

**REVISED DRAFT GILSTON AREA CONCEPT FRAMEWORK
(DECEMBER 2017)
SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND OUTPUTS FROM COMMUNITY
WORKSHOP
Gilston Village Hall, 20 January 2018**

1. Q&A SESSION

	Question	Response
Q1	How will output from workshop be used?	NPG will log comments and submit to EHDC and developers for response. Agreed that procedures need to be established for community engagement going forward
Q2	How will community engagement be funded in future? The Council is getting funding but not the NPG	Mary Parsons (MP) responded that PFP will continue to put in resources to ensure community have necessary support. Urban Silence work on CDF coming to an end but PFP will consider what is appropriate next. Will consider funding other specialist support but not legal advice. Wants to promote a different way of working and more joint working. The NPG will work through the Steering Group to identify work/ resources required in relation to outline planning application and village masterplans. Community can direct comments to Steering group and minutes of meetings are published. More regular dialogue is proposed with the PFP team
Q3	Relocation of Princess Alexandra Hospital within the development area. Does it work with garden Village concept?	Adam Halford (AH) responded that Council will work with Hospital to identify an appropriate location- more will be known in March. East Herts need to support hospital- understand needs and impact of proposals on Gilston. Could be a different form of provision. NPG view that regional hospital not appropriate in village community. MP advised that PFP had met hospital and will support new hospital- but not appropriate in villages: will assist in looking at options. Could be a different built form- scale/ campus layout: has to respect location
Q4	Capacity of sewage infrastructure and Rye Meads	NPG have raised issue. MP acknowledged need to demonstrate capacity and investment for Gilston and other development in area and advised this would be addressed in Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Need to be mindful of planned improvements
Q5	Progress of Eastern Crossing and acquisition of land	MP advised that Eastern Crossing would be a detailed application. PFP looking at detailed design and will undertake consultation on options as separate exercise after CDF. PFP mindful that they don't want to confuse consultations and have held back consultation on Eastern Crossing. Will decide through Steering group when this will take place. Recognised that owners need to be consulted. AB commented that running A road through community does not square with good places. Need to confirm 'conditions precedent' before development happens.

Q6	Highways Strategy and impacts on wider network not addressed- has access to Sawbridgeworth, Bishops Stortford, impact on Redricks Lane been looked at?	MP responded that transport team is looking at impacts on full network- understanding how people currently move. Extensive work being undertaken with HCC and ECC- diagram in CDF does not identify all routes but work is being undertaken. Nothing yet produced but happy to share this with community.
Q7	What percentage of the Metropolitan Green Belt will be built on?	No specific figures available but AH/MP confirmed this is not a matter for CDF but part of the Local Plan process. East Herts have concluded that there are exceptional circumstances for removal of land from Green Belt. Sarah Bagnall commented that diagram in CDF showing areas where Green belt will be released needs to be reviewed to ensure compliance with the District Plan.
Q8	Impact of eastern Crossing on Terlings Park- in particular land take, impact on children's play area and air quality	MP confirmed this would be part o consultation on revised options: detailed work brought forward to allow these issues to be addressed
Q9	CDF is silent on maintenance of green spaces- establishment of Community Trust/CIC needs to be enshrined in document	MP drew attention to p140- advised that CDF seeks to simplify approach but accepted that some further detail was required. Explained that form of legal trust needs to be determined- will take ownership of parks and assets to give community control. Trust will have responsibility for management and maintenance but nees to be planned and phased. Assets will be needed to generate income. MP confirmed that it would be more than a maintenance company- mix of revenue from assets and service charges.
Q10	Impact of Briggens Estate quarry proposals	MP advised that this was being promoted by City and Provincial as owners of Village 7 and PfP had no idea that proposal had been put forward until draft plan published for consultation. PfP will be responding to consultation. NPG of view that the proposal challenges integrity of the CDF. AH confirmed that East Herts will also be responding to proposals- recognise governance is essential and there is a need for greater certainty.
Q11	What are proposals for increasing capacity of Harlow Town Station and what engagement is taking place with Network Rail?	MP advised that Vectos are in regular discussion with Network Rail about specific proposals such as northern access. Garden Town initiative gives political weight to local planning authorities to deal with Network rail and other stakeholders. NPG observed that station is not well managed- poor provision for drop off etc. Mark Prisk highlighted risks- need 4 tracking rather than 3 tracking to Tottenham Hale. New rolling stock will help- meeting Network rail and Minister to address issues.

