

**Hunsdon, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group meeting with East Herts Steering Group 25<sup>th</sup> October 2017**

Topic	Group Lead and key points	Things we might agree?
Intro	<p>Lead Anthony</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Vast amount of work in this, helpful to have support from Urban Silence in bringing it together – thank you</li> <li>○ Linda’s statement is helpful and provides reassurance at strategic level</li> <li>○ We still do not want this but if it is to happen then it will be a path finder as Villages separated from but part of a Garden Town</li> <li>○ We continue to stand by our commitment made on October 2016 to work with you to develop a scheme (despite our loathing of it) but feel that our views are not being heard</li> <li>○ Colleagues are going to introduce the sections of the presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ That EH, as the relevant planning authority, will find an enhanced way of working with the community to develop these proposals.</li> <li>✓ That we can all acknowledge that what is being proposed is something new in urban design terms so needs the best in class experts with suitable experience to work on it to deliver Linda’s aspirations?</li> <li>✓</li> </ul>
1	<p><b>Procedural Issues</b></p> <p>Lead Bob?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ EH’s policy is clear that the master plan should be prepared in consultation with the community – it has not been done; that needs remedying</li> <li>○ Key point is that we need to agree the Vision, develop a Master plan and from that a CDF; this seems to us and everyone we talk to the logical approach – East Herts have not done this, there is much helpful work that can support this.</li> <li>○ The community, as the predecessor of what might become a significant community within East Herts needs to be engaged and we cannot be given the run around with multiple consultations without proper planning and resourcing – the point about expertise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ That the approach of Vision, master plan, CDF is a logical one</li> <li>✓ That the (to be appointed Director) will be in charge with producing a paper setting out a programme for this which allows for suitable community consultation</li> <li>✓ Resourcing (skills/cash) to make this meaningful</li> </ul>
2	<p><b>Vision</b></p> <p>Lead – Mark?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Restate point that the concept as 7 villages working in conjunction with Harlow but separated from it is a new (nothing wrong with that ) concept but appears to us to be stated more carefully</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ We agree that the concept is ‘new’ and is 7 villages with distinct ‘beings’ (so proper separation)</li> <li>✓ We agree that the build impacts need to be mitigated both now and</li> </ul>

	<p>so we are all clear about what this means – that is why the Linda proclamation is helpful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We cannot have a Vision which does not recognize the existing community alongside the incremental nature of the project over say 35 years so it needs to provide reassurance as to how the works will be undertaken – a point we lead with in October last year...but nothing has been said in response.</li> <li>○ The CLT idea is a good one for community assets – we agreed this last year but the only clarification statement we have had since then is that it will be set up in 35 years time, that feels like a joke in very bad taste. We, with respect, do not believe that EH are the right people to run this given your flexibility on Green Belt and there should be some for of parish and town governance – we tried to model this in January and are waiting to have a response – this does not ignore Harlow; it can work with is but is at its source a Hertfordshire matter?</li> <li>○ The A &amp; M Vision work is helpful although we have picked up that they have been discouraged from fully engaging with the Gilston elements (ie the 10,000 out of the 16,000 new homes – that seems the wrong approach)</li> <li>○ The work done to date is helpful as starting point</li> </ul>	<p>into the future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ We agree that A &amp; M should be encouraged and reassured that they are expected to fully embrace Gilston in developing their ideas and any suggestions that they are constrained by the CDF should be rebuffed</li> <li>✓ Full information on how a CLT might be operated from the outset and developed to manage assets as a “Town council’ for the [7] villages</li> </ul>
3	<p><b>Structure</b></p> <p>Lead Janine/Bernadette?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reverts, at its core to separate villages not an urban extension so points like</li> <li>○ Softer edges</li> <li>○ Separation</li> <li>○ While denser in the center not 7 storey</li> <li>○ Range of commercial uses to be accommodated</li> <li>○ The car needs designing in with care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ These areas need a rethink as concepts before the detail in the CDF can be addressed?</li> <li>✓ That the aim is ‘villages’ and not urban extensions</li> <li>✓ That the community are involved in the evolution of this work</li> <li>✓ The development of these ideas is complex and breaking new ground so we need people with the right expertise and experience to support this work</li> </ul>
4	<p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Lead Sarah?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We understand that the Inspector is asking for more work on the key</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ EH will share with us their</li> </ul>

