. Add statements to the SPD from Kier Construction and Glenn Howells Architects on their commitment to carbon efficiency.		
Mr James Tatchell	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Object	7.15 This clause is not nearly strong enough and will result in the developer ignoring it completely, as was the case in the heating provision at the Goods Yard Development. An insistence on solar (PV) cells in sufficient quantities on all roofs should be a bare minimum, as well as sufficient electric charging points in any car parking to meet expected demand for electric vehicles over the next 20 years	<p>The SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>The guidance in the SPD encourages the scheme to maximise sustainability and sets out a number of criteria in the green box on p57 that need to be considered, including improving current building standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design.</p>	<p>Amend the third bullet point in the box following paragraph 7.4.5 as follows:</p> <p>Carbon reduction on-site, <u>including the incorporation of renewable energy</u>, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible or viable....</p>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				<p>It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on improving the sustainable design and construction of new development, including fabric improvements and the incorporation of renewable energy. The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that reference to renewable energy could be more explicit, so the text is amended to include a reference in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5.</p>	
Carolyn Matthews (98)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Support		Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mrs Susan Swan (69)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		There is no mention of use of Alternative Energy in the form of heat pumps, solar panels etc. These are vital if we are to move towards reducing pollution and CO2 levels.	The guidance in the SPD encourages proposals to maximise sustainability and sets out several criteria in the following paragraph 7.4.5 that need to be considered, including improving current building	<p>Amend bullet point 3 in the box following paragraph 7.4.5 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon reduction on-site, <u>including the incorporation of renewable energy</u>, unless it can be</li> </ul>



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				<p>standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Council's Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on improving the sustainable design and construction of new development, including fabric improvements and the incorporation of renewable technologies. It also requires the submission of a checklist and statement that demonstrates how development minimises carbon emissions on site and to what extent.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that reference to renewable energy could be more explicit. Text has been added to the third bullet point in the box following paragraph 7.4.5.</p>	demonstrated that this is not feasible or viable....
Mark Doran (143)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Support	Proposals should be required to go beyond existing building regulations to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030. They should not worsen water scarcity or increase surface water run-off.	<p>The SPD has to comply with the wording within the District Plan, so cannot exceed the water efficiency standard in Policy WAT4.</p> <p>However, the guidance in the SPD does encourage the developer to</p>	<p>Insert the following bullet point into paragraph 7.4.2, after the first bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Water Chapter - East Herts District Plan 2018 (Chapter 23)</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			Design Principles		
			Use of sustainable drainage systems should be required.	<p>improve upon building standards, including water efficient design. This is set out in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on how to enhance water efficiency and requires developers to justify their approach to water recycling systems in the sustainability checklist and the Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement. It is not necessary to repeat this information in the ORL SPD.</p> <p>For clarity and to emphasise the importance of addressing water efficiency paragraph 7.4.2 has been amended to include reference to the Water Chapter (23) in the District Plan.</p> <p>The SPD sets out that 'SUDS within the site should be carefully considered as part of a holistic design process so as to integrate</p>	

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				with the surrounding public realm, including hard and soft landscaping.'	
Mr John Rhodes (189)  Stewart Marshall (383)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		<p>We should say firstly that we welcome the fact that the Council is at last complying with the requirement in policy BISH8 to produce a SPD to inform the master planning of the site. Having said that, as general observations, we feel that the present draft is too generalised to provide the guidance that is needed to inform the master plan and is probably trying to incorporate too many potentially incompatible forms of development on the site. We would like to suggest some more specific requirements which could enable the SPD to become a more useful document.</p> <p>Para 7.4.1 says that the developer should maximise sustainability at every possible opportunity. We agree. However, to ensure that this laudable objective is achieved, it should be made explicit that the existing buildings on the site covered by the SPD should be retained – being repurposed if necessary, and that new development should be fitted around the existing structures. The reasons for this are that there is</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible, and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.'</p> <p>The approach, including the need to minimise carbon emissions on site, will need to be further justified in the sustainability checklist and</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			a substantial amount of carbon embedded in those structures which will be lost if they are demolished, while the demolition process itself will add to the carbon footprint of the development.	Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.	
Bishop's Stortford Climate Group (310)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Object	Water use provisions The SPD section 7.4 references the need for water use efficiency but provides no solid requirements the developer must meet. Developers must address water efficiency in their Sustainability Checklist and incorporate water efficient design methods. Given that Affinity Water is already showing that we are regularly experiencing conditions which mean our groundwater conditions are Drought Zone it is hugely important that new buildings, which add to water use, are more efficient than the norm. The old Code for Sustainable Homes had a Level 4 target of 105l/person/day and envisaged that it was possible to achieve 80l/person/day at Level 5 or 6, compared to the current Buildings Regulations figure of 110l/person/day. This target would drive significant design changes, rather than the limited changes required by the Buildings	<p>The SPD has to comply with the wording within the District Plan, so cannot exceed the water efficiency standard in Policy WAT4.</p> <p>However, the guidance in the SPD does encourage the developer to improve upon building standards, including water efficient design. This is set out in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Council's Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on how to enhance water efficiency and requires developers to justify their approach to water recycling systems in the sustainability checklist and the Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement. It is not necessary to repeat this information in the ORL SPD.</p>	<p>Insert the following bullet point into paragraph 7.4.2, after the first bullet point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Water Chapter - East Herts District Plan 2018 (Chapter 23)</a></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			Regulations. Actions requested The SPD should require the collection and use of rainwater and the use of grey water systems where that is possible; and reduce the target water use accordingly, to 105l/person/day or lower.	For clarity and to emphasise the importance of addressing water efficiency paragraph 7.4.2 has been amended to include reference to the Water Chapter (23) in the District Plan.	
Bishop's Stortford Climate Group (309)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Object	<p>Section 7.4 covers energy and carbon emissions both in operational and construction terms.</p> <p>However, it essentially says nothing beyond signposting to existing documents which require nothing beyond current Building Regulations. Essentially these existing documents represent encouragement to minimise emissions but have historically resulted in little beyond current Building Regulations. So this section adds nothing to what already exists, which developers would already have to comply with in their application.</p> <p>For the ORL site the council is the developer, so we would expect the council to set itself the very highest standards and use the project to demonstrate to other developers what is achievable. As EHDC has committed to an area wide target of</p>	<p>The SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<p align="center"><b>Design Principles</b></p>		
			<p>net zero carbon by 2030 we would expect it to set an SPD for its own developer to meet the requirement of net zero carbon in operational terms and to set a specific target for construction emissions. The most specific additional requirements, in the box following 7.4.5 are again in terms of encouragement, minimisation and exploration of standards above the norm, so place no absolute standard to do better than minimum Building Regulations.</p> <p>The emerging Greater Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets the level of ambition we would expect to see in the SPD, with numeric Energy Use Intensity targets (p145).  <a href="https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-10/First%20Proposals%20-%20FINAL%20FURTHER%20REVISED%2028.10.21-red.pdf">https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-10/First%20Proposals%20-%20FINAL%20FURTHER%20REVISED%2028.10.21-red.pdf</a>. Best practice for urban development would suggest steady roll out of heat networks. Because of the higher densities that we see in urban centres, many European towns and cities have heat networks. This development represents an opportunity to initiate this and to</p>		

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			<p>then join the dots, making connections to Waitrose and across towards the Goods Yard and the recent developments along the Stort, which with little foresight by EHDC and no interest from developers went ahead with gas combination boilers and will be hard to retrofit with individual air source heat pumps. The source of heat for a heat pump-based heat network would be the building and supermarket cooling demands plus the aquifer using an open loop system. This could be supplemented if required with air source heat pumps. This opportunity should at least be explored as part of the development.</p> <p>Solar PV in new schemes is key to achieving zero carbon in operational terms. We would expect the SPD to require the developer to deliver building designs which maximise the roof area for solar PV. The emerging Greater Cambridgeshire Local Plan, above (p146), shows an expectation that renewable energy generated on site should at least match the energy demand for the buildings in use.</p>		

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			Request that the SPD must reflect EHDC's commitment to an area-wide target of net zero carbon by 2030. In particular it should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Set a requirement of net zero carbon in operational terms.</li> <li>- Set a specific target for construction emissions.</li> <li>- Require the developer to deliver building designs which maximise the roof area for solar PV.</li> <li>- Require the developer to examine fully a heat pump-based heat network, suitable to be extended over a wider area, engaging with other local businesses and examining the suitability of using the aquifer for an open loop system.</li> </ul>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		BSCF agrees with Para 7.4.1, which says that the developer should maximise sustainability at every possible opportunity. It is therefore important that the SPD requires comparison of the carbon expended in the demolition of the site's existing buildings and their replacement, in whatever form, versus their retention and repurposing. We expect the carbon expended in the former will be far more than that in repurposing them but this needs to be carefully assessed, the aim being	The ORL SPD specifically requires a 'reduction in energy embodied in construction materials through re-use and recycling of existing materials, where feasible, and the use of sustainable materials and local sourcing.' The approach, including the need to minimise carbon emissions on site, will need to be further justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.	No amendment in response to this issue



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			to avoid increasing the development's carbon footprint.		
Cllr Mione Goldspink (329)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Sustainability - I support this very strongly.	Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mrs Janet Reville (300)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Paragraphs 3.23/3.6/7.15 Any new buildings should be insulated to the highest standards and have solar panels. Where possible any refurbishment of existing buildings should include insulation upgrading and solar panels.	<p>The guidance in the SPD encourages proposals to maximise sustainability and sets out several criteria in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5 that need to be considered, including improving current building standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Council's Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on improving the sustainable design and construction of new development, including fabric improvements and the incorporation of renewable technologies. It also requires the submission of a checklist and statement that demonstrates how development minimises carbon emissions on site and to what extent. It is not</p>	No amendment in response to this issue

