

ID	DATE	FORMAT	TYPE OF CONSULTEE	DETAIL	SECTION OF NP	SPECIFIC POLICY	SUPPORT?	COMMENT	RESPONSE	NP CHANGED?
1	21/09/19	Verbal	Elected representative	Local councillor	Policies	AG2	Change required	The whole area hatched to the north of the power lines should be designated Local Green Space	Unnecessary as covered by separate policy and designation in District Plan	No
2	21/09/19	Verbal	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG2	Change required	Retention of the agricultural fields north of the power lines (e.g. 90 Acres Field) is important. It should not all be a country park	Agricultural uses may continue in countryside parks subject to Governance arrangements (Policy D2)	No
3	21/07/19	Verbal	Local resident	not sure	Policies	AG2	Change required	Fig. 12 - please amend map so that the area north of power line is differentiated from the Green Belt	Map changed	Yes
4	21/09/19	Verbal	Local resident	not sure	Policies	AG7	Change required	Transport is a key issue in the area and should be included in the AG policies more strongly and clearly	Policy TR3 now Policy AG8 to give greater weight to transport issues	Yes
5	21/09/19	Verbal	Local resident	Hunsdon	Local Context		Change required	Hunsdon Mead - make sure it is recognised in the NP, even if it is actually in the Hunsdon NP	Reference included to Hunsdon NP	Yes
14	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6 together; Policies could go further as villages need to be well separated, and housing in keeping with village setting. Also could be tighter to protect countryside and No additional building after planning approval	Policies clarified and tightened as far as possible with evidence available	Yes
7	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6 together; Policies could go further as villages need to be well separated, and housing in keeping with village setting. Also could be tighter to protect countryside and no additional building after planning approval	Policies (Ag in particular) have been strengthened to provide an appropriate framework for accommodating growth. Would not be possible to state there would be no other building after planning approval- any applications would need to be considered against policies and agreed masterplans	Partial
28	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6	Noted	N/a
36	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6	Noted	N/a
44	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6 Will Plan be guaranteed? Landscaping and infrastructure very important	Once approved at referendum	No
51	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6	Noted	N/a
59	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-9	Noted	N/a
71	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6 green corridors need to be high and dense for wildlife and privacy	Policy strengthened qualitatively but No specific width can be set as there is No backing of strong evidence.	Yes
127	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1	Yes	Ag1-6 but concerned about effectiveness of buffers both for new villages and existing communities. Important they have teeth and they be adhered to	Policy strengthened qualitatively but No specific width can be set as there is No backing of strong evidence.	Yes

	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG1	Yes	AG1-6 preserve the distinctiveness of the separate villages so that it does Not end up one big town. The densities and borders are vital points	Policy strengthened qualitatively but No specific width can be set as there is No backing of strong evidence. Policy Now requires open identification of best balance between corridors and densities and agreement of community.	Yes
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG1	Yes	Ag1-4	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes	We need to kNow exactly how they intend to keep the villages individual and how big will the gap between will be ?	Policy strengthened qualitatively but No specific width can be set as there is No backing of strong evidence. Policy Now requires open identification of best balance between corridors and densities and agreement of community.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes	We have some concern that the proposed "Country Park" on Hunsdon Airfield requires more detail and is in danger of being an adjunct to the Harlow North development rather than a buffer, particularly given the proposal for a "Visitor Centre".	Policy clarified and expanded for clearer involvement of local communities	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes		Noted	N/a
21	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6A but lack of clarity on road system	Policies cannot provide further detail or be prescriptive in matters of transport. AG8 clarified.	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes	Ensuring that any new developments are actually VILLAGES and done become urban sprawl is critical - as is protecting our green surroundings as much as possible to maintain wildlife.	Policies clarified and tightened as far as possible with evidence available	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG2	Yes	Strongly support the requirement of an overall Landscape masterplan	Policy AG1 and AG2 strengthen about Strategic Landscape Masterplan as a specific requirement	Yes
26	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	EX1	Change required	concerns about roads and Hunsdon must benefit	Policy text streghtened in EX1	Yes
37	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG6	Yes	AG7-9 strongly agree that utility and transport infrastructure come first	Additional AG policy on infrastructure	Yes
128	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG6	Yes	AG7-9 Importance of meeting area's infrastructure and it being in place ahead of completions	Additional AG policy on infrastructure	Yes
8	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9 They rightly require full consultation/involvement lacking up to Now	Consultation approach strengthened	Yes
15	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9 should lead to better consultation	Consultation approach strengthened	Yes

22	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9 But absence of village 7 plans and lack of detail hampers it	AG1 clearer about need for comprehensive development approach	Yes
29	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7	Yes	Ag7-9 very important to have adequate capacity of infrastructure	Additional AG policy on infrastructure	Yes
33	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1	Change required	60% modal shift is too ambitious	This reflects strategic objectives of the HGGT and can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
52	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9	Noted	N/a
72	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9	Noted	N/a
88	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9	Noted	N/a
120	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9 Local infrastructure must come before or early in the development	Additional AG policy on infrastructure	Yes
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7	Yes	AG7-9 very unlikely current water capacity will cope -community must be kept informed of throughout development.	Additional AG policy on infrastructure, based on evidence available.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Yes	There is an infrastructure deficit already ;will they listen to what they community says?	Additional AG policy on infrastructure and need to respect Garden City principles for betterment of area as a whole.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes		Noted	N/a
41	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	TRA1-4 Doubts about what happens if 60% modal shift not achieved	Part of Council's monitoring duties	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes		Noted	N/a
43	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Change required	Restrictive mobility plans	This reflects strategic objectives of the HGGT and can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes		Noted	N/a
45	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG6	Change required	AF7-9 What if everyone doesn't want to go to Harlow? What about other routes?	AG8 places additional requirements for transport and access.	No
46	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Change required	BU1-4 More affordable homes; and what happens if no 60% modal shift?	This reflects strategic objectives of the HGGT and can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
47	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Implementation and Delivery	C1	Change required	Funding of Community Assets ??	Policy D2 provides clearer wording	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes	Sport facilities do Not require flood lighting or artificial surfaces as peace & quiet are the essence of village life	Policy changed to make floodlighting conditional to landscape amenity and wildlife	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes	The road network and accessibility to peoples homes is key and it should Not be assumed that everyone will take buses or cycle - given the demographic of the existing community.	Stronger requirements for a transport strategy	Yes

	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Yes		Noted	N/a
9	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4 policies should help to deliver hi quality living environs for new and existing communities '	Noted	N/a
16	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4 policies should help if they are followed '	Noted	N/a
23	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
30	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
38	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes		Noted	N/a
53	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
60	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
65	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	Build Eco Houses to reduce carbon footprint; and preserve green spaces	Noted	
73	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
81	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4 Not to exceed 33 dph and less where close to existing residents and heritage assets	Reference to Concept Framework density has been included, but NPG canNot verify the density study independently and generate evidence for more detail on density. Policy AG6 Now requires open identification of best balance between corridors and densities and agreement of community.	Yes
89	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
103	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
112	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4 Don't let them be watered down	Noted	N/a
121	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
129	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1	Yes	BU1-4	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Yes	Villages must be distinctive	Additional detail on local character added in Appendix 4	Yes
68	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Local Context			Strengthen provisions for the disabled	Covered by national legislation.	No
69	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Appendices			add the local walks newsletter	Matter of detail. Not part of NP	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes	We as a community need to see designs of the proposed new builds to ensure that they match existing properties, to keep the "village" appearance, which in turn will blend in, and Not look like blatantly new builds in a field - New Hall/ old Harlow, is a prime example of how it shouldn't look!	Policy AG6 changed. Additional detail on local character added in Appendix 4	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes		Noted	N/a

	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes	Keypig buildings as low-rise as possible is desirable so as Not to spoil the horizon and country views.	Policy AG6 changed to include study of best possible balance. Additional detail on local character added in Appendix 4	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Yes		Noted	N/a
77	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Change required	define early planting?	Early planting (i.e. before building development) is considered sufficiently clear.	No
32	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
79	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6 but green corridors should specify density and not get eroded in future years	Policy AG1 and AG2 place additional requirements on the corridor. But not enough evidence to specify a specific minimum width.	Partial
80	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG6	No	AG7-9 Ensure gypsy and travellers sites tightly defined to ensure adherence in future years if achievable	Reference remove. District Plan policy remains.	Yes
40	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes		Noted	N/a
82	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	TRA1-4 need shuttle buses to serve stations, schools, shops etc	Policy AG8 on transport places requirements	Yes
55	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
62	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	c1-2	Noted	N/a
85	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	begin landscaping early to protect while development in progress	Policy clarified (EX1 / AG2)	Yes
75	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
87	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6 Plant early to protect privacy and wildlife define early	Policy clarified (EX1 / AG2)	Yes
84	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	c1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
91	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
105	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2	Noted	N/a
114	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	Hopefully	Noted	N/a
123	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	C1	Yes	The airfield needs to be passed to the community at the start of the development	Policy D2 amended	Yes
131	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	C1	Yes	transfer of undeveloped area to community and governance arrangements crucial and should be in place as soon as poss.	Policy D2 amended	Yes
94	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		Change required	but worried about adverse impact on TP and wants to redesign A414 plan	Policy AG8 stronger on avoiding severance	Yes
95	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6Don't go far enough on impact on landscape and existing communities	All AG policies strengthened. As much detail as possible has been added where justified by evidence.	Yes
96	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7	Change required	AG7-9 don't address community concerns about infrastructure capacity or adequacy	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
97	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1	Change required	BU1-4 don't reflect vision for the development	Noted. Policies clarified. Appendix 4 added.	Yes
98	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	TRA1	No	TRA1-4	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	No
99	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	No		Policy amended	N/a

100	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		No	not enough concern for T Park; better solutions for A414 layout required	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
101	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG1	No	p	Noted	N/a
102	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7	No	AG7-9	Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	C1	Yes	c1-2	Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	C1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	C1-2 But make sure it happens	Noted	N/a
106	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	TRA1	No	Road must not go through Pye corner and TP	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
107	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	No			
109	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Change required	very optimistic and doesn't reflect reality e.g. car parking, really adjunct of Harlow; no buses; traffic jams ; , will any one actually take any notice of the Plan' Lets see some early wins	Noted. Policies clarified as much as possible with evidence available	No
110	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	Ag1-6 see above	Noted. Policies clarified as much as possible with evidence available	No
111	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Change required	AG7-9 See above	Noted. Policies clarified as much as possible with evidence available	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	c1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Yes	But developers Not engaging with community on stewardship	Policy D2 amended	Yes
67	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Local Context	C2	Yes	Managing open spaces could be difficult;	Policy D2 amended	Yes
115	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gaston	Policies	TRA1	No		Noted. Policies clarified as much as possible with evidence available	No
116	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Local Context		Change required	Some typos and misnaming e.g. Overall.netherall,Botolph's, Dunstan's Not red lion but just Lion. What will younger people do to get involved as the development progresses? Build in legal safeguards in the plan so it cant be changed in future ; preserve ongoing knowledge in the Group	Text amended	Yes
12	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
119	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1	Change required	Ag1-6 but no clear picture in absence of Village 7 plans and the buffers are too narrow	AG1 stresses importance of comprehensive development. No specific width of buffer can be stated with evidence available	Yes
19	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
34	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes	Hope so	Noted	N/a
42	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
49	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Monitoring and Review	EX1	Yes	monitoring very important	Noted	N/a

124	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1	Change required	TRA1-4 stress the inadequacy of public transport now; and the impact on other villages north of the development too.	Policies AG8 / TRA 1 and TRA 2 clarified as much as possible with evidence available	Yes
125	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Local Context		Yes	Good Transport is the key for existing communities; and they should have more wins like village hall improvements and green spaces and recreational facilities	Noted	N/a
126	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Change required	Are the 13 Objectives deliverable or too all-embracing? Be more realistic?	Objectives were agreed with developers.	No
57	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
64	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
93	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
133	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	EX1	Yes	But infrastructure is essential and if done early will give local people confidence that other policies will be complied with	New AG8 and AG9 policies on infrastructure and timely delivery	Yes
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes	PfP take an active role NoW in maintaining the public Right of Ways. Many of them are overgrown and where they cross agricultural fields the RoW is Not reinstated in a timely manner after harvesting / ploughing.	Noted. This is a matter of detail, generally to be part of the Governance Strategy arrangements. Policy TRA2 reinforces the importance of local ROW.	No
134	xx	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Local Context		Change required	excellent work but ought to have more on disability access	Noted. Considered covered by national requirements and legislation	No
135	30/10/19	Email	Local business / activity	Eastwick	Local Context		Change required	Main concern is traffic through Eastwick, its effect on health of residents and character of village. No access through Eastwick lane	Noted. Only covered by AG8 and EX1 in general terms	Partial
136	30/10/19	Email	Local business / activity	Eastwick	Local Context		Change required	A local crossing on A414 as walkway or tunnel and concerns about Eastwick roundabout.	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
137	30/10/19	Email	Local business / activity	Eastwick	Local Context		Change required	increased hours and volume at the Lion should be restricted	Noted. Not a matter for NP	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes	Not at this time.	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Yes		Noted	N/a
142	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies		Change required	Supports all policies except for Changes to Gilston lane and footpaths unless to give residents more privacy	Policy EX1 clarified	Yes
10	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1	Yes	H1 & C1-2	Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies		Change required	Objects to any alteration of road linking church to community hall and Terlings, i.e. no cut off before Pye Corner	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
17	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1	Yes	H1 & C1-2	Noted	N/a

24	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1	Yes	H1 and -2	Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7	Change required	Allow for more parking	No evidence to go against Council / Garden Town strategy	No
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1	Change required	BU1-4 define the densities and separation of villages	NP does not have sufficient evidence to specify quantitatively density and separation. Policy AG6 and Appendix 4 give qualitative guidance.	Yes
31	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
39	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	TRA1	Change required	It is naïve to assume 60% journeys will be in cars. Transport policy should be more realistic	This reflects strategic objectives of the HGGT and can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
54	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		Change required	More emphasis on detrimental effect of new road on T Park	Policy AG8 and AG9 address this point as much as possible in NP	Yes
61	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1	Change required	Car parking will be a problem	No evidence to go against Council / Garden Town strategy	No
66	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	TRA1	Change required	But residents will not give up their cars	No evidence to go against Council / Garden Town strategy	No
	xx	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	Change required	policies will not minimise impact of new road structure on the existing community at T Park	Policy AG8 and AG9 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
74	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
83	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7	Change required	AG7-9 great concern about sewage treatment capacities. And make sure the community id generally kept fully informed.	Policy AG9 addresses the issue generally, as far as possible with evidence available.	No
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1	Change required	Parking will be a problem to be addressed; cars will not be reduced to the extent suggested for next 20 -30 years	This reflects strategic objectives of the HGGT and can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
	xxx	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	H1	Change required	don't make fiddlers Brook bridge an underpass	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
90	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	XX	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	Change required	The impact of the new roads cutting Gilston in half is unacceptable	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
104	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6 but Roads split communities and not enough green spaces	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Change required	address water and electricity shortages	Policy AG9 addresses the issue generally, as far as possible with evidence available.	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG8	Change required	Give community more notice and forewarning otherwise it's just tick boxing	Noted. Policy D1 on partnership with community should address comment	No

	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1	Change required	But watch housing density and use of cars too optimistic	AG policies address issues as far as possible with evidence available	No
113	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	people will not give up their cars-allow for that	Strategic objectives of the HGGT can't be contradicted by the Neighbourhood Plan	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	Don't split off T park from Gilston; the development will have massive impact will we have use of new facilities in return like schools, doctors?	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
122	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
130	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG3	Change required	Stress the importance of recreational facilities having minimum impact on existing communities	Policy C1 amended	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG5	Change required	But strengthen 5.40 to ensure minimum impact on existing community	Policy C1 amended	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7	Change required	Strengthen criteria to reduce impact of roads on existing esp. the new ring road.	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG8	Change required	Avoid rat runs and also protect footpaths from becoming cycle ways	Policy TRA2 clarify importance of footpaths	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	LA1	Change required	cross ref to AG3-6 and stress the importance of sports facilities having negative effect on existing. 5.75 define green buffers	Text in AG2 and AG5 strengthened	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1	Change required	Good but add the effect of increasing online delivery lorries	AG8 places requirement of traffic study on developers	No
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	H1	Yes	But don't bury Fiddlers Brook Bridge in an underpass	Noted. Stronger policy AG8 with clear reference to avoiding severance and need to minimise loss of amenity	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1	Change required	Avoid rat runs and also protect footpaths from becoming cycle ways	Policy TRA2 clarify importance of footpaths	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Change required	But expand it to make clear need to mitigate for existing comms	Policy Ag8 amended	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Change required	add allotments	Already included in District Policy	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	AG1-6 add need to restore rural setting to Pye Corner	AG 2 and EX1 address issue in general terms. Specific situation of Pye Corner will be address in responses to planning applications	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7	Change required	Ag7-9 poor capacity of rail service to be recognised more ; And infrastructure before building	Policy AG8 and 9 amended to address issue	Yes

xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1	Change required	Protect war memorial and listed buildings at Pye Corner.	AG 2 and EX1 address issue in general terms. Specific situation of Pye Corner will be address in responses to planning applications	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	C1	Change required	Share churches rather than building lots of new ones	Covered in general terms by policy C1	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	redesign Pye Corner as cul de sac, and make a by-pass	AG 2 and EX1 address issue in general terms. Specific situation of Pye Corner will be address in responses to planning applications	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	Ditto; more on allotments, woodland burial and church shares	Reference in para. 341 (policy EX1). District Plan policy will guide provision. No evidence for additional requirement	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1	Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes	There needs to be a "New Town Board" made up from existing parish councils and local government put in place for the new villages whether that be individual PCs or overarching single Council. It should in include landowners and Local residents to ensure t	Noted. This is part of the Governance Strategy arrangements. Policy D2 revised	Yes
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	LA1	Change required	Wants to see meaningful tree planting scheme for whole dev esp. opposite and to rear of old school Eastwick	Stronger references in AG3 and AG5	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	TRA1	Change required	On transport wants in Eastwick traffic calming and 20mph max, reduction in national speed limit between proposed roundabout for village 7 to Eastwick roundabout, bunds to reduce traffic noise on 414 passing Eastwick, and traffic lights at junction of 414 and Eastwick	AG8 and BU4 provide general principles. The details of transport arrangements are not the remit of the NP	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies		Change required	Dedicate a piece of land as an apiary for local bee keepers of whom there are a number.	Detailed requiremnt. Not suitable for NP policy.	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies			Don't let the developers water down the plan and make sure they comply with the policies ; otherwise as above re Eastwick	Noted. The NP will have value once approved at referendum	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Change required	more emphasis on protecting wildlife	Text amended	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies		Change required	Broadly supports but wants more to be done to protect countryside; and specifically to maintain Barn Owls habitats.	Text amended. Protection of habitats in general.	Yes

	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	On transport more needs to be done; no severance of existing lanes.	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form		Eastwick	Policies			Yes to all	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	EX1	Change required	Ensure safe junction with 414 from Eastwick	Policy AG8 and TRA1 address transport and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	EX1	Change required	need sound barrier at Eastwick from 414	This will be part of planning application details	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	EX1	Change required	prevent construction traffic entering Eastwick and Eastwick hall lane plus new traffic	Addressed in Policy AG8	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes	Policy H1- point 5.90, page 82 - should also refer to listed buildings in the Pye Corner area	Noted. Policy H1 refers to all listed buildings	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx\1	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	EX1	Change required	Improve sound barrier by planting more trees to shelter from 414;	This will be part of planning application details	No
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies	EX1	Change required	No construction traffic in Eastwick or Eastwick Hall lane traffic	Addressed in Policy AG8	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilst	Policies	TRA1	Change required	Don't cut off Terlings P	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	A bus stop outside Terlings to connect to High Wych and Sawbridgeworth	Policy AG8 and TRA1 address transport and accessibility as much as possible in NP	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes	Ensuring the protection of the views and surroundings of our heritage buildings is very important - particularly around Gilston Park House, St Marys Church in Gilston and St Btolphs Church in Eastwick.	New map and policy added (AG5) to strengthen this point.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1	Change required	Buffers must be adequate	AG4 addresses issues more clearly. No quantitative guidance possible.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	Yes		Noted	N/a
11	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1 -4	Noted	N/a
25	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	More needed for the locals, Channocks parkfield should be green space not a playing field.	Policy EX1 amended, as far as possible	Partial
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Change required	But more emphasis on existing community please	Policy EX1 amended, as far as possible	Partial
	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Change required	Harlow Council are taking advantage to alleviate their traffic problems; Terlings will be adversely affected which is wrong.	Policy AG8 and TRA1 address transport and accessibility as much as possible in NP	N/a

	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	Change required	Bus service from Eastwick-Terlings-High Wch -Sawbridge worth is necessary.	Policy AG8 and TRA1 address transport and accessibility as much as possible in NP	N/a
		Email	Elected representative		Introduction			I have been reading through the NPV1 draft and noticed that the areas of Eastwick and Gilston shown on Fig 2 Page 12 that have not been colour coded or otherwise identified are "Rural Areas Beyond the green Belt". Planning applications within the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt will be considered in accordance with Policy GBR2 of the District Plan, see below and attached.	Map changed	Yes
48	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Yes	Doubts that Train services will cope	Noted. Further requirement placed on transport strategy in Policy AG8.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Change required	Whilst you cannot use an existing standard for separation the proposed 10m or so does NOT provide sufficient physical separation of the villages. Developers should use existing spaces left between current villages eg 100m plus. This also includes separati	Policy AG2 and AG4 strengthened. Not possible with evidence available to give a minimum width	Partial
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Change required	Some of the improvements to infrastructure should be undertaken at the same time or before construction of the development takes place. This is to ensure that construction traffic does not negatively impact on existing roadworks. Works should commence imm	AG8 now addresses issue	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Change required	Totally disagree with the BU1 Paragraph 5. Reducing dedicated parking will only exacerbate on street parking and vehicle access problems. Despite the aims and objectives of sustainable transport people will not give up their cars unless government legisla	BU1 amended but transport strategy needs to conform to Garden Town and County Stratgy.	No
56	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4		Not unless agreed construction routes and access pints are agreed in advance and adhered to. Also the A414 Stort crossing needs to be finished in advance or at least concurrently with the development construction. the proposed river crossing is inadequate	AG8 AG9 and TRA1 address issue as far as possible	Yes
63	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4	Noted	N/a

76	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4 online shopping will reduce shopping trips but increase delivery traffic	Noted. Further requirement placed on transport strategy in Policy AG8.	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Change required	I suggest extra safeguards are necessary to ensure the two current landowners do not dissipate the obligations and that smaller developers do not resort to Viability Assessments to escape the obligations	Noted	N/a
92	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4	Noted	N/a
132	xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1	Yes	TRA1-4 Guarded Yes to be effective re car parking and use has to be credible and attractive public transport but it will take time to get people out of cars.	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	Change required	Even if the targets for local sustainable transport are met this will not alleviate the concerns over transport (road and rail) beyond the locality	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	Yes	There are great concerns about the "Village 7" development and whether the Developers will abide by these plans. It is necessary that they contribute to the infrastructure rather than evade their responsibilities in this regard. There need to be enhanced transport links with existing communities	Noted. Further requirement placed on transport strategy in Policy AG8.	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	Yes	Any sustainable transport options which are put in place must support all residents and Not just the new communities.	New AG8 and AG9 policies on infrastructure and timely delivery	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	Yes		Noted	N/a
18	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA4	Yes	TRA1-4	Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	No	It is of utmost pleasure importance that Gilston Lane - (the road from Pye Corner up to Gilston) is kept open for existing residents vehicles ONLY, with no join or link to the new proposed ring road. This road is a unique country lane, and has a wonderful feel to it, which must be protected and maintained as a "quiet country lane" Not for use by building traffic of new home owners!!! We don't want it shut off half way for it to become a cycle only road, which will mean that existing residents will hav	Policy EX1 amended, as far as possible. Details will have to be in response to specific proposals	Partial

xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	Change required	Clearer road markings to slow down traffic on some of the blind bends on Gilston lane! Start planting sapling trees around the designated green areas of the new villages, these will be established as the site grows! Include better Signage for all existing Public footpaths, showing clearly (using weatherproof maps) where the paths are especially those that pass through existing residents property.	Detailed transport issues are unfortunately outside scope of NP	No
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park				Firstly thank you for all of your efforts - we do appreciate it. The hope that the council and the developers will listen and act on our proposals is of the upmost importance, and we hope that our voice is listened to. On a personal note re page s 50 & 51, Green spaces, can you please explain, who designated these areas? What does a Green Space mean? Who can use a green space? Why are many other areas not included as a Green Space! I note that Little Park is shown as a green space,(privately owned)	Local Green Space need justification according to National Guidance. Justification added.	Yes
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		No	Provisions for businesses and shops. Those need to be concentrated in one location for economic reasons, where footfall will be at its highest, on Eastwick Road. Also sufficient parking needs to be available and space for deliveries and garbage bins. The current proposal is similar to Beaulieu Park in Chelmsford or Newhall in Harlow and in both cases the businesses and shops are struggling.	Noted. Concept of Village Core addressed in Policy BU2. No evidence to suggest change.	No
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	No	There should be curbs to protect young families with children, elders and commuters from cars, bike and electric scooter. Lighting should be generous so that people can commute safely at night and during the winter.	Policy TRA2 addresses in part this issue. Details of footpath are part of the developers' proposals to come in future.	No