2. WRITTEN RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TABLED AT WORKSHOP

Role of East Herts - Should East Herts take a stronger lead in regulating the development?
Yes
What is the difference between a 'Garden Town' and villages. Separation between villages is inadequate
I do not agree that Green Belt land should be used

Why did they not build these villages on the North Weald Aerodrome instead- flat land and devoid of any scenery to spoil
East Herts must tightly control and enforce design codes developed at each planning stage
Definitely, as long as they continue to listen to the affected communities and take / apply practical solutions to the issues
Yes
East Herts should be more involved.
Vision and Objectives - Do you agree with the revised vision? Do you agree with the Development Objectives?
As the document is not available we would like time to read the document and make comments
I would like Pye Corner Gilston to be a village
New infrastructure needs to be in place before villages are built to 'mitigate impacts of the developmenton existing communities'.
In the second world war the Americans came in with food!! We would have starved without it. We are now over-populated and still have to have food from other places. We couldn't feed ourselves without
Sewage and water- I feel hasn't been dealt with properly
If this scheme should go ahead the present infrastructure – roads, sewerage, water will not cope. Why is this not a priority?
Harlow Hospital will not cope. Where will the new hospital be sited? Doctors surgeries?
How many will be built? How will these villages be separated? Should be at least ¼ mile!! Will houses have a garden larger than a postage stamp?
Will we get compensation if we get subsidence from the effect of the quarry being sited very near to us? (Hunsdon Pound)
Community interest companies to be set up to run an maintain public realm and transfer assets to generate revenues to fund communities initiatives
Impact on local infrastructure is still inadequately addressed and glossed over. Existing roads, rail and transport systems WILL be affected. Just because the bottlenecks that result are away from this development does not mean that this proposal has dealt with the issue or resolved it.
Broadly agree
I will need to read more on this revised vision before I can make a comment
What is the link between 7 Distinct Villages and Gilston/ Harlow Garden Town?
We are East Herts not Essex. Sir Frederick Gibberd said the river and the railway line should stop the urban sprawl
We do not need and want this development!
Our land should be protected for future generation. Protect the 'Greenbelt' which has been put in place to protect the landscape. Do not move the 'GREENBELT'.
'IF' this development goes ahead we will require a confirmation of the timescale
This is land used for food for centuries. Use the aerodrome site.
Village Principles- Is the idea of development of Villages correctly interpreted?
What is the difference between a 'Garden Town' and villages. Separation between villages is inadequate
No- density proposed is totally at odds with existing historical villages (ie: excluding Terlins Park which is not a village)
No- 5 storey buildings do not constitute a village. Separation between villages of two hedgerows and a track is hardly adequate
Landscape buffers are insufficient in size between villages to create separation, must be accompanied by high quality mature landscape design
The use of the word villages is a misinterpretation of what it is being developed. The collective is one new town with some green spaces between. Villages are typically separate developments that are miles apart, not meters apart.
(4 stickers for NOT supported)

Yes
I'm still not clear on this
No – what's the link between the 7 Villages and Gilston/Harlow Garden Town?
Is the illustrative material helpful in illustrating the vision and objectives?
Not very. The Gilston Park community is not represented. I.e: illustrated with a white blank space so impact on this community is not represented eg: the closeness of Village 4
Has adequate parking space been allocated to these proposed developments?
Not for the proposed community facilities- there does not seem to be adequate schools, medical centres/ doctors etc for the number of homes in each village
Illustrative material must be made more consistent and give accurate interpretation of proposals in order that local residents can give a fully interpreted view on the plans.
(1 stickers for NOT supported)
Yes – it is reasonably clear
Worry about the Green Belt
I am not sure the material is sufficiently clear yet
Spatial Framework - Separation, height and density
If the buffer that separates the villages is so small, how should it be treated? A minimum width?
Much too small- a village must have at least 0.5 miles separation.
A lane and two hedges between villages is not enough! Possibility of using allotments between 'villages'. Can we stop using the word 'villages'- clearly these are not villages. This is a 10,000 housing estate
Please don't call it Gilston Park Estate
It must be made larger – a minimum width should definitely be agreed – maintaining green space is very important.
The depletion of the buffers should be the trigger for the cessation of the use of the word villages. It is one town similar to Harlow in that it is subdivided into areas that have different names. Who are you trying to convince? People who currently live in villages such as Gilston, Eastwick, Hunsdon, etc so don't try and disguise the size and impact.
There has to be a clear measure of what constitutes an appropriate buffer. But to large extent it seems arbitrary. 'Villages' would look to be something 'softer' and, as discussed, with less pronounced edges.
Is the proposed height limit to a range of 2-5 floors enough to ensure the height is appropriate to a village?
No- present villages do not reflect this
No- needs to be limited to two floors
No – parameter plans should be included within CDF
Agreed limits should definitely be included with more detail added in relation to where higher buildings would be and what purpose they would serve.
All limits are welcome, but still room for improvement if the village concept is to be believed.
I think this is probably right but there needs to be clear limits on the split
A height of 5 storeys to me is not a village.
Need confirmation regarding height of dwelling 2,3,4 or 5 storeys. A village should in this area blend in with the landscape NOT A TOWN DEVELOPMENT!
Are 4-5 storey buildings compatible with a village context?
No- many of our homes are single storey. How can 4/5 storey buildings be compatible?
I'm not happy with the thought of huge buildings in a village concept. People move to villages for space and in most cases gardens
If appropriately interspersed with traditional housing and in position that will not dominate the landscape.
Terlings Park has managed this very well, in my view.
No