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				necessary to repeat this information in this ORL SPD	
Mr Graham Oxborrow (207)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency	Object	<p>Have exemplary sustainability requirements for the buildings, including energy requirements, water use facilities, drainage and planting. Development of the site will add to the local population size and hence their use of resources and impacts on the environment.</p> <p>Section 7.4 of draft SPD does not mitigate this impact:</p> <p>Requires nothing more than meeting Buildings Regulations on energy, so does nothing to further the Council's commitment to net zero carbon emissions by 2030. In so doing it also misses the opportunity to use the site to start to provide zero carbon heating using a heat network.</p> <p>Requires nothing better than bog standard water use facilities, i.e., there is no requirement to use rainwater or greywater to reduce demand for mains water.</p>	<p>The SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach, including the need to minimise carbon emissions on site, will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue
Angela Marshall (279)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Sustainability Section 7.4 Charringtons Building - It seems a shame to demolish this building when it is only 50 years old, and very	Whilst the SPD itself doesn't specifically include proposals for the demolition of Charringtons House, if demolition is proposed through the	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			solid. Sure it could be re-purposed? I hope that solar panels will be used, and all buildings will be very well insulated.	submission of a planning application, applicants will be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.	
Amanda Anderson (268)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Once again at this day and age we should be including all possibilities for renewable energy - 3.6, 3.27, 7.15	<p>The guidance in the SPD encourages proposals to maximise sustainability and sets out several criteria in the green box following paragraph 7.4.5 that need to be considered, including improving current building standards and incorporating new technologies and low carbon design. It also refers to the validation requirements to submit a checklist and statement, and the need to take account of the guidance in the Council's Sustainability SPD.</p> <p>The Sustainability SPD sets out guidance on improving the sustainable design and construction of new development, including fabric improvements and the incorporation of renewable technologies. It also requires the submission of a checklist and statement that demonstrates how development minimises carbon emissions on site and to what extent.</p>	<p>Amend bullet point 3 in the box following paragraph 7.4.5 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Carbon reduction on-site, <u>including the incorporation of renewable energy</u>, unless it can be demonstrated that this is not feasible or viable....</li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				However, it is agreed that reference to renewable energy could be more explicit. Text has been added to the third bullet point in the box following paragraph 7.4.5.	
Cityheart Homes Ltd (340)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Whilst it is the developer's intention to promote a highly sustainable scheme proposal, the term "maximises" might be unhelpful. It would be preferable to include the term "optimises" instead. This makes sure that there is a pro and con / cost benefit approach to provision as it might be the case that some provision might be detrimental in other respects (scheme viability/design etc).	The Council is committed to addressing climate change and delivering sustainable development. As such the term 'maximises' is considered appropriate.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Hertfordshire County Council (351)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		The consultation should consider the opportunities that development adjacent to green space (such as the castle) could support species recovery for species disadvantaged by modern construction methods. An example would be the integration of Swift nesting opportunities either in construction of non-residential, residential or standalone (Swift Castle) in public realm. The species would be finding food in the nearby greenspace.	The Council recognises the importance of integrating biodiversity into new development. District Plan Policy NE3 Species and Habitats requires development to enhance biodiversity and create opportunities for wildlife, including the integration of bird and bat boxes for sites adjacent to open space. As such the support for species will be considered as part of the planning application process.  However, given its importance, reference to biodiversity	Amend bullet point 2 in the box following paragraph 7.4.5 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Integration of green infrastructure, <u>biodiversity enhancement</u>, urban greening and water management</li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				enhancement should be included in the SPD.	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (433)	7.4 Sustainability and Energy Efficiency		Sustainability and Energy Efficiency - Please refer to comments by Bishop's Stortford Climate Group for observations and ideas about this section.	Please see the Council's response to comments 309 and 310 above.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Graham Oxborrow (204)	7.5 Layout and Edges	Object	Ensure that there is not overdevelopment of the site, by setting: specific height limits that ensure that views from Water Lane and from Castle Park are not completely blighted by high buildings; and layout requirements that will enable air to circulate and provide for surface level shade, which will be important in coming years as the town heats up from climate change.	Noted. Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.  Similarly, final layout requirements will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel, which will take account of the design principles outlined in the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (434)	7.5 Layout and Edges		The effect of any [eventual] number of homes on the layout and edges will have an impact on this. The layouts shown in Ch 8 need to be available for rethought, especially with respect to views across the site,	The Strategic Masterplanning Framework Diagram has been updated and as such is now illustratively presented and should be used together with the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7 to	Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			the public space and possible retention, etc., of the URC Hall. The buildings frontages need to be fine grained, both vertically and horizontally, especially around the development's edge, c.f. the Goods Yard development, which is extremely coarse grained. With traffic still on Bridge St, moving the public space proposed in the TCPF north should be another option, and part of any residential area moved south, to face Bridge St and Jackson Sq. A lot of the focus is on north-south movement. With increased emphasis on active travel east-west movement is more important than the TCPF suggests. Making Barrett Lane pedestrian and cycling only should be considered, along with cycle access through the present URC Hall site (to allow retention of the historic wall between the hall and the present Waitrose car park).	inform emerging proposals. The updated Strategic Masterplanning Framework does not preclude alternative design solutions coming forward.  The SPD is intended to provide a strategic masterplanning framework for the Old River Lane site, rather than provide detailed proposals.	
The Gardens Trust/Hertfordshire Gardens Trust (2)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain	Support	We agree that the views and setting of the Castle Gardens and the motte should be retained and enhanced and that the design, height and massing of any development should respect these heritage assets and if possible, enhance them and their settings.	Support noted and welcomed.  Note: This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations on heights, massing and grain.	-

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>7.</b>			<b>Design Principles</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (16)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		This section is far too vague about building heights and does not give guidance on the acceptable height of buildings. 7.6.3 says the above principles should inform the masterplan for the site. The principles are four bullet point - the view from Castle Gardens, the setting of the castle mound, setting of Water Lane listed buildings and the general townscape of Stortford. These four principle lead clearly to a 2-storey limit over the central part of the site, east to west. At the north side of the site, there is scope for buildings up to 4 storeys. Adjacent to Charringtons House facing Bridge Street, up to four storeys. Amendments requested: Introduce a diagrammatic plan showing the acceptable height ranges across the site.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Mrs Sarah Ashton (45)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain	Object	What height do you want? This is vague and needs to be more specific otherwise you will get the tallest building repeated on this site. Require high quality design which uses architectural devices to break up scale and massing of the building and enhances the existing townscape. Also suggest varied building heights. Be more specific	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			about what you want and require an architect retention clause to secure high quality design.	review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Mrs Marguerite Rapley (108)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		The height of the buildings should not be above the 3-4 storeys that form the majority of the town centre as anything higher dwarfs the original buildings and does not fit with the town's heritage.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Cllr Chris Wilson (152)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain	Object	The implication here is that as some buildings are up to 6 storeys high, that the buildings in the ORL can be. It is important to emphasise that the buildings would spoil the overall vista of the town if they are as high as those 6 storey buildings. 7.18 could make this specific.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Mr John Rhodes (193) Stewart Marshall	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		Section 7.6 says that heights and massing of any development proposals should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site. This section needs to be more	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In	Update Section 7.6.



