

**Concept Framework community event led by Landowners - Summary of comments received (August 2017)**

| <b>Gilston Concept Framework Consultation- Summary of Responses (exhibition event at Manor Groves Hotel on the 5<sup>th</sup> August)</b> |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Issue Number</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   |
| What are your views on the overall vision for the Gilston Area outlined within the Concept Framework?                                     |  |
|   | There is a lack of employment provision on the site and very little consideration of job creation.   |
|   | The proposal is unsustainable with regards to infrastructure.  |
|   | The area will lose its character.  |
|   | The villages will be estates separated by a small amount of green space, this will encourage anti-social behaviour.                              |
|   | The proposal is poorly designed and there is no real thinking as to what a village is.   |
|   | Opposition to development on land that is currently designated Green Belt.   |
|   | This proposed development is solely landowner driven.  |
|   | Countryside will be destroyed forever.   |
|   | If this site resulted in less development in villages it would be welcomed but this is not the case.   |
|   | The scale of development is too high.  |
|   | New homes are needed especially affordable ones.   |
|   | Local people should be offered housing on this site at reduced costs.  |
|   | This is not a suitable location for development.   |
|   | The site is too far away from the main sewage works.   |
|   | Thousands of people will move from London to the Gilston Area.   |
|   | This part of the country is the driest part of the country.  |
|   | The concept framework is well designed.  |
|   | Concern that the development will be high density, housing will have small front gardens and footpaths will be narrow.                           |
|   | Support for the village concept and the protection of green space around the periphery of the site.  |
|   | Development will be a large suburb of Harlow to the detriment of Hertfordshire villages.   |
|   | Who will fund the road improvements?   |
|   | The scale of development is excessive.   |
| What are your views on the Framework's proposals for transport investment to support development at the Gilston Area?                     |  |
|   | Traffic is a major concern.  |
|   | Rail capacity is a major concern.  |
|   | The funding for transport has not been thoroughly explored.  |
|   | The second River Stort crossing has not been defined.  |
|   | There is no investment planned in Harlow station.  |
|   | Places for People explained that the vision is for the new population to work in Harlow, not commute to London, how will this happen?            |
|   | There is no transport plan.  |
|   | Very little thought of the people travelling from Gilston to work in Bishop's Stortford, the roads in High Wych and Allens Green could not cope. |
|   | The A1184 through Sawbridgeworth cannot cope.  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Traffic will be directed onto the A414 causing a major problem.   |
|   | The roads in and out of Harlow are gridlocked.  |
|   | Bus services in Harlow are poor.  |
|   | Re-routing the A414 so that it joins the M11 without going through Harlow is long overdue.  |
|   | There is a need for north side access to Harlow Town station.   |
|   | Burnt Mill Lane needs to have pedestrian walks.   |
|   | The Eastwick roundabout is too busy, pressure on it needs to be relieved.   |
|   | There is no public transport planned from Gilston into London.  |
|   | Road links to the new Junction 7a on the M11 are needed as soon as possible.  |
|   | Very pleased with the duelling of the bridge and the new bridge.  |
|   | Road and rail links must be improved before development proceeds.   |
|   | Current problems have not been addressed.   |
| What are your views on the Framework's proposals relating to landscape and safeguarding local heritage within the Gilston Area? |   |
|   | There will be a detrimental impact on the landscape.  |
|   | Heritage assets in the area will be destroyed.  |
|   | The risk of flooding will increase.   |
|   | There is no information regarding how the historic Gilston Park will be enhanced.   |
|   | The Grade 1 Listed Churches are poorly integrated as is the historic garden landscape of Gilston Park.  |
|   | The proposed 7 villages are an ugly urban sprawl.   |
|   | The proposed design of buildings will provide no sympathy for the views of the historic Gilston Church.   |
|   | Fields, woodlands and footpaths will be lost.   |
|   | Gilston and Eastwick villages will be absorbed by the extent of development.  |
|   | Preservation of buffer areas is greatly welcomed, but how long will this last?  |
| What are your views on the Framework's proposals for community facilities as part of development at the Gilston Area?           |   |
|   | There is not enough detail on community facilities. It is questioned how these facilities will be managed.  |
|   | There is a shortage of GP surgeries in the area. They will become oversubscribed.   |
|   | The budget is not adequate to provide leisure centres.  |
|   | To speak off community facilities is misleading.  |
|   | The Princess Alexandra Hospital is in special measures and cannot cope.   |
|   | The community facilities need to be in place before the houses.   |
|   | The schools will need to accommodate the current population and the new population. Current plans for schooling are not enough.                         |
|   | Nurseries are needed.   |
|   | It is questioned where the funding will come from.  |
| What are your views on the Framework's proposals for open parkland and green spaces?  |   |
|   | Opposition to development on agricultural land.   |
|   | The concept suggests 7 villages but fails to use the landscape to provide separation.   |
|   | It is questioned who will own and manage the green space to ensure it will remain.  |
|   | Open parkland and green spaces would disappear.   |
|   | The barn owl population will vanish if urban development is allowed.  |
|   | There is green space surrounding each village, which is the result of natural evolution of the communities. Parkland within housing development is very |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | different. Housing should be confined to within the village boundaries.   |
|  | The heritage and community facilities are being safeguarded through the proposal.   |
|  | The plans show plenty of planned parkland and green spaces but will this be adhered to.   |
| <b>What are your views on the proposed governance arrangements for the Gilston Area?</b> |   |
|  | Governance arrangements need to be discussed in more detail with the community.   |
|  | Governance arrangements are wholly inadequate, the community have asked for clarification but none has been forthcoming. Local community governance needs to be determined. |
|  | Governance would need to be organised by local residents not by East Herts Council.   |
|  | More detailed information is required as to how this will be operated. The 60% transferred to the community is not fully explained.   |
| <b>Do you have any further comments?</b>   |   |
|  | The consultations so far have not been widely advertised. The community were not adequately notified.   |
|  | The Framework has been around for nearly a year and the Council have waited until just before the EIP for a consultation.   |
|  | If development is needed by Harlow and Epping these authorities should provide the land.  |
|  | The exhibition was deliberately in August when many people are away.  |
|  | This may impact the value of my home.   |
|  | The maps were very difficult to relate to.  |
|  | What are the proposals for drainage?  |