

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
27	Historic England	_MM01	<p>UNSOUND. Comment: We welcome the reference in criterion c to heritage assets and criterion l to the wider historic environment. Whilst we welcome the reference to HIA in criterion o we continue to advise alternative wording for this criterion, as set out in our SOCG, which more closely reflects the NPPF. The wording suggested by HDC in which the tests for harm are not consistent with those set out in the NPPF. We note that the Inspector had specifically advised in his letter of 17th December that the Council should Criterion 2 (m) [now o] should be the Heritage England version. Our suggested wording from our SOCG is shown in the final column of this table. We strongly advise that this should be followed in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector.</p>	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
28	Historic England	_MM01	<p>Suggested Change: <i>Criterion o "A full Heritage Impact Assessment must be prepared. This assessment should inform the design of the proposed development. Development will need to conserve, and where appropriate enhance, the significance of designated heritage assets, both on site and off site. Harm should be avoided in the first instance. This includes the harm to the significance of heritage assets through development within their settings. Only where harm cannot be avoided should appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the design, as identified through the Heritage Impact Assessment."</i> These comments are particularly pertinent given that the Inspector stated that the 'New criterion re heritage protection should be Heritage England version' in his letter to the Council dated 17th December 2019.</p>	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
94	Essex County Council	_MM01	<p><i>Para starting "the four Garden Town Communities..."</i></p> <p>Object On basis of MM requiring additional text and in line with ECC's original position on this.</p> <p>The change does not add the additional explanatory text proposed by HDC (NB but in HDC case, using the term Garden Communities) in the SOCG (doc ref. EX00044). This is to ensure that the existing town, new growth within Harlow and all strategic developments on its edge are treated as a single GT entity.</p> <p>ECC considers this necessary to ensure the integrity of the existing town with the new developments, all as integral parts of HGGT</p> <p>ECC supports the inclusion of the new supporting text as proposed in the preceding column (but wishes to see that included with the additional text above)</p> <p>The full text as proposed is set out in the ensuing column (NB the term 'Strategic Developments' is shown in red, as this represents the only part of this text that ECC and HDC did not agree on).</p> <p>Add full proposed supporting text as shown in previous column. An alternative to the term 'Strategic Developments' could be 'Neighbourhoods' if preferred. ECC is open minded on this but reaffirms that use of the expression 'Communities' undermines the single HGGT community concept.</p> <p>ECC requests incorporation of full text as previously proposed, as follows: 5.2 Harlow and Gilston Garden Town comprises the whole of Harlow, together with four new Garden Town Strategic Developments planned on.....The four Garden Town Strategic Developments will be well connected</p>	Use term "Garden Town Strategic Developments" instead of "Garden Town Communities".	Suggested amendment would cause inconsistency with neighbouring Local Plans and the Garden Town Vision.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
95	Essex County Council	_MM01	<p><i>Specifically HGT1:</i></p> <p>Object On basis of ECC's original objection on these grounds.ECC maintains its objection (as referred to in its letter to the Inspector dated 10 May 2019 – doc ref. EX00043). This is partly due to the reasons and the case previously stated.</p> <p>As additional considerations and by way of update, practical experience and events have developed since the HDLP examination. These have demonstrated, such as through the Gilston area planning applications (villages 1-6 and village 7) the need for a cohesive, single garden town approach. Means of access and links to rest of the GT need to be approached consistently between the respective developments to deliver key objectives including the required sustainable travel mode share. Each new area needs to be integrated with existing town facilities such as the Harlow hatches and sustainable links ensured to link with neighbouring areas so allow easy movement between them and new and existing residents to connect with each other.</p> <p>Substitute text (policy and supporting text) as per ECC hearing statement for examination (see: https://www.harlow.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Essex_County_Council_-_Matter_3.pdf)</p>	Clarity sought on definitions of Garden Town developments across all three districts.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
135	Canal & River Trust	_MM01	We welcome the addition of: p) key transport interventions (such as M11 J7a and provision of sustainable transport (providing viable alternatives to the private car) will need to be agreed prior to the development being permitted. Measures to ensure future upkeep/maintenance of sustainable transport will be required... As set out in our responses to the Gilston villages planning applications, the Trust considers that there is a good justification for improving the canal towpath as a sustainable transport and recreation route linked to the proposed developments	Key transport interventions and measures to promote sustainable transport supported, which will also improve access to blue infrastructure and leisure activities.	Noted.
174	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	The reference to the four Garden Town Communities (Water Lane, Gilston Villages, Latton Priory and East Harlow) "must integrate with and regenerate neighbouring areas of Harlow" is crucial and needs to be made more explicit. Without such integration and regeneration, a divided town will be created – the new town, built to Garden Town standards, and the old town, which will be viewed as a lower standard. The new needs to be fully integrated with the old to avoid alienation between them.	Reference to the four Garden Town Communities is crucial to avoid a divided town. Reference should therefore be more explicit.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
175	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	Using the term "Garden Town Communities" is wrong: there is only one Garden Town, and that is Harlow and Gilston Garden Town, by separating the new elements into communities, you are exacerbating the division mentioned above – they should perhaps be called "the four new garden communities within the Garden Town".	"Garden Town Communities" is wrong terminology. Should be changed.	"Garden Town Communities" is used by neighbouring Local Plans and the Garden Town Vision.
176	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	The capitalisation is also wrong: Garden Town Communities is not a common noun, but the Garden Town is (as in Harlow and Gilston Garden Town).	Capitalisation of Communities.	"Garden Town Communities" is used by neighbouring Local Plans and the Garden Town Vision.
177	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	Why are seeking to only reduce single-occupant car journeys? The aim is to reduce car journeys per se. Remove "single-occupant".	Questions justification to reduce car journeys by single occupancy rather than car journeys per se.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
178	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	Under (p) there is a missing ')' after M11 J7a.	Typographical error.	Minor amendment.
179	Cllr Michael Hardware	_MM01	Under (q) does this mean developers need to make contributions to all the highway requirements in the IDP, or just those adjoining their development? It is not clear and needs to be.	Wording open to interpretation. Needs clarity.	This point refers to all the highway requirements in the IDP.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
180	Places for People	_MM01	I write on behalf of Places for People Developments Ltd, the promoters of Gilston Park Estate. Representations were submitted at all stages of the Local Plan process on their behalf suggesting that the framework for securing infrastructure contributions should be clearer, and should provide a better foundation for future SPDs. In particular it was suggested that it should be clear that contributions would be required, where appropriate towards strategic infrastructure (such as the new river crossings) from all types and sizes of development, within the present and future plan periods. MM1 recognises the need for contributions in relation to development covered by HGT1, although there is concern about the linkage to the IDP (on which Places for People made separate representations) .	Means to secure infrastructure contributions especially for strategic cross boundary infrastructure should be clearer and relate to the plan period and beyond. This would provide a better base for future SPDs. The respondent acknowledges the need for infrastructure identified in HGT1. The linkage with the IDP is covered under separate representations.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
207	Epping Forest District Council	_MM01	The Council strongly supports this modification but would suggest minor changes for the sake of clarity to ensure that it is clear the policy relates to both flora and fauna and to be consistent with the wording of paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. PROPOSED CHANGE: '...to <u>protect safeguard wildlife sites of biodiversity value</u>'	Minor changes sought to reflect para 114 of the NPPF	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
208	Epping Forest District Council	_MM01	The Council supports the clarification provided by this Main Modification in relation to accessible and safe transport system but would suggest that this should be strengthened in order to support the definition of sustainable transport and modal ambitions of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. PROPOSED CHANGE: 'accessible and safe transport system which reduces single-occupancy car use and maximise the'	Deletion of text "single occupancy".	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
209	Epping Forest District Council	_MM01 (para 5.28)	For the sake of clarity, whilst not a Main Modification this paragraph should be amended for the sake of clarity to differentiate between the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation and the Epping Forest District administrative area. PROPOSED CHANGE: '...Epping Forest <u>District</u> ...'	Need to distinguish between EFDC and EF SAC.	Accept as minor amendment.