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>7.</b>			<b>Design Principles</b>		
(383)			prescriptive. The new multi storey car park and the Jackson Square redevelopment are both excessive in massing and height and wholly unsympathetic to their surroundings. Charringtons House should be taken as the maximum height for any part of the development, with a view preserved from the castle mound to North Street and St Michael's Church requiring development significantly lower in height.	terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Mrs Jill Wade (258)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		Building Height Section 7.6 states that heights and massing of any development proposals should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site. Jackson Square and the new MSCP are both wholly unsympathetic to the Conservation Area - particularly the new MSCP, which should never have been allowed to be constructed to that design or that height so close to a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Charringtons House should be retained and taken as the maximum height for any part of the development but, in order to preserve views from the castle area to North Street and St Michael's Church, new development should be	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			significantly lower in height. There should be no attempt to build to the height of the new MSCP.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (442)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		<p>Building Heights and Grain Section 7.6 says that heights and massing of any development proposals should be sensitive to the areas adjacent to the site but it lacks any acceptable limits and parameters. This section should be more prescriptive.</p> <p>Both the new multi-storey car park and the Jackson Square redevelopment are excessive in their massing and height and wholly unsympathetic to their surroundings. However, the main body of the multi storey car park is set back some distance from the development and less visible from it, compared to, for example: Waytemore Castle, Castel Gardens, Sworders Field and buildings on Water Lane. Charringtons House should therefore be taken as the maximum height for the southern part of the development, reducing to two storeys in the central area to preserve views from the castle mound to North Street and St Michael's Church, and vice versa.</p>	<p>This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.</p>	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			Heights could then increase again to the north. Also, the site's external/edge grain needs to be fine, especially compared to that of the multi-storey car park. A development showing a variety of facades will be far more compatible with it being in the centre of the town's Conservation Area.		
Cllr Calvin Horner (170)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain	Object	7.6.2 This section in general and this paragraph do not give any indication of heights that would be acceptable on the ORL site and give the impression that 4-6 storeys would be acceptable in parts of the site. I believe that an indication of where heights above 3 storeys would be acceptable, in diagrammatic form, away from the heritage buildings and vistas should be included in the SPD. References to Jackson Square and the Northgate End car park are misleading examples to give with regard to the majority of the site.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Cllr Mione Goldspink (330)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		7.6.2 Heights The guideline should be 3-4 storeys. Please remove all references to Jackson Square and the new Multi-storey carpark at Northgate End. These extra high buildings are aberrations and have been widely criticised for not being compatible with the conservation	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			area and the majority of buildings in the town centre.	design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Ms Jill Jones (225)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain	Object	7.6.1 Object. The massing and height of the new Northgate End MSCP is an abomination. Photos of BS in the consultation document focus on the low level largely historic buildings. ORL should reflect the historic low-level nature of North Street and the central conservation area and take this down to the park and river, opening up the greenery and visual aspect (covid has shown us how important this feeling of space is an element understood well in the 19th century as a foil for civil unrest!). The inappropriate massing of BS with 2x6 storey buildings hopefully now does not sit alongside the criteria for good design in the National Planning Policy Framework. It would be good to have this clarified so that height at a low level can be supported, not an open sesame to six storeys.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Mrs Janet Reville (301)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		Paragraphs 7.6/7.19 The new buildings should be no more than 2.5 stories high and leave views of St Michaels Church and the Castle mound for the pleasure of the residents and visitors.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design,	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Amanda Anderson (267)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		No over development please - we do not want high buildings - certainly less than the new Northgate End monstrosity that no one wanted re: 7.6, 7.19.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Angela Marshall (283)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		Building Heights Section 7.6 I would hope that the buildings would be no more than 3-4 storeys high. I would like to be able to see the Castle Park and gardens as a view, not a window at the end of a concrete tunnel. The area will not feel like part of the town if all you can see as you stand in it is the tall building that you are standing next to.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>7.</b>			<b>Design Principles</b>		
Mr Colin Woodward (368)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		7.6.2 Heights – Bishop’s Stortford centre was low rise with the exception of the Mill but EHC have already conceded on height by several town centre developments thereby severely changing the built and historic environment to resemble that of any new town anywhere.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council’s expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Cityheart Homes Ltd (341)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		7.6.2 - Presence of E-W view (lost) to / from Castle and Church, and retention / enhancement as 2.2.14 above. The current wording implies that there is a specific view: "the retention of the view from Castle Gardens to the Church of Saint Michaels". The text should be amended here to more accurately reflect the current position, and what can be achieved/is expected.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council’s expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.
Lynne Garner (377)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		(7.6 - 7.19) Buildings should not be higher than the new car park. We don’t want another Goods Yard type development, which has left that end of town feeling unfriendly, depressing and claustrophobic, meaning many no longer want to use that end of town.	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council’s expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (435)	7.6 Heights, Massing and Grain		The SPD needs to recognise that number of any homes, offices, leisure facilities, etc., especially if they have retail units at ground level affects their height, the width of the streets, and so on. The number of homes should therefore be none/limited as discussed in 8.2 and elsewhere. Also placing new residential accommodation in the centre of the site (as presented in Ch 8) intrudes upon the views referred to in 2.2.20 and 2.3.6. especially as a right of way/easement is needed for the sewer rising main (see 2.3.5 & Figure 7) The MSCP's height is not considered relevant to this development, as it is not readily visible from much of it. Except for Charringtons House, which is 4 storey, most of the relevant buildings 2 - 2.5 storeys. So, even though many of them are set back form the development, they do set a precedent for much of it, especially with respect to views across the site between Castle Gardens, Sworders Field and the approaches from the	This section has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	Update Section 7.6.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			east through to Water Lane, North Street and St Michael's Church.		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (17)	7.7 Public Realm		<p>Designing a public square into the development would be welcomed by this group. It needs to be a principal feature, with buildings shaped around it. The eight design principles however all relate to details - materials, street furniture, signs, SUDS etc, and none of these principles address the location, size, shape, and function of a public square. There are options relating to where a square could be placed, and what its use would be - options should be provided. Size comparators should be provided, to demonstrate whether a marker, live events, passive sitting, cafe tables and chairs would be practicable. The public space has been relegated to a rather nebulous area to the south of the site almost as an afterthought. Far from being uppermost in the design consideration it is subservient to almost everything else.</p> <p>Amendments requested: Clear guidance on location, size and function of a Town square and the frontages around it. A minimum area. Use Saffron Walden Market</p>	<p>This issue is expanded upon in paragraph 8.4.5, which states: "Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area." Paragraph 3.4.2 and paragraph 7.7.1 will be expanded to further set out expectations.</p>	<p>Expand paragraphs 3.4.2 and 7.7.1 as follows:</p> <p>3.4.2 ... The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space, <u>which should be a welcoming and adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to provide it with a memorable character.</u></p> <p>7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility</u></p>



Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			Square as a comparator for size, shape and frontages.		
Ms Yvonne Estop (52)	7.7 Public Realm		This barely mentions the aspiration for a public square that has been discussed a lot. Changes required: Add text about how to design a square - its possible location, size and functions, as well as protection from sun and rain. One approach is to create the sense of a large space that includes the private-owned Coopers garden centre. This is a good idea and should be enunciated. Another approach is to place a square more centrally at the confluence of north-south and east-west walking and cycling routes. Building blocks should be shaped to define the space. It should provide outward views - to trees in the park and existing buildings It should provide size comparators as guides: BS market Sq - Bury St Edmunds - the square in the old town, and the square in the retail extension development which included a comparable arts centre. Cambridge market square Saffron Walden Market square. etc	This issue is expanded upon in paragraph 8.4.5, which states: "Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area." Paragraph 3.4.2 and paragraph 7.7.1 will be expanded to further set out expectations.	Expand paragraphs 3.4.2 and 7.7.1 as follows:  3.4.2 ... The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space, <u>which should be a welcoming and adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to provide it with a memorable character.</u>  7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility</u>
Mrs Sarah Ashton (46)	7.7 Public Realm		New public spaces/pathways/ improved townscape needs to be adopted by parish/district/county.	Noted and agreed. Long term stewardship and governance will be critical to the effective management	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			Stewardship in perpetuity doesn't work unless carefully considered as developers move on and bins don't get emptied so ask for maintenance contributions for a good period from the developer and plan to take these on.	of the development and encouraging a vibrant community.	
Carolyn Matthews (99)	7.7 Public Realm	Support	Height needs to be less than 5 levels to avoid the sense of an overbearing enclosure by a concrete environment.	Section 7.6 has been updated to provide greater clarity around the Council's expectations, with further guidance on anticipated building heights provided within the SPD. In terms of the final scheme design, acceptable building heights should be established through an evidenced design process that will be the subject of an independent design review from the Hertfordshire Design Review Panel.	-
Mark Doran (144)	7.7 Public Realm	Support	Accessibility of the public realm should be improved for those with disabilities, mobility issues etc.	Agreed.	-
Cllr Chris Wilson (153)	7.7 Public Realm		I believe there should be the addition of an insistence that there is to be a viable public square, as this was another aspect of ORL that has been much advertised and vaunted, as well as discussed in the meetings about this development over the last couple of years.	The SPD clearly sets out new public spaces will be created at Old River Lane. Figure 18 illustrates a new public space in front of Coopers and along Bridge Street, and this then forms an integral part of the Strategic Masterplanning Framework at Figure 21 (now Figure 20). Paragraph 8.4.5 sets out that 'any public square should provide a	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
				welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area.'	
Ms Jill Jones (218)	7.7 Public Realm	Support	7.7.2 support.  In addition to planning, the social engineering that the new ORL will bring needs to be taken into account. How will the MSCP at Northgate End be made an attractive, welcoming and safe environment? How will any new residential housing fit this specification? This needs to be called out - it appears the car park office was sacrificed due to cost issues as the project progressed, so what are the guarantees (not reassurances) that practical management and oversight will be of high-quality and available for the foreseeable future to secure the credibility of the ORL project? This is no longer just a planning matter as the introduction	Support noted and welcomed.  Noted, however this is not relevant to the SPD.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
7.			<b>Design Principles</b>		
			of the MSCP and the ORL changes the social fabric of BS.		
Deirdre Glasgow (274)	7.7 Public Realm		Town Centre Way Finding: For the cultural development and growth of the town centre, the Bishop's Stortford Museum and Theatre at South Mill Arts need to be part of the key routes signposted for residents and visitors, as part of the railway and South Street signage. South Mill Arts, is situated on South Road and linked to the Goods Yard. An opportunity not to be missed.	Noted. Proposals should include improved signage and way finding.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (436)	7.7 Public Realm		7.7.2 - opportunities for public art. This is the only place where public art is mentioned. The SPD should be clear that art includes performing arts, not just installations.	Public art can be any media whose form, function and meaning are created for the general public. The opportunity to provide public art is referred to in Section 6. It is also included in the green box following paragraph 7.7.2, at paragraph 8.4.5 and in the planning obligations schedule.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (385)	8. Strategic Masterplanning Framework	Object	<p>The SPD does not have any diagrams showing the existing Waitrose car park as a site constraint.</p> <p>There are options for the route of the north south footpath. The option shown in figures 17 and 21 is a straight-line route, which severs 50 car parking spaces from Waitrose. Relocating these spaces entails demolishing the URC hall, which we object to.</p> <p>There is another option, which we ask to be shown. This is a curved route going round the Waitrose carpark, and avoiding a significant relocation of spaces.</p> <p>We have reviewed the studies presented by Glenn Howells Architects showing alternative footpath routes. We would urge you to show the following two options in the SPD and to base the masterplan principles on option 1.</p> <p>None of these paragraphs and diagrams about layout show an option that retains Charringtons House. The SPD should have a</p>	<p>The Strategic Masterplanning Framework diagram has been updated and the illustrative pathway from north to south would not preclude a curved walkway if this was the preferred design solution.</p> <p>The Masterplanning Framework should be used with the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7 to inform emerging proposals.</p>	Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			diagram showing a layout option with Charringtons House retained. Please include a diagram. The following diagram illustrates how an arts centre can be accommodated alongside the existing Charringtons House. Please also see the paper submitted by this group to the steering group.		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (437)	8. Strategic Masterplanning Framework		8.0 - Strategic Masterplanning Framework. This section shows the drawings and suggestions contained in the Town Centre Planning Framework 2016. Things have moved on since then though, and even then they were only ideas and options. The SPD should allow for other layouts and features to be considered as part of the masterplanning. For example: changing the straight N-S pedestrian route to something more sinuous, especially considering the location for the new entrance to/from Jackson Square. If the URC Hall is retained and repurposed moving other parts of the leisure/arts offer to join with it	Figure 15 has been deleted as the level of detail shown is unhelpful. Consequently paragraph 8.2.4 has also been deleted and 8.2.5 amended.  Figures 13 and 14 have been retained as they are part of the narrative that explains the evolution of the Masterplanning Framework.	Delete Figure 15 with consequential amendments to paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5.  <del>8.2.4 Figure 15 above demonstrates a more detailed version of 'Option A'. Proposals at that time included the demolition of Charrington's House, the URC Hall and the three dwellings located to the south of the URC Hall.</del>  8.2.5 8.2.4 Alongside the delivery of four new blocks of development, <del>this proposal,</del> as well as Option B, both <u>options</u> presented a significant change in the infrastructure and accessing arrangements for Old River Lane.
Mr Matthieu Militon	8.1 Introduction	Object	Both options are horrendous. We need the space to be much more	Noted. Options A and B are from the Town Centre Planning Framework	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>8.</b>			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
(1)			open with a proper market place/plaza near a new theatre with less flats (maybe just blocks along the causeway with cafe opening on terraces), well connected to a semi pedestrianised or totally pedestrianised high street.	and have been refined. The Strategic Masterplanning Framework and the Design Principles set out in the SPD will ensure that proposals for Old River Lane create a well-designed development that responds to the character of the surrounding area.	
Mrs Helen Lednor (55)	8.1 Introduction		<p>The Arts are different to culture, community, civic society, leisure. The Arts are involved with creating and inspiring opportunities where awe and wonder happen. I see no vision to inspire awe and wonder in the ORL planning documents. Nor any understanding of how this has to be planned in, right from the start. The Arts are in danger of being excluded by omission because they are not specified within your strategic Masterplan.</p> <p>For example, the new Music Hub Government initiative which comes with its unusually generous amounts of new government funding available for Lead Organisations including money for building, redevelopment and strengthening economic, community and educational links; see Arts Council announcement of June 25th 2022 (but known it was</p>	The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<p align="center"><b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b></p>		
			<p>happening within the profession for months). What an opportunity to bring The Arts right in to the heart, centre and building design of Bishop's Stortford. And when the money that is needed to achieve such a vision is actually on offer at the same time! There is a thriving music scene here which could be supported and developed with proper funding. The youth community doesn't want Music Hubs in schools; they want it external, somewhere that is alternative, urban, contemporary, slightly edgy, where they can meet and be mentored by other professional gigging musicians who are complementary to but alternative to what formal education offers. Artists want meeting rooms, practice and recording facilities to be promoted within the town. Why aren't you grabbing this opportunity to bring together the money and community and professional musicians and artists, all in one suitably designated area of the town centre? You appear to be about to miss the opportunity because you haven't fundamentally rooted The Arts within your vision or</p>		



Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			Strategic Masterplan. There is no depth of thought here or recognition of the daily importance of The Arts in improving our lives and well-being, let alone the benefits financially to the town.		
Mrs Helen Lednor (54)	8.1 Introduction	Object	<p>Your strategic masterplan bulks together The Arts (arts I think is used once in the entire report?) with a mish-mash of non-explained terms such as "Culture" "Leisure" and "Community." The Arts are different to culture, community, civic society, leisure. The Arts are involved with creating and inspiring opportunities to encourage experiences of awe and wonder. I see no vision which inspires awe and wonder in these ORL planning documents. Nor any understanding of how this has to be planned in, right from the very start.</p> <p>The Arts are in danger of being excluded by omission unless they are specified within the vision. It's most disappointing when such a fantastic opportunity presented itself. You are setting the future of Stortford; how could you possibly neglect to consider The Arts and their development in the town? It's</p>	<p>The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.</p> <p>Objective 3 of the SPD is to deliver a mix of town centre uses, including arts and culture, to create a vibrant place that supports and complements the wider town centre offer.</p>	Add new paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6 to provide information on the Arts Centre.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			like forgetting to mention houses, or shops, it's just crazy it's not thought through when so much of our well-being depends on the quality of them.		
Ms Yvonne Estop (48)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016	Object	<p>Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 Comments - reference to diagrams in the 2016 study is misleading and unhelpful, as the diagrams do not take account of the constraints and later access studies. The diagrams are more detailed than anything else in the SPD and thoroughly distracting. This refers explicitly to Charringtons House and URC hall options, when the current guidance does not.</p> <p>Changes needed: Delete the whole section. Add an appendix with commentary on the TC Planning Framework alongside other items of evidence and representations used in preparing the SPD.</p>	<p>Figure 15 has been deleted as the level of detail shown is unhelpful. Consequently paragraph 8.2.4 has also been deleted and 8.2.5 amended.</p> <p>Figures 13 and 14 have been retained as they are part of the narrative that explains the evolution of the Masterplanning Framework.</p>	<p>Delete Figure 15 with consequential amendments to paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5.</p> <p><del>8.2.4 Figure 15 above demonstrates a more detailed version of 'Option A'. Proposals at that time included the demolition of Charrington's House, the URC Hall and the three dwellings located to the south of the URC Hall.</del></p> <p><del>8.2.5</del> 8.2.4 Alongside the delivery of four new blocks of development, <del>this proposal, as well as Option B,</del> both options presented a significant change in the infrastructure and accessing arrangements for Old River Lane.</p>
Mrs Susan Swan (70)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016		URC demolition will remove a Christina Place of worship - is this what the council really want?	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
				Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	
Mr Colin Arnott (134)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016		8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 Although DP Policy BISH8 I says that The Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework will form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document I believe the presentation of the TCPF options for ORL, including a detailed version of Option A, as the starting point for the SPD Framework is misleading. The TCPF provided only a very limited functional analysis of the Town Centre's retailing, business, cultural or community roles and focused on identifying potential brownfield redevelopment sites for housing purposes. Option A is a dense redevelopment of the whole available site for residential development apart from two short frontages for new shops with homes above and new office space and new community space in the exact locations already providing such space. The DP Policy DPS3 on Housing Supply to identify brownfield housing sites in Bishop's Stortford town centre including around 100 at ORL - should be	Figure 15 has been deleted as the level of detail shown is unhelpful. Consequently paragraph 8.2.4 has also been deleted and 8.2.5 amended.  Figures 13 and 14 have been retained as they are part of the narrative that explains the evolution of the Masterplanning Framework	Delete Figure 15 with consequential amendments to paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5.  <del>8.2.4 Figure 15 above demonstrates a more detailed version of 'Option A'. Proposals at that time included the demolition of Charrington's House, the URC Hall and the three dwellings located to the south of the URC Hall.</del>  8.2.5 8.2.4 Alongside the delivery of four new blocks of development, <del>this proposal</del> , as well as Option B, both <u>options</u> presented a significant change in the infrastructure and accessing arrangements for Old River Lane.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			recognised as the main driver of the TCPF options for ORL and set aside as a starting point for the further SPD analysis in Sections 8.3 and 8.4.		
Cityheart Homes Ltd (342)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016		8.2.4 (and Fig 15) - Ordering of text / images. Suggest this paragraph is better positioned above Figure 15 on the preceding page. Figure 15 is currently read as though it illustrates the point made in para. 8.2.3 immediately preceding it (i.e., relates to Option B), whereas it relates to Option A.	Figure 15 has been deleted as the level of detail shown is unhelpful. Consequently paragraph 8.2.4 has also been deleted and 8.2.5 amended.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr Colin Woodward (369)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016		8.2.3 URC Hall - there is a need to retain and enhance its performance space and address the maintenance issues or, it might be thought that EHC has a policy to make it undesirable for users seeking to book (?). No comparable replacement performing arts space has been indicated for ORL.	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities).	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (438)	8.2 Town Centre Planning Framework 2016		8.2 - The Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Planning Framework 2016 DP Policy BISH8.I says the TCPF will form the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document. However, BSCF believes the sole presentation of the TCPF options for ORL, including a detailed version of Option A, as the starting point for the SPD Framework	Figure 15 has been deleted as the level of detail shown is unhelpful. Consequently paragraph 8.2.4 has also been deleted and 8.2.5 amended.  Figures 13 and 14 have been retained as they are part of the	Delete Figure 15 with consequential amendments to paragraphs 8.2.4 and 8.2.5.  <del>8.2.4 Figure 15 above demonstrates a more detailed version of 'Option A'. Proposals at that time included the demolition of Charrington's House, the</del>