	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	No	There ought to be a corridor from the future North entrance of Harlow Town Station to Gilston Garden Village thru Burntmill Lane as most journeys by foot will be thru there. Gilston Garden Village should ensure there is no flyover as they tend to attract anti-social behaviours, graffitis and are unsightly.	Reference added to AG8	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	No	See the comment above. Restaurants should be segregated as residents will complain about smell, noise, and traffic, and restaurants will struggle to operate without proper clearance for deliveries and garbage collection. They could be located along the corridor between Harlow Town Station and Village 1 (thru).	Noted. Concept of Village Core addressed in Policy BU2. No evidence available to NP Group to suggest change.	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	H1, C1, C2	No	There ought to be room for a sport centre comparable to Harlow Leisure Zone but in Gilston Garden Town.	No evidence to suggest additional requirements in addition to District Plan.	No
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	No	Access to the station is the main issue. There is also no adequate bike storage. Bus route thru Burntmill Lane into Village 1 ought to be considered. This should be the first infrastructure investment so that the new development can attract train commuters rather than people who drive to work.	Reference added to AG8	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Policies	EX1	No	Terlings Park which was built five years ago will be split from the rest of Gilston by the new West Crossing. This is unacceptable.	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Terlings Park	Other			The team behind the plan ought to consult the Bell Street business association in Sawbridgeworth for advice and the businesses in Beaulieu Park in Chelmsford and Newhall in Harlow. I would also suggest that the team interviews young parents with children, commuters and pensioners. I felt those views were not represented by the team / the plan in general.	Noted. Concept of Village Core addressed in Policy BU2. No evidence available to NP Group to suggest change.	No
6	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
13	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
20	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
27	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
35	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
50	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a

58	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Other			There are concerns that East Herts Council might delay approving this plan in order to allow developers to avoid their responsibilities particularly in relation to the undisclosed plans for Village 7.	Noted.	N/a
70	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Change required	Figure 12, page 50- the boundary of Gilston Park is incorrect. Without understanding the purpose of defining "Proposed Local Green Spaces" I am unable to suggest what the boundary should be. I would like the opportunity to talk this through in order to improve my understanding. Figure 13, page 51- needs to define a "green corridor" alongside Gilston Lane between Cumberland Cottage and Church Cottages AG2 ii- Separation between villages and all existing clusters of dwellings to ensure th	Map amended	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG7 - AG9	Change required	Point 5.50, page 65, needs to include water deficiency AG7- very good statement AG8 point 3- needs to include other key destinations, such as Hertford, Ware, Sawbridgeworth, Bishop's Stortford, etc Point 5.58, page 68 - And opportunities for local residents through participatory preparation of the Landscape Masterplan and Village Masterplans.	Text amended as far as possible within scope of NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Change required	BU1, point 3, page 76- needs some indicative height limit Point 5- I do not agree with such a strong statement about restricting car parking- this is not realistic and will result in parking infringements along the roads. BU4, page 80 new points: Existing lanes will be respected and access restricted to the occupiers of existing settlements. Impact of the Development should be minimised by sensitive handling / design where new roads for the Development potentially intersect existing lanes.	Text amended as far as possible within scope and evidence available within the NP	Yes
78	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a

	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park		TRA1 - TRA4	Change required	Point 5.106, page 87- needs to include Hertford, Ware, Sawbridgeworth, Bishop's Stortford, etc I do not agree with the final bullet reducing provision for car parking- this is not realistic and will result in parking infringements along the roads. TRA1 2iv - include Hertford, Ware, Sawbridgeworth, Bishop's Stortford, etc Viii- remove "reduce parking " TRA3 3point 3 "New vehicular access and retain existing access for residents" Change "convenient" to "exi	AG8 AG9 and TRA1 address issue as far as possible. However, drive towards reduced car use can't be contradicted by NP.	Partial
86	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Other			Overall this is an excellent Neighbourhood Plan but I am concerned it does not suggest the community has a significant role with the preparation of the very important Landscape Masterplan General comment regarding all the Policies- I do not agree with the verb "support" this is too strong. Afraid I cannot think of an alternative perhaps "Proposals for the new villages will be positively assessed where it	Policy AG1, AG2 and D1 changed	Yes
118	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
138	25/10/19	Email	Local resident	Hunsdon			Yes	It is a well written and well argued Neighbourhood Plan	Noted	N/a
139	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
140	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies		Yes	Supports all but No changes to Gilston Lane or to footpaths which are needed to keep existing house private	Noted. Further requirement placed on transport strategy in Policy AG8.	Yes
141	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
	xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes	Would add need to secure additional infrastructure so it is Not forgotten later in development	Policy AG9 strengthened	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		No		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG1 - AG6	No		Noted	N/a
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	AG7 - AG9	No	remove the elevated section of the Eastwick Rd which is to run across Terlings Park.	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	BU1 - BU4	No	Ensure any properties are low rise, no higher than a TownHouse	Policy AG6 changed. No specific quantitative guidance possible, but qualitative guidance strengthened	Partial
	xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	H1, C1, C2	No		Noted	N/a

xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	No	remove the elevated section of the Eastwick Rd which is to run across Terlings Park. Ensure that Harlow town / Mill stations are included in the Oyster scheme.	Policy AG8 and EX1 address severance and accessibility as much as possible in NP	Yes
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Policies	EX1	No	Provision of a local shop in the Terlings Park area, in Gilston.	Noted. Policy EX1 refers to accessibility to facilities	N/a
xx/09/2019	Feedback form	Local resident	Terlings Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes	But very worried about the impact of new road on T Park	Noted. Stronger policy AG8 with clear reference to avoiding severance and need to minimise loss of amenity	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes	But continue to listen to local people who are affected by changes	Policy D1 about partnership working with community strengthened	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies		Yes	Supports all policies-It's a comprehensive document.	Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4	No	As previous comments Car usage is essential for some people . As a carer for elderly relatives and also a local Hertfordshire volunteer , why should walking / cycling / public transport take priority over car usage .the proposals do not take these needs into account. Personally we feel that as we get older it is important to maintain independence by continuing to drive.	AG8 AG9 and TRA1 address issue as far as possible. However, drive towards reduced car use can't be contradicted by NP.	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Hunsdon	Policies		Yes	Supports all policies	Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	AG1 - AG6	Change required	It is crucial that the new villages are designed to be separate from each other and from existing homes by early delivery of substantial buffer zone	Policy AG4 strengthened	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	BU1 - BU4	Change required	Do not agree with BU1 - car parking needs to be adequate for the needs of the residents not the aspiration of the Planners. Electrical cars require just as much spaces as fossil fuel vehicles. Most new developments do not provide enough car parking hence congestion on streets and pavememnts. BU2 business parks are not appropriate in a village setting. BU4 - adequate car parking is necessary as not everyone works locally.	BU1 amended but transport strategy needs to conform to Garden Town and County Stratgy.	No
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a

xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	TRA1 - TRA4		Do not agree with TRA1(viii) - reducing parking standards is not the way to resolve the problem as a visit to any new development demonstrates. There is a need for many families to have private transport; eg shift workers, emergency service employees (often staffed by "standby staff" who need to be able to get to a centre urgently), travelling to meet extended families, etc.	BU1 amended but transport strategy needs to conform to Garden Town and County Stratgy.	No
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Policies	EX1	No	The threatened blocking of Gilston Lane, stopping access to existing residents of the Gilston Park area must not happen. However Gilston Lane must be treated in such a way it is not attractive to be used as a rat run. What is hapening about the cross over of the Spine Road and Eastwick Hall Lane?	Policy EX1 strengthened	Yes
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Eastwick	Policies		Yes	Add safe junstction for Eastwick to 414 by lighting and 50mph limit;	Policy AG8 covers the topic. NP cannot be so specific about transport arrangmeents.	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Policies		Yes	Supports all	Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Feedback form	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes	There should perhaps be a mention of designing the development with sustainable energy and low carbon emissions. eg each house to have electric charging point, solar panels on roofs, grey water recycling schemes and possible community heating schemes usi	Policies BU have additional references. Objectives also include requirements for high standards. Not enough evidence to place additional requirements on the developers	Yes
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Other			Thank you for all the time & effort that has gone into developing this document on behalf of the community - it is very much appreciated.	Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Hunsdon	Vision and Objectives		Yes		Noted	N/a

xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives	Yes	<p>II Very important that new and existing villages & communities have substantial buffers between each of them that really are "meaningful and high quality".</p> <p>VIII Existing & communities / clusters of houses will be physically respected and Not encroached upon (by the creation and maintenance of meaningful, substantial buffers) yet functionally integrated to</p> <p>XI New infrastructure to avoid the impacts of the development (.....)</p> <p>XIII remedy current deficiencies, which is design</p>	Yes - Policy AG1 and AG2 strengthened. Principles very clear in Vision and Objectives	Yes
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston	Vision and Objectives	Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives	Yes	<p>Whilst we support healthy lifestyles etc</p> <p>We feel it should be Noted that for some people reducing car dependency is Not an option . Examples use of cars for people working outside of the area / requirement to travel during working hours / caring responsibilities/ disabilities etc We would like to see further clarity and detail on the proposed infrastructure and milestones / timescales as to when such infrastructure will be provided .</p> <p>We would like to see more clarity / detail in regards to villag</p>	Noted. Additional requirements for the transport strategy and clearer reference to Garden Town Transport Strategy	No
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives	Yes		Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives	Yes	I thoroughly endorse the work that the Neighbourhood Planning Group has done and the contents of this draft document.	Noted	N/a
xx/10/19	Online feedback	Local resident	Gilston Park	Vision and Objectives	Yes		Noted	N/a

ID	DATE	FORMAT	TYPE OF CONSULTEE	OFFICE - NAME	SPECIFIC POLICY	SUPPORT?	COMMENT	RESPONSE	NP CHANGED?
1	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	The Gilston Area Neighbourhood Plan (GANP) is seen as positive and responding to the strategic priorities in the development plan. However, the response states that significant work is required to ensure that the policies in the GANP are clearly written, deliverable and produce the outcomes that are intended.	Noted - comments welcome	Yes
2	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	NPPF requires plans to contain policies that are clearly written, unambiguous, justified and effective. The GANP would benefit from revisiting a number of areas to ensure that the Plan is compliant with this section of the NPPF.	Noted - all policies revised	Yes
3	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Outstanding issues remain around the effectiveness and deliverability of the policies set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted - the matter was discussed and considered after Reg. 14 (Oct 2019) and again in a interim version (Jan 2020)	Yes
4	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Issues remain around the justification and community engagement behind some of the policies. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear that Plans must be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between planmakers and communities and also based upon proportionate evidence. In some cases it is unclear where the community and evidence has shaped the policies within the draft Plan. The GANP should ensure that it clearly articulates the matters that are of greatest importance to the community.	Noted - see evidence and Consultation Statement	Yes
5	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	The GANP should have a Policies Map that draws together the geographical designations and various policies throughout the Plan.	Map added	Yes
6	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	For the sake of clarity the second part of the 1st sentence on page 5 (section 1.1) should note that the green belt was released when the District Plan was adopted, in order to accommodate the strategic allocated site known as the Gilston Area (GA1). Consider re-wording the first sentence to the following: "In October 2018 the East Herts District Plan was adopted, with this the area surrounding the villages of Eastwick and Gilston allocated for	Text amended	Yes
7	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	The final sentence on page 5 (section 1.3) refers to the Plan being 'made' after the referendum. To reflect recent changes and the formal process the line 'Once 'made' after the Referendum...' should be changed to say; "If more than half of those voting vote in favour of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Plan will come into force as part of the statutory development plan alongside the District Plan."	Text amended	Yes
8	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	In relation to the bullet points on pages 5-6 (section 1.4), it appears that you are trying to bring to people's attention the ways in which the Parish Council has participated or could in the future. For the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning this section isn't relevant and adds unnecessary detail that could be briefly summarised within a paragraph elsewhere.	Text amended	Yes
9	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Pages 6 (section 1.7): Bullet 3 - It is unclear who is required/expected to produce the comprehensive landscape masterplan for the whole area (including the existing settlements) as this by implication extends beyond the Policy GA1 area allocation. It is advised that wording is revised to provide clarity. Bullet 5 - It is advised that it be clearly indicated whose priority the projects are, and what engagement with statutory bodies has informed these as priorities. Bullet 6 - It is unclear whether the GANP is setting out the Delivery Strategy or identifying the need for a Delivery Strategy to be prepared by the applicant/bodies responsible for delivery of development in Policy GA1. It is advised that wording is revised to provide clarity.	Text amended - Matter now more clearly guided by the Gilston Charter SPD. References clarified	Yes
10	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	In relation to the 'Evidence Base' section on page 10 (section 1.21-1.22), it is advised that it would be useful to identify and be clear throughout the GANP, and particularly within the supporting text of each Policy, specifically which evidence has informed the policies in the Plan.	Further references provided and list of evidence base documents in Appendix. Where relevant specific cross reference added in footnote	Yes
11	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	On page 11 (section 1.25), East Herts District Council have stated that they are unsure what relevance noting fundamental concerns has to forming a Neighbourhood Plan. Your Plan is formed around the objectives and visions in the later chapters as well proportional evidence and community engagement.	Text amended	Yes
12	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	In order to avoid ambiguity it is advised that definitions on Figure 2, page 12 should match those of Figure 11.1 in the EHDC District Plan including: 'Site allocation developed area' and 'community trust open space land' to ensure consistency.	Maps amended	Yes
13	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Pages 13-23 (sections 2.1-2.45). Whilst it is appreciated that some policy context is useful – 10 pages that duplicate and repeat much of National Policy and guidance, then the same with Local Policy and the Garden Town does not aide the readability of this document. It might be better instead to summarise the issues that are really pertinent to this Neighbourhood Plan – such as the short, concise summary in paragraphs 2.18-2.21 and then make reference to extracts of the actual policy which could be detailed within the appendices.	Text amended and moved to Appendix	Yes

14	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 13, section 2.3 and 2.4. References should be provided to this definition of Sustainable Development.	Text amplified for this purpose	Yes
15	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 18-20, section 2.25. The statements included relate not just to Policy GA1 as indicated but also the supporting text of chapter 11 of the EHDC District Plan. It is advised that opening wording is revised to acknowledge this.	Text amended	Yes
16	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 19, section 2.25. Open Space - There is an incorrect quotation of the District Plan used which replaces and introduces new words. It is advised this should be corrected to ensure consistency.	Text amended	Yes
17	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 23, section 2.44. It is advised that wording should be clarified regarding "the framework of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Board". The Board does not in itself establish a framework. Advised that wording might be amended to "... the guidance of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town".	Text amended	Yes
18	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	The Gilston Area Concept Framework was agreed, together with the accompanying report (Gilston Area Concept Framework and Planning Process, East Herts Council Executive, 12 June 2018) as a material consideration for Development Management purposes in July 2018.	Text amended. Reference to both documents added.	Yes
19	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 27, section 3.10. Bullet point 2 is unclear, advise rewording.	Text amended	Yes
20	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 29, section 3.14. Assume reference is to Parndon.	Text amended	Yes
21	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 30, section 3.22. The remaining Chapter relates to Local Context, however, this paragraph appears to relate to objectives of the community which might be better set out with Chapter 4 of the Plan.	Text amended	Yes
22	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 31, figure 8. It is advise that captions for each image indicating the subject, location and what is particularly relevant about that image would add greater usefulness for future users of the GANP.	Captions provided	Yes
23	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 34. The introduction states that 'the vision and objectives are the result of collaborative joint work between the community, the local authority and the promoters of the development.' Whilst the vision and objectives in the Concept Framework might be the result of joint work the visions and objectives in the Neighbourhood Plan are not. The different contexts of the two documents are distinct and therefore you should be careful not to say that other parties have jointly progressed the Neighbourhood Plan when they have not. Once visions and objectives are set out in the GANP they become those proposed of the community. If the intent is to adopt the identical Visions and Objectives of the Concept Framework then the GANP might wish to state that, the Visions and Objectives of the Concept Framework are X and, that it is the intent of the GANP to adopt these for reasons of Y, therefore the Visions and Objectives of the Community through the GANP are also thus.	Text amended accordingly	Yes
24	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 34, section 4.1-4.2. Focus needs to be moved away from the consultation and endorsement of the Concept Framework and instead onto the endorsement and consultation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Again, it should be noted that the contexts are different and so this Plan needs to set out why the Visions and Objectives are suitable for this Neighbourhood Plan and its community.	Text amended	Yes
25	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 34, section 4.3. It is advised that clarity is provided regarding the agreement to which this first sentence relates and the parties to that agreement. The second sentence of the paragraph states that a landscape led approach will be adopted – it is not however in a Neighbourhood Plan's gift to determine such an approach, but only to suggest and evidence why such an approach might be used. Instead this should reworded to say that a 'landscape led approach is encouraged'. Likewise later in the sentence wording should be changed to suggest that the existing landscape 'could' be used to create an attractive place to reflect that the NPG will not be the developers of this site.	Text amended	Yes
26	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	Page 34, section 4.4 (II). The first sentence of II under Vision should be deleted as the location has already been determined through the District Plan.	Text amended	Yes

27	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>Pages 34-35. Where the word 'will' is used to describe an action (e.g. 'Every new village will be designed using a palette...'), it should be replaced with the word 'should' or similar. The NPG will not be directly delivering this development and so it cannot determine what will be delivered with certainty – it can only shape development through its policies.</p> <p>It is further noted that the Vision appears to be a rearrangement of text from the Concept Framework Vision which have in places been altered and added to. For example, Part II. appears to be entirely new and parts I. and IV. and VIII. have been added to or altered, generally throughout the Vision has been rearranged with the order of text changing which might change the meaning of that text where previously it formed a part of a larger paragraph. The editing has not been explained in the introductory text.</p> <p>Where the Vision is based upon the Concept Framework it is advised that that should be acknowledged and faithfully recreated, where a Vision is proposed to be adapted or added to by the GANP it is similarly advised that this is acknowledged.</p> <p>In the case of the later it is advised that consideration is given to whether there is any value in adapting an existing vision statement where this has been indicated elsewhere in the GANP as representing an agreed form, this risks undermining that existing vision. Similarly as the GANP is indicated as having been based upon the Concept Framework that contains the original vision its adaptation should be considered in the context of how this might risk undermining the implied foundation of agreement and evidence of the GANP.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the GANP for example seeks to articulate the links between the GANP policies to the District Plan and the Concept Framework and explicitly states this link is to the "Endorsed Concept Framework (2018) Vision" and therefore not necessarily the Vision set out in the GANP.</p> <p>This section needs to be clearly defined and needs to be linked back to the introduction of the Vision and Objectives chapter. The vision should be shaped by community engagement and be stated anew as the adopted Vision of that community, regardless of whether it has been previously endorsed.</p>	Text amended	Yes
----	--------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------	---	--------------	-----

28	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>Pages 36-40. It is again noted that these Objectives appear to be a rearrangement of text from the Concept Framework Objectives which have again in places been altered and added to. For example:</p> <p>Objective 1: reference to “with most developments fronting directly and overlooking the green spaces” and “The streets will be easily navigable and permeable, with streets treated as vibrant and active spaces to promote inclusive communities” have been omitted (Concept Framework, page 74);</p> <p>Objective 2: the addition of the word “equally” changes the objective in respect to provision of infrastructure for new development and existing communities”</p> <p>Objective 4: the addition of text in relation to the Stort Valley “preserved for its natural and water-related character” and changing of the word “natural” to “rich in biodiversity” in relation to Green landscape and the addition of text “rather than designed and managed like urban parks”;</p> <p>Objective 5: the change of wording from “long distance views” to “rural open setting”;</p> <p>Objective 6: the addition of “by walking, cycling and bus” and “new and existing”; and, in respect to parking, the addition of “and carefully managed to minimise the visual impact on the street scene and to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport”;</p> <p>Objective 7: “Walking and Cycling will be prioritised within each village” has replaced “safe and secure layouts designed to minimise conflicts”;</p> <p>Objective 8: omission of Essex villages as an inspiration; “adopted” has replaced the word “explored” in a generally reworked text relating to layouts and building lines; a qualification has been added in respect to back fences onto green areas being avoided where “for public use”; new text has been added in respect to “durable and high-quality buildings and public spaces”;</p> <p>Objective 9: this has been significantly redrafted throughout;</p> <p>Objective 10: there is minor redrafting throughout;</p> <p>Objective 11: addition of “early on” in respect to the transfer of land into community ownership;</p> <p>Objective 13: addition of “and phased to minimise and manage the impacts of the development on the local area”;</p> <p>Where the Objectives are based upon the Concept Framework it is advised that that should be acknowledged and faithfully recreated, where an Objective is new or proposed to be adapted or added to by the GANP it is similarly advised that this is acknowledged.</p> <p>As with the Vision, it is advised that careful consideration is given to the value of recreating and rewriting Objectives where these are based upon a document that is indicated elsewhere as forming an agreed position and the foundation for the GANP.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the GANP for example seeks to articulate the links between the GANP policies to the District Plan and the Concept Framework and explicitly states this link is to the “Endorsed Concept Framework (2018) Objectives” and therefore not necessarily the Objectives set out in the GANP.</p> <p>As with the vision, the objectives should be shaped by community engagement and be stated anew as the adopted objectives of that community, regardless of whether they have been previously endorsed.</p>	Text amended to ensure consistency with CF	Yes
29	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>The Council's comments draw attention to areas where further clarity is needed but the need to address clarity is not limited to these points only. Comments relate to the expectation that proportionate evidence is needed to inform the policies themselves which isn't always clear. It is also not always clear where the community have shaped the formation of policies.</p>	Explanatory text and reference to evidence base clarified.	
30	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>The introductory text for each Policy is split into “Rationale and Justification” and a separate heading for “Community Perspective”. These different sections, however, frequently appear to both provide perspectives rather than limiting the initial text to factual context based upon the District Plan and Concept Framework followed by the community perspective setting out the related key matters as viewed by the community through consultation. This area in particular should be improved to help clearly identify the overall rationale behind the policies.</p>	Considered important that community perspective is provided. “Rationale and Justification” more strictly focused on objective and factual justification	Yes
31	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>A general issue that is prevalent throughout is that Policies, as drafted, frequently appear to state what is going to happen, however the NPG is not the landowner/developer nor is the LPA that will use the GANP for decision-making. It is strongly advised that the Policies should be revisited so that their drafting provides clear guidance on the development and use of land, to both the landowner/developer and the decision-maker, and what considerations should inform proposals for development and the decisions made upon them.</p>	Text amended	Yes
32	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>Page 42, section 5.1. This should say that it supports the vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan – not the concept framework.</p>	Text amended	Yes
33	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>Page 44, section 5.5. The first sentence states that the intention is to develop the Gilston Area as a series of villages. The Neighbourhood Plan is unable to speak of the intention of the developer but should instead highlight that development should be in accordance with Policy GA1 Part III which refers to distinct villages.</p>	Cross reference provided	Yes
34	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	Change required	<p>Page 45, section 5.11. The community is concerned that ‘major development’?</p>	Clarification provided	Yes

35	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG1	Change required	<p>Page 46. Policy AG1 needs comprehensive re-wording in order to function as intended. It is the assumption that this policy relates only to 'Major Development' rather than 'all development'. This distinction should be clearly made and emphasised otherwise this policy could end up being applied to all development proposals irrelevant of their size or scale. Criteria 1 – this criterion states that proposals 'must be put forward' in the context of the overall development. Instead of using this terminology it might provide more clarity if the sentence is changed to read 'proposals should consider the context of the overall development of the Gilston Area and should demonstrate that it has not been considered in isolation'. That said, GANP might want to consider whether this criterion is necessary given Policy DES1 (III) and DES4 of the District Plan and whether it is unnecessary repetition. Criteria 2 – Unsure what the word 'positively' contributes to the criteria, consider deleting to provide clarity. Delete 'relationship'. Also delete reference to 'new' settlements as Gilston, Eastwick and Hunsdon are existing settlements. Add the term 'where possible' into the latter part of the criteria to acknowledge that this isn't achievable in all cases. Delete 'in line with new development' as this doesn't add any value to the criteria. Policy could be reworded as: "Proposals must demonstrate how they have considered the existing settlements of Gilston, Eastwick and Hunsdon, in respect to their character and setting. Where possible proposals should seek to enhance the landscape setting of these existing settlements and their access to services and facilities. Criteria 3 – covers a number of varying areas of planning. This policy refers to scale, location and form of development, as well as living and working environments, and local services, all of which could relate to individual policies and would benefit from considerably more detail in order to be successfully utilised. The main point of the third criteria is to introduce the sub-criteria, consider deleting Criteria 3 and instead replace with: "In order to assist the creation of sustainable development across Policy GA1, new development should:"</p> <p>Sub Criteria -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. "existing rural landscape assets" are not defined. It is advised that criteria i. , vi. and ix. could be combined to provide clarity on the nature of a landscape asset. It is advised that "Predominance" of the landscape setting should be articulated as relating to the entire Neighbourhood Plan Area and not individual development areas where this would be contrary to the delivery of the Development Plan allocation. ii. The term 'balanced' may benefit from being defined in the supporting text. iii. This has already been covered in criteria 2 – delete. v. Heritage and character is covered in policy H1 and doesn't need repeating. vi. Needs to be more specific about what villages are being referred to, is this the existing villages? ix. following the adoption of the District Plan the Green Belt was removed from the area covered by Policy GA1. Some areas of Green Belt still remain within the Neighbourhood Area but are not the subject of any development within this Plan. This point needs to be clearer as to what the expectations are on a development proposal that comes forward. x. Delivering all infrastructure in advance of requirement is an aspiration but in many cases not deliverable for a variety of reasons. Consider the use of the phrase 'where possible' to promote advanced infrastructure provision but also to recognise that it is not always deliverable. 	Text amended	Yes
36	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG2	Change required	<p>Page 47, section 5.14. The first sentence refers to 'guidance and policy documents' but does not explicitly mention any. In order to help justify the inclusion of the policy, the documents should be clearly referenced.</p>	text amended	Yes