194	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	As you are aware the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 (LPSV) is also currently at examination. Consequently, in making this response EFDC has had to be mindful of the interrelationship between the two plans with regard to the East of Harlow site. In February 2019, prior to the examination hearings of both plans, the two authorities (HDC and EFDC) had agreed a Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the site promoter (Miller Homes) (see ED20 https://www.efdclocalplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/ED20-SoCG-EFCE-Harlow-District-Council-Miller-Homes-redacted.pdf). The SoCG set out the trajectory for the East of Harlow site, which straddles the two authorities but comprises a single Garden Community as part of the HGGT, as follows: <i>SEE TABLE IN ORIGINAL SUBMISSION</i>	SoCG agreed between HDC and EFDC with regards East of Harlow.	Noted the agreed trajectory in the SoCG, showing completion of allocation in 2023/24 of 100 dwellings.
195	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	The agreed trajectory reflected the fact that although the Garden Community allocation straddles the two authorities, the expectation of both EFDC and HDC has been that the development would be brought forward comprehensively, and that Miller Homes are in agreement with this approach. This expectation was embedded in both HDC and EFDC emerging plans, which have policies that require development within the Garden Community allocations to be holistically and comprehensively planned. This includes the preparation of a Strategic Masterplan that must be developed and adopted by the respective authorities prior to the determination of any planning proposals (Policy SP 4 in the LPSV and Policy HS3 in the emerging Harlow Local Plan).	Development would be brought forward comprehensively, including a master plan adopted by both authorities.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
196	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	Following the hearing sessions last year, the Inspector examining the LPSV issued an Advice Note on 2 August 2019 (ED98) https://www.efdclocalplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/ED98-Epping-Forest-Post-hearing-Advice-Aug-2019-V1-final.pdf setting out the actions required in order to agree the Main Modifications for consultation. These included Action 16: To review the position of site SP5.3 (East of Harlow) in the housing trajectory in light of current evidence of progress; and to provide more detailed information concerning the likely use of the land to justify the northward extent of the proposed new Green Belt boundary.	EFDC Inspector concluded that the trajectory within EFDC for EoH should be reviewed.	Noted.
197	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	Paragraph 35 of the Inspector's advice provides the justification for why the Council needs to further consider the housing trajectory for this site. It states: "The site promoter intends to commence the masterplanning process upon the conclusion of the examination and has signed a Statement of Common Ground (ED20) confirming that delivery is expected to commence in 2023/24 as forecast in Appendix B of the HIS (ED410B). However, given the present stage of preparation, this is not convincing and a more conservative projection is required based on up to date evidence of progress. The Council should reconsider the position of this site in the trajectory and no delivery should be assumed within the next five years".	EFDC inspector not convinced that delivery on this site in EFDC area would not commence until 2023/24.	Noted.
198	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	In light of the Inspectors Advice and the progress on the delivery of the Strategic Masterplan for this site, EFDC has continued to hold discussions with Miller Homes and Harlow District Council and has reviewed the trajectory for that part of the East of Harlow site which is located within the Council's administrative area. As a result, EFDC is proposing to amend the trajectory for the site to take account of the Inspector's advice which shows no development coming forward within the first five years as follows: <i>SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION FOR TABLE</i> . This will be included in an updated Statement of Common Ground with Miller Homes. EFDC understands that the trajectory for HDC LP allocation site HS3 remains that agreed in the Statement of Common Ground (ED20) as follows: <i>SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION FOR TABLE</i> .	Discussions have taken place between EFDC, HDC and Miller Homes to review the trajectory. EFDC is proposing to review the trajectory in their part of the site to take account of the Inspectors advice, and produce a revised SoCG.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test. It should be noted that Miller Homes have not made any submission to suggest amendment of the figures in the Harlow Plan.
199	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	EFDC has identified two potential issues with the above trajectory and would wish that these are given further consideration: 1. Lead in times: Based on experience elsewhere sites of this scale, and with the associated infrastructure required to support them, generate significant lead in times. For example, on this site there are a number of steps in the process leading up to the delivery of any new homes. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a requirement to prepare a Strategic Masterplan for endorsement by the two Councils which needs to happen before any planning applications can be determined; • the preparation of those planning applications and the evidence based documents needed to support them; 	Lead times for the development is too long for completions in the first 5 years of the Plan.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
200	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	<p>Lead in times (cont):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the need to secure the implementation of the critical infrastructure and in particular the Sustainable Transport Corridor which is required to deliver the modal shift to non car generated journeys (the two emerging local plans set out the objective of 60% of all trips to be by sustainable active travel modes – this is also set out in the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town Vision adopted in November 2018 EB1406 https://www.efdclocalplan.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/EB1406-Harlow-and-Gilston-Garden-Town-Vision-November-2018.pdf the time to assess these applications and secure effective S106 planning obligations; and Once planning permission has been granted, time will be required to mobilise the site for construction. <p>All of the above must occur before construction can commence on any homes.</p>	Lead times for the development is too long for completions in the first 5 years of the Plan.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.
201	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	<p>Given the lack of evidence to clearly demonstrate that the first stage of the process identified above, has made any meaningful progress the Council has assumed a conservative lead in time of 5 years before a home is delivered on site. Consequently, in EFDC's view the more realistic delivery date for homes is 2025/26.</p> <p>The above assumptions are primarily informed by the recent Nathaniel Litchfields Research 'Start to Finish - What factors affect the build-out rates of large scale housing sites?' (Second Edition, February 2020, https://lichfields.uk/media/5779/start-to-finish_what-factors-affect-the-build-out-rates-of-large-scale-housing-sites.pdf) which provides an indicative view of development trajectories within England (excluding London). This showed that the lead in time for large sites ranges from 5 to 8.4 years. This would accord with the Epping Forest District LPSV Inspector's Advice that no delivery should be assumed within the first five years of the Plan period.</p>	Lead times for the development is too long for completions in the first 5 years of the Plan.	<p>Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.</p> <p>East of Harlow forms part of the HGGT and as such there is a focus and commitment from the 3 authorities and the HGGT to expedite the development of this site.</p>
202	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	<p>Given the commitment by both Councils to bring forward a comprehensive and holistic development on the East of Harlow site, the activities identified above that need to be undertaken prior to construction commencing on site apply regardless of whether it is within the Epping Forest District or Harlow District part of the site. In addition, the start date assumed in HDC's trajectory for East of Harlow indicates that development will come forward sooner within the HDC part of the site. However, it is not certain that the site will come forward in this manner given the site constraints and based on EFDC's understanding that the site promoter, Miller Homes, has recently indicated that the element of the site within Epping Forest District is likely to come first.</p>	Development will not come forward sooner as indicated on the HDC portion of the site. The developer has indicated that the EFDC portion will come forward first.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.