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			is misleading. Moreover, there have been some substantial changes to the town centre since the framework was prepared The TCPF provided only a very limited functional analysis of the Town Centre's retailing, business, cultural or community roles and focused on identifying potential brownfield redevelopment sites for housing purposes. Option A is a dense redevelopment of the whole available site for residential development apart from two short frontages for new shops with homes above and new office space and new community space in the exact locations already providing such space. As argued in 6.2. above BSCF believes that DP Policy DPS3 on Housing Supply to identify brownfield housing sites in Bishop's Stortford town centre including around 100 at ORL - should be recognised as the main driver of the TCPFs options for ORL and should be set aside as a starting point for the analysis presented 8.3 and 8.4.	narrative that explains the evolution of the Masterplanning Framework.  The SPD clearly notes that further work has been undertaken to refine these options, including the adoption of the District Plan 2018 which sets out criteria for the redevelopment of the Old River Lane site.	<del>URC Hall and the three dwellings located to the south of the URC Hall.</del>  8.2.5 8.2.4 Alongside the delivery of four new blocks of development, <del>this proposal</del> , as well as Option B, both <u>options</u> presented a significant change in the infrastructure and accessing arrangements for Old River Lane.
Ms Yvonne Estop (47)	8.3 Refining Options		Comments: Figure 20 Extend the commercial heart of Bishop's Stortford This diagram is very	Block shapes are indicative only. Overall, the SPD supports a degree	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<p align="center"><b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b></p>		
			<p>unhelpful in relation to land uses. It is also prescriptive in terms of block shapes. Leisure is meaningless for a planning guidance document. Changes to be made: Please delete figure 20. Create a new diagram showing where retail frontages would make sense, locations where civic uses would work, and where residential could overlay.</p> <p>Change the existing text to: 8.4.7 A mix of residential, business and civic uses is necessary to create a vibrant new area of the town centre. Active retail and restaurant frontages on the north-south path and around public spaces relating to Waitrose will be encouraged. Residential accommodation, including affordable housing, should create an inclusive community by providing homes for all ages.</p> <p>Comments: Figures 17, 18 The diagrams showing masterplanning principles should remain but need clarifying. Changes to be made: I would suggest amending the text as follows: Figure 17: Reinforce existing connections 8.4.3 Walking and</p>	<p>of flexibility around the precise mix of land uses on Old River Lane.</p> <p>It is considered that paragraph 8.4.7 as currently drafted already captures these points and is consistent with the objectives of the SPD.</p> <p>It is considered that paragraph 8.4.3 as currently drafted already captures these points.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<p align="center"><b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b></p>		
			<p>cycling routes into and through the site should be created to connect surrounding places: Castle Gardens; Jackson Square and Bridge Street; North Street; Rye Street; the Northgate End multi-storey car park. The north-south route between Northgate End and Jackson Square should be pedestrian and cycle only.</p> <p>Figure 18: Create new public spaces  8.4.4 and 8.4.5 All new streets and public spaces will be required to be safe, legible, attractive, with generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area. A new public square should form the focus of the development, shaped by key frontages and buildings and animated by pedestrian routes through it. Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities</p>	<p>It is considered that paragraph 8.4.4 and 8.4.5 as currently drafted already captures these points alongside the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			I suggest further masterplanning principles diagrams are added to address critical land use and layout matters. as follows: Vehicle access Building height distribution principles Path from Northgate End options over or around Waitrose car park Alternative layout approaches for the southern end of the site, with and without Charringtons House Location and form of arts centre / civic uses Active frontages Alternative locations for a public square Block depths and perimeter blocks (diagrams all assume 18m corridor blocks. The SPD should say 9-10m blocks are also acceptable.	The SPD provides a strategic masterplanning framework against which more detailed proposals can be assessed.	
Ms Yvonne Estop (51)	8.3 Refining Options		Comments: A new road access is a very significant part of the SPD, but this is very hidden here with virtually no explanation. The commentary should say the primary use of the access road is the existing Waitrose parking and deliveries. After the new development, additional service and residential vehicle movements will be added to the existing Waitrose traffic. The capacity of the junctions and road has to allow for the total movements. Retaining a road from	Section 8.3 clearly sets out the discussion around accessing arrangements. The eastern access has been identified as the preferred option following extensive discussions with Hertfordshire County Council following the feasibility of a northern and western access being ruled-out.  The eastern access was preferred to the southern access on the basis that it would allow Bridge Street to	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			<p>Bridge Street is an option for vehicle access - this should be shown. However, access from Bridge Street is untenable if a public square is located there, as the amount of vehicle movements would exceed that reasonable for shared space (this learned from Cityheart architect presentation). It should say that a key reason for proposing an access road from Link Road is that it is above the ring main sewer, thereby it is a practicable way of approaching a site constraint. This sewer is shown in figure 7 and needs to be shown as a constraint in the constraints and opportunities tables.</p>	<p>reach its objective of being more pedestrian friendly. Therefore, a balance will need to be struck between the best accessing option to the ORL site (including Waitrose) and the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>Reference to the sewer rising main has been added to the constraints table in Chapter 6.</p>	<p>Add the following constraint to the table in Section 6.1:</p> <p>d) <u>A 3m easement is needed for a Thames Water sewer rising main, and an 8m easement is needed for the culverted watercourse</u></p>
Cross-party working group on ORL site (27)	8.3 Refining Options		<p>Comment: On page 65, in para 8.3.3 is the fundamental layout issue: Further discussion has also been held with Waitrose, specifically around re-providing around 170 spaces to service their demand. This requirement and how this provision is configured will have implications for the proposals. Actually about 40 of Waitrose spaces would be relocated. Moving Waitrose parking would require a land swap</p>	<p>The strategic masterplanning framework does not preclude alternative options being considered. The final route of any pathway will take into account not only the needs of Waitrose, but also wider-design considerations informed by the principles set out in Chapter 7.</p>	<p>No amendment in response to this issue.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			agreement between a developer and Waitrose. This land swap turns on the route of the footpath from Northgate End. At present, we all walk through Waitrose car park to get to Bridge Street. There are options for the line of this path, taking larger or smaller numbers of parking spaces. Layout options relating to Waitrose car park are absent from the SPD. Relocating Waitrose parking is the reason why the URC hall might be demolished. Amendment requested: The SPD should show alternative, possible lines of a footpath. And the different implications for Waitrose car parking. Please show the options. Diagrams were given to the steering group on this subject.		
Cross-party working group on ORL site (29)	8.3 Refining Options		Comment; Para 8.10 - This group would vigorously object to demolition of the URC hall to accommodate Waitrose parking spaces. After clearing the surface car parks for development, to demolish a historic / well-used building for surface car parking would be shockingly ironic.	Noted. Whilst the SPD doesn't specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall, if demolition is proposed through the submission of a planning application, then this could facilitate the opportunity for the redevelopment of the wider site to provide high quality, sustainable new buildings of innovative design which contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			<p>Amendment requested: 'Layout' - from 8.11 to 8.14 needs to start with options for the layout next to Waitrose car park - where the footpath runs, where displaced parking will go, the extent of the development area. This is fundamental and needs diagrams.</p> <p>Comment: 'Layout' - In papers provided during the steering group, this group demonstrated that an arts centre could be built alongside Charringtons House. There is no reference to this layout option.</p> <p>Amendment requested: The SPD to say that it would be acceptable to build in the sizeable area alongside the retained Charringtons House, up the Old River Lane.</p>	The Strategic Masterplanning Framework does not preclude alternative options being considered.	
Carolyn Matthews (100)	8.3 Refining Options		<p>Option B retaining the hall as a public facility and reduce waste of resources in demolition, and environmental cost of new construction. It could provide a shared public space other than a restaurant/cafe as the Citizens advice has now gone perhaps a place where face to face contact for advice (legal, educational...) could be provided alongside emotional</p>	The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall. If a planning application is subsequently submitted which proposes the demolition of the URC Hall, then this will need to address the requirements of District Plan Policy CFLR8 (Loss of Community Facilities). Applicants will also be required to explain and evidence how their proposals comply with	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			support, free art / yoga/ classes run by volunteers, but backed by East Herts Council? Ask residents of the town for ideas.	relevant District Plan policies that seek to improve the environmental sustainability of new development.	
Cross-party working group on ORL site (18)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		<p>Comments: Figure 18 - the public square is an afterthought. This does not indicate a square giving life to the whole place. 'Semi-private amenity' is not public realm. If private gardens are semi-private, they are not safe and secure. Amendment requested: A separate diagram showing options for how a square should form the heart of a development, relating to movement, business and civic activity. Delete 'semi-private amenity'.</p> <p>Comments: Figure 20 - extend the commercial heart - this masterplanning principles diagram shows an amorphous blob representing leisure with no accompanying guidance at all on location, size and access, or operation of any kind of leisure activity. It is seriously appalling guidance, on land use and masterplanning. Amendment required: At appropriate places throughout the</p>	<p>The vision for the public space is set out in paragraphs 3.4.2, 7.7.1, and 8.4.5.</p> <p>Figure 18 has been updated to remove reference to semi-private amenity.</p> <p>Figure 20 (now Figure 19) has been updated to reference civic, community and leisure use. Further guidance has been added to Section 3.4, including a new section on the Arts Centre.</p>	<p>Figure 18 updated in line with this comment.</p> <p>Update Figure 20 (now Figure 19) to reference civic, community and leisure use.</p>