37	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG2	Change required	<p>Page 48. This policy is currently titled as Creating a Green Infrastructure Network but the policies appear to relate to a Landscape Masterplan. Thought needs to be given to whether it is better to refer only to Green Infrastructure rather than GI through the mechanism of a Landscape Masterplan which isn't a requirement of the GA1 policy. It is also unclear who is responsible for preparation of an overall landscape masterplan, how this accords with the development Plan allocation and how this is justified in advance of preparation of individual Village Masterplans. It is advised that further explanation and justification of this Policy is required. Criteria 1 – This criterion is vague and in its current state is unlikely to be effective or achieve its intended goal. As this policy currently reads, it would require development proposals to justify that a landscape masterplan had been prepared prior to the preparation of a masterplan and the commencement of development. Considering that a development cannot commence without a planning consent this is a non-point. If the intention is instead to require development proposals to conform with a landscape masterplan then it should simply state that. Again, whilst a Landscape Masterplan might be produced, it is not a requirement of policy GA1 it may be better to refer to GI network requirements outside of this context as these would still therefore be applicable in any context. Sub Criteria: i. Presumably this criteria is trying to explain that it wants the existing network of parks, woodlands and wildlife sites incorporated into any GI network? As it currently reads this is not being made clear. ii. The first part of point 1 of this criterion needs rewording in order to make sense "...and establishment of ample and wildlife". The second part of this point might function better separately by saying: - "Where possible consideration should be given to connecting any GI proposals with existing GI in the Stort Valley, Lee Valley Park, Epping Forest and Hatfield Forest". Point 2 refers to the separation between villages, Policy AG5 already deals with this and with reference to GI and so it should cross reference to that policy rather than repeating. Point 3 notes that walking and cycling access should be delivered but without encroachment into wildlife sites and the green separation between villages. This potentially conflicts with previous policy criterion that encourages the incorporation of wildlife sites into all GI. Likewise, a 'green separation' cannot prevent blanket encroachment – instead, the addition of a sentence such as "access is encouraged but should be sensitive to its environment". iv. Currently unsure how this criterion relates to GI. It either needs to consider views in the context of GI or should be deleted as views are considered in other policies. v. Again – this needs to be clear. Criteria 3 – unless the NPG is intending to extend the woodlands then this needs to be reworded. It could be reworded as follows; "Consideration should be given to extending or enhancing woodlands where appropriate. Management plans should also be considered at an early stage of the planning process." Criteria 4 – This criterion contains areas designated as Local Green Space (LGS). Paragraph 99 and 100 of the NPPF set out the policies that allow for the provision of LGS and also the criteria that a LGS must fulfil in order to be designated as such. There is no supporting evidence provided to justify the inclusion of these current allocations to support the requirements of the points in paragraph 100 of the NPPF. Criteria 5 – further clarification is needed as to the responsibility for preparing the management and maintenance plans for these areas and how this will be secured.</p>	Policy amended to provide further clarification. Reference to requirements of Gilston Charter SPD included. The Strategic Landscape MasterPlan is considered the best approach to ensure the policy is effectively applied.	Yes
38	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG2	Change required	<p>Page 50, figure 12. It is advised that evidence should be referenced that supports the designations on Figure 12 including the Local Green Space (see above) and Sensitive Historic Setting which should be defined.</p>	Text and justification to be added	Yes
39	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG2	Change required	<p>Page 51, figure 13. The figure does not appear to be referenced in the GANP.</p>	Reference now included	Yes

40	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG3	Change required	<p>Page 53.</p> <p>Criterion 1 – It might be worth the addition of a cross-reference to Policy GA1 in the District Plan to acknowledge that mitigation and impacts are in the context of a strategic development that will deliver around 10,000 new dwellings, employment areas and infrastructure. The addition of the words where possible would also be welcome and encourage a pragmatic approach to delivery of a strategic site.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – all references would benefit from being identified on a policies map.</p> <p>Criterion 4 – the addition of ‘where possible’ might be a pragmatic addition. It prevents sustainable modes of transport being discouraged by a requirement for natural finishes but also identifies a preference and aspiration simultaneously.</p> <p>Criterion 5 – add the words “...and where appropriate enhanced”</p> <p>Criterion 6 – Limitations on sports pitches could have adverse impacts to the success of community facilities and schools into the future. In particular:</p> <p>ii. Artificial surfaces and fencing are terms which can apply to a very wide range of treatments, it is advised that further consideration be given to what this policy criteria is seeking to achieve.</p> <p>iii. It is advised that “Exceptional Design” should be defined, for example reference be made to policy AG1 where “exceptional quality” has been defined in the GANP.</p> <p>v. It is advised that the unacceptable nature of an impact should be defined rather than using the term “no” impact which could be of any scale or nature.</p> <p>Criterion 8 – policy needs to be reworded to reflect that it might not be appropriate for all trees to be retained, but instead should consider where possible retaining trees that can contribute to the overall setting of the development.</p>	<p>Policy AG3 amended</p> <p>Crit.1 - text amended to 'seek to contain impacts'</p> <p>Crit. 2 (Now 3) - maps available in cross-referenced policies</p> <p>4 - amended</p> <p>Crit. 6 - community feels very strongly about impact of floodlighting and policy has been clarified in which context floodlighting is not appropriate</p> <p>8 - text amended</p>	Partly
41	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG4	Change required	<p>Page 54, paragraph 5.24. It is advised that reference to only 'existing' buildings being the exception is not consistent with Policy GA1.</p>	Amended	Yes
42	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG4	Change required	<p>Pages 55-56. It is advised that the term “Country Park” has a special meaning as an area originally designated under the Countryside Act or as accredited by the local authority with the support of Natural England. Clarification may need to be provided if this term is used to this meaning and whether the Policy would support the accreditation criteria being met. Criteria 1-4 and 5-6 establish a series of arrangements that haven't as yet been defined or agreed. This policy should be revisited and perhaps only focus upon detailing Criteria 4 further in order to shape the development of the area rather than the ownership and funding arrangements. The Council welcome further discussion on this policy following the consultation period.</p>	Policy wording amended	Yes
43	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG5	Change required	<p>Page 59. It is advised that “Community Boundaries” should be defined in the GANP if these are intended as a designation as indicated in Figure 18 (although this figure is not referenced in the Policy) with proportionate evidence to support why these designations are appropriate. This policy in general would benefit from further explanation, clarity of language and more backing in the supporting text.</p> <p>Criterion 1 – iii Views should be defined on a policies map in order to provide clarity around the description in this policy.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – suggest the deletion of the word ‘firm’ as this could be misinterpreted, or consider further wording defining this terminology.</p>	Community boundaries are defined and considered appropriate. Text changes, Map provided.	Yes
44	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG6	Change required	<p>Page 64. Examples should be provided/cited in the supporting text to support the policies and support whether the characteristics in the supporting text are asserted to be common to all Hertfordshire villages or are a local example that may form a consideration.</p> <p>Criteria 1-4 – all criteria are indistinguishable from the one another. Consider combining these criteria to provide one criterion that provides clarity and succinctness for the decision-maker.</p> <p>Criterion 6 – This is set out in Policy GA1 and does not need to be repeated</p>	Policy wording amended to provide greater clarity. Appendix 4 states what local common features should be used as inspiration	Yes
45	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG7	Change required	<p>Page 66. Criterion 1 – An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is an evidence document prepared by the Council, an alternative term may wish to be considered to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – It is advised that requirements must be compliant with regulations, as such, reference should only be made to needs and not define existing and new.</p> <p>Criterion 3 - It is advised that consultation on infrastructure requirements is through planning applications where the public and stakeholders have opportunity to raise comments to the local planning authority. As worded this policy part 3 could provide a misleading public perception that this forms a separate process.</p>	Text amended	Yes

46	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG8	Change required	Page 67. This policy relates to the provision of infrastructure for existing communities through development at GA1. This policy is currently in conflict with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 122 (2) and needs to be revised. Which state that; A planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is— (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; (b) directly related to the development; and (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Stating a planning requirement for upgrades that do not relate to that development does not meet with CIL Reg 122. It is advised that the GANP should seek to encourage opportunities for improvements being considered when planning and undertaking infrastructure works.	Text amended	Yes
47	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	AG9	Change required	Policies in Neighbourhood Plan's should predominantly relate to land use and shaping development. It may be better to phrase this policy in the context of Policy GA1 and particularly part IV as well as the policy DES1 in the District Plan.	Text amended - Policy D1 now.	Yes
48	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Page 71. It may assist the reader to have locational information attached to the individual photographs.	Captions provided	Yes
49	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	LA1	Change required	Page 72. Criterion 1 – the requirements of village masterplans are set out in Policy DES1 of the District Plan. A policy within a Neighbourhood Plan forms part of the Development Plan and so should not limit itself to certain elements of the planning process. Delete “this will be required as part of the Village Master Plans”. The first part of the Criterion would benefit from some rewording as well, consider; “The design of each village should respond to the existing landscape character and topography, and seek to have a positive relationship with...” Criterion 3 – refers to the routes of pedestrian and cycle routes. This criterion is only loosely related to landscape and provides similar wording to that covered within a number of other policies throughout the document. Consider only one comprehensive reference to pedestrian and cycle routes in order to avoid repetition and variations that create confusion. Consider whether this criterion is better emphasised elsewhere. Criterion 4 – A masterplan is prepared in advance of development proposal as specified within Policy DES1 of the District Plan. The chronology of this criterion does not work, and again limits itself to only applying to one part of the planning process. Consider deleting the introductory text and instead using the sub-criteria as the main criterion. Sub-criteria iii refers to important views, have any important views been identified and justified within the neighbourhood plan. The effectiveness of this criterion depends upon the Plan's ability to demonstrate where and why important views exist. Otherwise, the policy should seek proposals to identify key views and demonstrate how they have sought where possible for these to be maintained. Criterion 6 – the first sentence of this criterion needs rewording to ensure its effectiveness as it is currently quite vague as to what it is trying to achieve. Secondly, limiting sports facilities to areas within village boundaries needs to be justified as there might be a reasonable case for sports facilities being located outside of those boundaries providing they are compliant with all other policies and can demonstrate that there is no harm. Further to this, village boundaries haven't been defined within the Neighbourhood Plan so the effectiveness of referring to them is questionable. Criterion 7 – this criterion needs to be reworded as it refers to the 'early planting of key landscape areas' which isn't feasible. The occupation of development based upon the maturity of trees is also not justifiable, but it is assumed this was not the intended requirement of the policy. Consider rewording for clarity. Criterion 8 – the perpetual provision of landscape management and maintenance should be aspirational and also needs to be clear about what landscaping and green spaces it refers to, presumably just those being brought forward by that particular development proposal.	Text amended. Policy LA1 more clearly worded to refer to Landscape within the New Villages	Yes
50	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	LA2	Change required	Page 73, section 5.69. It should be noted that maintenance of trees and hedgerows rests with the landowners. It should be noted that landscape proposals relating to the implementation of Policy GA1 will typically cover the extent of the application boundary only unless off-site enhancement has been required based upon a definitive need to mitigate against the impacts of the development.	Policy consolidated with Improving Existing Villages EX1. Amendmnets included.	Yes
51	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	LA2	Change required	Page 74. This policy is likely to lack effectiveness as it refers to landscape improvements within areas that will not form part of an application boundary. It is sensible to maintain part 2 of the policy (with some rewording) as it relates to the integration of new connections with existing.	Policy consolidated with Improving Existing Villages EX1. Amendmnets included.	Yes

52	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	BU1	Change required	<p>Page 76. Criterion 1 – Presumably the final objective of this criterion is that developments have a defined character and individuality etc. Why limit this to the Masterplan process alone. Suggest deleting reference to master plans and instead focus upon development proposals. The use of the term ‘etc.’ within policy is not encouraged – likewise ‘contemporary interpretation of traditional character’ is likely to be a highly ambiguous term and should be set out and described somewhere in order to ensure effective compliance with this policy.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – The term ‘genuinely affordable homes’ should be removed as this cannot be directly controlled through planning policy, affordable dwellings and market dwellings are accepted terms. Consider whether this policy goes any further than Policy HOU1 in the District Plan – if not, consider deleting.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – Sub-criteria I refers to no development exceeding 33 dwellings per hectare in density. This is too prescriptive and has not been justified within the document. The criteria is then in conflict with sub criteria ii which states that higher densities might be acceptable in certain cases. Consider deleting both criteria and instead having one which could read as follows; “Residential development should provide variation in scale and height to create distinctiveness. Densities should be used appropriately respecting the character and the overall location of the development as well as the other policies within this Plan.” Sub-criterion iii needs to be reworded to provide clarity about its intentions and the term ‘sensitive views’ needs to be defined.</p>	Text amended to provide greater clarity. Prescriptive criteria removed. The preparation of Masterplans is an important part of the process for delivering development in Gilston Area and should be referred to in the Plan.	Yes
53	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	BU2	Change required	<p>Page 78. Criterion 2 – in order to strengthen and provide clarity, the second part for the criterion could be reworded as follows; “to support the role of the village centre, the close location of nursery and primary schools to the centre should be considered”</p> <p>Criterion 4 – basing development heights upon the height of trees is both too vague and also too restrictive. Consider deleting the middle part of this criterion so that it reads; “The height of development will be required to respect village character. The location for taller buildings should be considered throughout the planning process”</p>	Agreed - Text amended	Yes
54	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	BU3	Change required	<p>Page 78, section 5.86. Define what market and affordable employment space is.</p>	Reference changed to range of employment	Yes
55	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	BU3	Change required	<p>Page 79. Criterion 1 – Policy GA1 states that employment areas should be located in visible and accessible locations not explicitly within the village centres. Consideration needs to be given to the event that a suitable location comes forward that isn’t within a village centres and this policy could prevent that coming forward.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – conflicts with Policy ED1 in the District Plan.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – requires greater definition in order to be effective.</p> <p>Criterion 4 – in order to deviate from the parking standards set by the District Council, justification and supporting evidence is required. Consideration might instead be given to what is sought to be achieved by this and how that might be articulated. Thought needs to be given to how this policy relates with, and adds further details to those policies set out in Chapter 15 of the East Herts District Plan.</p>	Agreed policy needs to be in compliance with policy GA1 and set out criteria for location of employment development both within and outside the centres	Yes
56	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	BU4	Change required	<p>Page 80. Criterion 2 – refers to ‘all streets’ and then names ‘connecting and main roads’. The policy needs to be clear to what it is referring to and should be one or the other. Presumably ‘road speeds’ is referring to the speed of cars on the highway, further detail is needed here to determine whether natural measures or engineered measures are required. If so, consideration needs to be given to whether lowering road speeds throughout a development is a priority on all roads.</p> <p>Criterion 4 – thought needs to be given to whether ‘minimal street lighting’ conflicts with the priority of assisting pedestrians and the legibility of development. Street lighting will be determined by the status of roads in any case, if the road is adopted then it will be subject to County Council standards.</p> <p>Criterion 5 – please define a countryside tree and hedgerow.</p>	Text amended. Policy more clearly focused on character than transport performance.	Yes

57	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	H1	Change required	<p>This policy relates to heritage assets but does not at any point define or identify heritage assets. For this policy to be effective it should identify exactly what it considers a heritage asset. Criterion 1 – consider using the word ‘should’ instead of ‘will’ in the second sentence to reflect that open space isn’t likely to be brought forward by the Neighbourhood Plan, it is also repeated in criterion 3 part ii so might not be necessary here..</p> <p>Criterion 2 – change ‘will be’ to ‘have been’. Consider deleting the last part; ‘so that their meaning will not be lost’, as ‘meaning’ is ambiguous.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – consider changing the intro from ‘will also be required’ to ‘should:’. Sub-criterion ii and iii are duplicates of Criterion 1 – consider deleting one or the other to prevent unnecessary repetition.</p> <p>Criterion 6 – should state that “Any overall masterplan should identify heritage assets and a clear approach for their protection and where possible, enhancement should be incorporated into the overall masterplan.”</p> <p>Criterion 7 – This criterion says that ‘management plans will be developed for...’. Are the Neighbourhood Plan group committing to produce management plans? If not it should be reworded to suggest that management plans could supplement heritage conservation and should be considered.</p>	Text amended. Definition of assets required as part of a comprehensive assessment as part of development	Yes
58	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	C1	Change required	<p>Page 85. This policy and its supporting text would benefit from greater clarity of what a community facility is. Currently the policy and its supporting text could wrongly be interpreted as referring to strategic infrastructure such as schools, highways or utilities which are subject to complex mechanisms of delivery. Please revisit this policy to provide further clarity. Criteria 2 & 3 – both criterion appear to cross reference infrastructure and community facilities. Whilst community facilities are an essential part of infrastructure provision clarity needs to be found to ensure that strategic infrastructure is not confused with these policies. E.g. cumulative needs and capacity relate more readily to strategic infrastructure provision not that of community facilities. Criterion 4 – reference to master plans should be deleted so that policy applies to all development proposals. It is unclear what this policy wants to achieve, if it is attempting to suggest that community facilities should be located where possible within walking and cycling distance it should clearly word this.</p>	Further clarity provided. Policy clearly focused on community facilities - these are indicated in the District Plan	Yes
59	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	C2	Change required	<p>Page 86. Criterion 1 - It is advised that the timing of creation of a community trust or similar is not defined in the District Development Plan, requiring this to be completed prior to commencement of any works, including works necessary to enhance that area would need to be demonstrated by the NP as not compromising the delivery of allocation Policy GA1 including both developed and open spaces.</p> <p>Criterion 2 – again, for clarity, unless the Parish Council is developing a governance strategy this policy should say ‘should’ instead of ‘will’.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – the transfer of land to community ownership should not be determined through planning policy in a neighbourhood plan. Instead this policy could state that the timely transfer of land into a community trust is encouraged to ensure consistency in GA1. Unsure what funding is being referred to in this criterion – please define.</p>	Agreed - policy wording amended but requires partnership working with full involvement of local community	Yes
60	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	TRA1	Change required	<p>Page 88. Criterion 1 - It is advised that the HGGT Transport Strategy is presently a draft guidance document that has not yet been consulted upon.</p> <p>Criterion 2 - (i) certain terms should be defined for example “innovative mobility” for clarity. This includes reference to ‘through traffic’ that needs to be explained as the Neighbourhood Plan Area contains existing roads including the A414 and links between local settlements.</p>	Text amended	Yes
61	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	TRA2	Change required	<p>Page 89. It is advised that walking and short cycling distances should be defined for clarity. Consideration should be given to whether this Policy is consistent in terms of the access for existing communities with other policies in the GANP that seek to restrict the location of uses and the location of walking and cycling routes and whether those policies should be revisited.</p>	Text amended	Yes
62	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	TRA3	Change required	<p>Page 91. It is advised that this policy is likely to need to be revisited and engagement with the highways authority is recommended including in relation to the NPPF test of ‘severe’. Criterion 4 is too restrictive and needs to be revisited, a zero tolerance of construction vehicles will impact on the strategic priorities within the District Plan and as is rightly mentioned in Criterion 5, will form part of a construction management plan.</p>	Text amended	Yes
63	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council	EX1	Change required	<p>Page 93. This policy needs to be revisited. The policies within the rest of the Plan should be aimed at reducing negative impacts upon the existing communities by identifying and detailing areas that are exceptional to the community. The use of a policy that requires any development to enhance existing settlements without any details is not justified and would impact upon the strategic objectives within the District Plan.</p>	Text amended	Yes

64	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Page 94. The 3 stages highlight additional requirements of the various planning stages but the requirements are not set out in the form of policies and so will not be treated as such. This section as a whole does not put forward any policies or set out how the NPG will use their Neighbourhood Plan to assist in the implementation or delivery of its objectives. Consider re-writing this section to focus less on the planning application process and instead on the delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan's objectives.	Policy on community engagement now included as Policy ID1	Yes
65	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Page 94. Paragraph 7.1 makes reference to 'Figure xx' presumably this is an unfinished reference and needs to be updated with a complementary Figure/diagram.	text amended	Yes
66	September - October 2019	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	East Herts District Council		Change required	Page 95. Please remove reference to East Herts Council from paragraph 7.4 as you cannot commit the LPA to monitoring a Neighbourhood Plan unless this has been established beforehand. The LPA will monitor certain aspects of Neighbourhood Plan's progress across the District but this is dictated by the Council itself and various regulations, not by the Neighbourhood Plan group. In summary, this section needs to reflect how the NPG will monitor its own Neighbourhood Plan.	Collaboration with EHDC essential in monitoring plan and progress of the strategic development, which is clearly beyond the remit of the NPG - further discussion required. Text revised	Yes
100		Policy note	Statutory consultee	Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust			Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust have provided biodiversity policy guidance to inform the Neighbourhood Plan.	Welcomed. Part of evidence base.	Yes
101	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England		Support	We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, which we consider to be comprehensively produced and clearly laid out. For general advice, we would refer you to our detailed guidance on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into your neighbourhood plan, which can be found here: < https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/ >.	Noted	N/a
102	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England	AG2	Change required	We welcome the designation of various areas as Local Green Space, as part of Policy AG2, in particular areas of landscape that comprise the setting of the two scheduled monuments (Local Green Space H). We consider that the protection of the setting of these monuments could be strengthened if the Local Green Space allocation were extended, within the remit of paragraph 100 of the NPPF, to include a slightly greater area of land to the south of the scheduled monuments.	Extent of Local Green Space H reviewed: the southern boundary is linked to change in topography (bottom of the valley) and the extent of the designated Wildlife Site. No change was justifiable.	No
103	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England	AG6	Support	Policy AG6 and LA1-LA2. We welcome Policy AG6 as a clear attempt at securing the development of new places that maintain and are representative of the local distinctiveness of this part of Hertfordshire. We consider that this policy is underpinned and augmented by the provisions of Policies LA1-LA2.	Noted	N/a
104	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England	H1	Support	We are particularly pleased to note the inclusion Policy H1, with special reference to the need to respect, preserve and enhance historic boundaries where possible, and the need to minimise or avoid the negative effects of light pollution on Gilston Park and Hunsdon House.	Noted	N/a
105	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England		General	For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate the Historic Environment Record at Hertfordshire County Council.	Noted	N/a
106	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Historic England		General	To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.	Noted	N/a
107	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	National Grid		General	National Grid provided information and guidance about the assets they own within the Neighbourhood Plan Area.	Noted	N/a
108		Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency		General	We recommend the NP considers and draws upon key evidence base documents such as: - Harlow-Gilston Garden Town Water Cycle Study Update (2018) and Garden Town Water Cycle Study Addendum (2018) – see www.harlow.gov.uk/evidence - East Hertfordshire Level 1 and Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2016) and Addendum (2017) – see www.eastherts.gov.uk/planning-building/east-herts-district-plan/evidence-base - River Stort Catchment Management Plan – see www.riverleacatchment.org.uk/index.php/river-stort-home	Text amended. Evidence added	Yes
109		Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency		Change required	Vision (page 35) Despite the reference to a cohesive and enhanced rural landscape and community ownership and management of these areas, we thought there could be more in the vision about improving habitats and biodiversity, the natural environment and resilience to climate change.	Text amended and stronger references added.	Yes
110		Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency		Change required	Objectives (page 39/40) We support and can see positive elements within objectives 9, 10 and 13. In particular we support objective 10 where it states the creation of buffer zones to minimise the impacts on areas of ecological importance and that new habitats will be created to improve biodiversity. This could contribute to restoring the health of the local rivers and their associated habitats but we would have liked to have seen more specific references to the water environment throughout the objectives.	Support noted and policy amended to make reference to water resources and flood risk	Yes

111	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG1	Change required	There are many positive elements to this policy. For example, we support protecting areas of ecological, wildlife and landscape value and creating a network of natural open spaces. We agree that the necessary physical infrastructure should be in place at each stage of the development to ensure the needs of existing and future residents are met without pressure on the existing services. However we recommend the policy brings in other sustainability factors relating to the conservation of water resources and protecting existing and future communities from the impacts of flood risk and climate change.	Support noted and policy amended to make reference to water resources and flood risk	Yes
112	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG1	Change required	We would encourage the NP group to explore with East Herts, Affinity Water and the developer how further water efficiency measures could be captured as part of the development. Policy WAT4 'Efficient Use of Water Resources' in the District Plan promotes water saving measures, recycling of grey water and requires 110 litres per head per day as a standard for residential development (as per Requirement G2 in Part G of the Building Regulations 2010). The NP could build on this by requiring that new non-residential buildings are required to achieve the same or a BREEAM 'excellent' rating for water efficiency. In addition, the practicalities of retrofitting of existing buildings (which are often the least efficient) where opportunities arise through refurbishments and changes of use could be explored. Water efficiency retrofitting is a theme that could be explored as part of Policy EX1 'Improving existing settlements' or Policy AG8 'Infrastructure parity for existing settlements.'	Policies BU2 and EX1 amended to include reference to water efficiency in new development and refurbishment	Yes
113	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG1	General	The majority of the Gilston area is located in Flood Zone 1 (land with a low probability of flooding from rivers) with the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the Stort Valley touching Flood Zone 2 and 3 (land with a medium and high probability of flooding from rivers). There may be useful recommendations within the SFRA which tie in with theme of sustainability.	Supporting text amended	Yes
114	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG1	Change required	Hertfordshire County Council is the Lead Local Flood Authority. They will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from surface water flood risk (including groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. The SFRA, Surface Water Management Plan or any guidance produced by the LLFA will contain useful recommendations and actions about how areas at risk of surface water flooding can be managed. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance. We recommend policy AG1 requires an assessment of climate change when assessing flood risk to inform the design and layout of new developments within the Gilston Area.	AG1 amended to include reference to water efficiency and climate change. Policy AG3 and supporting text amended	Yes
115	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	In the rationale and justification for this policy, the rural landscape, wildlife areas, veteran trees, woodland, hedgerows and ditches were all described. We didn't get a sense of how the rivers themselves play an important part of the green infrastructure network in either the rationale text or the policy itself. We think this should be amended so that the river environment is either incorporated within this policy, or consideration given to the creation of a separate policy.	Text amended to refer to water courses	Yes
116	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	To provide context, the Gilston area lies within the River Stort catchment, which is one of the tributaries of the River Lea. The Stort Catchment Partnership (details available on their website here) are a group of people and organisations who are working to improve the River Stort and Stort Navigation. The partnership was formed in 2012 and is hosted by Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust. There is also a River Stort Catchment Management Plan available on the website which sets out the objectives and main projects to improve these watercourses and associated habitats. We recommend you make contact with this group to gain some local knowledge of the river conditions and aspirations to improve, and whether the NP could help deliver any of the projects.	Text amended. NPG in contact with Stort River Partnership.	Yes
117	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	We support 1v of the policy which requires the establishment of new habitats to support net gain in biodiversity. We understand it is chiefly the landscape masterplan that will incorporate the main green infrastructure elements and therefore it is this that the policy aims to influence. However, the individual village masterplans will incorporate some elements of green infrastructure, for example, the 20 metre watercourse buffer zones where they exist outside of the overall landscape masterplan. Could the policy ensure it is providing direction to both the landscape and village masterplans? Could it also encapsulate the 20 metres buffer zone (on either side of the river) standard for rivers which is already been referenced in the recent planning application? Although the policy stipulates 'adequate separation distances and buffer zones according to or exceeding best practice' we recommend there is reference to what this standard should be as a minimum.	Text amended in Policies AG1 / AG2 / AG3 (structural landscape) and LA1 (landscape within villages). No other quantitative guidance is included directly in the policy text. For consistency 20m buffers have not been specified.	Partly