203	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	<p>EFDC's 5 Year Land Supply (YLS) period upon adoption of the Local Plan is 2020-2021 to 2024-2025 and differs from HDC Local Plan 5YLS period (which is 2019-2020 to 2023-2024). Whilst HDC's Main Modifications acknowledge that East of Harlow will largely be delivered later in the plan period, 100 homes are assumed to be delivered within in 2023/24 one year earlier than delivery in the EFDC part of the site.</p>	EFDC 5YLS period differs from that in the HDC main modifications in that 100 dwellings will contribute to the 5 YLS in Harlow.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
204	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	2. Build out rates: EFDC is not aware that the proposed build-out rates in the revised trajectory have been evidenced based on a robust assessment of the factors that would affect such a rate of delivery. This is pertinent when considered within the context of the HGGT and the ability of the market to absorb the rate of new homes coming forward at a similar time. This is an important as the HGGT is expected to deliver 16,000 homes over the plan period. It is noteworthy, within this context, that the build-out rates indicated for the sites at Gilston, Latton Priory and Water Lane, which will all be delivering during the same period, are lower than the build-out rates for the East of Harlow assumed in the revised trajectory. Taking these factors into consideration EFDC is concerned that delivery at this rate is unrealistic. This view has also been informed by discussions with Miller Homes who have indicated that a figure of 300-350 homes would still be ambitious but more realistic.	EFDC not aware of robust assessment rate of delivery, and that the rate of delivery is ambitious.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.
205	Epping Forest District Council	_MM02	On the basis of the above, EFDC considers that further amendments are required to the trajectory to ensure it is 'deliverable' within the context of Footnote 11 of the NPPF 2012 and therefore provides a sound basis for the planning of the area, including in relation to the funding and delivery of infrastructure. Importantly EFDC's response has been informed by the views of Miller Homes and from evidence of recent major site delivery and appeal decisions elsewhere. It would therefore be unfortunate if due regard were not paid to either those views or the evidence referred to. In doing so EFDC considers that its suggested approach would continue to demonstrate the clear ambition of both Councils to support the delivery of much needed new homes.	Amendments are required to the trajectory to ensure it is deliverable.	The Council is content with the Inspector's Modification based on the evidence presented by the developers at the Examination Hearing sessions. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.
29	Historic England	_MM03	UNSOUND. Comment: We continue to express our concern that these sites are simply listed in tabular form with no specific policy criteria for each allocation. Particularly for the larger sites, we would expect to see more detail regarding the sites and policy criteria to indicate how the decision maker should react (para 154 and 157 of the NPPF). We suggest that individual policies be included for these sites. We had previously advised that an HIA was needed for the Kingsmoor site. In the absence of an HIA we welcome the deletion of this site,	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
30	Historic England	_MM03	Suggested Change: We would expect to see more detail regarding the sites and policy criteria to indicate how the decision maker should react (para 154 and 157 of the NPPF). We continue to suggest that individual policies be included for these sites.	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
84	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	_MM03-ref 1	Support change of dwelling capacity target to 550 dwellings, which is also reflected in SoCG.	Support MM3 - HS2 -11.	Noted.
47	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM03, ref 15	I am pleased to see that the Planning Inspector, by his letter dated 17th December 2019 page 4 ref: 15 to Harlow District Council, has proposed the removal of this site for future housing development from the proposed Harlow Replacement Local Plan. However, the Inspector needs to go further to protect this area from future development by allocating it into the Green Wedge. This play area lies between Jocelyns and Broadway Avenue and has been used by generations of local residents for recreation. It also has a newly constructed children's play area.	Pleased HS2 - 15 deleted as allocation. Area should be allocated as Green Wedge.	For the Inspector's consideration. The evidence from the Green Wedge Review showed that this site should be removed from the Green Wedge.
48	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM03, ref 15	Recommendation: This park should be fully reinstated as Green Wedge because there is no man made or natural barrier between the park and the tree belt (allocated Green Wedge) that borders the A414. As this is part of the same area of land it should be allocated the same protection.	Reallocate HS2-15 as Green Wedge.	For the Inspector's consideration. The evidence from the Green Wedge Review showed that this site should be removed from the Green Wedge.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
54	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM03, ref 15	In the Planning Inspector's letter dated the 17th of December (page 4, reference 15), it was proposed that Harlow Council remove the playground west of 93-100 Jocelyns as a future housing site. I welcome this change to the Local Plan as I raised formal concerns about the inclusion of the park as a potential housing site in my 2014 consultation response. However, the Planning Inspector does not go far enough to protect Jocelyns park from the threat of development. The park sits between Jocelyns and Broadway Avenue – the main access is a narrow entrance at the bottom of Broadway Avenue. Jocelyns park has been used by generations of local residents for recreation. The land flows into the tree belt (allocated Green Wedge) that borders the A414. This park should be fully reinstated as Green Wedge because there is no man-made or natural barrier separating the park and the tree belt, it is the same land and should be given the same level of protection.	Welcome HS2 - 15 deleted as allocation. Area should be re-allocated as Green Wedge.	For the Inspector's consideration. The evidence from the Green Wedge Review showed that this site should be removed from the Green Wedge.
61	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM03, ref 15	Recommendation: 1. Reinstate the playground west of 93-100 Jocelyns as Green Wedge land with immediate effect and update the Local Plan accordingly.	Reinstate HS2-15 as Green Wedge land with immediate effect and update the Local Plan accordingly.	For the Inspector's consideration. The evidence from the Green Wedge Review showed that this site should be removed from the Green Wedge.
162	Harlow Conservative Group	_MM03, ref 15	Ref 15. Playground west of 93-100 Jocelyns – The Planning Inspector was right to recommend the removal of Jocelyns Park as a potential housing site. This park should be fully reinstated as Green Wedge because there is no man-made or natural barrier separating the park and the tree belt bordering the site, it is the same land and should be given the same level of protection.	Deletion of HS2-15. Should be reinstated as Green Wedge.	For the Inspector's consideration. The evidence from the Green Wedge Review showed that this site should be removed from the Green Wedge.
160	Harlow Conservative Group	_MM03, ref 3	Ref 3. Land East of Katherines Way, west of Deer Park – The Conservative Group welcomes the Planning Inspector's decision to reinstate this site as Green Wedge.	Deletion of HS2-3.	Noted.
161	Harlow Conservative Group	_MM03, ref 9	Ref 9. Land east of 144-154 Fennells – It is a positive step that the Planning Inspector has requested this site be deleted as a housing site. Harlow Council should protect the site from the prospect of future attempts to build housing and designate it as Green Belt.	Deletion of HS2-9.	Noted.