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			SPD, provide actual land use guidance about suitable land uses for ORL, and public uses that will be meaningful for this town. Delete the ambiguous 'leisure'. Delete the leisure blob from this diagram.		
Ms Yvonne Estop (43)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan	Object	Comments: Figure 21 The Strategic Masterplanning Framework. The requirement that The Strategic Masterplanning Framework should be used to inform the emerging proposals for Old River Lane is quite firm and therefore the diagram is too prescriptive. The diagram shows one option only for access, the north-south path, leisure, and block forms. It does not resolve the critical masterplanning issues. It denies other layout options. The most critical thing it denies is Waitrose car parking. With the masterplan principles as shown, around 50 spaces are cut off. Waitrose would not accept a loss of spaces, but the replacement parking area is not shown on the masterplanning principles diagram. The URC is left as existing, so it implies the relocated parking will be in the development area. In fact all the studies made over the last two years and all the	The Strategic Masterplanning Framework Diagram has been updated. It is agreed that the draft framework was too prescriptive and as such is now illustratively presented and should be used together with the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7 to inform emerging proposals. The updated Strategic Masterplanning Framework does not preclude alternative design solutions coming forward.	Figure 21 (now Figure 20) updated in line with this and other comments.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			presentations to the steering group show the parking replaced on the site of the URC hall. So the diagram is seriously misleading as well as denying practicable options. Changes to be made: The masterplanning principles diagram should be deleted. The foregoing masterplanning principles diagrams should be left in, and new ones added, as each of them usefully sets parameters for masterplanning.		
Mrs Susan Swan (71)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		Public space is very poorly explained - just a pink blob on the map. What exactly are you envisaging?	This issue is expanded upon in paragraph 8.4.5, which states: "Any public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area." Paragraph 3.4.2 and paragraph 7.7.1 will be expanded to further set out expectations.	Expand paragraphs 3.4.2 and 7.7.1 as follows:  3.4.2 ... The clustering of any of these uses should preferably be focussed around a key public space, <u>which should be a welcoming and adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to provide it with a memorable character.</u>  7.7.1 Policy BISH8 requires the creation of new streets and public spaces and as such having a high-quality public realm will be key to the successful implementation of these public spaces and streets at Old River Lane. <u>The public space should have a</u>

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
					<u>welcoming character and be an adaptable space, suitable for public events, and with high quality hard and soft landscaping and public art in order to make it memorable, thus benefiting townscape legibility</u>
Carolyn Matthews (101)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		8.12 Eastern access - how will this affect traffic flow around Link Road.	The eastern access point has been identified as the preferred access point during discussions with HCC. All options for access will be tested in detail during any pre-application and planning application processes.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mark Doran (145)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan	Support	Existing trees should only be felled by exception, the aim should be to preserve all mature trees.	The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mr John Rhodes (195)  Stewart Marshall (383)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		We suggest that the illustrative layouts in the SPD will need to be revised in the light of these comments. It may well be that before the SPD can be finalised, some transport modelling will be needed of the implications of various use types, building densities access arrangements and pedestrian movements so that the master planning of the site can be informed by more precise and specific	Whilst detailed transport assessments and modelling will be required to define detailed matters, the SPD only seeks to ensure that the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage.  The Strategic Masterplanning Framework, together with the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7, should be used to inform the	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			guidance than this document contains.	emerging proposals for Old River Lane.	
Gary Jones (293)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		8.4.5 There is no requirement for or detailed guidance on the creation of the public square. Bishop's Stortford has been offered a public square in previous developments, but the outturn has been pathetically small and subsumed into adjacent hospitality uses. The SPD must specify a requirement for a public square and an indicative or minimum size.	<p>The SPD sets out that 'high quality new streets will be created, and public spaces will be provided in strategic locations alongside key frontages and buildings, including Coopers and along Bridge Street.'</p> <p>More specifically the SPD sets out that proposals for a public square should provide a welcoming, legible, and adaptable public space at the confluence of pedestrian and cycle routes, with active edges presenting retail opportunities, generous levels of passive surveillance, benches to meet and rest on, and public art to reinforce a memorable character that enhances the character and appearance of the Bishop's Stortford Conservation Area.</p>	No amendment in response to this issue.
Jan Mccarthy (284)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan	Object	The SPD consultation draft which is looking at the strategic environmental assessment of the development has a supporting statement "the development is not expected to give rise to any environmental effects". I do not agree with the Figure 19 diagram shows that a number of large tress	<p>The SPD notes that there are several important trees across the site, including Category A trees which are of significant value. The SPD requires the retention of existing mature trees where possible.</p> <p>The SPD does not specifically include proposals to demolish the URC Hall.</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.



Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			will be affected. These include the ancient oak in the Waitrose car park, which EHDC confirmed to me last year has a Tree Protection Order. Also, the large trees that border the United Reformed Church are showing on Figure 19 as remaining as is the ancient tree adjacent to Charringtons House. If the URC trees are remaining, why not keep the building + not build a Leisure Centre (which hardly features in the SPD).		
Cityheart Homes Ltd (343)	8.4 Strategic Masterplan		8.4.8 (Fig 21) - The indicative position and alignment of the vehicular access point is consistent and compatible with dialogue held with key stakeholders (including the County Council Highways Authority).	Noted.	-
Cross-party working group on ORL site (30)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing		<p>Planning obligations: Comment: Affordable Housing on-site provision of up to 40% subject to viability Amendment requested: Delete subject to viability. Ensure full compliance with policy (even though 80% is barely affordable). Add provide homes for local key workers.</p> <p>Comment: All types of development The first 7 bullets, 13th and 14th are not planning obligations, they are all what the developer has to do</p>	<p>Affordable Housing will be required in accordance with District Plan Policy HOU3. This sets out that lower provision may be permitted if it cannot be achieved due to viability reasons or where it would prejudice the need to secure other infrastructure priorities.</p> <p>Section 8.5 contains an indicative list of planning obligations. The full list and scope of individual planning obligations requirements will be</p>	No amendments in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			<p>anyway. Amendment requested: Delete first seven, 13th, 14th bullet points starting 'public realm'.</p> <p>Comment: Car clubs - this is a critical part of the strategy for less on-site parking. Amendment requested: State a minimum number of vehicles (3), dedicated parking space for them, commitment to a 10-year operating contract, who manages after that period, automatic free membership for all residents.</p> <p>Comment: Other site-specific requirements Amendment requested: Please add to this section: Cover the full cost of refurbishment of URC hall and hand over to a trust or a public owner. Provide a design scheme and cover the cost of pedestrian streetscene improvements in Bridge Street.</p>	<p>defined in detail through the consideration of the planning application/s.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed. This level of information would be discussed and negotiated at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed. Matters such as these would be discussed and negotiated at the planning applications stage.</p>	
Mr Colin Arnott (135)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing		8.5 Delivery and Phasing DP Policy BISH8 I says that a Supplementary Planning Document will be used to inform the masterplanning of this site. Section 8 has started to provide a framework for the Masterplan and, although masterplanning for ORL has commenced in advance of the	<p>The SPD sets out a Strategic Masterplanning Framework which has been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders and the public.</p> <p>There is a requirement for a Masterplan to be submitted with any</p>	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<p align="center"><b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b></p>		
			<p>adoption of the SPD, it is assumed that it will be completed in accordance with DP Policy DES1 II and be collaboratively prepared, involving site promoters, landowners, East Herts Council, town and parish councils and other relevant key stakeholders and further informed by public participation. It is assumed that, as for all other significant developments the Masterplan would then be adopted by EHDC before any application is submitted as a basis for considering it. It would be helpful if this continuing policy process was made clear at the beginning of section 8.5. It would also be helpful if key development needs and impact assessments which have not been covered in the SPD including EIAs, retail and other economic assessments and, in particular, transport assessments which will be required for the masterplan are also set out in this section.</p> <p>Although para 8.5.1 says that the full list and scope of individual planning obligations requirements will be defined in detail through the</p>	<p>planning application, which will be subject to further consultation.</p> <p>The schedule is intended to helpful and as set out in the SPD is indicative.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			consideration of the planning application/s, in view of the above I believe that any discussion of S106 obligations and financial contributions beyond the principles are likely to be premature. The Indicative Planning Obligations Schedule on page 73 is therefore too prescriptive at this stage until impact and other mitigation requirements are assessed and should be reserved until the masterplan.		
Carolyn Matthews (102)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing		8.26 - additional infrastructure such as school and nursery places cannot be provided in this development if the overall concept is to enhance the area and reduce car use. A daytime crèche /nursery might be feasible for those employees working in town to avoid extra car use. The current town library is adequate and within walking distance of new proposed homes. Grange Paddocks leisure facilities will be accessible via the river footpath/ eastern access onto link Road as is Nuffields and the gym opposite Wetherspools.	Contributions towards education, open space, community and library facilities will still be required relative to the number of units being proposed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Mark Doran (146)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing	Support	Priority should be given to sustainable transport facilities and to maximising recycling.	Agreed.	-

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
<b>8.</b>			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
Cityheart Homes Ltd (344)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing		8.5.5 - Indicative planning obligations / Section 106 Heads of Terms. The list set out will need to be reviewed in detail, to ensure all is necessary / reasonable / expected etc. The document does however make it clear that the precise S.106 provisions will be defined as part of any planning application.	As set out in the SPD this is an indicative schedule of planning obligations.	No amendment in response this issue.
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (439)	8.5 Delivery and Phasing		8.5 - Delivery and Phasing DP Policy BISH8.I says a Supplementary Planning Document will be used to inform the masterplanning of this site. Section 8 has started to provide a framework for the Masterplan therefore masterplanning has to some extent commenced in advance of the adoption of the SPD. This was further built on by the proposals Cityheart prepared and presented as part of its bid. BSCF, however considers that these proposals are not binding and that the masterplanning, etc. should be completed in accordance with DP Policy DES1.II and will be: collaboratively prepared, involving site promoters, landowners, EHDC, town and parish councils and other relevant key stakeholders, and, further informed by public	The SPD sets out a Strategic Masterplanning Framework which has been prepared in consultation with key stakeholders and the public.  There is a requirement for a Masterplan to be submitted with any planning application, which will be subject to further consultation.	No amendment in response to these issues.