No
At small scale potentially, if there is development, it must provide affordable housing (of ten. Flats)
Where should more density be located? Is the concept proposed right?
The maximum in any area should not be more than 33 dph. Village 4 for example (current proposal) = 2000 homes. Therefore this would be 9.5 times Terlings Park- <u>this is not a village!!</u>
In other developments. Does it always have to be the best economic model: it should be a nice place to live.
Not in this area. The infrastructure cannot cope. I don't believe that any amount of roads etc will be enough for this size of development. Too much development already happening in East Herts and Essex
Can we have an idea of the density of a village like High Wych
What should be the maximum density in line with the village concept? Any examples?
22 absolute maximum which equates with 2/3 Terlings Park.
Maximum densities must be set for each and every village to ensure appropriate quantum of development in every village.
There needs to be a variation in density to replicate a true village. True villages evolve over hundreds of years. Look at local examples and follow those. Gilston, Hunsdon, Eastwick. If the total number of houses on the available land has to reduce so be it!
10,000 is too many for area. 1/3 of the proposed density sounds more reasonable.
As it will be 2035-50, once got planning will up the density of the housing.
Transport and Movement
Is the proposal for the Eastern Crossing and Eastwick Road/ Pye Corner correct? Should it be considered a strategic link road or a street in the village?
Building a road next to a children's playground and homes carries large environmental and health concerns
We live just south of this junction, one of 4 houses Grade II listed. We worry about access to A414 our only route out. They said there would be traffic lights but will we be catered for properly or have to wait for half an hour for our turn?
Too much traffic going by Pye Corner
Eastern Link road should be moved further west to avoid severing links between Terlings Park and Pye Corner
Lack of clarity in relation to the proposal is making it difficult to give to give and express view on this
I live in Terlings Park and consider myself part of Gilston and surrounding community.
Yes, it is correct . It should be built before any housing is started.
Highways need to answer this not me! If yes, it should be built before any development. In fact a new Junction 7a for the M11 is needed now!
Pye Corner C170 is already congested and not only during rush hour. Need positive infrastructure before building begins.
<u>No mention of how large the roundabout is, coming in + out of Terlings Park?</u>
Should the proposal of a connecting primary street/ boulevard interconnecting the new villages be restricted to a 2 way road or is it ok to have a dual carriageway?
Living in Gilston we already hear traffic around A414 (Eastwick Roundabout). What will it be like then?
To keep a village environment only a two way road should be used. I am concerned with the increase of traffic with already problematic congestion on the A414 going into Harlow and the strain on the local surrounding roads
How will surface water from the new villages down hill to A414 and River Stort be controlled? Will it all run down our lane?
Dual carriageway is not appropriate in any location.
Agree that dual carriageway is not appropriate here.
Should not be a dual carriageway. This is about a village and not a 'TOWN'!