118	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	Buffer zones (or river corridors) perform a vital role in preserving and enhancing the health of rivers both in terms of water quality, floodplain storage and habitats. In particular, river corridors are used by migrating and foraging protected species such as bats and thus allow the movement of species between areas. Water voles depend on these riverine habitats as well as a range of aquatic species. The Stort Catchment Plan indicates that otters are current absent from the Stort partly due to a lack of habitat for them and a project had been identified to encourage them back to the area. Networks of these buffer zones will help wildlife adapt to climate change and they provide the opportunity to gain access to restore or repair sections of watercourse. These buffer zones also minimise artificial light spill onto the river and its corridor which are particularly inhibitive to bats and disrupt the natural diurnal rhythms of a range of wildlife. The current rural landscape and the sensitivity of the watercourses support a standard of buffer zone greater than that required in policy WAT3 of the District Plan.	Various policies amended to refer to this issue.	Yes
119	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	We recommend 'net gain' is explained further in the explanatory text e.g. what percentage net gain should be achievable, 10% as a minimum or can the development go further? We would like to see the restoration and enhancement of rivers and their corridors (e.g. Fiddler's Brook and projects within the Stort Valley) expected as a contribution to the overall achievement of biodiversity net gain.	Text amended in Policies AG1 / AG2 / AG3 (structural landscape) and LA1 (landscape within villages). No other quantitative target is included directly in the policy text. We have no evidence to suggest a specific % in the policy but included 10% minimum requirement in supporting text.	Yes
120	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG2	Change required	We support 1.vi of the policy for the creation of effective sustainable drainage systems. Although this does have some narrative on why and how this is expected, e.g. protect Stort Water systems, we thought there could be more explanation or context within the rationale and justification section. Firstly the term "Stort water systems" probably needs to be explained, and secondly the evidence above highlights the problems that are being caused by urban run-off and rural land management (pollutants, sediments entering the rivers). There is a strong policy in the District Plan (WAT5 Sustainable Drainage) which requires the most sustainable measures are selected from the SuDS hierarchy that deliver benefits for biodiversity and water quality and also that they are resilient to adverse weather conditions (e.g. climate change) and are maintained for the long-term. Could WAT5 be referenced in the rationale and justification section?	Text amended. Cross reference added.	Yes
121	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG4	Change required	Part 4.ix of the policy states "flood water retention, especially to remedy current flooding patterns within Hunsdon Village should be carefully integrated within the landscape." Having checked our flood map there's no fluvial flood zones so this may relate to surface water flood risk. It might be worth explaining this more within the supportive text and liaising with the relevant lead local flood authority on what measures could help alleviate the flood risk in Hunsdon Village.	Text amended	Yes
122	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG4	Change required	The airfield could contain potential land contamination from its previous activities. We support the policy proposals for a new country park. We recommend the area is investigated for the potential for land contamination, remediated as appropriate and any future works or drainage proposals that may disturb the ground do not risk contamination of groundwater.	Text amended	Yes
123	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	TRA3	Change required	We note part 2 requires measures to be taken to ensure that adverse impacts from traffic and road infrastructure on the existing communities will be negligible in terms of safety, speed, pollution and local character. We recommend the scope of this policy is widened to take into account the potential impact of polluted runoff entering rivers. There is already evidence to suggest that the River Stort is not achieving good partly due to diffuse urban runoff which can also come from roads (e.g. oils, grits, leaked fuel, etc). The Harlow-Gilston Garden Town Water Cycle Study also identifies there is limited capacity available within the surface water sewer systems, highlighting the need to use sustainable drainage measures to manage surface water. The introduction of new road infrastructure, its usage, potential growth in usage and the impact of intense heavy rainfall is likely to increase pressure on receiving watercourses. There should be no risk of deterioration to the water quality of the River Stort or any of the other watercourses (main river or ordinary) as a result of surface water run-off from new transport infrastructure. We would want to see appropriate measures in place to significantly reduce the risk of potential pollutants from the road runoff entering watercourses, the measures being resilient for the lifetime of the infrastructure and climate change.	Text amended	Yes

124	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency	AG7	Support	Paragraph 5.47 identifies that water and sewerage under the heading of utilities is part of the definition of infrastructure for the purposes of this policy. We support this and would refer the NP group to the evidence within the Harlow-Gilston Garden Town Water Cycle Study Update (2018) to supplement this. As stated above phosphate loading due to permitted discharges from sewage treatment works and intermittent discharges from combined sewage overflows is having an impact on the River Stort. The Fiddlers Brook is also being impacted by leaking utility sewers. Therefore it is important there is sufficient capacity in the foul water network to accommodate both the existing and future needs of the communities within the Gilston Area without further deterioration of water quality. We also work with the Water Companies to raise awareness and identify solutions and there is also the opportunity to explore how the new development could improve water quality. The updated Water Cycle Study found that there are some restrictions in capacity in the surface water and waste water sewerage infrastructure and upgrades to the foul sewer infrastructure may be need to support the expected growth. There is more detailed information within the study for individual sites. Sufficient capacity is available within the Rye Meads Wastewater Treatment Works. This study had informed the District Plan policies (e.g. WAT6 Waste Water Infrastructure) and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, however it would be helpful to capture any specific recommendations for the Garden Town within the supporting text of the NP.	Text amended - Evidence added.	Yes	
125	Letter	Statutory consultee	Environment Agency		General	Page 5 of the Environment Agencies letter provides general advice on neighbourhood planning opportunities and provides references to guidance material on neighbourhood planning.	Noted	N/a	
126	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Support	The aspirations set out at Paragraph 1.25 are noted. These dovetail to a significant degree with the expectations for the realisation of Policy GA1 as expressed in the Garden Town Vision and Garden Town Design documents. The delivery of distinct villages through a Masterplanning exercise is a key requirement of Policy GA1, and one which HCC is committed to supporting.	Noted	N/a	
127	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Support	The objective in the NP of seeking better connectivity for the whole area is consistent with the support enshrined in LTP4 to achieve better connectivity and improvements to existing, and provision of new footpaths and cycleways. The importance attached to these elements, and the opportunities to provide permeability between and through the villages comprising the development to the existing settlements and transport nodes beyond, needs to be achieved in pursuit of achieving the ambitious modal share targets of the Garden Town.	Noted- text amplified to reflect this	Yes	
128	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Support	The NP attaches importance to stewardship seeking an appropriate model of stewardship. This needs to be delivered to enable the community to manage and maintain open space and other facilities in Gilston.	Noted	N/a	
129	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	This section largely repeats the content of the adopted Plan and the supporting documents which have been produced by HGGT including the Vision and Design Guide. It acknowledges the Transport Strategy and its target of 60% modal share by sustainable means within the Garden Town. Again, HCC would reiterate that this movement strategy is consistent with LTP 4 and the importance attached to achieving sustainable development which is identified as the fundamental purpose of the planning system in the NPPF.	Noted	N/a	
130	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	There is again alignment between these aspirations, the expectations in policy in the adopted plan and in the ongoing work of the Sustainable Transport workstream at the Garden Town.	Noted		
131	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Change required	It is also worth noting that in terms of infrastructure required associated with the development of the Garden Town, the HGGT IDP, or that part of it relating to the Gilston Area, is the evidenced list of infrastructure requirements for Gilston. The IDP cross references to the infrastructure requirements of the policies mentioned at 1.10 and the planning obligations/infrastructure requirements of the Local Plan which pass the three tests for obligations set out at 1.7 of the letter.	Reference to IDP included	Yes	
132	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	The content of the NP at section 3.19 to 3.22, in relation to safe crossing of the A414 by those on foot and cycling, and to the need for enhanced cycle facilities at Harlow North Station is noted.	Noted	N/a	
133	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	General	There is close similarity between these aspirations and the LTP 4 hierarchy, which should influence the preparation of village masterplans pursuant to the delivery of Policy GA1. The contribution which can be made by enhancement to the Rights of Way network via improved and new footpath and cycle connections and the importance placed on that by the existing community (and in due course by the new community) is understood. Village Masterplanning will need to deliver on these expectations. The interrelationship with the A414 and any subsequent A414 East West strategy will also need to be carefully considered.	Noted- text amplified to reflect this	Yes
134	01/10//2019	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	Change required	The objectives from the Vision document are repeated in the NP, therefore they are not at issue. In respect to Objective 1 – Creating Distinctive and Balanced Communities - it is worth noting that while placing education facilities in village centres makes sense in terms of primary education, care will need to be taken in terms of locating secondary schools and their playing fields. (The latter of which could play a role in the wider green space/open space separation between villages).	Noted- reference to secondary schools included	Yes

135	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	Change required	Amongst the goals in objective 2 – that green corridors will provide walking and cycling routes, the fundamental interrelationship with LTP 4 has been noted several times previously. The same objective requires timely provision of infrastructure which will rely upon appropriate provision, heads of terms, triggers and monitoring within legal agreements associated with planning permissions for the development of the site.	Noted- text amplified to reflect this	Yes
136	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	Change required	The objective of creating Healthy Communities (objective 5) dovetails with the work of the Garden Town Health Workstream, which is producing a Healthy Town framework. The Public Health team at HCC has contributed to the production of that document which seeks to meet one of the key objectives of the NPPF which is to deliver strong, vibrant and healthy communities and to support communities' health and social wellbeing. The way in which these matters have been assessed will need to be demonstrated as part of the Masterplanning of the villages.	Noted- text amplified to reflect this	Yes
137	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	General	Objective 10 identifies a need for protected and enhanced landscapes and a network of green spaces to be delivered through the policy allocation. This is consistent with LTP 4 aspirations of permeability. The need is also recognised for integration of footpaths and cycleways with Green space and landscape corridors between villages as well as within villages themselves and for those spaces to also provide for Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and appropriate models of stewardship.	Noted	N/a
138	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Vision and Objectives	Change required	Objective 14 relates to phased delivery of infrastructure to meet needs arising from the development. Infrastructure requirements need to be considered in the light of the HGGT IDP (April 2019) and trigger points and phasing will need to be delivered through appropriate clauses within the legal agreements associated with planning permissions. There will also be a need for monitoring.	Noted- text amplified to reflect this	Yes
139	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council		General	This section provides comments in relation to the policies contained in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is important that the comments we make are considered in the context of the comments set out in 1.4 to 1.10 of this response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in relation to adopted policy, • the HGGT IDP, • emerging work from HGGT, • and with regard to the three tests of planning obligations 	Noted	
140	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG2	Change required	The policy seeks to ensure that the landscape masterplan will identify existing parks and open spaces, and identify the new green corridors between the villages and neighbouring settlements. It seeks to ensure protection of habitats/habitat enhancement promote walking and cycling. It also notes the importance of appropriate sustainable urban drainage systems. These are all elements to which HCC attaches importance. Connectivity from an LTP4 perspective, new footpath connections and cycleways across the green corridors between villages and onwards to existing communities are important components of supporting the modal share aspirations of the allocation. HCC is aware of the potential opportunity for betterment from a drainage perspective to be achieved through an appropriately designed SuDS system which can assist in addressing historic flood problems. It is also essential to ensure that appropriate stewardship arrangements are in place to ensure that any blue/green infrastructure is appropriately managed and maintained in the future.	Text amended with clearer reference to SuDS in Ag2. D2 addresses stewardship comment.	Yes
141	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG3	Change required	The protection of the visual amenity and character of the countryside setting is a laudable objective. There are three specific areas of the policy which we believe needs to be tempered: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In order to support and encourage walking and cycling, materials for paths and cycleways/bridleways should be durable and gates and barriers minimised so as to not undermine sustainable modes of travel. 2) The limitation on sports pitches being naturally surfaced could unduly restrict the ability of schools to obtain revenue from community use agreements with sports clubs etc, and the usability of sports pitches at secondary schools during the autumn and winter months. 3) If it is to be used for dual community use purposes, then floodlighting might be required at secondary school pitches, and therefore care should be taken in the Masterplanning of those locations from the outset. 	Noted and changes made to polices to reflect comments. Floodlighting of pitches tempered, still with aspiration to reduce impact on countryside and wildlife by locating them appropriately	Partly

142	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG4	Change required	The creation of the Country Park is supported by HCC. There is an opportunity to consider wider betterment in relation to drainage and water management for Hunsdon within the proposed Country Park. They mainly relate to legacy drainage issues associated with the old airfield area to the north of the site. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is of the view that this should be sought as it could represent the only opportunity to achieve this betterment in a planned and managed way. The broad areas which it would be worth giving particular attention to in terms of any betterment are shown in the plan attached to this response as Appendix A. As suggested by the policy, it is considered that it is important to form a common understanding of the recreational and ecological function which the park will fulfil as part of the wider Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. The need for management and long term maintenance arrangements chimes with the stewardship observations made above at 3.3. HCC believe that the sixth criteria of the policy would be improved if it was amended to include the text in bold below: vi. Establishment of appropriate footpath, cycleway and bridleway connections to existing and new villages, onwards to the Stort Valley to Harlow North Station and Harlow , and the wider countryside.	Agreed - text changed in renumbered Policy AG7	Yes
143	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG5	Change required	While the general thrust of the policy is understood, it is not considered that the Green Corridors should become barriers to pedestrian and cycle movement. Criteria iv of the policy states that "paths and cycle connections"should only be provided...." if incidental, without reducing the depth of vegetation and physical separation between villages". HGGT and HCC/ECC attach significant emphasis to achieving the modal share aspirations reflected in the Garden Town Vision. Facilitating the behavioural change to achieve the 60% share by sustainable modes, means that opportunities for walking and cycling connectivity must be embraced in the planning of the villages, the landscape and the green corridors. It is therefore considered to be critical that these matters are considered as an integral part of the Masterplanning process in relation to both landscape and village Masterplanning. Path and cycleway connections cannot be purely incidental.	Text amended- not intended to be barriers to movement but need to be sensitively designed and integrated in landscape. Clarification provided	Yes
144	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG7	General	The wording of the Infrastructure Delivery policy is noted – and the need for the policy to reflect the tests in NPPF policy and practice guidance, (1.7 above), reiterated. The HGGT IDP, which lists prescribed infrastructure requirements associated with Gilston along with the rest of the Garden Town, was published and jointly endorsed by the Garden Town authorities in April 2019.	Noted - IDP referenced	Yes
145	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG7	Change required	The third criteria of the policy should be amended to reflect the fact that infrastructure should be provided and delivered in accordance with Policy GA1, DES 1, TRA 1, and DEL1 of the adopted East Herts Local Plan 2018, and as set out in the HGGT IDP April 2019.	Policy refocused to be more specifically addressing comprehensive infrastructure needs.	Partly
146	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG7	Change required	The identification of Heads of Terms and triggers associated with the delivery of infrastructure all need to be carefully considered as part of engagement with all infrastructure providers on individual planning applications.	Text amended to remove triggers	Yes
147	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG8	Change required	The aspirations within the policy that existing settlements benefit from enhanced access from a pedestrian and movement perspective are consistent with LTP4, and the potential for new Suds networks at Gilston to offer benefits by addressing historic problems with surface water runoff have been noted. It is worth caveating that any other infrastructure requirements would need to pass the tests set out in NPPF policy and practice guidance and referred to at 1.7 above.	Test amended	Yes
148	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	AG9	Change required	Policy GA1 requires a masterplanned approach to the delivery of the Gilston Area, and the way this occurs needs to be flexible to accommodate the variety of ways the applicants might seek to bring the site forwards. Policy GA1 also specifies that engagement with local and emerging communities in the planning process should be set out in a Community Strategy for Gilston. It is understood that initial engagement on the production of a Community strategy (including with representatives of the NP group) has already commenced with a view to completing the strategy for publication next June. It is recommended that Policy AG9 should reflect the requirements set out in the strategy to ensure a consistent approach to engagement in the planning process is undertaken.	Noted- text amended to ensure a consistent approach is adopted. Gilston Area Charter also strengthens this point. Community Engagement Strategy not ready.	Yes
149	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	LA1	Change required	The sixth criteria of the policy identifies that sports pitches will be supported in appropriate locations where they are set within an overall structure of enhanced landscape, visual amenity and ease of access. It continues that ; <i>Sports facilities including artificial surfaces and floodlighting will be acceptable within village boundaries provided there is no adverse environmental impacts on the landscape setting, biodiversity or residential amenity.</i> We have commented at 3.4 above, that secondary school sports pitches may need to be artificial in order to maximise their availability to support both education use and for dual community use. This amplifies the need for consideration to be given to the location of secondary schools and their playing fields as part of both the village and landscape Masterplanning process. (It is worth considering the potential role which secondary school playing fields can play in contributing to green corridors and wider landscape Masterplanning since school playing fields are likely to preserve the openness of land in perpetuity).	Noted. Location of secondary school(s) is critical, especially if sports pitches are to be sensitively located. Text amended	N/a

150	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	BU1	Change required	The National Planning Policy Framework para 137, identities that there should be a significant uplift in density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport. (HCC emboldening for emphasis). The Gilston Area Considerations section of the Garden Town Vision document (page 17) notes local density ranges from 20 dph in Hunsdon to 80dph in Sawbridgeworth. We wonder whether the densities prescribed in the policy are too prescriptive, and definitely do not seem to reflect the opportunity to achieve higher densities in locations well related to Harlow Station, or the Transport Hubs which are intended to form part of Gilston. (Admittedly, those hubs will not be to the same hierarchy – and the position in the hierarchy of the hub should influence the appropriate density of development).	Noted- reference to density cap in Policy replaced with criteria. Reference to guidance in Concept Framework included in supporting text	Yes
151	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	BU1	Support	The fifth criteria of the policy relates to car parking standards. It indicates that car parking provision should be lower than current standards and progressively reduced to reflect advances in the provision of sustainable transport. The aspiration is one which HCC and the GT support. Understanding how flexible parking, using allocated and unallocated parking provision, (including off site), is capable of being achieved and repurposed for other uses in the future requires careful thought. Consideration also need to be given to the mechanisms which might monitor and trigger that flexible use. One idea might be that there could be a Transport Review Group annually monitoring performance against modal share for Gilston (and/ or the wider Garden Town) – and that annual review could also consider elements of parking strategy.	Noted. Many points of details suggested to be considered at village masterplanning stage	No
152	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	BU2	Change required	In terms of delivery of education, HCC believe placing the primary schools within the heart of the villages maximises their accessibility on foot and by other sustainable means and acknowledging their role as a community meeting place is supported and endorsed. The potential for use of the sites when not required for education purposes, for example by community use agreements, could also be acknowledged. HCC has already identified that it will be important for any potential school operator to be made aware of these potential requirements.	Agreed. Text amended. Details to be part of legal agreements: too much detail for NP	Partly
153	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	BU2	Change required	For the same reason, the aspiration around location of schools is consistent with the objectives of the Garden Town Sustainable Transport, and Healthy Towns work. It is likely that each village will need to provide a transport hub of varying scales, (potentially keeping cars away from the village centre) and these might further consolidate the community meeting place role of the primary schools.	Agreed. Details to be part of illage masterplans: too much detail for NP	No
154	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	C1	Change required	Text at 5.95 of the NP suggests that there should be a balanced mix of land uses relative to the scale, size and role of the village. One of the challenges of the GA1 Gilston allocation will be appropriately locating the two secondary schools. Fundamentally, those schools will need to meet the site specification requirements of HCC, but the potential role of the schools playing fields to the wider community and in relation to their potential contribution to the landscape Masterplanning and green/open space and suds strategy is also a very important consideration.	Reference included in plan. Details to be part of illage masterplans: too much detail for NP	Partly
155	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	C1	Change required	Any infrastructure required should meet the three tests at 1.7 (of this consultation response report), and criteria 2 of the policy is superfluous as there is an IDP for the Gilston Area which forms part of the wider HGGT IDP.	Text recognises IDP, which is still in draft form.	Partly
156	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	TRA1	Support	From an HCC perspective, there is total alignment between the aspirations of policy TRA 1 in relation to the promotion of an LTP4 compliant hierarchy of movement.	Welcomed	N/a
157	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	TRA1	Change required	The whole thrust of Policy TRA1 is to support sustainable transport choices, including integration with sustainable transport initiatives in the wider Harlow area, including to make provision for frequent and extended public transport services, supporting changes in transport technology and support smart mobility services. The whole thrust of the policy is consistent with LTP 4 and supported by HCC on that basis.	Supporting text amplified in renumbered policy AG8	Yes
158	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	TRA General	Support	The County Council considers that the policy could be improved if the potential contribution the land falling within the NP area could make to the A414 east - west corridor is embraced in the policy. Harlow and Gilston Garden Town lie at the east end of the A414, and the NP area potentially offers an opportunity to anchor facilities, whatever they may end up being, at the east end of the Corridor. (See HCC Growth and Infrastructure Planning and the Economy Cabinet Panel Paper – Adoption of the A414 Corridor Strategy, 22nd October 2019 for further details of what this has to say about the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town area.	Proposals for A414 have not been finalised and are locally widely contested. It would be premature to include in NP	No
159	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	TRA3	Change required	The second criteria of the policy is not required. As the statutory Highway consultee, HCC would not accept a proposal which had an unsafe highways impact. The approach of HCC and ECC would be to encourage and promote the transport hierarchy enshrined in LTP4 and support delivery of as many sustainable trips as possible for both existing and new communities. The policy also needs to reflect the fact that the NPPF only supports a highways reason for refusal where what is known as the residual cumulative impact is considered to be severe.	Text amended	Yes
160	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	EX1	Change required	The desire to achieve improvements to existing settlements through policy EX1 is noted. HCC notes that the reference to making section 106 funding available to improve and mitigate impacts in the existing villages in accordance with a list of priority projects to be identified by the local community, would require any such improvements to meet the tests set out at paragraph 1.7 (of this consultation response report).	Text amended	Yes

161	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	Change required	Herts Fire & Rescue Service does not have any specific comments relating to the policies and content of the neighbourhood plan. The requirements of the Service are articulated in detail in the consultation response relating to the Gilston planning application and within the HGGT IDP.	Noted	n/a
162	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	Historic Environment The views of the Historic Environment Team are set out in full in the consultation response which has been provided in relation to the Gilston Outline Residential planning application. Clearly Historic England has a statutory role in relation to Gilston Park Estate and house. It has been suggested that a combination of conditions can successfully protect Heritage Asset interests – which will need to be factored into the formulation of Village Masterplans and subsequent Reserved Matters planning applications (or to cater for any subsequent full planning application in the event one is submitted).	Noted	N/a
163	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	Sections 5.2-5.9 of Hertfordshire County Council's consultation response report provides guidance advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority on flood risk and drainage.	Noted	N/a
164	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	Section 6 of Hertfordshire County Council's consultation response report provides advice on waste and minerals planning. Preferred Area 1 – The Briggens Estate (Olives Farm) as identified within the Proposed Submission Minerals Local Plan and shown on the map at Appendix B, is in close proximity to the Plan Area. This site, should it come forward, is set to provide over ten million tonnes of sand and gravel over an expected twenty-two years. The county council, as Minerals Planning Authority, urges the Parish Councils to give consideration for the potential of this site to come forward. The proximity of the village developments to the preferred area should be taken into account for a number of reasons; the potential for cumulative effects, the potential to use locally sourced materials in the development and the potential provision of green/open space as a result of restoration.	Minerals Local Plan is in draft form and site is outside NP boundary. It is not considered appropriate for reference to be included in the NP	No
165	01/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Hertfordshire County Council	General	HCC welcome the opportunity of commenting on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Delivery of the GA1 Gilston Area allocation is clearly significant to both the existing communities and the new communities which will form. HCC look forward to the opportunity to comment on subsequent versions of the plan in due course and contributing to the other emerging policy and guidance being produced by the Garden Town and EHDC which will underpin the translation of the policy allocation through implementation to delivery.	Noted	N/a
166		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 1.25, point 1. This paragraph states that the expansion of Harlow and its “very different development model” would be inappropriate. However, as Harlow was planned from the outset as a New Town, it shares many of the aims of the new Garden Communities, including preserving the landscape when developing (a landscape-led approach), the creation and preservation of Green Infrastructure and ensuring that residents have easy access to community facilities, employment sources, shops and other services. Such facilities will be of benefit to the new future residents of the Gilston area, as alluded to later in the Neighbourhood Plan. HDC would like this paragraph to be reworded to recognise these points.	Text amended	Yes
167		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 1.25, point 2. Presumably “suburban districts separated by green fingers” is a reference to Harlow. If so, the text needs to be amended to replace “districts” with “neighbourhoods”. Paragraph 4.3 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that “a landscape led approach will be adopted with much of the existing landscape being used to create an attractive place and setting for people to enjoy”. This was one of Frederick Gibberd’s aims when he planned Harlow. HDC would like this sentence (and other similar sentences in the Neighbourhood Plan) to be reworded to recognise these points.	Text amended	Yes
168		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 2.31. This states that the Vision was formally adopted by Essex and Herts County Councils as well as the three District Councils. However, the Vision was endorsed (not adopted) by the District Councils and was not directly endorsed/adopted by the County Councils. This sentence needs to be reworded accordingly.	Text amended	Yes
169		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 2.37. This point should be corrected to read “50% in existing areas of Harlow”.	Text amended	Yes
170		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 3.20. This should be corrected to read “Harlow Mill” (also check elsewhere in the Neighbourhood Plan).	Amended	Yes
171		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 3.22. Reference to the Sustainable Transport Corridor is needed here.	Text amended	Yes
172		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 4.4, Point VII. Reference to the Sustainable Transport Corridor is needed here.	Text reflects the content of the Concept Framework	No
173		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Para 4.4, Point XII. Do the initiatives to further develop and regenerate Harlow refer to the Town Centre Area Action Plan? If so, explicit reference here would be appropriate.	Reference included in NP	Yes
174		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Obj. 2, Point 2. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise that the corridors will also connect to wider places, including Harlow.	Text amended	Yes
175		Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	Change required	Obj. 2, Point 2. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise that much of the area in Harlow immediately to the south of the Stort is Green Wedge, Green Finger or Green Belt.	Outside the NP boundary	No