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<p align="center"><b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b></p>		
			<p>participation. It is assumed that, as for all other significant developments the Masterplan would then be adopted by EHDC before any planning application is submitted as a basis for considering it. It would also be helpful if: this continuing policy process was made clear at the beginning of section 8.5; the key development needs and impact assessments which have not been covered in the SPD including EIAs, retail and other economic assessments and, in particular, transport assessments all of which will be required for the masterplanning they are set out in this section. (see also 9.0)</p> <p>Also, although para 8.5.1 says that: the full list and scope of individual planning obligations requirements will be defined in detail through the consideration of the planning application/s, in view of the above, BSCF believes that any discussion of S106 obligations and financial contributions here, beyond their principles, is premature. The Indicative Planning Obligations Schedule on page 73 is therefore too</p>	<p>The schedule is intended to helpful and as set out in the SPD is indicative.</p>	

Rep No.	Section / para	Support or Object	Issue	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment
8.			<b>Strategic Masterplanning Framework</b>		
			prescriptive at this stage, until impact and other mitigation requirements are assessed, rather they should be reserved until the masterplan. (see also 9.0)		

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation (44)	9. Planning Application Requirements		Discussion of planning application requirements in Section 9, which acknowledges that these will be subject to planning conditions and pre-app discussions with the local authority, is premature. The list of Planning Requirements on the final page of the SPD is completely misleading and includes many items that must form part of the masterplan assessments to be adopted first including: Transport Assessment, Economic and Business Development, Flood, Drainage, Sewerage etc assessments Retail Demand and Impact; and the Masterplan itself! This section should be deleted and, insofar as anything is	A planning application/s will be submitted on this site and so Section 9 is considered helpful in setting out what supporting information will be required.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			relevant at this stage, incorporated into section 8.5.		
Mr Trevor Steggles (5)	9.1 Requirements	Object	How can I have confidence in the competence of the team working on this project when the document has several English errors and indeed uses the word Fowl when describing wastewater!	Spelling mistake has been corrected.	Correction to be made the Planning Requirements box following paragraph 9.1.2: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Fowl</del> <u>Foul</u> Sewerage and Utilities Assessment</li> </ul>
Mr James Tatchell (38)	9.1 Requirements	Object	Included in these requirements should be a proper multi-use performance space, definitely NOT A CINEMA, which is not needed or wanted by anyone.  Any previous consultations on this subject have been poorly worded	Noted. The Council, as landowner, would like to bring forward a new Arts Centre at Old River Lane. It is currently anticipated that the offer could include a live arts programme to be delivered through the flexible design of cinema, foyer and outdoor space. Proposals are however indicative at this stage and any subsequent planning application will be required to explain and evidence how the proposals comply with relevant District Plan policies. A new section has been added to the SPD which provides further information.  There has been mixed feedback on whether a cinema should form part of the proposals for Old River Lane.  Comments regarding previous consultations are noted.	No amendment in response to these issues.



Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			and biased to achieving the result desired by EHDC.		
Mrs Susan Swan (72)	9.1 Requirements		It seems to me that this development is a long way from being anything more than a dream. So many details are missing from this plan relating to the Arts and Culture areas, sustainable building and energy supply, retention or not of the URC and Hall, improved transport links to encourage use of public transport which is expensive and sporadic.	The purpose of the SPD is to provide a Strategic Masterplanning Framework against which more detailed development proposals can be assessed.	No amendment in response to this issue.
Bishops Stortford Civic Fed (136)	9.1 Requirements		Discussion of planning application requirements in Section 9, which acknowledges that these will be subject to planning conditions and pre-app discussions with the local authority, is premature. The list of Planning Requirements on the final page of the SPD is completely misleading and includes many items that must form part of the masterplan assessments to be adopted first including: Transport Assessment, Economic and Business Development, Flood, Drainage, Sewerage etc assessments Retail Demand and Impact; and the Masterplan itself! This section should be deleted and, insofar as anything is	A planning application/s will be submitted on this site and so Section 9 is considered helpful in setting out what supporting information will be required.	No amendment in response to this issue.

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			relevant at this stage, incorporated into section 8.5.		
Carolyn Matthews (103)	9.1 Requirements	Support		Support noted and welcomed.	-
Mark Doran (147)	9.1 Requirements	Support	<p>The ambitions in the SPD are good but do not go far enough in terms of sustainability. The Council has a great opportunity here to lead the way in a net zero development (which would help achieve its own climate policies), air quality and the incentivisation of sustainable transport, improving biodiversity and ensuring the development does not worsen water scarcity or local flooding. The SPD should therefore set unambiguous aims in these areas, going well beyond existing buildings regulations to meet net zero.</p> <p>I have also read and support the comments of the Bishop's Stortford Climate Group in relation to this SPD, particularly: Section 3 also needs amending to take into account the key importance of specific policies on sustainability and Climate Change</p>	<p>Noted. However, the SPD cannot introduce targets that exceed the policy requirements of the District Plan.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p> <p>It is agreed that climate change and environmental sustainability are a key consideration. However, to avoid repetition, it is not necessary for this section to repeat all the sustainability requirements. The SPD should be viewed in its entirety and</p>	<p>No amendment in response to these issues.</p> <p>Amend the heading 3.6 as follows: 3.6 <del>Other Policy Requirements</del> <u>Air Quality</u> Delete the sub-heading <u>Air Quality</u>.</p>

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			<p>(mitigation and adaptation). We would expect as a minimum statements of the importance of design securing space and buildings adapted to future climate change; and the commitment to zero carbon on the development, in line with the Council's Climate Change motion.</p> <p>To make unambiguous requirements to disincentivise car/freight traffic and promote sustainable travel, including more radical options such as pedestrianising Bridge St and also South St / North St, making the town centre a more attractive retail/hospitality destination and enabling easy movement between the town centre and ORL. The need for sustainable transport to be prioritised should be reflected in clearer and firmer wording that removes potential caveats ('where possible', explore etc).</p>	<p>sustainability is addressed in Section 7.4. Likewise, other policy considerations relevant to the site, such as heritage, design and transport are outlined in other sections of the SPD.</p> <p>However, the 'Other Policy Considerations' heading is misleading as it implies all other policy considerations for the site will be listed. It should be replaced with 'Air Quality'.</p> <p>Chapter 4, alongside the Design Principles set out in Chapter 7 aim to promote modal shift by supporting and encouraging sustainable transport modes of travel, as well as addressing the current movement constraints on the site.</p> <p>The SPD seeks to ensure that the right package of measures and opportunities are signposted so that any development can integrate these into the scheme from an early stage.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			<p>Section 5 of rationalise and reduce car parking and improve servicing arrangements/facilities should not be opaque but should be spelled out.</p> <p>Section 7.3 the policies are framed in enabling terms. Likewise, it is unacceptable for the SPD to provide for any public car parking. It is wrong to say some level of on-site parking, sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed when the new Multi Storey Car Park was designed and built to meet public parking needs, fully replacing the parking provided for shoppers and workers. The statement alongside that there should be a significantly reduced amount of parking (7.3.2) does not prevent the site attracting and providing for additional parking in this town centre site.</p>	<p>The SPD takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce carparking on Old River Lane, particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities.</p> <p>Policy BISH8 part (g) states that: <i>“on-site car parking will need to be sufficient to meet the needs of the uses proposed, without encouraging travel to the town centre in order to avoid worsening traffic congestion and further impact on the Hockerill Air Quality Management Area. Parking will need to be provided to serve the town centre as well as commuters.”</i></p> <p>As such the SPD notes the policy requirement to provide for car parking to meet the needs on the site, but also sets out the access to nearby car parks and the need to prioritise active travel. As such it takes a balanced view, but one that encourages opportunities to be sought to reduce car parking on ORL particularly where parking could be provided in existing facilities.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			<p>There should be clear requirements for bus stops adjacent to ORL.</p> <p>The Sustainability and energy use section addresses the carbon embedded in construction, but this misses the point that to reduce carbon from construction the best approach is to refurbish existing buildings, unless compelling evidence can be provided that it is simply incompatible with the new use cases.</p> <p>For the ORL site the council is the developer, so we would expect the council to set itself the very highest standards and use the project to demonstrate to other developers what is achievable. As EHDC has committed to an area wide target of net zero carbon by 2030 we would expect it to set an SPD for its own developer to meet the requirement of net zero carbon in operational</p>	<p>A new Section 4.3 on Public Transport has been added to the SPD. Old River Lane is adjacent to 3 bus stops and therefore any development must ensure that it supports the retention and function of these bus stops and also any future upgrades to them.</p> <p>As above, the SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>As above. The SPD cannot introduce mandatory targets that exceed the policy requirements of Policies CC1 and CC2 of the District Plan. Therefore, the inclusion of specific energy targets is not appropriate in this document.</p> <p>The Council is committed to addressing climate change and the</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<p align="center"><b>Planning Application Requirements</b></p>		
			<p>terms and to set a specific target for construction emissions. The most specific additional requirements, in the box following 7.4.5 are again in terms of encouragement, minimisation and exploration of standards above the norm, so place no absolute standard to do better than minimum Building Regulations. The emerging Greater Cambridgeshire Local Plan sets the level of ambition we would expect to see in the SPD, with numeric Energy Use Intensity targets (p145): <a href="https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-10/First%20Proposals%20-%20FINAL%20FURTHER%20REVISED%2028.10.21-red.pdf">https://consultations.greatercambridgeplanning.org/sites/gcp/files/2021-10/First%20Proposals%20-%20FINAL%20FURTHER%20REVISED%2028.10.21-red.pdf</a>. Best practice for urban development would suggest steady roll out of heat networks. Because of the higher densities that we see in urban centres, many European towns and cities have heat networks. This development represents an opportunity to initiate this and to then join the dots, making connections to Waitrose and across towards the Goods Yard and the recent developments along the Stort,</p>	<p>the SPD provides a framework for maximising the sustainability of the development but avoids being overly prescriptive. Specific details about how sustainability opportunities are maximised will be considered as part of the planning application process. The approach will need to be justified in the sustainability checklist and Sustainable Construction, Energy and Water Statement.</p>	