Worries of the size of the ring road around villages. How many lanes: 1,2,3, or 4?
Also village 1 worries regarding the size of the ring road
Is there sufficient commitment to reducing the impact of traffic through innovation, excellent public transport and opportunities for walking and cycling?
No- it will just not happen
Will there be extra trees against the A414 to help reduce noise from extra traffic on the side of Stort Valley- mounds of earth may have to be planted on to deaden noise and pollution
Woodland areas need to be planted and nest boxes for owls/ bats and then the deer may come back eventually from the Christian College area
No. Plans are not detailed enough and lack of timescales makes it difficult to interpret.
Agreed that plans should be more detailed. Glossy statements with denial of the impacts. Walking and cycling is not always a practical solution. People don't have time.
This just isn't clear from the plan. There needs to be clear commitments.
Agree – there needs to be clear commitments.
Is walking and cycling important?
Yes- but it will just not happen
Yes, but concept of foot traffic to Harlow from distant villages is flawed.
Yes – but routes to key areas must be defined. E.g. station, shops in the new villages, etc.
Yes – but it is more of a leisure pursuit than a solution to people getting to places.
Yes
It is certainly important for those using rail services, particularly given the limited car parking facilities at Harlow Station. Access to the Stort is essential for cycling.

3. OTHER COMMENTS RECORDED ON POST-IT NOTES ON WALL DISPLAY AT COMMUNITY WORKSHOP

Topic/ page number	Comment
Generally	We felt that the CGI representing the types of housing we can expect lacked any form of likeness to what we would like to see or expecting a 'village' setting. There needs to be the appropriate pressure applied to PFP to ensure that the building guidelines given to the house builders are very specific and detailed to ensure that 'villages' are built and not cheap town like buildings.
P11 Gilston Area Vision	More information required about principle of land value capture and phasing of new infrastructure to mitigate impacts of development (including on existing communities)
	Confirmation on scale of development. A promise that the development will not grow.
	Issues with Terlings Park integration, village 1, link to Homewood, the crescent near St Mary's and village 4
	Separation of Terlings Park from Gilston (3 non support stickers): This is one community <u>NOT</u> separate entities. Should <u>NOT</u> be divided by a main road.
	Eastern crossing not supported (1 sticker)
	Gilston Area Garden City Principles Box – supported (1 sticker)
P12 - Objectives	Protecting and enhancing heritage assets supported (1 green sticker)

P 24 – Strategic context	At present we are only talking about the East Herts project – which will incorporate a min of 15-20,000 plus cars on to our roads. We are overlooking the fact of the new builds in Burnt Mills on playing fields, Old Harlow, New Hall + Hatton Priory on green belt, all filtering on the A414, M11, etc! Our roads are gridlocked during rush hour & it only takes one accident to gridlock roads outside of rush hours. These projects are going to be suicidal madness – also not to mention the disastrous problem of flooding – lack of infrastructure, water/ electricity shortage!!!
P 46 – Ecology and Natural Habitat	How are you going to keep the Barn Owls??
	Issues with surface water???
p54- Village Views	Is it a village or a town?
P62 – Surface water	No confidence that this will adequately addressed and improve current conditions
P64 - Water	No confidence that current water shortage to existing homes is recognised and will be improved
	What about the houses in Hunsdonbury who rely on ground water – will our water be compromised / contaminated?
P66 – Access and Movement	Current issues are not identified and not addressed.
	Gilston Lane - I cannot recall seeing much in terms of reference to maintaining the integrity of the lane. In our opinion the lane, stretching from The Plume of Feathers all the way to Homewood, contains a large number of ancient hedgerows and is part of what helps make up the fabric of the community. In addition it will help shield residents from the potential development to come. As a result, in our opinion the lane should not only be left as it is today, but should also be closed off to any future vehicular traffic from the potential new villages planned.
	Bridleways - The maintaining/provision of new bridleways has not been mentioned. A large number of people in the Gilston, Eastwick, Hunsden and surrounding areas utilise the existing bridleways, away from traffic. The maintenance and/or provision of new bridleways is very important, as is the ability to have these bridleways linked to the villages but away from vehicular traffic. The 'green corridors' may address this to a degree, but there needs to be the provision of an underpass or overpass for horse riders to safely navigate the planned ring road linking the villages.
P77 - Principles	Protecting and enhancing heritage assets supported (2 green sticker)
	Green Belt Protection (p77-78) - This has to be one of our strongest challenges to the whole plan. However, if the plan does go through how will the new green belt be protected to ensure that it can NEVER be built on again? We understand that the details of this are being worked on, but this has to be a major objection to the building plans.
P78 - Principles	Engaging local communities supported (1 green sticker)
	Last three bullet points of Engaging Local Communities have to do with transport