31	Historic England	_MM04	UN SOUND. Comment: Whilst we note that reference to a HIA is made in criterion h, we continue to advise that alternative wording for this criterion, as set out in our SOCG, which more closely reflects the NPPF. The wording suggested by HDC in which the tests for harm are not consistent with those set out in the NPPF. In his letter to HDC, the Inspector stated that the 'New criterion re heritage protection should be Heritage England version' in his letter to the Council dated 17th December 2019. Our suggested wording from our SOCG and Hearing statement are shown in the final column of this table. We strongly advise that this should be followed in accordance with the recommendations of the Inspector.	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
32	Historic England	_MM04	<p>Suggested Change: A full Heritage Impact Assessment must be prepared. This assessment should inform the design of the proposed development. Development will need to conserve, and where appropriate enhance, the significance of designated heritage assets, both on site and off site. Harm should be avoided in the first instance. This includes the harm to the significance of heritage assets through development within their settings. Only where harm cannot be avoided should appropriate mitigation measures be incorporated into the design, as identified through the Heritage Impact Assessment.” This wording outlined above more accurately reflects the NPPF than the wording suggested by HDC in which the tests for harm are not consistent with those set out in the NPPF. Revise wording of Policy to make explicit reference to the listed buildings and Registered Parks and Gardens and set out how the masterplanning process should take the historic environment into account. In our hearing statement we also suggested the following ‘Conserve and where appropriate enhance the historic environment including (list key heritage assets) and their settings through careful design, landscaping heritage buffer zones’ These comments are particularly pertinent given that the Inspector stated that the ‘New criterion re heritage protection should be Heritage England version’ in his letter to the Council dated 17th December 2019.</p>	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
41	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM04	I am disappointed that the Inspector has made no substantial modification to the proposed strategic Housing site to the East of Harlow. This small corner of Harlow faces the prospect of 2600 new Homes in the proposed replacement Harlow Local Plan which will govern development up to 2033. There is already a development underway of 1100 homes on Gilden Park. A new motorway Junction (7a) is been built using Gilden Way as the feeder Road. There is also a preferred site for the new Princess Alexandra Hospital to be built in this area. I understand and accept the need for new Housing but I am extremely concerned of the social impact this development will have on the way of life enjoyed by the existing local population.	Disappointed that no substantial modification was made to this site. To mitigate the social impact on the local population.	This allocation forms the basis for the Local Plan's overarching strategy. It makes a significant contribution to meeting the housing needs of the district.
42	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM04	This area is a small corner of Old Harlow and because of the lack of meaningful consultation there has been no indication or plans for what if any infrastructure that would be required for all this new build but more pertinently the impact it would have on the existing infrastructure which is already struggling to cope. Gilden Way is a relatively small country road and is already suffering from severe congestion at peak times. Gilden Way will bear the brunt of the congestion as it will become an arterial route through Mark Hall and Old Harlow. It is therefore important that planners should seriously consider the impact of increased vehicle movement that would come from the proposed East of Harlow housing site.	Lack of consultation, and no indication of infrastructure. Gilden Way will bear the brunt of traffic.	Gilden Way is being upgraded to facilitate J7A of the M11. The Sustainable Transport Corridor will service the site giving access to the town centre and the station and will promote modal shift to reduce traffic onto local roads.
43	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM04	Harlow District Council has failed to properly set out their strategic planning ambition in cooperation with Epping Forest District Council for the phasing of this development which will have unacceptable long term repercussions for this area. The impact of a development of this size would undoubtedly have a profound effect on Churchgate Street and other local communities, for which a mitigation action plan has not been identified.	Authority has not worked with EFDC on the phasing of the development. Impact on local area and its mitigation has not been identified.	The duty to co-operate process has been acknowledged by the Inspector as being sound. Harlow is working in conjunction with our Garden Town partners. A phasing plan would be developed as part of the masterplanning process which both HDC and EFDC are jointly committed to prior to development commencing. **Also see ID 193 for comment from Epping regarding DfC.**
44	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM04	Further consideration must be given to the loss of a significant amount of amenity land which borders the districts of Epping and Harlow. The land that stretches between Sheering and Matching along the M11 corridor enhances the character of this area and the village communities of Old Harlow and Churchgate Street. This development also will erode the Gibberd principles of preserving where possible the historic character of Harlow.	Loss of amenity land on the periphery of the allocation.	This will be considered further at the detailed masterplanning stage. Preservation of the Gibberd principles is an important part of future development in the Garden Town, as set out in policy PL1 of the Local Plan.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
46	Cllr Michael Garnett	_MM04	Recommendation: Suspend the adoption of the current version of the Proposed Replacement Local Plan to enable a properly conducted consultation and review of the East of Harlow proposed housing site to include infrastructure and effect of the new M11 junction and Hospital site. Delay any development applications coming forward for this site for 15 years to allow a new indicative strategic planning assessment to be produced following the completion of the new junction and Hospital.	Suspend adoption of the Plan for properly conducted consultation.	This allocation forms the basis for the Local Plan's overarching strategy. It makes a significant contribution to meeting the housing needs of the town. The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
55	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	I am disappointed that the Planning Inspector made no substantial modifications to the proposed strategic housing site to the East of Harlow. This corner of Harlow faces the prospect of 2,600 new homes, the construction of Junction 7A and is the preferred location, as agreed by the Princess Alexandra Hospital Trust Board, for a brand-new hospital. The complexities of building new housing and necessary infrastructure have not been properly explored by Harlow Council in this corner of Harlow.	No modifications for the Strategic site. Complexities of this site have not been properly explored.	This allocation forms the basis for the Local Plan's overarching strategy. It makes a significant contribution to meeting the housing needs of the district. Council has been fully engaged with all parties responsible for infrastructure provision.
56	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	Adding additional traffic flow onto Gilden Way, even with new traffic enhancements, will cause congestion at peak travel times. I am concerned that congestion on Gilden Way will have a knock-on impact on the rest of the local road network. The A414 will face the brunt of the congestion as an arterial route through Mark Hall and Old Harlow. It is important that planners reconsider the impact of increased vehicle movements that would come from the proposed East of Harlow housing site.	Congestion will be caused at peak times on Gilden Way and A414.	Both Gilden Way and A414 are being upgraded to cope with the additional development. In addition the STC and HGGT proposals will promote a modal shift to more sustainable transport.
57	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	Further consideration must be given to the loss of a significant amount of amenity land bordering Harlow and Epping. The land that stretches between Sheering and Matching along the M11 corridor enhances the overall character of the local area and the settled village community in Old Harlow. Harlow Council risks eroding the Gibberd principles of being sympathetic to and preserving, where possible, the historic character of the town.	Loss of amenity land on the periphery of the district.	This will be considered further at the detailed masterplanning stage. Preservation of the Gibberd principles is an important part of future development in the Garden Town.
58	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	Although I fully support the building of a new hospital on the preferred site, Harlow Council has failed to adequately set out, even in high level terms, their strategic planning ambition for phasing the development to the East of Harlow and how they will cooperate with Epping Forest District Council to achieve their goals. The scale of proposed housing development does not match the reality on the ground when planners focus on the technical undertaking needed to deliver housing growth. Churchgate Street and other established communities in Old Harlow will be badly affected. The impact on the local community has not been fully explored and steps to implement a mitigation action plan to limit the severity of such housing growth has not been properly identified.	Failure to establish the strategic planning ambition for the phasing of development and co-operation with EFDC. Local community will be badly affected.	The duty to co-operate process has been acknowledged by the Inspector as being sound. Harlow is working in conjunction with our Garden Town partners.