	<p>infrastructure needs to be completed this Friday – clearly we await that and look forward to seeing it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CFD talks about aspirations and not what will be delivered - it should cover this better</li> <li>○ We accept that the infrastructure need to think about the up to 30,000 people the scheme might accommodate but 6 lane roads do not feel like the answer = need to rework?</li> <li>○ In this day and age we cannot accept a new A road dividing our present communities – there needs to be a serious re think on that which is just an indication of the issues within the CDF</li> <li>○ We understand the sustainability points but feel that the car will be with us for many years – the issues have not been developed well within the CDF</li> </ul>	<p>suggested infrastructure assessment – we should be given access to an independent advisor to review (not duplicate) this work – it is technical by its nature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ The CDF needs to talk about what will be delivered not aspirations which might be watered down by subsequent landowners/developers</li> <li>✓ The identified deficits need remedying before development starts so we are not adding fuel to a fire already out of control</li> <li>✓ Careful review of clashes such as outside Terlings (to include assessing the scheme against other problems like Gilston Lane) needs to be undertaken and acknowledged</li> </ul>
5	<p><b>Governance</b> Lead Mike/Anthony</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The long term needs looking at - we tried to do that in January in response to the request that we do so – we have had no response from East Herts, as proposed this will be 7 new villages working with a cluster of other land separated from but in close proximity to Harlow in Essex; in aggregate it will be a community of c. 30,000 people so of a significant scale to merit its own governance and sub governance as communities</li> <li>○ The CDF as a concept is underpinned by Land Value capture, without that existing residents will have to pay through the Community Charge; we have asked since January for details of how this will work and that it is enough to cover the infrastructure necessitated by the proposals but have heard nothing more – why?</li> <li>○ CLT again we have asked but had no information on what this will cover the only thing we have been told is that it will be in place in 35 years time = unacceptable. As the predecessor community we believe we should have control rather than East Herts or Developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ A response to our proposal on governance and the long term management to the communities that might be created will be provided within[ ]</li> <li>✓ Details of the land value capture etc will be provided within say [ ] months</li> <li>✓ Details of the CLT will be provided with [ ] months</li> </ul>
6	<p><b>Local Issues</b></p>	

	<p>Lead Janine/Sarah?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Eastern crossing details</li> <li>○ War memorials and other historic attributes which can lead to distinctiveness have been ignored</li> <li>○ Sport pitches are excellent but are shown in the wrong concept – take a look at other villages sports field Hatfield Heath's cricket ground</li> <li>○ The ghastly crescent</li> <li>○ Get the existing details right – buy a new copy of the base plan rather than use one which is incorrect</li> <li>○ Get the Row network correct and plan what new RoW's will be created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ East Herts as Planning authority will, if the scheme proceeds, undertake to bring in or acquire relevant expertise to create CFD and from that parameter plans which acknowledge the local history and current state and seek to enhance it not steam roll it out of existence – (link back to Linda's statement)</li> </ul>
7	<p><b>Next Steps</b></p> <p>Lead Anthony</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ We all support Linda's statement but feel that is not being offered to us</li> <li>○ Simply a vast amount in all of this, we need to distinguish the strategic issues from the detail</li> <li>○ We need the expertise to take this forward assuming it is going forward; both for us and East Herts – this is new territory for planning</li> <li>○ We need a programme which allows for sensible community engagement – we have not had that, especially since the duplicate consultations were launched when we should have been preparing for the EiP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ We need assurance from East Herts that they will consult (currently we believe that we are getting lip service to consultation – what have we heard back from the planning dept.... we of course recognize that they have a 'day job' and made that point in January so it is new resources for the complexity of what you, not us are proposing)</li> <li>✓ DCLG need to be approached to get pathfinder funding for the community</li> <li>✓ We need to agree how we will work going forward – the last year has been useful but if the project is to go forward then we need to look at the refresh button?</li> </ul>