P 80 – Landscape led approach	Ancient Woodlands & Hedgerows(p77 & p80 & p92) - These woodlands and hedgerows are incredibly special and contain significant wildlife. The document makes reference to ancient woodland being 'enhanced'. The word 'enhanced' worries us as it has obvious connotations. we would prefer to see the words 'protected' and 'managed'. Page 80 refers to 'woodland parks' and it should be made clear and we should receive assurances that 'woodland parks' should not and will not be built within any ancient woodland. Further, no ancient hedgerows should be taken out (p92).
p85 – Diagram showing key features that will shape Village 5	Village buffer not enough
P90 / 92-93 Response to Heritage	Importance to protect the existing landscape settings. The proposal for village 4 gives no indication of the sympathetic landscaping around the heritage Church of St Mary's
p105- Density approach	Don't agree with density approach. Taking Terlings Park out of the equation, what is the net density of Gilston as it stands? 15 dph is more in keeping with a village
	This density is too high. Terlings Park is too cramped and should not be used as a guide. Even if it means reducing the number of houses overall.
P107 Appropriate density	Where is the highest density going to be sited 'IF' this goes ahead!!!
	Where do the timings come from? Use real times instead (hills, bendy roads, few crossings)
p108-109 Methodology for calculating density	4 agreed with 15 dph 6 disagreed with 33 dph
	These are not villages. They are too near each other . This is a town.
P116 – Green infrastructure strategy	The plan on page 116 shows a pedestrian route going through private property (Homewood) – needs to be amended
	Various 'green links' are planned, however, the plan shows one of several of these going straight through our property. We would therefore like the corridor/link running through our property on the map removed from the document. If need be the route can easily be replaced by a link via the back of our property, where an existing path/bridleway already exists.
	Would like restricted access into Homewood ancient woodland to protect the wildlife from new homes surrounding. On p. 117 Homewood is indicated for community play – risks of children destroying the nature
	The plan shows a 'community play' area within Homewood. Homewood is an ancient forest and should not be open to having a community play area within it. This should be removed from the plan.
P129 – Open Space Character	Homewood ancient woodland shown on map as outdoor sport facilities, community play on page 117, woodland on p79, strategic green corridor on p127, protected ancient woodland on p47 Homewood has been designated an area for 'Outdoor Sports Facilities' and again, Homewood is an ancient forest and should not be open to having a 'outdoor sports facilities within it. This should be removed from the plan. We believe from speaking to Martina(?) at the event that this could be an error on the drawings, but regardless needs to be corrected.
p135 Education and leisure Facilities	Types of schools are not shown on plan- should relate to summary of provision on p138

	A leisure centre has now crept into the plan alongside the proposed secondary school on the land north of Homewood. Further, it is proposed that these leisure facilities are shared between the public and school. This could have a significant impact on our home through noise pollution. Further, if shared with the public it is likely that here could be outdoor facilities such as tennis courts of 5-a-side football pitches etc. that could cause noise and light pollution in the evenings and at the weekends.
P136 – community facilities and healthcare	Types of schools are not shown on plan- should relate to summary of provision on p138
	Will there be adequate doctors and nurses to work within the proposed health centres as the NHS are in crisis.
p138 Summary of Community Provision	Village 1- Estate/ Town not Village Village 2- don't agree: 1,700 homes is too big Village 3- don't agree with 1000 homes Village 4- don't agree. 2000 homes is too big Village 6- make bigger than 700 homes Village 7- make bigger than 1,500 homes
	Village 4 too large. 2,000 dwellings is not a village!!
	Need further details of community facilities strategy and delivery plan Existing problems of capacity. One health centre shown in Village 1- does this serve whole development. Need to provide further details of types of school to be provided in each village.
p138-139 Summary of Community provision	What facilities are proposed for teenagers?
	What does retail and related uses mean? How does this differ from foodstore? Further details required
	Village 7- 1500 homes but no school or health facility proposed
P 141 - Governance	Village 6 (7) will have a quarry and land fill next to them!
	Fencing around Gilston Park as we pay hundred of pounds each month for maintenance... we do not want randoms picnicking and walking dogs and playing tennis on our private land.
p147 Street Typologies	6 lanes= M25!
	The planned ring road linking the villages could be six lanes wide in places. This is equivalent to the M25!!! The ring road needs to be in keeping with the new 'villages' and countryside and in our opinion should be no more than two lanes wide (one lane each way) - the equivalent of Edinburgh Way. Anything more would create a significant nuisance for Gilston and the surrounding parishes.
	Ring Road (p146) - Aside from my comments above in relation to the size of the ring road, on the plan the ring road has been position directly at the back of our property, which is on the boundary. This will naturally have a significant effect on our home life from both noise and street lights. We would therefore like this ring road to be moved away from my property, forming a semi-circle to the north of the planned secondary school, rather than south.
	(Red box text second column p 146) This statement in its current context implies that no traffic from the development will impact the existing road infrastructure, which is clearly untrue. There needs to be greater clarity on how the existing infrastructure will be expanded / improved. Similar comment applies to other transport infrastructure.