176	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council		General	It is worth noting that inspiration can still be drawn from urban places, particularly parts of Harlow and existing Garden Cities.	Noted. The Gilston community recognises the values of urban spaces, but aims, through the NP, the adoption of village character in accordance with Policy GA1 and the Concept Framework and HGGT Vision.	No
177	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG2	Change required	1. ii, Point 1. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to include reference to the Green Belt/Wedges/Fingers in Harlow which about the River Stort. Such connectivity into Harlow is mentioned later on in the Neighbourhood Plan but needs referencing here.	Text amended	Yes
178	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG3	Change required	Para 5.20. Given that Harlow New Town was primarily designed to be built into the landscape, "urban parkland" is not the most appropriate term to describe Harlow's open spaces in general. The Green Wedges, for example, the size and shape of which are unique to a town of Harlow's size, were designed to bring a sense of countryside into the town and they still successfully do this. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise this.	Text amended	Yes
179	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG5	Change required	This should be corrected to read "neighbourhoods" and not "districts". HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise how Harlow's original design was landscape-led.	Text amended	Yes
180	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG5	Change required	Para 5.37. While Harlow cannot be said to be formed of individual villages, there are many different designs present in the neighbourhoods, which were planned at different times and built with differing materials. Examples include the contrast between Old Harlow, Bishopsfield, Church Langley, Newhall and Mark Hall North. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise this.	Noted. The Gilston community recognises the values of urban spaces, but aims, through the NP, the adoption of village character in accordance with Policy GA1 and the Concept Framework and HGGT Vision.	No
181	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG5	Change required	Para 5.39. It is worth noting that Harlow is already separated due to the River Stort and Green Belt, as alluded to earlier in the Neighbourhood Plan.	Agreed	Yes
182	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG5	Change required	Para 5.40. Merging with Harlow would not be possible due to the physical constraints of the River Stort and its floodplain, and the spatial planning tool of the retained Green Belt. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to recognise this point.	It is a concern of local community and relevant to include in NP with caveat	Yes
183	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG5	Change required	Point 4. Have studies been undertaken to ascertain the levels of light/noise pollution in the area as a result of there proximity to Harlow? If so, they - and their findings - should be referenced here.	Text clarified	Yes
184	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	AG8	Change required	Point 3. It is worth noting that this would benefit from less physical separation between Harlow and Gilston area.	Physical separation between Harlow and new villages in Gilston Area is a key objective but linkages will be footpath, cycleway and public transport linkages encouraged	No
185	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	LA1	Change required	5.68. See previous comments about the landscape-led nature of Harlow. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded accordingly.	Text amended	Yes
186	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	BU1	Change required	Point 3. HDC would like this sentence to be reworded to include reference to drawing from the local character of nearby Old Harlow.	Local Character is more narrowly defined by the villages and history of the immediate local area and 'distinct villages'. This does not preclude designers taking inspiration from Old Harlow as appropriate.	No
187	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	H1	Change required	HDC would like this sentence to be amended to add "in Harlow" after "Little Parndon".	Text amended	Yes
188	Schedule of comments.	Statutory consultee	Harlow District Council	TRA2	Change required	It is worth noting that this was one of Gibberd's aims for Harlow in his original New Town masterplan.	Text amended	Yes
189	24/10/19 Report.	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town		Support	Subject to the qualifications set out in their response, the Garden Town welcomes the preparation of the GANP. The Neighbourhood Plan further refines the policy context against which development proposals coming forward will be considered. The information set out in the first four sections of the GANP (Introduction, Planning Policy Framework, Local Context and Vision and Objectives) sets out a sound basis for the GANP, its background and preparation. It also provides a good additional source of local information.	Noted	N/a

190	24/10/19	Report.	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG4	Change required	Policy AG4 clearly has a strong relationship with the aspiration of the Garden Town that appropriate governance and stewardship arrangements are in place to secure the long term management and maintenance of a range of community assets – including SUDs features, parks and public spaces. The principle and approach of the policy in general terms is supported therefore. The Garden Town is continuing its work to establish appropriate stewardship models for the future. However, the element of the policy that requires land to be transferred prior to the commencement of development (set out in part 1 and part 5 of the policy) is considered too prescriptive at this stage. In addition, part 1 refers to the transfer to a community trust or equivalent instrument, whilst in part 5 only a community trust is referred to. In the context of the ongoing Garden Town work, this is considered over prescriptive at this stage, and that there is inconsistency within the policy. Similarly, part 3 of policy C2, refers to the requirement for the transfer of land to community ownership, prior to the commencement of development. These comments are not intended to seek to resist or curtail the strong community desire to influence future governance arrangements. They are made in the spirit of ensuring that options are not unnecessarily restricted at this stage.	Text amended in Policy Ag7 and D2	Yes
191	24/10/19	Report.	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG4	Support	Part 4 of the policy sets out the requirement that the Country Park is to be developed in consultation with the local community. This is to be supported. It is considered that the Country Park can be an asset which has the potential to provide significant recreational benefits to the wider community in the longer term. This is particularly the case given the comparative greater ecological sensitivity of the land close to the river Stort south of the Gilston area site.	Noted	N/a
192	24/10/19	Report.	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG6	Change required	A strong desire for development to draw its inspiration from existing Hertfordshire villages is articulated in the GANP. The characteristics are set out well in the rationale and justification section which precedes this policy. In that context, it is considered that the policy is well framed – referring to the need for an analysis of typical Hertfordshire village layout, but that design can be contemporary and innovative. It is considered however that part 4 of the policy then closes down the potential for innovation, requiring layouts to clearly reflect Hertfordshire village patterns and also that this is clearly reflected in density. Cross reference is made here with policy BU1, Housing and Residential Neighbourhoods, where a density ceiling is set out (part 3i.) that net density should not exceed 33 dwellings per hectare. The comment from the Garden Town in relation to this issue is that the strategic policy background (policy GA1 of the East Herts District Plan) enables 10,000 homes and a considerable range of infrastructure, social and community to be accommodated in the GANP area. Whilst the background and analysis of existing character is well articulated and rationalised in the Plan, it is considered that, without an equally critical assessment of the ability to accommodate the scale of growth within the context of the design, character and density requirements set out, establishing a density ceiling is too prescriptive at this stage. An action that is probably suitable for the required Master Planning phase. It is noted that the HGGT Design Guide draws its inspiration for densities from a wider area, referring the density in Sawbridgeworth as being up to 80 dwellings per hectare.	Policy AG6 reframed to require exploration of local character without constraining design or innovation. Reference to density cap in policy deleted. Appendix 4 added.	Yes
193	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG6	Change required	Whilst part 3ii. of the policy potentially allows for higher densities, the qualification that this is only within a zone which comprises a 15min walking time from Harlow Town railway station, again is considered too prescriptive and would rule out this potential for the significant majority of the development site.	Reference to Concept Framework included. Policy modified.	Yes
194	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG6	Change required	Part 5 of policy BU1 is one of a few occasions where reference is made to sustainable transport modes, shared mobility services and the need to reduce car parking provision. The objective of the policy aligns with that articulated in the Garden Town Transport Strategy and is supported. There may be a need to set out more clearly what the intention is in relation to the progressive reduction of car parking provision. The interpretation of the Garden Town is that later phases of development would be subject to more restrictive standards. It may be that further consideration should be given to this issue early on in development, as this is mostly likely to comprise the location closest to the existing transport facilities in Harlow (Harlow Town railway station) and therefore a location where transport mode shift has significant opportunity.	Clarification provided	Yes
195	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	AG7	Change required	As set out in the introduction to this response, the Garden Town has published an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, establishing infrastructure requirements to support development across the Garden Town. How this would operate is set out well in part 1 of this policy, referring to the legal agreement approach and the phasing of provision. It is also well articulated in part 3 of policy C1 – Community Facility Provision. As above, this refers to the need for phasing in relation to development. Against that, part 2 (of policy AG7) is considered overly prescriptive however and not consistent with part 1 of the policy. As phrased it appears to seek to prevent development in certain circumstances in relation to the timing of infrastructure provision.	Text amended to address overly prescriptive requirement, but maintain the need for consideration of comprehensive needs in accordance with Garden City principles.	Yes

196	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town		General	Delivering quality places. The next set of policies in the GANP focus on the quality of development which is supported to come forward. As set out above, the Garden Town has established a Quality Review Panel as an independent advisor in relation to design quality matters. It will continue to seek the assessment of policy documents, master plans and development proposals by the Quality Review Panel. The opportunity for the GANP to be reviewed by the Panel could be explored if the Neighbourhood Plan Group considered that independent assessment of this nature would support further versions of the Plan.	Noted. QRP met twice in Oct 2019 and Feb 2020.	N/a
197	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	BU2	Change required	Similarly to policy BU1, this sets out some prescription in relation to building heights (in part 4). Given this relates to the height of trees, this could be subject to some significant interpretation and difference of view later – which trees are mature and does this relate to trees that are proximate to the proposed building. At this stage it is suggested that setting out such a control is best left to master planning. The remaining section of part 5 is probably sufficient, requiring master plans to set out the location for taller buildings.	Policy reworded. Qualitative reference to predominance of landscape.	Yes
198	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	BU3	Change required	Reference was made in the introduction to ongoing work that is being undertaken in relation to the opportunity for development in the area to provide for employment needs. At present, the employment policy background (East Herts District Plan policy GA1) supports employment areas in visible and accessible locations. The rationale to the policy rightly sets out that village centre locations will be accessible. But it is not supportive of business park development because these are typically car-based and, the rationale sets out, make a limited contribution to community life. The transport strategy approach to the whole of the Garden Town development is that it should seek to achieve a step change in the choice of travel mode through a range on interventions. So, whilst the current business park typical access model is acknowledged, policies coming forward should not establish the parameters for this form of development on the basis of current access models (just as they shouldn't for the residential and other elements of the development). The approach of the Garden Town is not to suggest that a business park model should be implemented in the GANP area, but again, to avoid undue prescription at this stage. It is considered that some change therefore to part 2 of the policy in this respect would be appropriate.	Agreed - policy reworded. Integration of any non-centre business uses with the rest of the development remains essential.	Yes
199	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town	TRA1	Change required	This headline policy in relation to transport matters cross refers to the Garden Town Transport Strategy. This is an area of policy in which the Garden Town is investing considerable resources to ensure that it can clearly articulate what measures are required to be taken to ensure success in this area. The GANP policy is welcomed and supported in relation to its consistent approach to both that of the East Herts District Plan and the ongoing Garden Town work. The list of requirements set out in part 2 of the policy i. to ix. are suitably wide ranging. It is suggested that consideration be given to one further element however, given the output of the A414 study undertaken by HCC and the potential for bus rapid transit routes westward along the A414 in the future. A reference for sustainable transport links to be provided which serve for journeys outside of the Neighbourhood Plan area to nearby urban centres (other than Harlow) would probably cover this.	Supporting text amplified. Role of A414 is locally controversial and beyond the scope of the NP.	Yes
200	24/10/19	Report	Statutory consultee	Harlow and Gilston Garden Town		Support	In summary, the Garden Town sees the preparation of the GANP in its current form as a supportive and consistent policy document. The Neighbourhood Plan Team is to be congratulated for the significant and in depth work that has clearly been undertaken in the preparation of the draft. Where policy amendment has been suggested in this response, it is to be taken as seeking to achieve positive improvements to the Plan coming forward. If there is any element in this response which is unclear, or in relation to which further explanation would be helpful, please do make contact with Claire Hamilton.	Noted	N/a
201	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggs Estate 1 Limited		Change required	The draft Neighbourhood Plan as it develops will need to acknowledge the potential approval of the outline planning applications for Village 7 (and Villages 1-6) and with them the approved parameter plans in providing the framework for detailed design.	Noted- emerging NP should be taken into account in determining applications	
202	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggs Estate 1 Limited		Change required	We are concerned about the draft Plan's approach to density considerations and other design principles. This approach needs to be consistent with the adopted Local Plan and also the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) to encourage the use of minimum density standards where appropriate, including accessible locations. It is our view that the draft Plan needs to clearly revert back to the parameter plans underpinning the outline planning applications for Village 7 (and Villages 1-6) which have resulted from a comprehensive and thorough design assessment (reflective of the design principles also set out in the Gilston Concept Framework).	Text amended to reflect District Plan policy, Concept Framework and HGGT guidance. Parameter plans should not guide policy.	Partly

203	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	We are concerned about the weight placed on design principles drawing from character and layouts of nearby existing village settlements whereby the new Gilston Area villages are subject to an illustrative design benchmarked against core Garden Town Design principles and design guidelines set out in GA1 which the draft Plan advocates more generally throughout. It is therefore important that there is consistency here. It is important to note that the that the formal feedback from the Quality Review Panel when both applicants presented on the Gilston Area proposals stated that " the panel is concerned at the reliance on the village concept to drive identity. While the panel understands the rationale for promoting the village concept it has concerns this might be misleading given the density of development proposed and may constrain consideration of a fuller range of urban typologies." It therefore draws back to the need to optimise development where appropriate through a sensible design and place making approach in creating a wide range of housing type and tenure.	Noted but the creation of distinctive villages which reflect characteristics of local villages is a key objective. Some further clarification provided in supporting text and Appendix 4.	Yes
204	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	We are concerned that the draft Plan places a certain weight on the Gilston Concept Framework. The Concept Framework is not a Development Plan Document (DPD) or Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and therefore carries very limited weight in the decision-making process. It is instead principally a design-focussed document setting out design principles in demonstrating how a comprehensive development across Gilston Area as a whole might come forward. These design principles have informed the development parameters underpinning the submitted outline planning application for Village 7.	CF is a material consideration for development management purposes and weight should be placed on it. It was endorsed by the Council and part of the Statement of Common Ground used as evidence for the allocation.	No
205	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	We are concerned about the emphasis placed on the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Infrastructure Delivery Plan (April 2019) (the draft IDP). This is a live, non-statutory document which was prepared and published in the absence of detailed impact assessments which now support the Village 7 outline planning application. These detailed impact assessments identify the relative impacts of Village 7 and appropriate mitigation which are now contained within the submitted outline planning application. The weight attached to the draft IDP should be therefore be considered in the context of the above.	Noted and clarification provided in NP. It will be necessary to show that infrastructure needs can be met in respect of overall development to comply with Garden City principles as stated in Policy GA1 of District Plan.	Yes
206	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	Finally, we are concerned about the draft Plan's contents regarding infrastructure delivery and the timing for this. The village specific (on/off site) infrastructure associated with Village 7 and any financial contributions (based on relative impact) for strategic infrastructure across the Gilston Area will be agreed through detailed section 106 negotiations with EHDC. This approach will ensure that the scale and nature of the impacts identified by these planning applications are subject to robust mitigation and enhancement measures, where appropriate. The wording of draft policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan needs to be reflective of this and not pre-empt the required timing for the delivery of infrastructure which will be a matter for the Development Management process.	noted- accepted that it will be necessary to phase development in relation to infrastructure provision. Policy Ag9 reflects Garden City principles and the need to ensure capacity to meet actual needs.	No
207	25/10/19	Letter	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited		Briggens Estate 1 Limited welcomes the Neighbourhood Plan Group's support for the Gilston Area and the hard work that has been undertaken in producing the draft Neighbourhood Plan for the Gilston Area. However, we have a number of concerns in relation to the draft consultation document, as highlighted above and as detailed within the enclosed comments schedule. Once the Neighbourhood Plan Group has the opportunity to review these comments, we are pleased to extend the offer of a meeting with you to discuss these.	Noted. Meeting took place in Feb 2020.	N/a
208	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	Para. 2.25 – The Gilston Area. Changes are proposed to this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with Policy GA1 of East Herts District Plan (October 2018) and to ensure the new and improved provision for connections is not open to interpretation in serving the whole of the Gilston Area. <i>"Transport: a wide range of small and large scale interventions and sustainable transport measures will be required to ensure that development in the wider Harlow area, including the Gilston Area, is able to proceed without causing unacceptable congestion in Harlow, the surrounding towns and villages, as well as the wider strategic transport network. These interventions include a new Junction 7a on the M11, upgrades to Junctions 7 & 811, a second River Stort crossing, widening of the existing crossing, and upgrades to the Amwell Roundabout. Sustainable transport measures will also be required including new or extensions to existing bus services, connecting to Harlow and the wider area, as well as new and improved provision for walking and cycling routes connecting to Roydon, Harlow Town and Harlow Mill railway stations.</i>	Text amended	Yes
209	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	Para. 2.37 – HGGT. Changes are proposed to the following paragraph to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy. <i>"The HGGT Transport Strategy is in preparation in line with HCC's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4). It sets out three headline objectives. These are to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Achieve a target of 60% of all journeys within the new Garden Town communities (and 50% across the whole of the HGGT Harlow) to be undertaken by sustainable modes, · To deliver mobility options on a hierarchy that prioritises reducing the need to travel, walking, cycling and public transport and, · To support a culture of active and sustainable travel within the HGGT". 	Text amended accordingly	Yes

210	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	<p>Para. 2.40 & 2.42 – Concept Framework. The Concept Framework is not a Development Plan Document (DPD) nor a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The main joint document supported by all main parties should be the adopted District Plan (October 2018) for East Herts which was publicly consulted on and supported by both landowners/ developers. Revisions to the relevant paragraphs are therefore recommended to reflect the recognised position. The purpose of the Framework is design-focussed, as set out within the Introduction section of the document, and it therefore has very limited weight in the decision-making process. The Introduction states that the Framework of design principles and Illustrative Concept Masterplan provide an indication of “one way in which the key site principles would be developed into a concept layout.” It is emphasised that the masterplan is “purely illustrative at this stage”. As such it “provides a useful tool in showing how a high quality outcome could be achieved and forms the basis for assessing broad development impact and mitigation as a result of the proposals at this strategic location.” It therefore supports the comprehensive approach to development across the Gilston Area, through establishing a basis for high quality design and placemaking, including land use, movement and green infrastructure. Please see suggested changes to the paragraph below:</p> <p>...</p> <p>“The Concept Framework preparation was led by the landowners / developers and has received substantial inputs from the local community (September 2017-January 2018) and was endorsed by East Hertfordshire District Council in July 2018. It represents therefore the main joint document supported by all main parties. It is a design-led document which identifies high quality design and place-making principles, potential land uses, landscaping and public realm, transport and social infrastructure requirements amongst other design considerations and phasing. The Framework illustrates the form that development might take, to support the comprehensive approach to development across the Gilston Area. These design principles have been adhered to within the submitted parameter plans underpinning the outline planning applications relating to Village 7 (Briggens Estate 1 Limited as the applicant) and Villages 1 to 6 (Places for People as the applicant).</p> <p>...</p> <p>At the meeting of the Executive on 12 June 2018, the Council agreed that whilst the Gilston Area Concept Framework was never intended to be a formal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it would be as a material consideration for Development Management purposes albeit and in accordance with Policy GA1 remains the adopted, statutory development plan policy of greatest weight in providing over-arching development principles resolved to use it as a benchmark against which future development proposals will be assessed”.</p>	The CF was a jointly produced document with extensive community engagement. It has been endorsed by the Council as a material consideration for development management purposes. The CF is a requirement of Policy GA1 and was used to justify the allocation of development through a Statement of Common Ground signed also by Briggens Estate.	No
211	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	<p>Para. 3.20 – Transport and Mobility Patterns</p> <p>Harlow Town Station currently features secure cycle parking, cycle racks outside of the station and lifts so in transport terms the existing cycle parking facilities are not considered to be “poor”. This paragraph as currently worded is therefore misleading and should be rectified accordingly. Similarly, train services offered at Roydon rail station provide for a direct connection to London Liverpool Street and therefore it cannot be described that these services are fewer or slower when compared presumably to Harlow Town rail station services. Please see suggested changes to paragraph below.</p> <p><i>“Cycling trips to Harlow Station are undertaken by some local residents, but this is not helped by the lack of safe crossing facilities at the A414 and Eastwick Roundabout and poor cycle parking facilities at Harlow Station. Harlow Mills, further east, and Roydon have fewer and slower train services and are therefore less used”.</i></p>	Cycle parking facilities are considered to be poor by the local community because they would not have the capacity to accommodate the needs of development on the scale proposed and cycle movement expectations set by the 60% sustainable movement target	No
212	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	Change required	<p>Para 3.21 -Transport and Mobility Patterns.</p> <p>Traffic surveys on Church Lane were undertaken between 2011 and 2015 to inform the Paramics model that was developed by Vectos for the work supporting the allocation of the Gilston Area in East Herts District Plan (October 2018). This shows that traffic flows along Church Lane for the “2018 Base Year” scenario do not exceed 233 vehicles for any hour period within the AM and PM peak periods (0700-1000 and 1600-1900). Therefore, Church Lane should not be considered as a “dangerously busy” road and the paragraph should be amended to ensure it is not misleading. Alan Baxter Associates does not hold traffic data for Eastwick Road so is not able to comment on this but the draft Neighbourhood Plan should avoid making comments of this regards unless it is robustly supported by analysed transport modelling data. the draft Neighbourhood Plan should avoid making comments of this regards unless it is robustly supported by analysed transport modelling data. Please see suggested changes to paragraph below.</p> <p><i>“Most residents are aware of the impacts of through movements using, for example, Church Lane and the main village street in Hunsdon to go to Bishops Stortford or Eastwick Road serving Sawbridgeworth. These movements are particularly intense when there is congestion on the M11, spilling over onto the A10. Often in these occurrences, the Eastwick Roundabout causes severe delays. ,and Church Lane and Eastwick Road become dangerously busy”.</i></p>	It is considered that traffic levels on Church Lane and Eastwick Road are dangerous because of the narrow width of the road and the limited forward visibility.	No

213	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited		Change required	<p>Para. 3.18 – Settlement Character</p> <p>Throughout the draft Neighbourhood Plan, reference is made to “the character of a village” as the standard by which all future development will be judged. It is clear by way of descriptions and photographs within the document that ‘character’ in this context is based almost exclusively on the character of the existing local villages of Gilston, Eastwick and Hunsdon. The census data provided within the draft Plan makes assumptions in relation to the population density of the Gilston Area based on these much smaller villages which are characterised by historic settlement patterns that grew naturally out of a land-based agricultural economy. By definition, a large village like Village 7 cannot and will not have the characteristics of much smaller villages. Therefore, the references made within the draft Plan need to be broadened to ensure there are examples more in-keeping with what is expected of the Gilston Area as part of the Garden Town and the Garden City Principles set out under Policy GA1 of the District Plan (October 2018). Villages in Hertfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Essex provide more comparable populations to those anticipated in for the individual villages of the Gilston Area. It is important to note that the formal feedback from the Quality Review Panel when both applicants presented on the Gilston Area proposals stated that “thinking on character appears tentative and the panel is concerned at the reliance on the village concept to drive identity. While the panel understands the rationale for promoting the village concept it has concerns this might be misleading given the density of development proposed and may constrain consideration of a fuller range of urban typologies.”</p> <p>This needs to be fully recognised throughout the draft NP whilst also identifying that such design principles have been carefully considered and reflected within the submitted parameter plans forming part of the outline planning applications for Village 7 (and Villages 1-6).</p> <p><i>Proposed rationalisation of this paragraph with a more explicit recognition of the physical and functional constraints of the existing village settlements and how in fact the new villages proposed as part of the Gilston Area development will represent a significant step change in role, character and functionality in line with the Garden Town design principles and GA1.</i></p>	<p>This forms a key part of the vision and objectives for the Gilston Area and is in line with objectives for Garden Towns. It is inappropriate for the NP to refer to parameter plans in OPAs which have not yet been determined. Appendix 4 has been added to clarify the elements that make up a village.</p>	Partly
214	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG5	Change required	<p>Figure 16.</p> <p>Hunsdon and Widford are small historic villages separated by over 800m of open farmland with intervening landscape features such that one village cannot be readily seen from the boundary of the other. Distances between new villages in the Gilston Area as shown indicatively in Fig. 15 are in many cases less than 800m and the photographs are not therefore representative of a reasonable aspiration for ‘gaps’ between the new villages in the Gilston Area. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested that the photos are removed.</p>	<p>Appropriate to include photographs to show the existing character of local area</p>	No
215	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG5	Change required	<p>Figure 17.</p> <p>The examples shown are, with the exception of the third image from the top, representative of extremely lowdensity historic land use patterns that are not compatible with a responsible, contemporary approach to efficient land use. The examples do not appear to be outward-facing into the landscape as per the aims of the Concept Framework (p19). At higher development densities, the land use patterns illustrated by the photographs would result in poorly overlooked open spaces reminiscent of the less successful aspects of Harlow’s Green Wedges. The images do not, therefore, present a reasonable comparative example for new villages in the Gilston Area. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested that the photos are removed.</p>	<p>Appropriate to include photographs to show the existing character of local area</p>	No
216	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Change required	<p>Paragraph 5.42 sets out a number of “characteristics of local villages that should be reflected in the design of the new villages”. Whilst these characteristics can be ascribed to local villages and perhaps to very small villages generally, attributing these same characteristics to much larger settlement types constitutes a formal category error. The unique character and setting of the existing villages should be cherished and protected. These villages should not, however, be used to establish binding morphological criteria for settlements of a completely different taxonomic rank. On this basis, the specific characteristics set out in Paragraph 5.42 should not be directly referenced within the policy wording. Please see below suggested changes to the paragraph:</p> <p><i>“The village layouts should clearly reflect Hertfordshire village patterns-(see Paragraph 5.42)- and this should be reflected in the density, the hierarchy of streets and lanes and the softer edges”.</i></p>	<p>Reflects Concept Framework and vision and objectives. Cross reference to supporting text deleted from policy. Clarification of what aspects of local villages are considered material is clearer in the policy and supported by Appendix 4. This is not considered to be in any way contradicting contemporary design. They define the qualities of a village.</p>	Yes