59	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	This should raise serious concerns and be subject to further scrutiny by the Planning Inspector. At the very least, Harlow Council should be required to produce a new indicative project plan, including milestones, for achieving their planning goals for the East of Harlow before the Local Plan is adopted.	Project Plan required.	Noted, not required for statutory plan-making process.
62	Cllr Joel Charles	_MM04	Recommendation: 2. Suspend the Local Plan process so that a review of the strategic housing site to the East of Harlow can be conducted and a new indicative strategic planning assessment can be produced. This assessment will help gain further clarity about how the feasibility of building 2,600 dwellings, Junction 7A and a new hospital can be realised.	Suspend Local Plan process to review strategic site.	This allocation forms the basis for the Local Plan's overarching strategy. It makes a significant contribution to meeting the housing needs of the town. The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
96	Essex County Council	_MM04	<i>Specifically points (d)-(g) of policy:</i> Support - Changes essentially as proposed / agreed within HDC/ECC SOCG	Supports MM4.	Noted.
136	Canal & River Trust	_MM04	We suggest that given the scale of development proposed, it would not be appropriate for the developer(s) of the Gilston Garden town to simply provide footpaths, cycleways and bridleways within the development and link them to the existing Harlow network and adjacent networks in the Epping Forest District The development will place increased expectations and burdens on such infrastructure beyond the site boundaries and it should be expected that the developer funds improvements to these. We suggest 'funding improvements where appropriate' is added to the end of this additional point of policy HS3.	Developers of HGGT should be expected to fund improvements to the footpaths, cycleways and bridleways beyond site boundaries.	It would be inappropriate for Harlow, as LPA, to seek contributions from developments outside the district boundary.
210	Epping Forest District Council	_MM04	The Council supports the inclusion of the reference to natural/semi-natural space in new b)	Supports ref. to natural/semi-natural space.	Noted.
211	Epping Forest District Council	_MM04	The Council strongly supports the inclusion of the need for footpaths, cycleways and bridleways to link with adjacent networks in the Epping Forest district.	Supports inclusion of need for footpaths etc. to link with adjacent networks in Epping.	Noted.
212	Epping Forest District Council	_MM04	The Council strongly supports the inclusion of new m) but would suggest minor changes for the sake of clarity to ensure that it is clear the policy relates to both flora and fauna and to be consistent with the wording of paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 PROPOSED CHANGE: '...to protect safeguard wildlife sites of biodiversity value....'	Minor changes sought to reflect para 114 of the NPPF.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
213	Epping Forest District Council	_MM04	For the sake of clarity and consistency the Council would propose an amendment to the wording of the reference to the Epping Forest Development Plan PROPOSED CHANGE: '...the northern part of which has been <u>proposed for allocation</u> ed in the <u>emerging</u> Epping Forest <u>Local Development</u> -Plan (2011-2033) for 750 dwellings'	Proposed wording change to a reference to EFDC's Plan.	Accept as minor amendment.
234	Environment Agency	_MM04	No further comments to make.	No further comment.	Noted.
85	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	_MM04, 9f	Support inclusion of 'healthcare facilities' as part of infrastructure to be provided.	Support inclusion of healthcare facilities as part of infrastructure to be provided.	Noted.
97	Essex County Council	_MM05	<i>Specifically ED2, broadband point:</i> Support strongly - Changes essentially as proposed / agreed within HDC/ECC SOCG	Supports ED2, specifically broadband point.	Noted.
98	Essex County Council	_MM05	<i>Specifically new para after 8.17, broadband:</i> Support strongly - Changes essentially as proposed / agreed in SOCG	Supports new para after para 8.17, relating to broadband.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
214	Epping Forest District Council	_MM06	The Council supports the inclusion of a new paragraph after paragraph 10.8 as it refers to the minor amendments to the Green Belt to take account of the proposed Garden Town Community in Epping Forest District west of Harlow.	Supports new para after 10.8 .	Noted.
228	Environment Agency	_MM06/07	We are pleased to see our comments have been taken on board.	Pleased that comments taken on board.	Noted.
1	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	1.1 These representations are made on behalf of Barratt Homes, Persimmon Homes and Taylor Wimpey (referred to hereinafter as “The Consortium”), who have secured planning permission for, and are currently building out, development of land north of Gilden Way (now known as Gilden Park).	Info on Gilden Park developers.	Noted.
2	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	1.2 Across the site full planning permission (under a number of outline, reserved matters and full planning applications) is in place for a total of 1,054 new dwellings, in conjunction with a new primary school, local centre (hatch), public open space and allotments. An extract from the site location plan, showing the red-line boundary for the original outline planning permission for Gilden Park is include below by way of locational context (Fig 1).	Info on Gilden Park site.	Noted.
3	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	1.3 This submission relates specifically to land owned by the consortium, within the area immediately north of the residential development area, and south of the railway line, within which a range of recreational and open space uses associated with the Gilden Park scheme are located. The Document No. IMS-F-15, Revision 1, 01.05.2018 Page 2 of 5 following further plan extract below illustrates the role of this area of land (annotated as GS3) within the overall masterplan (Fig 2).	Mod relates to site g.ii.	Noted.
4	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	2.1 The modification in question proposes “Reinstated Green Belt designation to site g.ii” as shown on Map 6.d. An extract from this Map is included below for ease of reference (Fig 3). 2.2 Harlow Council had proposed removal of the hatched area of land from the Green Belt consistently through the Local Development Plan preparation process, including within the Pre-Submission version, and in the context of the Examination (within the Council’s Hearing Statement) stated the following by way of general justification applicable to all of these sites (at para. 107): “It is the Council’s position that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of these sites as the land in question is evidentially not sufficiently providing the purposes of the Green Belt, and the release would result in the provision of stronger and more robust inner Green Belt boundaries.”	Council proposed to remove site g.ii from Green Belt but MM6d proposes to keep it as Green Belt.	Noted.
5	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	2.3 More specifically, in relation to the circumstances of the site (g.ii) itself, it is noted that the site was assessed as “poorly performing Sub-area 9.1” at Stage 2 of the Green Belt Review (para. 137). It is acknowledged that the site forms part of the master-planned open space (including playing fields and allotments) of the Gilden Park housing development, and upon removal from the Green Belt would become undesignated land “due to it not performing well as Green Belt” (para. 138). It is stated that removal of the site would increase robustness of the newly formed inner Green Belt boundary, raising concern that retention of the designation would result in a boundary that “would not be particularly strong” (para. 142). 2.4 It is noted that the Inspector concluded, within his letter of 17th December 2019 in the context of his suggested Main Modification MM7 Policy WE1 Strategic Green Infrastructure, that the Green Belt designation should be reinstated to the following sites (a.i, a.iii, f.iv, g.ii, h.i). The brief explanation provided is that “exceptional circumstances test for their deletion not met”.	Site g.ii didn't perform well in Green Belt Review. Inspector concluded exceptional circumstances for removal from Green Belt not met.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
6	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.5 At this stage the Consortium wishes to object to the Council's proposed Main Modification MM6 on the basis that reinstatement of the Green Belt designation is unnecessary, unjustified and unduly restrictive. Further matters which are felt to underline and reinforce this stance, which may not have been previously presented for consideration in connection with the specific circumstances of the site, are set out below.</p> <p>2.6 It is evident that the nature of the site will change due to its open space role in conjunction with the Gilden Park development. This will include significant earthworks associated with the provision of sports pitches, within the western part of the site and the introduction of a range of structures and equipment (fencing, sheds, paths and tracks, irrigation kit etc.) associated with creation of the allotments in the eastern part of the site. The locations of these elements may be seen by reference to the plan extract included previously (Fig 2).</p>	Reinstatement of site g.ii as Green Belt is unjustified, unnecessary and unduly restrictive. Land will experience significant earthworks and other structures/equipment associated with sports provision.	Land use not necessarily factor in considering Green Belt designation (as per the national five purposes). Enabling earth works and sports pitch provision are activities that are not incompatible with the function of the Green Belt.