	(Pointing to Village 7 Primary Road) What is to stop people cutting through Hunsdon? + 'Not expected that traffic will significantly increase on any local roads@ will they not travel to Hertford or Harlow? Or are they not going to use cars?
	CGI of housing not representing village feel or style of housing
	These pictures (P147) represent towns not villages
p149 Indicative pedestrian and cycle routes	The existing crossing will not be made wider. How and where will all the new residents drive into Harlow? A new crossing will be for buses/ cycle/ pedestrians- more roads needed
P150 – Bus Strategy	The bus service through Gilston and Eastwick runs only twice a week (Tues / Thurs) 3 times a day. A small bus is used and driver has to get out and physically put steps down for people to use. Not surprisingly hardly anyone uses buses and Essex County Council is under pressure to cut services here. It also shows that infrastructure MUST be sorted BEFORE any brick is laid.
P152 Rail Strategy	Transport - It is clear, that especially in relation to train capacity and parking at Harlow Town train station that work still needs to be done to address what will be a strain on an already stretched service. New and extended rolling stock will help, but will not come close to satisfying the expected demand from the potential new developments.
p154- Highway Improvement Strategy Summary	Who will pay for the roads, etc and when. What is the maximum amount of buildings before a developer has to put his hand in his pocket to pay for the roads?
	Regarding the potential increase of traffic using Redricks Lane (east of the Eastern Crossing) - is Redricks Lane going to be widened or straightened as currently it is a bendy lane and not suitable as a bypass road
	Eastern crossing not supported (1 sticker)
	HCC transport expert at the EiP indicated that the A414 causeway would be expanded only to support sustainable transport. Does this mean HCC will reverse the reduction in bus services to the existing villages?
	Build ring road first- keep existing Gilston lane for existing residents- do not link to new road!
	What protection is there for SSSI in Hunsdon Mead/ Stort Valley
	Where will the buzzards and deer go – Village 7
	Water table- we are 4 houses (listed) in Stort Valley- SG12 8LF: all on borehole water- how will this be preserved?
	Surface water drainage- where will surface water go south of A414 and to River Stort- there are 4 houses between in SG12 8LF
	Have you consulted Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust who own Hunsdon Mead (SSSI) and Eastwick Mead- a flood plain?
P168 - Phasing	Villages 1 + 2 should not be started until the railway has increased transport into London otherwise the trains will not be able to keep up with demand. Trains are already overcrowded and cannot take any more commuters. This is standing room only at peak times.
P 172 – Next Steps	Development Plans – 20-30 years. We need the right level of development plans – stages of planning details of any changes and why? Who will let us know?

4. OTHER WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM PARTICIPANTS FOLLOWING WORKSHOP

Topic/ page number	Comment
General	Why do maps keep showing Terlings Park as separate to Gilston?
General-power cables	Beaulieu developers considered it economic to bury the power cables running across their site. I urge PFP to consider doing the same to remove the arbitrary boundary for building - this would offer opportunity to put a decent buffer between the proposed "villages" and existing communities and between each of the proposed "villages".
General-Gilston Lane	I cannot recall seeing much in terms of reference to maintaining the integrity of the lane. In our opinion the lane, stretching from The Plume of Feathers all the way to Homewood, contains a large number of ancient hedgerows and is part of what helps make up the fabric of the community. In addition it will help shield residents from the potential development to come. As a result, in our opinion the lane should not only be left as it is today, but should also be closed off to any future vehicular traffic from the potential new villages planned.
General-Bridleways	The maintaining/provision of new of bridleways has not been mentioned. A large number of people in the Gilston, Eastwick, Hunsden and surrounding areas utilise the existing bridleways, away from traffic. The maintenance and/or provision of new bridleways is very important, as is the ability to have these bridleways linked to the villages but away from vehicular traffic. The 'green corridors' may address this to a degree, but there needs to be the provision of an underpass or overpass for horse riders to safely navigate the planned ring road linking the villages.
General-Transport	It is clear, that especially in relation to train capacity and parking at Harlow Town train station that work still needs to be done to address what will be a strain on an already stretched service. New and extended rolling stock will help, but will not come close to satisfying the expected demand from the potential new developments.
General	Housing - We felt that the CGI representing the types of housing we can expect lacked any form of likeness to what we would like to see or expect in a 'village' setting. There needs to be the appropriate pressure applied to PFP to ensure that the building guidelines given to the house builders are very specific and detailed to ensure that 'villages' are built and not cheap town like buildings.
p1	Gilston Park is a private estate which is for the sole use of the resident. We all pay to maintain the estate therefore is not for general use for the public. We would want 8 foot high wire fencing all around to not only protect the privacy of residents but to protect the listed history of the land.
p6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2nd crossing land to be acquired at 'appropriate stage' • Importance of 2nd crossing does not mention existing traffic congestion • How could government confirm support before the EiP?
p10	Needs to strongly mention 'buffer zones' around existing clusters of houses
p12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protective green landscape needs to be sized to actually be protective • Needs to continue wide open spaces around existing dwellings to retain rural aspect
p12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what is "genuinely affordable housing"? • Enhancing assets - Gilston Park in need of landscape enhancement. What does this mean?
p13	Is Little Park happy to have this in CDF?
p14	Definition of a village 'usually found in a rural setting'. Therefore need lots of space around each village to avoid being thought of as a town