217	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited		Change required	<p>Para. 7.1 – Planning Process</p> <p>Throughout the draft document reference is made to outline planning applications, as plural. This also needs to be reflected in the planning process section to reflect to separately submitted outline planning applications for EHDC's determination. Policy changes also set out the accurate description of each of the parameter plans submitted in support of the outline planning application for Village 7.</p> <p>Please see below suggested changes for this paragraph.</p> <p><i>Stage 1: Outline Planning Applications</i></p> <p><i>The outline planning applications for the Gilston Area will demonstrate how the policy requirements have been incorporated into the development. They # will set a spatial framework for the detailed masterplanning of the villages, establishing development parameters for the location of in relation to Land Uses, Buffer and Development Zones, Green Infrastructure and Open Space, Vehicular Access and Movement, Building Heights and Density (with detailed access plans for approval). built development, protection of open space, and heritage assets, provision of infrastructure, etc. The applications will also be supported by a set of design code guidelines to inform future more detailed design work and as part of the village masterplan document submitted for EHDC's approval as a conditional requirement to the outline planning permissions. This will ensure high quality development is delivered.</i></p>	It is not the function of the NP to define what Parameter Plans are to be submitted with the OPAs. This is the function of the LPA. The NPG is of the view that issues such as density and building heights should be determined through the development of Village Masterplans	No
218	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG1	Change required	<p>The location of the development will be strictly defined by the parameter plans. Scale and form are largely a function of development density. The scale and form of Village 7, with an average development density of circa 25 dph will differ significantly from the scale and form of existing historic settlements by which this paragraph establishes a measure of 'appropriateness' and reference to the parameter plans will help to provide balance.</p> <p>Please see below suggested changes to paragraph.</p> <p><i>"The scale, location and form of development in the Neighbourhood Area as informed by submitted parameter plans should be appropriate to the character of the area and existing settlements and provide living and working environments of exceptional quality, supported by a network of local services and facilities. (...)"</i></p>	The wording of Policy AG1 is in accordance with Policy GA1 and Parameter Plans are a requirement of the planning process to be informed by Development Plan which the NP forms part of	No
219	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG2	Change required	<p>The Concept Framework already provides detailed guidance on the landscaped-led approach to the Gilston Area alongside the submitted green infrastructure parameter plans (as part of the outline planning applications) which can inform the later Village Masterplans and first phase reserved matters applications.</p> <p>Please see suggested changes to paragraph below.</p> <p><i>The Concept Framework, through the Illustrative Concept Masterplan, provides detailed guidance on the landscape-led approach to the Gilston Area to include a strategic landscape masterplan. The submitted Green Infrastructure and Open Space parameter plans which form the basis of the outline planning applications for the Gilston Area will also provide a basis for An overall Landscape Masterplan has been prepared for the Gilston Area as a whole, including the existing settlements, prior to the preparation of individual Village Masterplans and Reserved Matters applications, prior to the commencement of development. The Landscape Masterplan Gilston Area Concept Framework will incorporate a Green Infrastructure Network comprising...</i></p>	The Strategic Landscape Masterplan is an important requirement now set in the Gilston Charter and the best instrument for comprehensive setting of the development. The Concept Masterplan is indicative only. The Parameter Plans are part of the planning application	No
220	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG2	Change required	<p>Reference should be made to Policy CFLR2 of East Herts District Plan (October 2018) and the purpose for identifying these local green spaces. The source from which these individual designations and the figure have been identified should also be inserted to ensure the Plan is robust.</p> <p>Please see suggested changes to paragraph below:</p> <p>The following sites are designated as Local Green Space and in accordance with Policy CFLR2 of the District Plan, development will be consistent with the function, character and use of these (see Fig. 12[Insert source]):...</p>	Reference to Policy CFLR2 included. Local Green Space justification added	Yes
221	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG7	Change required	<p>Para. 5.45.</p> <p>As noted above, the Concept Framework is a design-led document, not a statutory DPD or SPD and, therefore, carries very limited weight in the decision making process. It is not intended to provide a tool for guiding the delivery of infrastructure. The S106 agreement which will be prepared and agreed in conjunction with the granting of outline planning permissions at the Gilston Area will establish appropriate triggers and phasing for the delivery of infrastructure required for Village 7 (and Villages 1-6) based on relative impact and specific needs and demands generated from each scheme as development comes forward. Reference to the Concept Framework in this paragraph is therefore unnecessary and should be deleted.</p> <p>Please see below suggested changes to paragraph.</p> <p><i>The District Plan sets out the requirement for infrastructure provision to support growth in the Gilston Area. One of the objectives of the Concept Framework is to ensure the phased delivery of necessary infrastructure to meet the needs arising from the development.</i></p>	Concept Framework carries weight- is a material consideration in Development Management. It was also supported by Briggens Estate in the Statement of Common Ground signed to support Policy GA1.	No

222	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG7	Change required	<p>Para 5.4.6.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is a non-statutory document which was prepared and finalised in the absence of detailed impact assessments for the Gilston Area which will identify the specific impacts of development and infrastructure requirements arising from these. The weight that is attributable to the IDP should be reflective of this through the decision-making process.</p> <p>Section 3.3 of the IDP confirms that “The IDP is a live document and will be updated over time; when published or reviewed it is based upon the best available evidence at the time of publication or review.” As a working document it will be superseded and require updating as more detailed and reliable information becomes available in support of the Gilston Area planning applications.</p> <p>Section 4.3 states that “Whilst the IDP identifies what is currently expected to be required to support growth across the Garden Town, it may be subject to change and will not necessarily identify every sites pacific requirement which might be identified in response to specific planning applications.” The emphasis placed on this in the draft Neighbourhood Plan therefore needs be carefully considered and as such amendments are recommended.</p> <p>Please see below suggested changes to the paragraph.</p> <p><i>...An Infrastructure Delivery Plan was published in April 2019. This is a live document which identifies the infrastructure requirements that could be associated with the new villages and the apportionment of costs based on the technical information available at the time of publication, and prior to the detailed impact assessments undertaken in connection with the Gilston Area planning applications. The document will therefore be updated over time-Very importantly-the IDP but seeks to establishes the principle of comprehensive infrastructure upgrades, to serve the needs of the new communities, assist the regeneration of Harlow and address local deficiencies as part of a comprehensive plan.</i></p>	Text clarified as part of Section 1.9	Yes
223	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG7	Change required	<p>Para. 5.4.8</p> <p>Triggers for the delivery of infrastructure will be identified within the relevant Section 106 agreements associated with the outline planning applications. These will be agreed with East Herts Council having regard to the scale and relative impact of the Village 7 proposals and Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>Please see below for suggested changes to paragraph.</p> <p><i>...The timing for the delivery of the main physical or social infrastructure items will be identified through specific and robust-development triggers, linked to the relative impact of each development and in accordance with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). A certain quantum of development or a specific event-Details of the infrastructure triggers to control the delivery of key infrastructure must be provided as part of the will be identified in the S106 agreements associated with the outline planning applications.</i></p>	Text amended to provide clarity	Yes
224	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG7	Change required	<p>The preparation of the outline planning applications for the Gilston Area have comprised an assessment of needs arising from the respective development proposals. This technical work is on-going and will inform the S106 agreement negotiations which will take place with East Herts Council and relevant stakeholders in association with the outline planning applications. The outline planning applications will be subject to an extended statutory public consultation period post-validation to receive comments from the public on infrastructure delivery at that time. The timing of delivery will be subject to the relative impact and, therefore, different infrastructure will have different triggers. For example, some transport related infrastructure may need to be delivered prior to the commencement of development where as others may only be required prior to ‘x’ unit occupation based impact. Each of the respective outline planning applications comprise a Delivery Strategy which provides indicative triggers to inform negotiations with East Herts Council. A separate Infrastructure Delivery Plan is considered therefore surplus to requirements and reference to this should be removed from draft Policy AG7 to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Please see suggested changes below.</p> <p>The early delivery of infrastructure where justified and feasible will be encouraged, and development proposals will be supported where the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An assessment of needs arising from development has been undertaken with and an Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be secured through a legal agreement which demonstrates how associated infrastructure secured through planning obligations which will be phased to ensure that the needs of the new and existing communities will be met; 2. No development should take place unless it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient capacity to accommodate new and existing needs at the time of first occupation. Delivery triggers for new and improved infrastructure will be informed by the scale and relative impact of the development itself to ensure necessary infrastructure items are provided at the right time of development either by way of actual provision or financial contributions; 3. Infrastructure requirements and the timescale for provision will be subject to public consultation and determined as part of the approval of future planning applications and secured in agreement with East Herts Council through a legal agreement. 	Outline planning applications part of planning process- to be considered in context of Development Plan which NP is part of. Some further clarity provided in Policy AG9	Yes

225	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG9	Change required	Figure 19. It is acknowledged that this flow chart is taken from the Concept Framework but in subsequent discussions with East Herts Council as part of the pre-application process for the outline planning application, the intention will be to bring forward the Village Masterplan (for Village 7) alongside the first reserved matters application(s) for the first phase or sub phase of development given its relative scale to the wider Gilston Area. Therefore, we think it would be helpful if the draft Neighbourhood Plan reflects this updated position and shows the Village Masterplan and Reserved Matters tabs side by side. <i>Briggens Estate 1 Limited have recommended reconfiguring the flow-diagram so that the Village Masterplans and Reserved Matters tabs sit side by side.</i>	Figure removed as superceded by Gilston Charter.	Yes
226	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	LA1	Change required	We are satisfied with the below wording in reference to prior to occupation on the basis that it relates to "early planting of key landscape areas". <i>Provision has been made for early planting of key landscape areas will be required to ensure that rich landscape and mature trees will provide a dominant visual and bio-diversity feature before occupation of the development.</i>	Text amended	Yes
227	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU1	Change required	There is no justification for the threshold of 33 dwellings per hectare (dph) that is identified and nor is this considered an appropriate ceiling to the density of development in an event. It is important that this draft policy instead allows for flexibility in allowing for appropriate densities to come forward according to circumstances and context, such as village centre locations which benefit from access to public transport. For example, the density and height parameter plan submitted in support of the Village 7 outline planning application achieves much higher densities above 33 dph in parts of the illustrative masterplan to include the village centre which has been a result of a careful and innovative place-making approach to achieve a range of housing needs and demands at this location. These proposed changes will allow for Policy BU1's compliance with paragraph 127(e) where it states the aim to "optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development." Please see below suggested changes to paragraph. <i>... 1. Residential development should be variable in scale and height to create distinctiveness reflective of the submitted parameters set out in the outline planning applications informed by the illustrative masterplans which seek to achieve appropriate densities to meet a range of housing needs and demands through an innovative and thoroughly considered place-making approach. but the overall net density in each village should not exceed 33 dwellings per hectare;</i>	Text amended but inappropriate to refer to parameter plans. Density cap removed from Policy BU1. Further clarification provided and reference made to exploration of 'best balance' in collaboration with the community.	Partly
228	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU1	Change required	In line with the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT) Transport Strategy, the development at Village 7 has been designed (as a standalone scheme) to achieve a mode shift target of 60% of total journeys to be made by sustainable transport modes and 40% by private car. Various new and improved transport sustainability measures are identified within the outline planning application for Village 7 in securing this target by 2030 (the first year of full occupation). It is not reasonable or practical to expect the development to achieve this target early on in the development programme due to the measures that need to be place for this target to be met. As such, the draft Neighbourhood Plan should be positive in encouraging development to achieve the modal shift at an appropriate point in time. Please see suggested changes below. <i>"Car parking provision should reflect the objective of encouraging more sustainable transport modes and encourage take up of shared mobility services. Car parking provision should be lower than current standards and progressively reduced to reflect advances in the provision of sustainable transport and modal shift when feasible and practical within the development programme in early phases of development."</i>	Further clarification provided in text including reference to draft HGGT Transport Strategy	Yes
229	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU2	Change required	As noted in relation to draft Policy BU1, it is important that policy within the draft Neighbourhood Plan accords with the District Plan (October 2018) and national planning policy to provide flexibility in allowing for appropriate densities to come forward as a result of a design-led, place making approach and in meeting a range of housing needs and demands. The outline planning application for Village 7 establishes the density parameters for the proposed development having regard to the above and this will control the density of development that comes forward to ensure it relates positively to its surroundings and creates a high quality sense of place. The proposed change to draft Policy BU2 will ensure it is consistent with the approach coming forward through the outline planning applications in accordance with Policy HOU2 of the adopted District Plan which states "...higher net densities will be favourably considered on central sites in or near town centres and where the character of the surroundings allows" and paragraph 127(e) where it states the aim to "optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development." Please see below for suggested changes. "A higher density of development will be acceptable in village centres and other appropriate locations in accordance with the submitted height and density parameter plans (forming the basis of the outline planning applications at the Gilston Area). of development should be in accordance with Policy BU1."	Density cap removed from Policy BU1. Further clarification provided and reference made to exploration of 'best balance' in collaboration with the community.	Yes
230	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Support	Para. 5.42 - Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Village <i>Briggens Estate 1 Limited generally support this statement.</i>	Noted	N/a

231	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Change required	Para. 5.42 - Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Villages <i>Arrival into the village do not present a 'gateway' point: typically arrival is through a transition area with buildings partially hidden by deep green open space at the front;</i> The above text is generally true of small villages – although there are exceptions such as Abridge – but does not reflect the structure of larger villages which generally have abrupt boundaries against open farmland. Unlike small historic villages which have grown incrementally over centuries, the boundaries of Village 7 will be strictly defined from the outset and a more flexible approach to arrival should be adopted, one that actively choreographs the sequential passage from open land to village and from village to village. Consideration should be given to whether this paragraph is applicable to the villages of the Gilston Area or could be amended to allow sufficient flexibility for the structure of these larger villages, as per our comments.	Policy has been changed to provide further clarification. Appendix 4 is also intended to provide further explanation of what it is intended as Hertfordshire village character.	Partly
232	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Change required	Para. 5.42 - Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Villages <i>Within the village, the main spine is the focal point of active land uses and community facilities. It is typically narrow, informally laid out with narrow side pavements and low or no lighting. Despite limited pedestrian provision, it is pedestrian friendly allowing safe informal crossing and spill-over walking into the carriageway;</i> We support this in principle however it should be remembered that the historic form described here is the result of specific social and economic conditions that are no longer operational. Whilst this urban form (narrow streets, informal layout, high levels of enclosure, low light levels) may be desirable – and we think it is – it must also accommodate contemporary requirements, especially around movement (pedestrians, bicycles, motor vehicles) and safety. The informal layout described here is the result of incremental growth over a very long time period of time. Whilst the wilful application of this formal approach can be very pleasant, there are alternatives that should also be given space for consideration. For example, see: Hertfordshire Guide to Growth - 2021: How Should the County Grow. Consideration should be given to whether this paragraph is applicable to the villages of the Gilston Area in line with our comments and if not, should be amended or deleted.	Policy has been changed to provide further clarification. Appendix 4 is also intended to provide further explanation of what it is intended as Hertfordshire village character.	Partly
233	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Support	Para. 5.42 - Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Villages <i>There is considerable variety of built form and massing: from compact and continuous frontages in the core of the village (Hunsdon, Eastwick, High Wych) to deeply set back isolated buildings (Gilston Lane, Eastwick Road upon entering the village from the A414, outer fringes of Hunsdon);</i> In relation to the above paragraph we support a variety of built form and massing throughout the Gilston Area.	Policy has been changed to provide further clarification. Appendix 4 is also intended to provide further explanation of what it is intended as Hertfordshire village character.	N/a
234	25/10/019	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	AG6	Change required	Para. 5.42 - Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Villages <i>Hertfordshire villages display 'soft' and informal edges, without continuous frontages or repetitive rooflines and with built volumes partly hidden by tall trees and thick bushes.</i> More often than not, Hertfordshire villages at the scale of those proposed within the Gilston Area are strictly delimited by hard edges – usually defined by back-garden fences – against open farmland. These edges generally represent the interface between centralised planning policies and private land ownership boundaries. The 'soft and informal' edges described here are the result of incremental growth over long periods of time. As land in the village centre became more intensively used, agricultural uses dispersed to the periphery, leading to a characteristic soft edge. Whilst this edge condition is indeed characteristic of small villages that have resisted significant growth since at least the mid-19th century, it is not a condition generally seen in larger settlements. We support the aesthetic of soft, informal edges and we agree with the general principle of decreasing density from centre to periphery. However, formal concepts based on historic growth patterns – which emerged organically from social / economic / cultural conditions that no longer exist – must be balanced with a current-day approach to land use efficiency and density which are, themselves, primary form-drivers. Consideration should be given to whether this paragraph is applicable to the villages of the Gilston Area in line with our comments and if not, should be amended or deleted.	Policy has been changed to provide further clarification. Appendix 4 is also intended to provide further explanation of what it is intended as Hertfordshire village character.	Partly

235	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU2	Change required	<p>The outline planning application for Village 7 establishes maximum height parameters for the development which will control the heights of development that come forward. These parameters have been derived through a carefully designed illustrative masterplan which takes account of placemaking, distribution of land uses, views, heritage and other constraints and opportunities across the village centre and beyond and was informed by the findings of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. These policy changes are in accordance with adopted Policy DES4 (a) of the District Plan(October 2018) which requires development to “make the best possible use of the available land by respecting or improving upon the character of the site and the surrounding area, in terms of its scale, height, massing (volume, shape), orientation, siting, layout, density, building materials (colour, texture), landscaping, environmental assets, and design features, having due regard to the design opportunities and constraints of a site”.</p> <p>Whilst the existing landscape forms an important consideration, the height of mature trees does not provide a robust measure, as these are variable, subject to change and only represent one feature within the site’s context that contributes to the character. As such, we recommend that the wording of the draft policy is revised as recommended.</p> <p>Please see suggested wording for paragraph below.</p> <p><i>The height of development will be in accordance with submitted parameter plans, required to respect village character. Variations in height will be acceptable but should not normally exceed the height of the crowns of mature trees; The location for taller buildings will be defined in the Village master Plans.</i></p>	Policy has been changed to provide further clarification. Appendix 4 is also intended to provide further explanation of what it is intended as Hertfordshire village character.	Partly
236	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU3	Support	<p>Briggens Estate 1 Limited is supportive of the draft wording of Policy BU3. The work undertaken in support of the outline planning application for Village 7 confirms that the Gilston Area is not suitable for a business park but suited for smaller scale office accommodation to cater for smaller companies (SMEs) that serve the local market across a combination of small private offices and flexible workspaces. This will supplement rather than compete with the existing larger scale office clusters nearby. Up to 1,195 sqm of B1a office is proposed as part of Village 7 in the form of a mid-size office building or series of smaller buildings.</p>	Noted	Supporting text amplified
237	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	BU4	Change required	<p>These photographs are representative of extremely lowdensity environments that are not compatible with a responsible approach to land use efficiency and contemporary density expectations of circa 25 dph. Only one of the examples (top right) presents a pedestrian and cycle friendly condition and two of the examples (bottom left and right) present conditions that are hostile to both, representing significant health and safety concerns.</p> <p>Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested removing the photos.</p>	The photos are clearly indicated as representative of existing village character to be used as inspiration for future village design. They are considered appropriate to the purpose. Further detail in new Appendix 4.	Partly
238	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	H1	Change required	<p>The illustrative design of Village 7 in support of the outline planning application is based on the fundamental design principles of place making to achieve a high quality environment in meeting a range of housing and other wider socio-economic needs and demands across the village. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have recommended deleting the following text:</p> <p>...The importance of the structure of the model farms will be reflected in design proposals...</p>	Not relevant to NP. Reference to model farms changed.	Partly
239	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	C1	Change required	<p>The Gilston Area as a whole will provide a range of community facilities to meet the needs arising from the development. The proposed quantum for Village 7 is set out within the outline planning application following an assessment of a range of community needs and will be secured through the S106 agreement.</p> <p>As noted previously, the Garden Town IDP is a live document, prepared and published in advance of detailed impact analysis for the Gilston Area being available. As stated at section 4.3 of the IDP, Section 4.3 states that “whilst the IDP identifies what is currently expected to be required to support growth across the Garden Town, it may be subject to change and will not necessarily identify every site specific requirement which might be identified in response to specific planning applications.”</p> <p>The emphasis currently placed on the IDP within the draft Neighbourhood Plan needs to be refined and focused instead on the legal agreement that will secure new and improved community facilities and provision, the timing of their delivery and long-term management. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested making the following changes.</p> <p>...The provision of community facilities should take place in accordance with the parameters approved through the outline planning applications and associated planning obligations contained within the respective legal agreements an agreed Infrastructure Delivery Plan which has been prepared in consultation with the local community infrastructure requirements and the timescale for provision will be determined as part of the approval of planning applications;</p> <p>...</p>	The NP will provide part of the Development Plan against which all applications will be considered. Text amended to provide greater clarity of expectation in Policy AG9	Partly

240	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	C1	Change required	It is envisaged that a planning condition will be attached to any outline planning application granted in relation to the Gilston Area in order for a site-wide phasing strategy to be agreed with the Council and secure the timely delivery of housing and strategic infrastructure which will form part of the more detailed section 106 negotiations between both landowners and the Authorities. A detailed assessment of needs and relative impacts arising from the development of Village 7 has been undertaken as part of the outline planning application to inform Village 7 specific triggers in delivering village specific social and transport infrastructure as contained within the submitted IDP supporting the application. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested the following changes. ...The provision of necessary infrastructure will be delivered phased in accordance with a site-wide phasing strategy secured via planning condition relation to development to ensure there is adequate capacity to meet the cumulative needs of the development, new and existing communities...	Agreed- clarification provided. Text amended in Policy AG9 for the phasing to reflect suggestion	Yes
241	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	C2	Change required	In accordance with Policy GA1 of the District Plan (October 2018), a Community Trust Vehicle will be established and a strategy for the governance of community assets secured through the respective S106 agreements. For consistency, this agreed approach should be directly referred to within the draft policy to remove any ambiguity around the potential 'measures' that could come forward. Please see suggested changes from Briggens Estate 1 Limited. Measures-A community trust or other mechanism and framework for governance will be established through put in place a Section 106 agreement before the commencement of development to ensure the community has the necessary means to secure the long-term operation and maintenance of community assets;...	Policy C2 now merged with delivery Policy ID2 to form Policy D2.	Yes
242	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	TRA1	Change required	Changes are proposed to this part of the policy to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy. In addition, the reference to "through traffic" should be deleted as is not considered a mode of transport. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested the following changes. 2. Development will be required to: i. Promote sustainable transport choices with a clear order of priority: reduce the need to travel , walking, cycling, public transport innovative mobility, shared transport, private transport; through traffic through the area should be minimised;	Text amended	Yes
243	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	TRA1	Change required	Para. 5.104 Changes are proposed to this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy. This is specific to the Garden Town and, therefore should be reflected as such to ensure the supporting text is not open to interpretation. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested the following changes. Development in the Gilston Area must promote sustainable transport choices, anticipate foreseeable changes in transport technology and reduce the dominance of cars and traffic within existing and new Garden Town Communities and on the wider transport network across the locality.	Text amended	Yes
244	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	TRA1	Change required	Para 5.105 Changes are proposed to this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy which sets out the modal shift requirements. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have suggested the following changes. The Harlow and Gilston Garden Town HGGT Transport Strategy has set itself a very ambitious target of 60% of all movement journeys in within new Garden Town Communities areas to be undertaken by sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling, shared mobility services or public transport), and 50% in existing areas of across Harlow . This is a very significant shift, and one which will not happen unless a comprehensive strategy for mobility is developed and adopted for the site and for the wider area, which also take account of progressive changes in travel habits and technology changes.	Text amended	Yes

245	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	TRA1	Change required	Para. 5.106 Changes are proposed to this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy. In addition, the reference to "through traffic" should be deleted as is not considered a mode of transport. Briggens Estate 1 Limited have recommended the following changes. Notwithstanding the indeterminate future of transport technology, it is to be anticipated that a sustainable mobility strategy should consider at least: - Order of priority which gives precedence to reduce the need to travel , walking, cycling, public transport, mobility as a service vehicles, freight and delivery vehicles and private cars and through traffic, in this order; - Village layouts that are open and permeable, to shorten distances and offer multiple safe routes; - Enhanced cycling and pedestrian access to all Harlow Town, Harlow Mill and Roydon railway stations ;	Text amended as suggested	Yes
246	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited	EX1	Change required	Regulation 122 (2) of the CIL Regulations 2010, establishes the need for planning obligations to be directly related to development. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework similarly states that planning obligations must only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, any financial contributions to be secured through the S106 agreement will need to be compliant with the above and will be identified having regard to the scale and relative impact of the proposed development. The current wording of the policy is ambiguous in suggesting that S106 funding may also be secured to directly serve the needs of existing settlements. Revisions to the wording are recommended to ensure this is clear. Please see recommended changes below. ...Section 106 funding will be made secured relative to the scale and impact of the proposed development available to undertake improvements to the existing settlements to make the development acceptable in planning terms in accordance with CIL Regulation 122. mitigate the impacts of new development; priority projects will be identified in consultation with the relevant stakeholders local community...	Noted- clarification provided. Policy closely linked to mitigation of the impact of development.	Yes
247	25/10/19	Schedule of comments.	Landowner/ developer	Briggens Estate 1 Limited		Change required	Appendix 2 – HGGT Vision: Sustainable Movement Changes are proposed to this paragraph to ensure it is consistent with the statements and expectations already established by the HGGT Transport Strategy. Please see suggested changes below. Integrated transport; a viable and preferred alternative to cars to achieve a modal shift- 50-60% of all trips within the new Garden Town Communities and 50% of trips across Harlow to be undertaken by sustainable active transport modes.	Text amended	Yes
248	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Support	Much of the proposed development is some distance from the River Stort and so the Trust's primary interests are the impacts of the proposed bridge crossings, the impact of development on use of the Towpath and the opportunities for improvements to the waterway corridor to mitigate adverse impacts (on bio-diversity for example) across the wider development area. Overall, we welcome the draft Neighbourhood Plan, which: - includes multiple and integral ambitions on promoting and providing for walking cycling, health and wellbeing, and includes connections to the River Stort, through landscape and green space connectivity and transport connectivity; - aims to protect and enhance green spaces and connectivity for wildlife and people; - aims to protect and champion the heritage and character of the area; - aims for a high standard of development.	Noted	N/a
249	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Support	Objective 4: Well Connected To, But Distinctive From, Harlow. We are supportive of the objective of the existing and new communities being well connected to Harlow, particularly through public transport, walking and cycling and believe that the River Stort towpath will play a key role in this aspiration.	Noted	N/a
250	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Support	Objective 5: Promoting Healthy Communities. We are supportive of this objective and consider that the River Stort has an important role to play in it. Maximising the benefits of the River Stort will require physical improvements and investment but some opportunities, such as promoting community engagement and social interaction through volunteering activities, for example, may not. Amongst other things, we believe that these activities can help to improve physical and mental health.	Noted	N/a
251	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Support	Objective 7: Promoting Sustainable Transport. We welcome development in the Gilston Area being "integrated with sustainable travel initiatives in the wider Harlow area including the creation of sustainable transport corridors" and would again advise that the towpath will support this objective.	Noted	N/a