7	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.7 It is considered worthwhile to note the findings of the Inspector (Philip Ware) in relation to the Section 78 Appeal which granted outline planning permission for the scheme in 2012 (ref: APP/N1540/A/11/2167480). It was concluded that whilst such uses were not in themselves inappropriate within the Green Belt context, the impacts would undoubtedly impact detrimentally the openness of the Green Belt. Paras 130 and 131 of the Inspector's report are quoted in full below, for ease of reference. "130. The proposed sports/recreation area will amount to a material change of use from the current agricultural use. In addition, the change in land level at 2 metres in general and in parts at up to 3 metres will cause a significant impact on openness of the Green Belt. This is a harm which should be accorded substantial weight. The area of Green Belt affected will appear contrived and out of place.</p>	Inspector for original appeal into Gilden Park considered Green Belt would be adversely affected.	Land use not necessarily factor in considering Green Belt designation (as per the national five purposes). Enabling earth works and sports pitch provision are activities that are not incompatible with the function of the Green Belt.
8	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>131. The proposed allotments were specifically not inappropriate development in the former Planning Policy Guidance 2, but that reference no longer appears in the Framework. In any event, as is clear from the long list of paraphernalia which the appellants accepted were Document No. IMS-F-15, Revision 1, 01.05.2018 Page 4 of 5 likely to be found with allotments, the openness of the Green Belt is likely to be affected. This is especially as the allotments would be close to the residential development and they would be read together."</p> <p>2.8 Returning to this issue later in his report (paras. 283-289), the Inspector further emphasizes the view that the change of use from agricultural land to sports pitches would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and that the associated engineering works would, in failing to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, also represent inappropriate development in that respect. In connection with the allotments, whilst it is concluded that the retention of agricultural use would not be development, and the range of associated structures would not arguably require planning permission, this does not change the fact that consideration ought to be given to the impacts on openness that would result in the context of this current exercise.</p>	Inspector for original appeal into Gilden Park considered Green Belt would be adversely affected.	Land use not necessarily factor in considering Green Belt designation (as per the national five purposes).
9	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.9 Ultimately these matters were considered in the overall planning balance and outweighed by the positive benefits of housing delivery, and acceptance that the scheme as a whole represented sustainable development, with the Inspector recommending that the appeal be allowed, a position that was endorsed by the Secretary of State in granting approval.</p> <p>2.10 Para. 361 of the Inspector's report is considered relevant to current consideration of the role of the land as functional Green Belt going forward, stating: "The harm to the Green Belt caused by the sports facilities being located within the designated area must not be ignored. The harm by reason of inappropriateness has been considered against all the material considerations advanced by the parties and these considerations, especially the provision of much needed housing, clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances to justify the inappropriate development therefore exist."</p>	Appeal allowed as very special circumstances justified the inappropriate GB development.	Through the plan making process, areas of land can be designated as Green Belt if it can be shown that such land fulfills associated purposes.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
10	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.11 In addition to the above conclusions evidencing that inappropriate development has been approved within this area of Green Belt that will harm its openness, it is considered that other specific circumstances and practical considerations are also relevant. The lack of flexibility that would result from reinstatement of the Green Belt designation can also be seen in a specific situation relating to future use of the sports pitches in this area. Given the Green Belt status of the land in question, care was taken to ensure that the pavilion serving the pitches was tucked into the development area on land that had previously been removed from the Green Belt and designated as an Area of Special Restraint.</p> <p>2.12 At the planning committee, when considering determination of the Phase 2 Reserved Matters application (HW/REM/15/00389) which established the siting details of the pavilion, Councillors raised concern that this was distant from the pitches. Such was the level of their concern that the following was included as an informative on the approval notice: "3. The Local Planning Authority has concerns regarding the degree of separation between the pavilion and the sports pitches. Whilst it is understood that the outline planning permission (reference HW/PL/15/00142) restricts the location of the pavilion, the Local Planning Authority would welcome discussion on amendments to the scheme to allow the pavilion to be more appropriately located."</p>	Councillors expressed concern at distance of pavilion from sports pitches.	Noted.
11	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.13 Removal of the restrictive Green Belt designation would therefore have enabled potential re-siting of the pavilion into this area of the site in order to address the concerns of the Planning Committee members, in a manner that would not now be readily possible were the designation to be reinstated. 2.14 Furthermore, it should also be noted that a significant proportion of the area to be reinstated is covered by a Scheduled Ancient Monument designation. This relates to a Roman Villa buried within the centre of the g.ii site, as illustrated in the plan extract below (Fig 4).</p>	Removal of site g.ii would enable potential resiting of the pavilion. Large part of site protected in any case by Scheduled Monument designation.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
12	Boyer (o.b. o. Barratt, Persimmon & T. Wimpey)	_MM06d	<p>2.15 It can therefore be seen that a large area of the site is significantly constrained by this heritage designation, preventing any future physical built development within this area regardless of whether or not the Green Belt designation were to be present. This may provide further reassurance about the consequences of a decision not to reinstate the Green Belt designation. 2.16 In light of the various considerations set out above, it is therefore requested that MM6 d. be reconsidered by the Council, and this particular strand of the modification be deleted such that the area of land in question be removed from the Green Belt.</p>	Request change to remove site from Green Belt.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
137	Canal & River Trust	_MM08	We welcome the inclusion of canals and rivers within the scope of this policy	Welcome inclusion of rivers & canals.	Noted.