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			<p>which with little foresight by EHDC and no interest from developers went ahead with gas combination boilers and will be hard to retrofit with individual air source heat pumps. The source of heat for a heat pump-based heat network would be the building and supermarket cooling demands plus the aquifer using an open loop system. This could be supplemented if required with air source heat pumps. This opportunity should at least be explored as part of the development.</p> <p>- The SPD should require the collection and use of rainwater and the use of grey water systems where that is possible; and reduce the target water use accordingly, to 105l/person/day or lower.</p>		
Cityheart Homes Ltd (345)	9.1 Requirements		<p>9.1.1 - Planning application requirements / supporting evidence This list of submission requirements is the subject of separate dialogue. The finalised list of requirements once this dialogue has been completed ought to be pulled through into this document.</p> <p>9.1.2 - The developer is undertaking considerable, detailed, and extensive</p>	<p>Noted. The case officer has been consulted and additional requirements have been added to the list.</p> <p>Noted and welcomed.</p>	<p>Add the following requirement to the Table following paragraph 9.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Drainage Strategy</u></li> <li>• <u>Energy and Sustainability Strategy</u></li> <li>• <u>Land Contamination Assessment</u></li> <li>• <u>Open Space, Landscape and Public Realm Strategy</u></li> <li>• <u>Waste Strategy</u></li> </ul>

Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<b>Planning Application Requirements</b>		
			pre-application dialogue with both the local planning authority and many other interested parties, including the County Highway Authority, other statutory consultees, and the Design Review Panel etc.		
Hertfordshire County Council (353)	9.1 Requirements		<p>In accordance with the requirements set out in Chapter 9 of the consultation document the applicant or applicants will be required to complete a Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Assessment.</p> <p>From a Flood Risk point of view, HCC would advise the following with regards to any Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Assessments being submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All plans to follow the SuDS hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practical: 1) Into the ground (infiltration) 2) To a surface water body 3) To a surface water sewer, highway drain, or another drainage system 4) To a combined sewer.</li> <li>• All plans to incorporate SuDS design, taking into account Water</li> </ul>	Requirements noted for the Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Assessment.	No amendment in response to this issue.



Rep. No	Section/ para number	Support or Object	Issue	Officer response	Proposed amendment
9.			<p align="center"><b>Planning Application Requirements</b></p>		
			<p>Quality, Water Quantity, Amenity and Biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential to incorporate tree pits / raingardens to enhance the sites amenity value, promote biodiversity and reduce flood risk.</li> <li>• Potential to incorporate permeable paving where possible across the site to aid volume management and treatment of water.</li> <li>• Potential to incorporate green roofs to aid volume management and biodiversity across the site.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you again for engagement HCC services have had to date and for the opportunity to provide comment. HCC welcome the Old River Lane SPD and broadly endorse the policies that underpin the document. Furthermore, HCCs relevant services look forward to the opportunity to continue working with EHDC and other stakeholders in creating a more sustainable East Hertfordshire.</p>	<p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>	



## APPENDIX C: CONSULTEES

The following organisations were directly notified of the draft Old River Lane SPD in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). It should be noted that individuals on the planning policy consultation database were also consulted but are not listed.

### Specific Consultation Bodies and/or Duty to Cooperate Bodies

- Affinity Water
- Anglian Water
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- Communication Operators
- EDF Energy Networks
- Environment Agency
- Essex County Council
- Great Anglia
- Hertfordshire Constabulary
- Hertfordshire County Council
- Highways England
- Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- Historic England
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
- National Grid
- Natural England
- Network Rail
- NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG
- NHS West Essex
- Neighbouring Authorities: Broxbourne Borough Council, Epping Forest District Council, Harlow District Council, North Hertfordshire District Council, Stevenage Borough Council, Uttlesford District Council
- Police and Crime Commissioner
- Stansted Airport
- Thames Water
- The Coal Authority
- The Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust
- Veolia Water

<b>East Herts Town and Parish Councils</b>	
Bishop's Stortford Town Council	Hertford Heath Parish Council
Buntingford Town Council	Hertingfordbury Parish Council
Hertford Town Council	High Wych Parish Council
Sawbridgeworth Town Council	Hormead Parish Council
Ware Town Council	Hunsdon Parish Council
Albury Parish Council	Little Berkhamsted Parish Council
Anstey Parish Council	Little Hadham Parish Council
Ardeley Parish Council	Little Munden Parish Council
Aspenden Parish Council	Much Hadham Parish Council
Aston Parish Council	Sacombe Parish Meeting
Bayford Parish Council	Standon Parish Council
Bengeo Rural Parish Council	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council
Benington Parish Council	Stanstead St Margarets Parish Council
Bramfield Parish Council	Stapleford Parish Council
Braughing Parish Council	Stocking Pelham Parish Council
Brent Pelham and Meesden Parish Council	Tewin Parish Council
Brickendon Liberty Parish Council	Thorley Parish Council
Buckland and Chipping Parish Council	Thundridge Parish Council
Cottered Parish Council	Walkern Parish Council
Datchworth Parish Council	Wareside Parish Council
Eastwick and Gilston Parish Council	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council
Furneux Pelham Parish Council	Westmill Parish Council
Great Amwell Parish Council	Widford Parish Council
Great Munden Parish Council	Wyddial Parish Meeting
28 Other Parish Councils outside of East Herts	

<b>General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations</b>	
Aldwyck Housing Group Ltd	Hertfordshire Community Health Services
Bat Conservation Trust	Hertfordshire Gardens Trust
Bellway homes	Hunsdon Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group
Beds and Herts Local Medical Committee	Hutchinson 3G UK Limited
Bishops Stortford Methodist Church	Ian Baseley Associates
Bishop's Stortford District Footpath Association	Jarvis Homes Ltd
Bishop's Stortford Chamber Of Commerce	Labour Party
Bishop's Stortford Liberal Democrats	Layston Pre-School and Nursery
Bishop's Stortford Mencap	Leach Homes
Bishop's Stortford Town Centre Management Partnership	Leaside Church
British Horse Society	Leaside Under 5's Kindergarten
British Telecommunications plc	Lee Valley Regional Park Authority
British Waterways	Linden Homes

<b>General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations</b>	
Building Research Establishment	Linden Homes Eastern
Buntingford Chamber of Commerce	McMullen & Sons Ltd
Buntingford Civic Society	Mobile Operators Association
Buntingford Town Partnership	Molewood Residents Association
CABE	National Express East Anglia
Canal & River Trust	National Farmers Union
Carers in Hertfordshire	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
CBI East of England	Network Homes
CDA for Herts	North East Herts Labour Party
Chaldean Estate	North Hertfordshire Homes
Christ Church C of E (VA) Primary & Nursery School	Openreach Newsites
Church Commissioners	Orange Personal Communications Services
Circle Anglia	Origin Housing Association
Coke Gearing Consulting	PACE
Community Safety & Crime Reduction Department, Herts Constabulary	Paradigm Housing Group
Countryside Management Service	Paradise Wildlife Park
CPRE Hertfordshire	Parsonage Residents Association
Croudace Homes	Parsonage Surgery
Department for Transport Rail Group	Pelham Structures Ltd
Diocese of St Albans	Persimmon Homes
DPDS Consulting Group	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd
East Herts Ramblers	Plainview Planning Ltd
East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust	Planning Potential
East of England Development Agency	RSPB
East of England Local Government Association	Salvation Army Bishop's Stortford Corps
Essex County Cricket Board	Sanctuary Carr-Gomm
Fairview New Homes	Sanctuary Hereward
Fields In Trust	Savills
First Capital Connect	Shelter
Forebury Estates Ltd	South Anglia Housing Association
Forewind Ltd	Sport England
Framptons	St Joseph's RC Primary School
Freight Transport Association	St Michaels Church
Friends, Families and Travellers and Traveller Law Reformed Project	Standon and Puckeridge Surgery
Garden History Society	STANDonA120 campaign
Gascoyne Cecil Estates	Stevenage Liberal Democrats
Gladman Developments	Stewart Ross Associates

<b>General Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations</b>	
Good Architecture/ Transition Hertford	STOP Harlow North
Grange Builders	Strategic Planning Research Unit, DLP Planning Ltd
Granta Housing Society Ltd	Strutt & Parker
Hanover Housing Association	Sustrans
Hastoe Housing Association Ltd (East)	Telefonica O2 UK Ltd
Hatfield Town Council	Tesni Properties Limited
Haymeads Residents' Association	Thakeham Homes
Hazel End Farm	The Bishop's Stortford High School
Hertford Disability Support Group	The Canal and River Trust
Hertford Heath Primary School	The Gallery at Parndon Mill
Hertfordshire Action on Disability	The Georgian Group
Hertfordshire Association of Parish and Town Councils	The Gypsy Council
Hertingfordbury Conservation Society	The Lawn Tennis Association
Herts & Middlesex Badger Group	The Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust
Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	The Theatres Trust
Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust	The Traveller Law Reformed Project
Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	The Ware Society
Hertfordshire Community Health Services	The Woodland Trust
Hertfordshire Gardens Trust	Theatres Trust
Hertfordshire Police Authority	Wallace House Surgery
Herts & North Middlesex Area of the Ramblers	Ware Town Partnership
Herts Sports Partnership	Wareside C of E Primary School
Hightown Praetorian and Churches Housing Association	Watermill Estate Residents' Association
Hill Residential	Wates Developments
Hockerill Residents Association	Wattsdown Development Limited
Home Builders Federation	Welwyn Garden City Society
Home Farm Trust Herts & Essex	Wodson Park Sports Centre
Housing 21	Woodhall Estate
Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust	Hertfordshire Football Association
Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Hertfordshire Cricket
Hockey England	Rugby Football Union