252	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Change required	Objective 10: A Protected And Enhanced Landscape And Network of Green Spaces. We recommend the following point in Objective 10 also include reference to the River Stort and its towpath which links the neighbourhood plan area to green space beyond "The existing network of parks, views and paths will be integrated with new connections to form a rich and permeable network of green spaces which will be linked by a series of environmentally viable green corridors between new and existing settlements which will provide walking routes and promote rich biodiversity appropriate to the area".	Text amended	Yes
253	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Change required	Objective 11: Protecting And Enhancing Natural Assets. We note the objective of "Existing areas of ecological, wildlife and landscape value will be protected, enhanced and incorporated as part of the integrated network of green spaces". Whilst we support the intention of protecting and improving the biodiversity of the area and River Stort valley in general, we have some concern that a strict, site specific interpretation would limit our ability to widen towpaths along the River Stort to help deliver other objectives in the plan. We recommend revising the objective to read: "Existing areas of ecological, wildlife and landscape value will be protected, enhanced and incorporated as part of the integrated network of green spaces. Where appropriate to the habitat in question, this may involve the creation of compensatory habitat to mitigate any that is lost in the delivery of other objectives". Improvements to the Stort Valley may help to compensate for habitat lost or adversely affected across the development area.	This is reflected in Policy AG3. The River Stort is outside the NP boundary	No
254	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	AG2	Change required	The Trust supports the preparation of a Landscape Masterplan. It should be ensured that the plan incorporates the River Stort Navigation and connections to it. Views from the Stort should also be considered under point 1(v) of this policy as these can significantly impact on the experience of canal users and the enjoyment and benefits that they derive from a visit to the waterway. Of particular concern are the impacts of bridge crossings and wider highways proposals.	Text amended	Yes
255	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	AG2	Change required	Figure 12 is not sufficiently clear to enable the Trust to determine whether or not the River Stort Navigation is included in the Local Green Space designations for Terlings Park and Fiddlers Brook and Lowland Fens. Whilst we welcome the desire to protect the character of our waterways, the Trust usually advises that it can prove not to be in the best interests of the management of the waterway to designate it as Local Green Space and therefore, apply Green Belt restrictions on development. It can, for example, limit opportunities to develop facilities that enable new or improved recreational uses.	Figure 12 reviewed. Map includes Terlings Park property only and Fiddlers Brook Lowland Fen as designated by Natural England.	No
256	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	AG3	Change required	The Trust aims to provide paths that are durable, drain well and are suitable for a variety of visitors (including those with cycles, wheelchairs and prams/buggies). We recommend the following text be revised with the additions underlined: "4. Paths and cycle/bridgeways should have <u>natural/permeable-a durable</u> finish <u>sited to the local context</u> and all walls and gates take inspiration from the local countryside".	Text amended to reflect need for durable footpaths and cycleways	Yes
257	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	TRA1	Change required	We support the policy intention to promote sustainable and active travel and reduce car dependency, creation of sustainable transport corridors, provision of multiple safe and direct cycle and pedestrian routes to Harlow Town Station, and improvements to sustainable transport access to Harlow Mill station (potentially making use of the River Stort towpath). The Stort towpath is not mentioned as a cycling route. As well as providing a local route to Harlow Station for the proposed villages to the eastern and western extents of the development area, it provides a connection to Sawbridgeworth station and on to Bishops Stortford (8 miles between Harlow Town and Bishops Stortford). Connections to the Stort are also not identified as a policy priority. We suggest adding that development should contribute to improvements to the towpath route and access to it as part of the walking and cycling network.	Text amended. Cycle routes linking to the stations are included, without specific reference to the towpath, as the community would prefer the towpath to remain a semi-natural space, rather than a commuting cycle route.	Yes
258	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	TRA2	Change required	We agree that "Promotion of sustainable transport choices requires an extensive network of safe and convenient routes linking new and existing settlements and providing access to their facilities, open space and the countryside," and that layout should "integrate with the wider area and network of paths and bridleways and cycle routes (Policy TRA4)". The River Stort towpath should be specifically referenced within point 2(iii) as a route in the wider area for walking and cycling. This policy appears to be incorrectly labelled as TRA1, rather than TRA2. We have labelled it as TRA2, so as not to confuse these comments with the ones we have made in relation to Sustainable Mobility.	Text amended	Yes
259	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust	TRA4	Change required	We note the Stort Valley / Lee Valley Park are mentioned and Hatfield Forest, which could be accessed via the River Stort towpath from the Gilston area and that the proposed Green Infrastructure network includes the Stort. The East Herts District Plan Policy (referenced in the neighbourhood plan) includes two new bridge crossings over the Stort - the neighbourhood plan should also state a requirement that these new crossings should provide good connections to the Stort towpath, including wayfinding, and limiting their impact on the Stort and its character.	Text amended (Ag1 and Ag2)	Yes
260	25/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	Canal and River Trust		Change required	In addition to recommending that the neighbourhood plan show support for improvements to the River Stort towpath and access to it as we have above, we suggest that it should also support the provision of additional boater facilities and the maintenance of the navigation on the basis that the new population of Gilston may increase the level of boating activity.	This is outside the scope of the NP	No

261	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	The Land Trust		Support	First of all congratulations on getting this far and preparing the first draft. It's clearly a large and complex task for such ambitious development plans, but we recognise that it is so important that you as the local community, are able to influence and inform the outcomes. This is fundamental to our own principles as a community focussed charitable trust. It is also good to see that the value of green space and the public realm is identified as an essential part of the plan along with the need for safeguarding how it will be managed in the long-term. Given the right resources and management structures, the scale and diversity of the proposals should allow excellent opportunities for delivering a whole range of benefits to the local community. The Land Trust is uniquely placed to advise on such resource and structural issues and we are looking forward to our opportunity to make a presentation to the Hunsdon, Gilston and Eastwick Neighbourhood Planning Group shortly. Overall, we support the approach outlined and agree that the proposed policies - in particular draft policies AG1-5, LA1-2 and C1-2 relate to green space, the proposed country park and future management arrangements, amongst other matters provide a valuable framework for creating sustainable greenspace resources.	Noted	N/a
262	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	The Land Trust		Support	It is good to see green infrastructure is a key element of sustainable development. Making sure that the green infrastructure does indeed become a multi-functional resource is important and we support your moves to ensure that the community is fully engaged with the process. Our experience highlights the real value of a community that feels part of their local environment. In doing so, we do however also recognise, that whilst it is important to ensure that priority is given to opportunities for influencing and informing, these don't necessarily need to be hand in hand with the day to day demands and risks associated with actual land ownership and management. At the Land Trust we see this as enabling 'emotional ownership', which allows a community to be involved where it most wants and can be most effective. A big part of this is that we can create the "capacity" to allow this to happen in a "safeguarded" way that does not place undue risk and responsibility on any individual or group of individuals.	Noted	N/a
263	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	The Land Trust	AG4	Change required	We also recognise that creating multi-functional green space is only achievable by having the resources and skills to manage it properly. A key part of this is in balancing the needs of competing demands (for example, recreation and conservation) - such as in the proposed country park where Policy AG4 helpfully identifies the complex range of issues to be addressed. Establishing how this balance will be achieved and how it might be sustainably funded should be priority. Again, we would be pleased to demonstrate how we manage and safeguard our own portfolio of sites to achieve this.	Noted p Policy D2 clarified and reinforced.	Yes
264	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	The Land Trust	C2	Change required	We note that the draft plan proposes the transfer of the new country park to a Community Trust (Policy AG5-5) and Policy C2-3 calls for the undeveloped land North West of Gilston to be transferred into community ownership. As we have outlined above we believe "ownership" is critical to sustainable greenspace management, however we do recommend that further consideration is given as to what this "ownership" might take. Our own experience suggests that there is often an initial desire for standalone Community Trusts to be created, however except on relatively small -scale projects we also find that the full complexity and financial implications often create to great a hurdle for long-term sustainability. Needless to say, the scale of the challenge within the plan is very large, especially when combined with your need to ensure and "integrated approach to management is achieved across the entire development area". Challenges to local community trusts that we identify include: - Finding willing and able volunteers to be Trustees - Ensuring financial sustainability and value for money - Ensuring scale and capacity and the skills required for volunteers/Trustees - Additional costs and resources required in setting up a new Trust and staff required - Community breakdown through constant need fro Trustees to pursue fellow residents for service charge recovery - Succession planning, governance and risks of Trust failure in the future We would therefore recommend that the draft policy C2 is amended to enable proposals from other community focussed organisations, such as the Land Trust, to be considered alongside the Community Trust model. We would recommend that the policy is amended to state: Policy C2: The undeveloped land to the north west of the Gilston Area to be transferred into community ownership or charitable ownership by a suitable community focussed organisation supported by! This would also seem to accord more closely with the relevant wording in policy AG4 that already identifies scope for an equivalent instrument.	Noted- these are issues which should be addressed through further work on developing appropriate vehicle for delivering objectives. The definition of 'ownership' is part of legal agreements discussed outside the scope of the NP	No
265	24/10/19	Letter	Statutory consultee	The Land Trust		Change required	We are aware that climate change is likely to increasingly impact on all our lives. This potentially creates opportunities for the natural environment to make a significant contribution to wider challenges for shade, shelter, moisture retention etc. However, it also raises a range of potential threats to a health environment in terms of rising temperatures and increased risks from pests etc. Within the context of long-term sustainability, we would therefore recommend that the plan gives some further thought as to how the green infrastructure proposals might be developed in such a way that they are more resilient to a changing climate change.	Policy AG1 amended to provide further reference to climate change mitigation	Yes

Meeting with East Herts DC Planning Dept on

Section/ Objective/Policy	Page No.	Comment	NP RESPONSE	NP CHANGED?
Chapter 1: Introduction				
Section 1	4	Title might benefit from being moved onto new page (page 5) for clarity	Amend	
1.1	5	First sentence might benefit from slight change of language to better describe that the green belt was released through the Local Plan process rather than by the document itself. Sentence could read; “...Gilston and Eastwick was released when the East Herts District Plan was adopted in October 2018 in order to accommodate...”	Amend	
Chapter 4: Vision and Objectives				
Overview	32	I think the bullet points in paragraph 4.1 needs to be rearranged slightly , bullet 1 might be better at the end so that it is clear that the developers endorse the final document that was approved at Council rather than the document that was published prior to any public consultation. Likewise, is it correct to state that the Parish Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group modified and agreed the concept framework vision and objectives – or is this referring to the vision and objectives now being presented in the NP? Clarity needed as to which vision and objectives are being referred to as although similar, they are not identical.	Amend	
Chapter 5: Neighbourhood Plan Policies				
General				
All Policies	-	Consider deleting the policy number e.g. ‘AG1’, ‘C2’ etc. from the section titles to help clarity in distinguishing between supporting text and the actual policy.	Amend	
Policies				
5.4	45	Reference to GT Design Guide is figure 14 (on page 66) but reference in text is to figure 15.	Amend	
5.17	47	Appreciate this is a concern from the community and an understandable one – I think, if there is the opportunity to temper some of the expectations though it should be taken where possible. What I mean by that, is that of course the development of 10,000 dwellings will substantially change the current rural setting of the area and so this does need to be reflected. Likewise, development economics do not support the forward-funding of infrastructure in general (although it will be secured where possible). Whilst I appreciate that this is the perspective of the community – it might help if sometimes the limitations of what can be achieved are explained alongside this perspective to assist the reader in understanding why the policy is worded (usually more flexibly) in this way, despite the stronger community perspective. The example of this is 2 iv. of Policy AG1 which sets out a pragmatic policy for dealing with infrastructure.	This is a concern raised by the community and it is therefore valid to make reference to that fact in the Neighbourhood Plan. Para 132 amended to provide further clarification that development will have an impact on the rural character of the area and existing settlements.	

<p>AG1</p> <p>48</p> <p>5.22</p>	<p>Criterion 2, part i. This criterion provides a tricky notion because of the words 'be appropriate to the character of the area and existing settlements' – because the character of the area is likely to substantially change with this development. I wonder whether deleting those words highlighted above and starting the policy at 'Provide living and working...' would help to acknowledge this and character and landscape are addressed in other policies anyway so you wouldn't be losing anything with this deletion.</p> <p>Part v. is there a conflict with having a 'landscape-led approach' and a 'predominance of the landscape' – maybe just use one of the terms to avoid any confusion.</p> <p>Part ix. This policy appears to deal with a landscape and visual separation point as well as a design (of the built form) point. Considering the built-form is to be dealt with in detail in other policies I would recommend deleting the words 'and distinguished in built form from Harlow' so that the criterion is more focussed and doesn't repeat something that is addressed comprehensively later on.</p> <p>Part xiii. Again, I think the reality is that morphology and character of settlements in the NP area do not lend themselves to the delivery of GA1 – it might be better to either delete this criterion completely (because it will be addressed in AG7 anyway) or at least delete the words 'the morphology and character' so that it is clear the policy relates to design.</p> <p>Might it be useful to reference the HGGT Sustainable Transport Strategy in this paragraph?</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>		
<p>AG2</p> <p>50</p>	<p>I think in the previous meeting, I commented on some of the potential issues I had with this policy – whilst I appreciate the addition of this policy is a response to the communities concerns I still wonder whether the individual criterion fit better in other policies rather as one policy that simultaneously covers, roads; traffic and water run-off. On a separate note – part 1. Refers to the design of road infrastructure minimising damage to the rural and village character of the area. Whilst I think its fine to talk about minimising impacts on communities and avoiding severance – I think we need to be realistic that some infrastructure (the River Stort crossing) is substantial and will be unable to demonstrate anything close to a rural or village character.</p>		<p>Policy AG2 now revised as Policy AG8. Policy GA2 refers to impact in landscape and heritage assets of new road infrastructure. Reference to minimising impacts of new transport infrastructure now addressed in Policy AG8</p>	
<p>AG3</p> <p>54</p>	<p>Criterion 1 ii – I would delete reference to the 'development boundary' that way the criterion applies to the whole Plan area. Criterion would finish after '...waterbodies'.</p> <p>Criterion 1, Part iii – instead of development and implementation of woodland management plans, it should read 'establishment or creation of and implementation of ...' This is to avoid confusion in development management terms over what is meant by 'development'.</p> <p>Criterion 2, final paragraph refers to 'Green and Infrastructure Network' – is the 'and' a typo or is it referring to the Green Infrastructure Network, <i>and</i> a separate Infrastructure Network? Clarity should be provided here to ensure no confusion.</p> <p>Criterion 2, Part ii. bullet 1 – does it need the word 'and' between corridors and connections? It also describes "...green belt/green wedges that abut ...Epping Forest and Hatfield Forest." Whilst I appreciate the point you are trying to make is that there are wider considerations and not just those in the immediate area. The inclusion of the word 'abut' and then listing Epping and Hatfield Forest which are some distance away might confuse the decision-maker. I would be tempted to reword for more clarity.</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend to provide further clarity-reference retained to links to wider green infratructure network</p>		

		<p>Criterion 2, Part ii. bullet 2 – is essentially another version of policy AG6 (and references it) to avoid any overlap I would perhaps just look to cross-reference in the following way; <i>“Green corridors to be incorporated and contribute to the goal of distinct villages as set out in policy AG6”</i></p> <p>Criterion 2, Part iv – needs a definition of what is an important view. Is it from high points across, is it towards built or natural landmarks, or even from particular landmarks – crossover here between other heritage impact setting issues. An opportunity for a diagram perhaps.</p> <p>Criterion 2, Part vi – is there duplication here with other water management policies? If this criterion is attempting to integrate water management into the GI network then it should be phrased as such, also, the traditional ditch and pond features are likely to be sufficient.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – Local Green Space – should it be a reference to Figure 13? Welcome the additional reference to NPPF but, regarding LGS still can't see any reference to the supporting evidence as needed to meet the NPPF requirements. Typo; too many 'onlys'.</p>	<p>Text amended to avoid duplication</p> <p>Reference to views removed to avoid policy duplication</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Now moved to Policy AG5 with justification</p>	
AG4	59	<p>Criterion 1: Maintaining our point during the previous consultation as well as the QRP's comments about ensuring the strategic objectives can still be delivered we would welcome the use of 'where possible' or other wording that reflects that containing development and mitigating visual impacts on the current landscape needs to be balanced with the delivery of District Plan policy GA1 and the allocation of this area for the delivery of 10,000 homes.</p> <p>Criterion 2: first bracket says 'as defined' in AG3 – it might be worth deleting 'as defined' as AG3 only sets out the policy context for a GI network and doesn't explicitly define it. It should also be noted that all of the types of 'area' that are described would all contribute towards GI so the wording of the policy could perhaps be better worded to reflect this. Typo; areas <u>of</u> woodland.</p> <p>Criterion 3: plant species of the rural setting – do they mean arable field species?</p> <p>Criterion 7: the tense seems wrong</p> <p>Criterion 8: Further flexibility here would be welcomed, maybe by saying “Villages (new and existing) should be clearly set within the rural landscape and their distinct separation should utilise natural features such as fields or woodland blocks as meaningful buffers”, or alternatively delete the reference altogether to the separation of villages and instead cross-reference to policy AG6 which far more comprehensively deals with the issue. Typo; in last sentence - <u>ad</u>.</p>	<p>Policy AG4 now AG3 Text revised - measures which seek to contain and mitigate visual impacts of development</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Further clarification provided</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>	
AG5		<p>Previously we raised the issue as to whether designating something as a formal Country Park was in the Neighbourhood Plan's gift, or indeed a desirable outcome. Please revisit and ensure this as there could be big implications regarding the role and function and also in terms of impact on traffic generation.</p>	<p>Policy AG5 now AG7 Now referred to as Countryside Parks to avoid misinterpretation</p>	

		<p>Criterion 2 – the termination of existing uses is a tricky subject and may not be within the scope of a NP, and in order for any sort of use-class style policy there would need to be accompanying definitions.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – is not completed.</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part iii – could be too restrictive. It might be more effective if you just reference ‘recreation’, rather than ‘informal’</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part v – Whilst I note the wording is restrictive, car parking may conflict with other strategies such as sustainable transport and mode shift ambitions. The park may become an attractor for those travelling from further afield and the provision of parking may encourage unsustainable trips and unnecessary movement around the locality as drivers will look to find spaces if the car parks are small. It may be worth cross-referencing to the lower parking standards being encouraged in TRA1 etc.</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part vi – Harlow Town Station, not North.</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part vii – might be worth replacing ‘and natural character’ with ‘open character’ as the airfield is a man-made feature. One concern is that this criterion might be too restrictive and may prevent some good uses which may be income-generating and would support the community stewardship side of things.</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part viii – be aware that ‘exceptional architectural quality’ could be open to interpretation without any definition. As above, remove ‘informal’ from recreation.</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part x – it might be worth including more information regarding the sensitive gap referred to here (not necessarily in the policy).</p>	<p>Amend to 'consideration of relocation'</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend to 'countryside setting and open character'- further amplification provided</p> <p>Reference included to Building Better, Building Beautiful Report</p> <p>Covered by other policies</p>	
5.55	64	References organic villages – this might not be the correct terminology as the new settlements will be planned, not organic.	Amend	
5.61	65	Open countryside corridor between villages is in conflict with other statements about woodland buffers between villages. Ensure there is similar language between supporting text and policies to avoid conflicts.	Amend to ensure consistency of terminology	
AG6	67	<p>As referenced in the introduction, this policy is where we already start to see some repetition – so if possible any areas that could be deleted because they are being addressed elsewhere is encouraged.</p> <p>Criterion 1 – Figure to be updated – currently reads ‘figure 18’. The use of community boundaries is a slightly confusing one – I think further evidence is needed to establish exactly why these areas have been selected to be inappropriate for certain types of development in order to ensure these operate both as intended and are robust enough to stand up to scrutiny through a consultation and subsequent examination.</p>	<p>Text amended to avoid duplication</p> <p>Policy AG6 now AG4 For discussion- clarification provided on definition of village boundaries Community boundaries addressed in Policy AG6</p>	

		<p>Criterion 3, part ii. This will need to be balanced with strategic priorities, darkness at night is fairly ambiguous likewise the reference to wild animals. It might be more pragmatic to have part i. read; “<i>Sufficient width to clearly mark separation between villages</i>” that way you can address both the separation of villages and width collectively without relying on ambiguous terms like darkness and wild animals. Deletion on part ii following this update.</p> <p>Criterion 3, Part iv. – could be a good opportunity to add reference to avoiding areas of ecological value as well.</p> <p>Criterion 4 – appears to attempt to address one issue in a number of different ways creating some confusion. I wonder whether there is a necessity for this criterion at all given that the green belt, and the Stort Valley occupy the area being referred to, and thus encroachment and in fact and development is restricted anyway. Likewise, the GA1 policy has a boundary that limits the development area available for strategic purposes.</p> <p>Criterion 5, Criterion 6 and Criterion 7 all appear to broadly be repeats of policies covered above or elsewhere.</p>	<p>Clarification provided about need to balance NP policies against strategic priorities. Text amended</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Now addressed in Policy AG3</p> <p>Text amended to avoid duplication</p>	
5.66	71	The criteria included here needs to be adapted inline with the comments below that relate to the policy as a whole. As noted, happy to have a further discussion on this subject.	Text revised	
5.67	72	Typo first sentence – ‘The use of <u>use</u> of wood...’ Note on wooden construction; Traditional wood construction has benefits in terms of the primary source of material, if sourced locally and sustainably, but does not provide the necessary thermal mass required to exceed standards and therefore has to be balanced against other sustainable construction measures, which have embodied energy reduction properties and a long life span.	Text revised	
AG7	72	<p>This is currently a policy that, as highlighted by the QRP, needs to be amended to ensure that the strategic priorities of the District Plan can be delivered. The main issue here is that implementing a ‘Hertfordshire Village Character’ with the current criterion would fail to deliver 10,000 dwellings and the accompanying employment and infrastructure etc.</p> <p>The QRP’s note referred to exploring the principles that would define a ‘Village character’ in the <u>21st Century</u>. In particular, further work on housing typology, morphology and urban form – could then be interpreted and applied in a contemporary context as a way of attaining this ‘village character’ whilst still delivering the strategic priorities.</p> <p>With that in mind, the areas of this policy which I consider are in direct conflict with this are mainly the 1st criterion, and parts i. – v. In particular part ii. which relates to ‘densities which are appropriate and characteristic of villages’. Whilst it is appreciated that GA1 is to be delivered in a series of distinct villages, the density, if in line with other Herts villages, would not allow the full delivery of GA1. Nor would the requirement to have views of fields and pockets of rural landscape enclosed within village boundaries.</p> <p>I would recommend removing the link (part ii.) between density and village characteristics – this would also benefit you in allowing the density flexibility needed to achieve other NP goals of sustainable transport, village cores and especially buffers between the villages. E.g. allowing higher densities and building heights nearer to services reduces the need to travel by car and simultaneously allows for the efficient use of land in those areas, leaving more land for buffers etc.</p> <p>Likewise, Part iii. potentially doesn’t have the flexibility needed either.</p> <p>As mentioned in the QRP – the goal of reflecting a ‘21st Century Hertfordshire Village Character’ might be best achieved through focussing on housing typology, morphology and urban form, ideally therefore this policy, and particularly the details under criterion 1 would be replaced by further work into those areas. Thus retaining the goal, but in a slightly different way.</p>	<p>AG7 now AG6- text amended to address comments from QRP and East Herts</p> <p>Further clarification provided on key characteristics of villages and interpretation</p> <p>Text amended</p> <p>Text amended</p> <p>Text amended</p> <p>Text amended</p>	

5.76	74	<p>This policy does remain a fairly substantial concern when it comes to the NP addressing the strategic priorities so I am happy to discuss this, and assist you when you revisit this policy to ensure that it is as robust as possible whilst still addressing your aims as an NPG.</p> <p>Typo in second line 'to be ensure'</p>	Text amended Amend	
AG8	75	<p>Criterion 1, part i. is likely to be unachievable with reference to the existing communities as we are not allowed in planning law terms to make good existing deficits within existing communities. This also applies to paragraph 5.80. While new infrastructure can benefit existing communities, it is not a requirement to upgrade existing provision within settlements unless it is proven to be an unacceptable consequence arising from the development.</p> <p>I would consider rewording Criterion 1, Part ii. As I'm not sure it would operate in the way that you desire it to as currently written.</p> <p>Criterion 1, Part iii is not really necessary as this is written in planning legislation.</p>	Policy AG8 now AG9 Text amended to reflect Garden City principles and HGGT guidance Amend Delete	
AG9	77	<p>Much like the comment above relating to AG8 (1. i.), this may be a difficult policy to fully retain as it refers to the upgrading of existing infrastructure, where the impact of the GA1 development may not be unacceptable or not require mitigation.</p>	Further clarification provided	
Part B: Delivering Quality Places				
LA1	80	<p>As commented on in the introduction, this policy is another area where there is some repetition and thus the potential for conflicts and lack of clarity</p> <p>Depending upon the outcome of any re-wording to policy AG7 you may have to update Criterion 1, part i. reference to Hertfordshire village.</p> <p>Part iii. Of this criterion still refers to 'important views and connections' – as we noted in the previous response, for this to be truly effective it should identify those important views and connections.</p> <p>Part iv. When referring to Heritage features, is this existing or new? Presumably the SuDS and sports facilities are new, might be worth clarifying the Heritage features just to assist with clarity.</p> <p>Part ii. Presumably reference now to be updated to AG3 rather than AG2. I would suggest also that the policy is slightly reworded to say:</p> <p><i>"The landscape with the boundary of each village should incorporate existing and new landscape features, and any green spaces should be integrated into the Green infrastructure Network (see policy AG3) to maximise its continuity."</i></p> <p>Part iii. Policy TRA4 no longer exists. Criterion might not be needed as largely a repeat of above (could consider merging as long as clarity is still retained).</p> <p>Criterion 3; Is the second sentence missing reference to the green corridors or buffers?</p>	Text edited to avoid duplication Update to reflect changes to AG7 Important views identified in Policy AG5 and Fig.21 Amend Amend Amend Amend	