p15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wheathampstead town? • Why no photos of Gilston and Eastwick? • Is the development a town or several villages?
p15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anatomy of a village - are the proposed villages going to have High Street Market Square. Are these really villages?
p16	Making extensive use of Gilston Park. Need to enlarge the proposed green space
p19	Road map is misleading- A414
p20	'restoring and recovering historic landscape routes'- where?
p25	No mention to strategic traffic and transport issues. No photo of Gilston?
p26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green belt • Reference to historic buildings • Including the smaller clusters
p29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it 10,000 homes by 2033? • Where is Figure 11.2? • Including protection for the smaller clusters currently more rural • Consideration of light and noise pollution
p36	No mention of existing Green Belt status
p39	Map again shows Terlings Park as distinct
p48	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of birds of prey- sparrow hawk, buzzards, kestrels, owls • Mention consultation group but surely this CDF should hold the detail
p50	Only place mentioning Green Belt
p52	No mention of Green Belt Eastwick
p54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of Green Belt Gilston • Does not include Gilston Park etc
p60	Terlings has own section?
p64	To lay a new power supply from Redricks Lane to the new development will cause traffic chaos. It is already severely congested
p67	Access and Movement- no mention of congestion (road and rail)
p68	No mention of new gravel extraction bid
p69	Concerned with the statement "accelerating the delivery of housing sites" what does this mean?
p74	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define sympathetic • Define sufficient width x 2 • Infrastructure phased- when? • Early improvements to green buffers- when?
p75	Light and noise pollution needs limiting
p76-77	Green Belt protection- This has to be one of our strongest challenges to the whole plan. However, if the plan does go through how will the new green belt be protected to ensure that it can NEVER be built on again? We understand that the details of this are being worked on, but this has to be a major objection to the building plans.
p77	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the revised Green Belt? • Missing text?
p77 & p80 & p92	These woodlands and hedgerows are incredibly special and contain significant wildlife. The document makes reference to ancient woodland being 'enhanced'. The word 'enhanced' worries us as it has obvious connotations. we would prefer to see the words 'protected' and 'managed'. Page 80 refers to 'woodland parks' and it should be made clear and we should receive assurances that 'woodland parks' should not and will not be built within any ancient woodland. Further, no ancient hedgerows