215	Epping Forest District Council	_MM09	<p>The Council strongly supports the inclusion of the new paragraphs 1 and 2 in relation to internationally designated sites outside of the district but would suggest minor changes for the sake of clarity to ensure that it is clear the policy relates to both flora and fauna and to be consistent with the wording of paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.</p> <p>PROPOSED CHANGE: 'Internationally designated wildlife-sites of biodiversity importance..'</p>	Change "internationally designated wildlife sites" to "internationally designated sites of biodiversity importance" to ensure NPPF compliance.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
216	Epping Forest District Council	_MM09	<p>The Council would suggest an amendment to the wording of part of the new paragraph to be inserted after paragraph 10.26 for the sake of clarity and consistency recognising that there are higher order assets outside of the District to which Policy WE3 relates.</p> <p>PROPOSED CHANGE: '...follows the hierarchy of sites located within Harlow District to which Policy WE3 relates....'</p>	After "follows the hierarchy" add "of sites located within Harlow district to which Policy WE3 relates..." to clarify that there are higher order assets outside the district to which WE3 relates.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
217	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10	The Council strongly supports the inclusion of this new policy but would suggest that the title of the policy is amended for the sake of clarity to ensure that it is clear the policy relates to both flora and fauna and to be consistent with the wording of paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012. PROPOSED CHANGE: <u>Safeguarding Wildlife Protecting Sites of biodiversity importance beyond the District Boundary</u>	Change title of policy to "Protecting sites of biodiversity importance beyond the district boundary" to ensure NPPF compliance.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
218	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10	In addition the Council would suggest that the wording of the policy is strengthened to reflect the Habitats Regulations in that any development which has a likely significant effect on an internationally designated site is required to submit a Habitats Regulations Assessment. PROPOSED CHANGE: Where significant effects on the Epping Forest SAC alone or in combination are likely, a project level Habitats Regulation Assessment <u>may will</u> be required.	Project level HRAs should be mandatory.	This is not in accordance with advice received from Natural England.
219	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10	The Council notes that the justification refers to three sites but these are not specified. For the sake of clarity it is suggested that an amendment is made to rectify this. PROPOSED CHANGE: Whilst there are no European designated sites within the district boundary, there are three which are located within sufficient proximity that there could be impact pathways arising from development in the Local Plan such that the integrity of the sites could be affected. <u>These sites are the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation, the Wormley-Hoddesdonpark Woods Special Area of Conservation and the Lee Valley Special Protection Area and Ramsar site.</u>	European sites beyond the district boundary to be identified by name.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
220	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10	The Council would suggest that for the sake of consistency that the justification should make reference to avoidance as well as mitigation. PROPOSED CHANGE: However, of these the habitats regulation assessment produced in support of the plan demonstrates that only in the case of Epping Forest SAC is an adverse effect likely unless satisfactory <u>avoidance or</u> mitigation is put in place.	The wording should include avoidance as well as mitigation.	Accept as minor amendment.
221	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10, imp new para 1	The Council would suggest that for the sake of clarity that the first new paragraph is amended to make it clear that the 'zone of influence' may change over time. PROPOSED CHANGE: <u>The latest A visitor surveys undertaken in 2017 demonstrate- identified that 75% of visitors to Epping Forest arise from within 6.2 km of its boundary which can be considered the core recreational catchment area or 'zone of influence'. This only involves a small part of the south of the district. Further visitor surveys will be undertaken from time to time as part of the monitoring measures may result in a change to the 'zone of influence'.</u>	Date of visitor survey to be mentioned and wording inserted to indicate further monitoring may result in changes to the ZoI.	Accept as minor amendment.
222	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10, imp new para 2	The Council is of the view that there may be other appropriate mechanisms to ensure the efficacy of the Mitigation Strategies and therefore would suggest that the second new paragraph is amended to provide flexibility as to the most appropriate mechanism to ensure the efficacy of the mitigation strategies. PROPOSED CHANGE: In order to avoid potentially adverse effects on these two sites due to recreational pressure from new residents, the Councils concerned are working with Natural England and the site owners to develop suitable mitigation strategies which will be <u>formally adopted as supplementary planning guidance as a material consideration in the determination of planning and other applications</u> in due course.	Additional wording suggested to indicate potential status of the mitigation strategies as material considerations.	Accept as minor amendment.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
223	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10, imp new para 3	The Council considers that the reference to a 'zone of influence' in relation to air quality could cause confusion recognising that this is a more commonly applied term for identifying the extent of recreational pressures. The Council would therefore suggest that the new third paragraph is amended for the sake of clarity. PROPOSED CHANGE: Natural England agree that growth in Harlow district will have a small or negligible effect, that a 'zone of influence' must be identified for practical purposes and in this instance it would be reasonable for air quality mitigation measures to be the responsibility of Epping Forest district.	Zone of Influence is normally said to be for recreational impacts, not air quality.	Accept as minor amendment.
224	Epping Forest District Council	_MM10, imp new para 3	The Council is of the view that there may be other appropriate mechanisms to ensure the efficacy of the Mitigation Strategies and therefore would suggest that the second new paragraph is amended to provide flexibility as to the most appropriate mechanism to ensure the efficacy of the mitigation strategies. PROPOSED CHANGE: Policy WE3a will be implemented in the context of co-operation between the Councils and other bodies concerned with the protection of each site. Harlow Council is committed to this co-operation and, following full discussion and agreement, will <u>formally</u> adopt as necessary <u>supplementary planning guidance</u> <u>any mitigation strategy</u> setting out any necessary requirements for development within its district <u>as a material consideration in the determination of planning and other applications</u> .	Additional wording suggested to indicate potential status of the mitigation strategies as material considerations.	Accept as minor amendment.
86	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	_MM11	reference to re-provision of Princess Alexandra Hospital to East Harlow and fall-back redevelopment in situ option. Support inclusion of revised wording which is also reflected in SoCG.	Support reference to re-provision of PAH to East Harlow and fall-back redevelopment-in-situ option.	Noted.
99	Essex County Council	_MM11	<i>Specifically "require safeguarding" wording:</i> ECC supports this part of this MM strongly - Changes considered necessary to ensure effective protection of land identified for key infrastructure measures from other development	Supports safeguarding point of this MM.	Noted.
100	Essex County Council	_MM11	<i>Specifically SIR1:</i> The second part of this policy could usefully remain as a policy addressing the 6 identified key infrastructure interventions, their safeguarding and their illustration on the Proposals Map. Object On basis of ECC's original objection on these grounds. This policy confuses its subject matter between generic infrastructure requirements, processes etc. that all developers need to refer to. That content is instead best covered in Policy IN6. Policy SIR1 is concerned with the most strategic infrastructure measures and how these are dealt with in HLDP. It will therefore benefit Plan users to separate these policies from their current form . Move first 5 clauses of policy into Policy IN6 Planning Obligations – as these all deal with generic infrastructure requirements, processes and the IDP. Leave final sentence and 6 key infrastructure measures within this policy (SIR1) as identified Key Infrastructure Requirements .	Object, as policy confuses subject matter between generic infrastructure requirements that all developers need to refer to. Move first 5 clauses of policy into Policy IN6. Leave final sentence and 6 key infrastructure measures within Policy SIR1 as Identified Key Infrastructure Requirements.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
225	Epping Forest District Council	_MM11	For the sake of clarity, this Main Modification should be amended for the sake of clarity to differentiate between the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation and the Epping Forest District administrative area. PROPOSED CHANGE: '...Epping Forest <u>District</u> ...'	Need to distinguish between EFDC and EF SAC.	Accept as minor amendment.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
101	Essex County Council	_MM11	<i>Specifically new para after para 11.34:</i> ECC supports this MM overall. However, to be consistent with ECC's position on Policy HGT1 and related Garden town matters, ECC requests substituting the proposed expression 'the new Garden Town Communities' with 'the new Garden Town Strategic Developments'. Reflects identified future infrastructure requirements in this subject matter	Use term "Garden Town Strategic Developments" instead of "Garden Town Communities".	Suggested amendment would cause inconsistency with neighbouring Local Plans and the Garden Town Vision.