LA2	82	Again, this policy would appear to repeat areas covered beforehand. Typo; Criterion 1, Part i is not complete.	Text revised to avoid duplication	
5.96	83	The mention of Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople is noticeably absent from the document – this may be the best opportunity to mention alongside the other groups and needs.	Policy GA1 would apply and the Neighbourhood Plan does not provide any additional details. Proposals would be required to	
BU1	85	<p>Criterion 2 – my comments on this criterion still recommend that ‘genuinely affordable’ is removed as explained in our regulation 14 response.</p> <p>Criterion 3 – I’m happy that some of the very prescriptive points of the previous draft have been deleted, however I wonder whether this criterion adds anything further than the points set out in a number of previous policies? In particular policies AG4, AG5 and AG6 add more detail on the subjects discussed, the addition of this criterion doesn’t appear to add much but could take away from the clarity in the other policies.</p> <p>Criterion 4, part ii. I wonder whether referring to ‘active frontage’ instead of just frontage better captures your desire in this policy?</p> <p>Criterion 4, Part v – unfortunately this criterion as currently written, would directly prohibit the delivery of 10,000 homes and therefore conflict with the DP.</p> <p>Is Criterion 5 best placed here or in TRA1? I also wonder whether (wherever you choose to locate this criterion) reference within the policy to the Garden Town Transport Strategy might strengthen the criterion overall.</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend to direct frontages</p> <p>For discussion- unclear why this would be the case given the CDF</p> <p>Retained as parking provision has implications for design</p>	
5.107	86	It may not be appropriate that <u>only</u> the village centres are the location for employment uses, particularly as there is a role for different types of employment uses in more rural, edge locations in order to have a variety of opportunities.	Amend to preferred location	
BU2	87	<p>Criterion 3 – does this add anything extra than AG7 does? It might be worth just noting that a higher density is acceptable in village centres, rather than then cross-referencing to another policy.</p> <p>Criterion 4 – whilst I appreciate that the goal is again to reflect ‘Hertfordshire village character’ – as noted in the QRP it needs to be flexible to respond to contemporary issues – perhaps the deletion of the first sentence assists this, whilst still retaining the need to consider tall buildings through the planning process and in masterplans.</p>	<p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>	
BU3	89	<p>Criterion 2 still conflicts with Policy ED1 – it is the terminology; ‘will generally not be supported in the Gilston Area’ that is creating problems. If this could be reworded to be more positive, whilst also reflecting the criteria below it would go some way to rectifying this conflict (maybe a criterion similar to part 3 of this policy would work better).</p> <p>As with paragraph 5.107, it is important not to be too prescriptive around the location of employment uses. There will be perfectly reasonable opportunities in non-central locations where they support a more diverse type of employment offer, such as rural crafts and agricultural jobs for example.</p> <p>Typo in Criterion 3, Part iii should <u>be</u> suitably designed.</p>	<p>Amend to ensure consistency with Policy ED1</p> <p>Amend</p> <p>Amend</p>	
BU4	90	My only point on this policy is whether a cross-reference to whichever policy deals with parking standards (I say whichever policy, as I recommended potentially moving the parking criterion in Policy BU1 to TRA1). A cross-reference just ensures that there is no confusion between policy BU4 which refers to parking in a place-making context, and the other parking policy which contributes to the wider strategic aim of encouraging sustainable transport.	Amend standards may change over lifetime of plan. Reference to parking standards provided in TRA1	

H1	93	<p>Criterion 3, part ii. Again refers to key views but I cant find any that have been identified.</p> <p>Criterion 5 Have 'model farms' been defined somewhere?</p> <p>Criterion 6 is very vague, whilst it is similar to criterion 3, part i. which refers to improvement through an 'appropriate layout'; this policy states that appreciation and understanding should be promoted through 'village design and incorporation of appropriate references'. I'm not completely sure what that would mean...</p>	<p>Details of views provided in AG5 and Fig 21</p> <p>Definition provided</p> <p>Amend to provide further clarity-</p>	
C1	95	<p>On reading part iii. Of this policy it seems to only repeat what the first two parts say. I would consider whether it really does add anything additional, if it doesn't – consider deleting.</p>	<p>Amend to avoid duplication</p>	
C2	97	<p>I believe that part ii. Of this policy is already being reviewed in light of what the QRP said and our discussion at the meeting prior to the QRP. I'm happy to continue to discuss this. There may need to be an acknowledgement that there will need to be a community in situ to maybe take on the task of representing the community in some form.</p>	<p>C2 now moved to Delivery and Implementation as Policy D2 and further clarification provided</p>	
TRA1	100	<p>Typo in critterion 1, part i. reference should be; '<u>Harlow and Gilston</u> Garden Town Transport Strategy'. I wonder also whether it might be worth saying '...and any subsequent update to this' just to improve the longevity of the policy should the HGGTTS change or be updated.</p>	<p>Amend</p>	
5.145	99	<p>3rd bullet is not complete.</p>	<p>Amend</p>	
TRA2	102	<p>Part ii. Refers to layouts being open and permeable – does this conflict with AG7's policy criterion on narrow streets?</p> <p>Criterion 2, part iii. Refers to TRA4 which no longer exists.</p>	<p>Policy TRA2 deleted to avoid duplication</p>	
TRA2, TRA3 and EX1	102, 103 and 105	<p>As highlighted in my general comments – because so much ground has been covered by the previous policies it devalues what these policies are trying to achieve. In some cases these policies are nearly identical in their wording to previous policies and their criterion, in some cases they are close to, but not identical and this could create confusion. I would revisit all of the policies to see whether there are conflicts and repetition, where they are I would consider deleting the repetition or condense and focus the policy to cover only the purpose you want it to. It only needs to do it once, not multiple times.</p>	<p>Amend to avoid duplication and ensure consistency. TRA2 deleted</p>	
EX1	105	<p>As noted in our comments to Policy AG9 the gains for existing communities may in some cases not be necessary to make the planning application acceptable, and therefore the criterion is unlikely to comply with CIL Regulations.</p>	<p>Further clarification provided</p>	
6.6	107	<p>Worth specifying that Policy DES1 is of the East Herts DP.</p>	<p>Amend</p>	

Hunsdon, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group

Notes of meetings on NP with Landowners on NPv2

28.02.20

1 With Briggens Estate 1 at 33 Margaret St W1 11-12.30

Present

Frank O'Shea and Janine Bryant HENPG

Martina Juvara and Joanna Chambers Urban Silence

Will Lusty Savills and Chris Lovegrove BE1

Update of present position of NP and planned steps to get it passes by September target.

Discussion of points arising on Savills' responses to the NPv1 in Reg 14 consultations;

General appreciation of most amendments made or to be made.

Main points of difference remaining are:

- Content and detail of Parameter plans over policy in NP
- Village Character -NP is too prescriptive
- Phasing and Delivery of Infrastructure-S106 should be the place to deal with delivery and trigger points-there are commercial aspects; we put onus on developer to demonstrate how it meets the needs of existing and future residents in a development of this size.

Briggens Estate Comment

NP RESPONSE

After being invited to submit further comments, they subsequently emailed to say *"By way of follow up and as discussed, there are instances where you have proposed amendments which seek to address our comments and these are noted and welcomed.*

However, you will appreciate that we continue to have a number of key concerns, as per our submitted representations and maintain that our proposed amendments to the Plan, as per our representations, will be necessary in order for those concerns to be addressed

Support for changes included in revised NP noted and welcome.

Response to previous concerns and representations included in Reg. 14 - Statutory Consultees

2. With Quod at their offices London W1 1pm -3.45

Present

Frank O’Shea and Janine Bryant and Anthony Bickmore HENPG

Martina Juvara and Joanna Chambers Urban Silence

Rachel Godfrey of Quod and James Anderson of PFP

Update of present position of NP and planned steps to get it passed by September target.

Discussion of points RG wanted to raise from their responses to NPv1 . She was looking for clarification of some issues ; reiterated that PFP val

- Duplication with the DP discussed- but see the CF too and don’t underestimate its importance/relevance
- Village and Landscape Masterplans-how did NP fit in? all seeking the same process as now in draft Charter- Landscape led as in both CF ar
- A number of points of detail and questions from RG to allay concern that NP might not align with the DP or the CF or the draft Charter.
- Local Green spaces-justification? Conflict? Too restrictive might prevent ancillary use on Airfield -but see wording which should address h
- Floodlighting of sports grounds?

Employment use in Vill 1-6 they have been told to provide another 29200 sq. m. and gypsy /traveler sites. What is our policy in light of this?

They will report back to PFP and aim to let us have written of points for further consideration within 2 weeks.

Quod Subsequent Note of Further Comments on behalf of Places for People 31.03.20

GILSTON AREA NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN: COMMENTS ON DRAFT 2.1 ON BEHALF OF PLACES FOR PEOPLE

GENERAL COMMENT

National planning policy and guidance is clear that the role and function of neighbourhood plans is to support strategic policies. As a result one
The draft GANP explains that the intent behind the emerging document is to take the agreement reached by the Council, developer and comm
In continuing to prepare the GANP we need to make sure that the GANP is consistent with the Concept Framework as well as GA1 to not under

GANP Draft Policy	PFP Comment and Implication for GPE
Policy AG1, criterion 1(v)	Policy AG1 talks about a ‘predominance of the landscape setting and character over the built area’ – ie emphasis over landscape rather the policy requirement for 10,000 homes set within the landscape. The District Plan and Concept Framework (CF) talk about delivering 10,000 homes in a ‘landscape led’ approach – this should be reflected in draft Policy AG1.

Policy AG1, criterion 2(iv), Policy AG8, Policy AG9

Repeated reference to infrastructure addressing the existing needs of the community as well as new residents – national guidance does not require that the scheme pick up existing community infrastructure deficiencies

Policy AG2, criterion 1(i)

Policy AG2 seeks new road design to ‘avoid severance of existing settlements and damage to rural/village character’, and deliver no significant increase in heavy vehicle movement – this is potentially at odds with Policy GA2 and the delivery of the Eastern Stort Crossing

Policy AG3, criterion 3 and figure 13 (referenced as 12 in policy)

Policy AG3 seeks the designation of 12 Local Green Spaces, some of which potentially conflict with the development proposals

Policy AG4, criterion 1 and 8	Policy AG4 sets a test of visual impact on the landscape. It has been acknowledged through the District Plan process that the introduction of 10,000 homes will have a visual impact on the landscape, but this was outweighed by other factors and it was noted that mitigation should be introduced on the village boundaries. It also requires village buffers to comprise 'fields and woodland blocks' which is not consistent with the District Plan or CF
Policy AG5, criterion 2	Policy AG5 seeks the termination of leases of 'existing non-conforming uses'
Policy AG6, criterion 1 and figure 18	Policy AG6 sets Community Boundaries where buildings and settlements are to be protected – however, the boundaries drawn cause conflict with the District Plan and CF specifically around the Eastern Stort Crossing and St Mary's Church.
Policy AG7, paragraph 5.66, bullet 8	Supporting text to AG7 refers to typical heights of 2 storeys

Policy AG7	AG7 expands the intent of the CF to suggest that the scale of buildings should draw inspiration from the existing surrounding villages, when the CF instead says the morphology and character of the new villages should take inspiration from the existing villages
Policy BU1, criterion 3(ii) and (iii), paragraphs 5.98 to 5.100	Policy BU1 and the supporting text suggest/imply that the average gross and net densities of 15 and 33 dph (as set out in the CF) should be applied as maximum densities. This is inconsistent with the CF.
General	The document states it is based on evidence used as part of the District Plan and Concept Framework processes, however, in many cases different policy approaches are taken which are not evidentially based

ID	SPECIFIC POLICY	COMMENT	RESPONSE	NP CHANGED?
1	General	The Council's previous comments on this policy noted that the main issue was the implementation of the term 'Hertfordshire Village Character'. Our comments were echoed by the QRP's, who suggested that any such term would need to be defined within the context of the 21st Century and also in the context of delivering Policy GA1.	The community felt that the reference to Hertfordshire villages was a reasonable assumption to make as 'local character' is referred in the Concept Framework and HGGT guidance. It also refers to context sensitive design. However, it understands that local villages are very small and that, if interpreted literally the reference could be restrictive. The title of Policy has therefore been changed to omit reference to Hertfordshire Villages and wording amended to make clear that existing villages to be used as design cues and need to meet current design standards and make best use of innovation and technology	Yes
2	General	The expectation was that the updated policy would seek to bring in elements and examples of village character that would be suitable for Policy GA1 to draw inspiration from and critically, would also work in the context of delivering modern sustainability objectives. With that in mind, elements of this policy are still in conflict with the points referred to in the first paragraph and do not achieve the expectations of the second. Particularly in reference to the term 'Hertfordshire Village Character' where the definition hasn't been suitably amended or explained to provide comfort that GA1 could still be delivered.	Reference to Hertfordshire villages removed. Appendix 4 was intended to bring in elements and examples of village character that would be suitable for new development to draw inspiration from. The NP assumes that developers would be better placed to reinterpret the elements of local character into current design and sustainability standards. The text and appendices have been revised to provide further clarity and make it clear that new villages to draw inspiration from characteristics of existing villages whilst delivering overall strategic aims of Policy GA1	Partly
3	Appendix 4	The appendices, although helpful in defining characteristics of what is meant when referring to Hertfordshire Village Character, generally only highlight the key characteristics of existing villages and how these characteristics are good examples of a typical Hertfordshire village.	This was the intention - to leave designers free to interpret local character in new designs. Explanation added regarding purpose of Appendix 2 and how this is to be used.	Partly

4	General	<p>The key point here is remembering that whilst the Gilston development is expected to deliver a series of <i>distinct</i> villages, they are garden villages and <i>not</i> traditional villages. If they were to take the form, layout and character of the Hertfordshire villages referred to in the supporting appendices, the strategic objective of Policy GA1 would not be met.</p>	<p>The NP considers that the 10 elements of local character describe the morphology and character of local villages (i.e. what is intended as soft edges, variety, etc) without being prescriptive about how the new villages are to be designed. The policy asks for demonstration of the extent by which the development has been 'informed' by these elements.</p> <p>The policy does not prevent local distinctiveness (as the examples are drawn from diverse local villages) and does not prevent reinterpretation to meet strategic aims. Text adapted to provide clarification and to make clear that development will need to meet the overall aims of Policy GA1. The term garden villages has not been used in Policy GA1, the Gilston Area Concept Framework or the HGGT Vision and Design Guide and it is considered inconsistent to introduce it in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Partly
5	para 194	<p>184 – the principle was established for accommodating 'distinct' villages not 'individual' new villages. There is an important difference between distinct (recognisably different) and individual (single or separate) and perhaps this is creating some issues within this area. This is later recognised in the following two paragraphs but should be clarified in the first.</p>	Text changed	Yes
6	para 198	<p>189 – whilst I appreciate that density and building heights are clearly a key issue for the Neighbourhood Plan Group, the neighbourhood plan should recognise the benefits to increased density and building heights where appropriate across the GA1 development.</p>	<p>The NP Policy AG6 (1) recognises the need for 'best balance' between height, density and open space. The community does not support heights and densities that could lead to urban / suburban style of development, when delivery of villages has been promoted.</p>	No
7	para 190	<p>190 – Only part of the HGGT Vision definition of a 'village' is included in this paragraph, the whole quote should be included to ensure this is not taken out of its context.</p>	Section expanded	Yes

8	para 191	191 – The first sentence should be reworded as it doesn't accurately reflect a summary of the policy and guidance documents. It would be more appropriate to refer to new designs taking cues from existing assets both man-made and natural. New designs can't be appropriate to an existing villages morphology as the context is entirely different.	First sentence reworded to include encouragement of contemporary design criteria and sustainability standards. The identified elements of local character are not necessarily in contradiction with new design. Flexibility is confirmed by statements like: 'being informed by', 'taking cues from', 'drawing inspiration from'.	Partly
9	AG6 Title	Policy AG6: The title refers to Hertfordshire Village Character – and not as an updated definition or in the context of delivering a strategic site allocation as suggested through previous comments. Consider deleting and instead having the title; 'Securing Distinct Character in the Garden Villages' POLICY AG6 – Securing Hertfordshire Village Character in the Design of the New Garden Villages	Policy title changed to remove reference to Hertfordshire Villages but reference to 'Garden Villages' is inappropriate as it is not referred to in Policy GA1, in Concept Framework or in HGGT guidance. The new villages form part of the HGGT which is a single 'Garden Town' initiative not separate entities. The Garden City principles will apply to the design of the new village (as they would to individual Garden Villages) and this is clearly referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan. Title amended to (Creating New Villages with a distinct and Locally Inspired Character'	Partly
10	Policy AG6: Part 1	Policy AG6: Part 1 – talks about masterplan preparation – Policy DES1 of the District Plan and in the Gilston Area Charter already set out the masterplan process which involves extensive community engagement and collaboration. Delete reference to masterplanning. 1. Proposals for the new Villages should clearly demonstrate that the best possible balance has been achieved between landscape, village separation, mass and density and agreed as part of a Village Masterplan prepared in collaboration with the local community the overall delivery of the aims of Policy GA1 in the District Plan, which together:	overall delivery of the aims of Policy GA1' added. Reference to Village Masterplans as the stage where the 'best balance' is explored is retained as it provides clarity as to when this is to be achieved (reference to this is not included in Policy GA1 and DES1 is a general policy)	Partly

11	Policy AG6: Part 1, Cri	<p>Policy AG6: Part 1, Criterion iii. links density to general village form and layout – considering village form has been defined via the appendices and the appendices only refers to existing Hertfordshire villages this would not allow the delivery of Policy GA1. Delete reference to ‘village form and layout’ and instead use ‘...the objectives of each distinct village’.</p> <p>iii. Provides a range of densities and building heights which are appropriate to the objectives of each distinct village village form and layout.</p> <p>iv. Creates garden villages of distinct character</p> <p>iv. Delivers the development allocation identified in Policy GA1 of the District Plan.</p>	<p>Criterion iii (now iv) - amended as suggested</p> <p>Criterion iv (included as ii) - included but without reference to Garden Villages (see item 9 above)</p> <p>Criterion iv - incorporated in Point 1 for clarity and removed from the list</p>	Yes
12	Policy AG6: Part 2;	<p>Policy AG6: Part 2; Again, direct link to a ‘typical Hertfordshire village layout and character’ which in order for the strategic priorities of Policy GA1 to be met, this policy simply wouldn’t allow it. Delete ‘...typical Hertfordshire village layout and character...’</p> <p>2. Village Masterplans should demonstrate how the design of the new village has been informed by an analysis of typical Hertfordshire village layout and character and of its relationship with the landscape and existing heritage assets to create an distinct individual village character. This should as far as possible be reflected in:</p>	<p>Text amended - Point 2 rephrased. Reference retained to drawing inspiration from existing villages in the Gilston Area and elsewhere in Hertfordshire</p>	Partly
13	Policy AG6: Criterion i	<p>Policy AG6: Criterion i. potentially conflicts with other NP policies (albeit I haven’t seen the subsequent drafts) which refers in places to wooded spaces. Consider deleting reference to ‘open’ land.</p> <p>i. Clear visual integration with the countryside, with direct views over open land separating the villages and the retention of pockets of natural greenspace within the village boundary.</p>	<p>Text changed to 'rural landscape' to include fields, semi-natural land and wooded places. This is consistent with other policies. Term of 'land' on its own too vague</p>	Yes
14	Policy AG6: Criterion 4	<p>Policy AG6: Criterion 4 – this policy should be reworded to focus only on the Gilston Area being distinguishable from Harlow but not refer to its ‘predominantly urban character’ as the Gilston Area development will have urban functions given its scale.</p> <p>4. The character, built form and morphology of the new villages should be clearly distinguishable from the predominantly urban character and character and built form of the wider Harlow area.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	Yes

15	Policy AG6:	Policy AG6: One area that is notably absent in any particular detail is reference to prominent materials or architectural styles – this is a key component of creating distinct character and an area where the NP could be influential without directly impacting upon the delivery of a strategic site.	This policy (AG group) is about the morphology and masterplan of the Gilston area. Material and architectural styles are matters of detail. Reference to local material is included in policy BU1.	Yes in policy BU1
16	Appendix 4			
18	A4.1:	A4.1: Policy HOU2 does state a lower net density in villages, but Policy GA1 is a strategic site and not a village so that statement has taken on the wrong context.	Text amended	Yes
19	A4.1:	A4.1: The HGGT Vision does indicate that housing densities will be broadly between 20 and 55 dph; however it does not indicate a preference for Gilston. Likewise, Gilston is not going to be a village, it is a series of Garden Villages and so this extract should only be presented factually not with an assumption on density.	Text amended. Reference is also made to density in the Gilston Area Concept Framework which is a material consideration	Yes
20	A4.2	A4.2: All examples presented only note the existing character of historic villages and not their relevance or suitability to a strategic site such as Gilston or modern sustainability goals.	Intro changed to provide greater clarity	Yes
21	A4.3	A4.3: Street character – Whilst I agree with the overarching principle of low traffic speeds and shared use. There is potential conflict between the examples here and those in the HGGT Vision and the aspired mode share targets, which prioritise pedestrians and cyclists. For example, “narrow footpaths” on High Streets are highlighted, which is not necessarily a design cue we would want to encourage. Could this section focus more about other elements of street character? Enclosure/frontage/views/landscape treatments/lighting etc.	Text amended	Yes
22	A4.4	A4.4: Arrival into village; I note a preference for a foreground of fields on arrival. I do not think this is a realistic aspiration for the garden villages, and instead landmark buildings on entry to a garden village may be a more desirable trait, especially in terms of legibility.	The community has strong preference for soft edges and landscaped fringes, as a trait of local character. This would need to be addressed at the masterplanning stage. The HGGT Design Guide also refers to greater fragmentation at the edge to respond to the landscape setting.	No

23	A4.4	A4.4: View of the countryside from the heart of the village; much like the above this section will be tested in the different context of a garden village, and may prove to be unrealistic.	The word 'occasional' added. The visual interaction between countryside and built areas is very important and it can be addressed through attentive masterplanning, as it does not necessarily require significant landtake (as it does not in local villages at present). This will be influenced by existing landscape features and topography.	Partly
24	A4.7	A4.7: Village edges, “inappropriate urban edges” – there are likely to be instances when a more rural form to the village edge will work best, and equally instances when a more urban form to a village edge will work best – I am particularly thinking in terms of ensuring passive surveillance along aspects of the village boundaries with public access (which is not typical in a Hertfordshire village).	Inspiration notes added. Urban edges should be typically considered inappropriate towards the open countryside. Passive surveillance should not require compact, repetitive frontages. The distinction between more intense village centres and greater fragmentation at the edges to respond to landscape settings is referenced in the HGGT Design Guide.	No. Notes added.
25	A4.7	A4.7: Furthermore, it is likely that a combination of solutions would be acceptable throughout the site. For example the interaction between new villages and existing villages would need a softer, lower and more informal approach, as would new village edges with the wider countryside. New village edges that overlook internal public open space and face other new village edges would have a need for active frontages and could be treated differently.	These are matters of detailed solutions for specific locations to be addressed in consultation with the community at Masterplanning stage. Softer edges and integration with the landscape setting are nevertheless a characteristic of villages.	No. Notes added.
26	A4.9	A4.9: Landmark buildings isolated from the village; we may want landmark buildings at the heart of the garden villages, as well as in various other locations to be designed through a collaborative masterplanning process. In addition, there will be the various historic landmark buildings isolated from the villages, particularly Gilston Park House, so this is not a particular reason to create new isolated landmark buildings.	Note added to clarify suggestions and inspiration	Yes

27	A4.10	A4.10: Building heights; it is noted that there are typical heights found within Hertfordshire villages, but this is a point in which the garden villages will differ significantly from Hertfordshire village character.	Policy AG6 requires the identification of the 'best balance' between, height, density and landscape. The community feels very strongly that village character is related to careful heights. Assuming that the future villages will surely require significant deviation from local character contradicts the Concept Framework and pre-empts exploration of the 'best balance' advocated by the NP. This is a matter for determination at the village masterplanning stage and it is premature to determine at this stage.	No. Note added.
28	Conclusions	Conclusion: If the objective of this policy is to draw on features of village character for use across GA1, then any updated policy should seek to highlight the elements and examples of village character that could be suitable for the new development to draw inspiration from. But critically these elements need to work in the context of the delivery of Policy GA1 and also modern sustainability objectives.	Additional clarification added to ensure that the element of local character are more easily relatable to future design and do not compromise delivery of Policy GA1	Yes

TYPE OF CONSULTEE	SECTION	POLICIES	SUPPORT
Local resident	Introduction	AG1	Yes
Local business / activity	Policy Framework	AG2	No
Landowner/ developer	Local Context	AG3	Change required
Statutory consultee	Vision and Objectives	AG4	
Elected representative	Policies	AG5	
	Implementation and Delivery	AG6	
	Monitoring and Review	AG7	
	Appendices	AG8	
		AG9	
		AG General	
		LA1	
		LA2	
		BU1	
		BU2	
		BU3	
		BU4	
		BU General	
		H1	
		C1	
		C2	
		TRA1	
		TRA2	
		TRA3	
		TRA4	
		TRA General	
		EX1	