	should be taken out (p92).
p78	Needs a lot more detail
p80	'appropriate buffers' etc needs better definition
p81	Village centre on axis with gateway frontage to Gilston Park? !!!! NO WAY!
p82 and 83	Proposed buffer between Village 2 and 3 is tiny No mention of size of buffer around Channoeks
p84	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RoWs look incorrect on map- not in proportion • Seek to conserve and enhance St Marys- too woolly • No mention of buffer for existing village • No mention of buffer between Village 4 and Gilston Park (Blackthorn Cottage) • Buffer between Village 3 and Village 4 very tiny (existing road)
p85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names keep changing (Home Wood and Gibsons Shaw) • No mention of buffer in front of Homewood Cottages • Tiny buffer between Village 1 and Village 5 • Location of secondary school?
p86-87	Buffer between Village 6 and Village 7 very tiny
p87	Size of buffer - not clear where they are or the width.
p88-89	Map needs better key (what are dotted lines, sports fields? Refer to new roads etc and show existing roads)
p92	Minimum area around St Mary's needs defining now
p94	Transport Strategy?
p97	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation needed now • Set back of Village 5 and Village 6 needs defining
p99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View 3 text and maybe photo incorrect • Proposed green buffer belongs to someone else
p99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will consultation on masterplan happen? • Close the road through Pye Corner- is this permissible?
p98 and p100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps show different access and new crossing strategy • Terlins Park own section • No section for Gilston Park and surrounding houses
p105	33 dwellings per hectare (same as Terlins)- too much
p107	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to have lower densities close to existing dwellings (Gilston Park, Dairy Cottages etc) • Maps show crescent in front of St Mary's as developed yet p89 suggests otherwise
p113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing off green corridors • Gilston Playing Fields in front of St Mary's
p114	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East-west link missing (across crescent)
p114-116	In relation to Homewood 'Green Links/Corridors' - Various 'green links' are planned, however, the plan shows one of several of these going straight through our property. We would therefore like the corridor/link running through our property on the map removed from the document. If need be the route can easily be replaced by a link via the back of our property, where an existing path/bridleway already exists.
p116	East-west link 'primary green corridor' missing
p117	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing fields- 06 Village 5 • 12 Village 2 (next to/close to Channoeks)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16 Gilston park Fields • 23 Village 3
p117	In relation to Homewood 'Community Play Area' - The plan shows a 'community play' area within Homewood. Homewood is an ancient forest and should not be open to having a community play area within it. This should be removed from the plan.
p119	'significant component of Gilston Area Sports and Recreation'- how will these be kept open?
p127	Detailed design of open spaces at the masterplan stage too woolly- needs more detail
p128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floodlighting more than 'where appropriate'-restrictions? Type? • Lighting on amenity open spaces?
p129	In relation to Homewood 'Outdoor Sports Facilities' - Homewood has been designated an area for 'Outdoor Sports Facilities' and again, Homewood is an ancient forest and should not be open to having a 'outdoor sports facilities within it. This should be removed from the plan. We believe from speaking to Martina(?) at the event that this could be an error on the drawings, but regardless needs to be corrected.
p132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Phased delivery...in line with' What does this mean?
p135	In relation to Homewood Leisure Centre - A leisure centre has now crept into the plan alongside the proposed secondary school on the land north of Homewood. Further, it is proposed that these leisure facilities are shared between the public and school. This could have a significant impact on our home through noise pollution. Further, if shared with the public it is likely that here could be outdoor facilities such as tennis courts of 5-side football pitches etc. that could cause noise and light pollution in the evenings and at the weekends.
p137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map should show existing places of worship • 'over the course of the masterplanning process'- how far on is this?
p137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density!
p141	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mention of Eastwick, Gilston and Hunsdon residents? • What does it mean by 'Gilston Park Estate'
p144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant quantum of employment- need to quantify • No mention of current congestion on rail • No mention of lack of east-west rail
p146-147	The planned ring road linking the villages could be six lanes wide in places. This is equivalent to the M25!!! The ring road needs to be in keeping with the new 'villages' and countryside and in our opinion should be no more than two lanes wide (one lane each way) – the equivalent of Edinburgh Way. Anything more would create a significant nuisance for Gilston and the surrounding parishes.
p146	In relation to Homewood Ring Road - Aside from concerns in relation to the size of the ring road, on the plan the ring road has been position directly at the back of our property, which is on the boundary. This will naturally have a significant effect on our home life from both noise and street lights. We would therefore like this ring road to be moved away from my property, forming a semi-circle to the north of the planned secondary school, rather than south.
p147	Traffic calming measures need to be defined eg: not speed humps
p147-148	

p148	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lighting needs to be sensitive (minimise light pollution) • 2nd crossing 'may be provided' • Encourages pedestrians and cyclists through Terlings
p152	Surely EHDC should be leading northern access to rail station
p154	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do traffic measurements show regarding numbers of cars from east/west? • Western crossing more useful? • Implications of closing Pye Corner to through traffic • Northern by-pass J7a to A414 • Improvements to traffic- too woolly • Our lane link designed to be only local- how? • Except for improved river crossings land owner contributions limited
p161	Potential.....photovoltaics etc
p168	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expected numbers built each year? Needed now • Questions 3000 by 2033 (may increase) • Phasing needs to be detailed now
p172	Primary road should be fixed?
p176	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CDF establishes key principles- this one needs lots more detail • No definition of masterplan