

Hunsdon, Eastwick and Gilston Neighbourhood Plan Group

Assuming that Gilston's green belt status is removed what are the local communities 'Key Strategic Objectives' to be proposed within its response to the proposed Local Plan re "Gilston"

Ref	Objective	Comments/reasoning	Agreed?
1	Secure dedicated funding to enable communities to make a reasoned response to the Local Plan, at both consultation and EiP stages and thereafter.	The Joint parishes have few resources to support responding to the proposed Local Plan. East Herts are abandoning one of their key policies, retaining the Green Belt, maintained by them for 60 years so it is down to the joint parishes to both make the case for the Green Belt retention and respond to East Hert's Gilston proposal. Given that East Herts have worked this up in detail with the Landowners without engaging with the community or their representative elected councils and, additionally, just published a substantial 'Concept Framework' specific to Gilston" with no consultation there is much detailed work to be done by the joint parishes which requires the support of experts; it would be democratically inequitable for the communities not to be professionally represented, especially when East Herts and the developers seem to have unlimited funding - as a community we should not be so disadvantaged.	
2	Creation of an Independent body to oversee the development of the 'string of villages'; assuming that is allocated, against our wishes.	The concept proposed by East Herts and the Developers is of immense scale and will take 30 years to be delivered. East Herts, as a district Council, are, in our opinion, not set up to have the expertise to oversee such a project. A form of "Villages Development Corporation"	3

		<p>needs to be established because it can take a longer term view, is outside of local political pressures, that might affect East Herts in delivering services for the wider district, would bring into the process a team to represent the community with the correct skills and expertise and have a board which gives proper representation to the community directly affected by these proposals which are being forced on them against their will, East Herts could have some representation on such a Board.</p> <p>NOTE East Herts have applied to DCLG for funding and assistance because they recognise that they do not have the skills needed to oversee this complex project.</p>	
3	<p>The Landowners proposal is for a string of 'villages' not a Garden City and the concept plan put forward by East Herts supports this; it should be clearly stated that the proposal is indeed a string of Villages and not the discredited and we believe abandoned "Harlow North" or some form of 'Garden City' proposal.</p>	<p>The terminology being used drifts between Garden Villages and Garden City, in the context of the "Gilston Concept", located just to the north of Harlow, a planned second generation New Town, this causes confusion. The former Harlow North proposal anticipated the development of a substantial extension to Harlow while never addressing the way the proposal would have because it needed to be a sustainable part of Harlow spanning, inter alia, the:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative (County and district) boundaries • Railway line • River • Flood plain • Industrial areas along Harlow's northern boundary 	
4	<p>The proposal needs to address how it will manage its impacts on the current community; assuming it is to be</p>	<p>East Herts and the developers are proposing that the project be developed over 30 years. In doing so they are</p>	

	imposed on them by East Herts and the Landowners promoting it.	tearing up the long established Green Belt protection that East Herts has defended robustly and so putting the communities investment in their homes etc. at risk while offering them the prospect of living on a building site for 30 years. The area has a legacy of poor planning of its infrastructure (esp. roads, schools and other services). If “planning policy” is to be dramatically changed then it is only fair that detailed consideration should be given to substantial proposals to manage the impacts of the development on the existing community.	
5	Land holding vehicle for community assets to be established at day 1.	East Herts, and the developers, have proposed that substantial areas will be made over to some form of community land trust to secure their status as green field community assets and suitably wide landscape barriers between the Villages proposed. These assets should be put into a robust community trust alongside suitable funding for their upkeep. This trust should be outside the control of East Herts, especially given that East Herts has seen fit to change its longstanding policy of defending the Green Belt from development. The community is concerned that unless this happens then East Herts might again change its mind as a result of pressure on it (we accept that East Herts might, at some future date, propose the compulsory acquisition of some of this land but that would require a public inquiry).	
6	Proper phasing of the delivery of infrastructure.	The infrastructure needed by the development must not be delivered ‘as the last thing’. The developers have drawn up proposals, with East Herts, which paint a picture of a balanced community with its infrastructure	

		needs met. East Herts has conducted viability studies, which we have not been shown, which we understand confirm that the project is viable. That being the case the community would expect that the defects in infrastructure that exist now will be addressed, and so delivered, as a priority. (If the project is not 'viable' then the case is misplaced and should be withdrawn).	
7	Possible relocation of Harlow Hospital to be objected to challenged as not fitting into the development concept and unfunded.	There is reference to the "Gilston" proposal providing a site for the relocation of the regional hospital. We believe that this does not fit with the "village" concept so is miss founded and should be deleted from the proposal now. The hospital serves this community and so we know about its weaknesses, poor master planning and underinvestment. A relocation to a green field site away from the Town centre facilities and existing public transport that serves the town is simply bad planning by Harlow Council and NHS Estates. A creditable plan for addressing the hospital's needs must be prepared alongside a funding package supported by the NHS.	

7th October 2016