102	Essex County Council	_MM13	<i>Specifically point (a) of PL1:</i> ECC supports this MM strongly. Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG	Strongly supports.	Noted.
69	Home Builders Federation	_MM14	We are concerned that the proposed modifications to the text supporting policy PL3 are not consistent with the way the policy is worded. The policy as set out in the submitted local plan states that support will be given to "development where it meets or exceeds minimum standards required by building regulations". The minimum requirement in this policy was for development to meet building regulations with the Council seeking to encourage applicants to go further where possible. Yet the supporting text at paragraph 13.17 states that "Development will be supported where it exceeds the minimum standards required by Building Regulations" and goes on to set out the degree to which applicants should exceed the requirements of Building Regulations. This proposed modification moves away from the original policy that is seeking to encourage improvements rather than require them. Given that the Council are proposing to support development that meets the minimum requirements of building regulations whether or not they should be exceeded, and if so by how much is for the applicant to decide. In order to ensure consistency between the supporting text and the Council's policy we would suggest the following amendments.	Possible discrepancy between policy wording and supporting text - development being supported where it meets/exceeds minimum standards, versus development being supported where it exceeds minimum standards.	To clarify, the supporting text should say development which exceeds the minimum requirements will be encouraged .
70	Home Builders Federation	_MM14	Suggested amendment: Remove the new sentence proposed to be included at the end of paragraph 13.16. This sentence refers to the preferable amount by which building regulations should be exceeded.	See text.	Retain to provide details for developers wishing to exceed the minimum. Provides hook for greater sustainability.
71	Home Builders Federation	_MM14	Suggested amendment: Amend the proposed modification to paragraph 13.17 to read: "Development will be supported where it encouraged to exceeds the minimum standards required by Building Regulations. The amount by which the standards should be exceeded is preferably at least 19%. The Council supports development that follows the principles of sustainable construction, and encourages developers to deliver schemes which adopt a fabric-first approach to development and meet the performance and quality set by appropriate standards, such as Passivhaus, Home Quality Mark (HQM) and BREEAM UK New Construction 2018."	See text.	The Council is content with changing "supported" to "encouraged". Next bit could say "Where the developer exceeds the minimum standards, the amount by which the minimum standards should be exceeded is preferably at least 19%

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
88	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	_MM14	<p>policy emphasis change and addition of further detailed supporting justification. No objection to the policy wording which seeks high standards of sustainable design, construction and energy efficiency. However, further clarification is required concerning the proposed revised supporting text at para 13.17. This text explains that development will be supported where it exceeds Building Regulations standards. The inference to this could be that development that does not exceed Building Regulations standards may not be supported even if there was a good reason not to do so and therefore, could be refused planning permission if interpreted literally.</p> <p>The legislation guiding Building Regulations is the Building Act 1984, whereas, planning matters are dealt with by separate Town & Country Planning legislation. Planning policy should not seek to determine or duplicate matters that are addressed through separate legislation and therefore, the interpretation and application of the text in para 13.17 needs to be clarified in this respect to avoid confusion and potential challenge.</p>	<p>Planning policy should not seek to determine/duplicate Building Regs matters. Higher construction standards could have viability consequences.</p>	<p>To clarify, the supporting text should say development which exceeds the minimum requirements will be encouraged. Next bit could say "Where the developer exceeds the minimum standards, the amount by which the minimum standards should be exceeded is preferably at least 19%.</p>
89	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	_MM14	<p>Also, if higher constructions standards are sought to be imposed, this may have viability consequences for development schemes, particularly in the current economic climate, including healthcare and residential led schemes brought forward by PAH. Therefore, the application of Policy PL3 requires a degree of flexibility through the inclusion of a viability clause in a similar way that affordable housing and other developer contribution based policies are constructed. If such a suitable clause was applied in this instance, PAH would not object to the aspirational policy approach in PL3, which seeks high standards of design and sustainability.</p>	<p>Planning policy should not seek to determine/duplicate Building Regs matters. Higher construction standards could have viability consequences.</p>	<p>To clarify, the supporting text should say development which exceeds the minimum requirements will be encouraged. Next bit could say "Where the developer exceeds the minimum standards, the amount by which the minimum standards should be exceeded is preferably at least 19%.</p>
72	Home Builders Federation	_MM15	<p>The decision to include a policy relating to the Green Belt is unnecessary as this merely seeks to summarise national policy. The danger of such an approach is that in summarising national policy some elements can be missed. For example, 145 of the NPPF – relating to new buildings that are exceptions to paragraph 144 – includes cemeteries, burial ground, and allotments – yet these are omitted from the Council's proposed modification. These could be added; however, we would suggest an alternative approach would be more effective if the inspector is minded to include a policy on Green Belt. Rather than repeat national policy verbatim we would suggest that instead policy PL4 is amended to include reference to the Green Belt.</p>	<p>Green Belt policy repeats national policy and misses elements. Amend PL4 to include Green Belt.</p>	<p>Author of rep is using 2019 NPPF; Plan was examined on 2012 NPPF.</p>
73	Home Builders Federation	_MM15	<p>Suggested amendment: The title of PL4 be amended to read "Green Belt, Green Wedges and Green Fingers";</p>	<p>See text.</p>	<p>Separate Green Belt policy reflects the difference between Green Belt and Green Wedge/Green Finger.</p>
74	Home Builders Federation	_MM15	<p>Suggested amendment: The policy be amended to begin "Development on land designated as Green Belt will be severely restricted in line with national policy to ensure it continues to fulfil the five purposes of the Green Belt. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Substantial weight will be given to any harm to the Green Belt when assessing planning applications."</p>	<p>See text.</p>	<p>Separate Green Belt policy reflects the difference between Green Belt and Green Wedge/Green Finger.</p>
75	Home Builders Federation	_MM15	<p>Suggested amendment: The text set out MM15 relating to the justification for and implementation of Green Belt policy to be included in the relevant sections for PL4.</p>	<p>See text.</p>	<p>Separate Green Belt policy reflects the difference between Green Belt and Green Wedge/Green Finger.</p>

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
76	Home Builders Federation	_MM15	[The suggested amendments] would allow for the inclusion of a policy on Green Belt but ensure that it remains consistent with national policy by avoiding the risk of summarising the relevant paragraphs in the NPPF. It is also simpler and reduce the risk of the local plan being out of date should there be changes to Green Belt policy in future.	Amendment avoids risk of LP being out of date if national GB policy changes.	Future national Green Belt policies would be incorporated, as necessary, during LP Review within 5 years of adoption.
111	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	We are acting on behalf of our Client, de Merke Estates, with regard to land at Latton Farmhouse and its surrounding curtilage (off Latton Street), hereafter referred to as "the Site". The Site comprises a residential dwelling with numerous outbuildings and extensive residential curtilage – all lying within (or "washed over") by the "Green Wedge" of Harlow. Representations have previously been made on behalf of our Client during the production of the Local Plan, including: • Development Management Policies Reg 18 Consultation Draft (July – Sept 2017); and • Pre-Submission Local Plan Reg 19 Consultation (May – July 2018).	Rep relates to land at Latton Farmhouse. Reps have been made at earlier stages of LP production.	Noted.
112	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	Following the above, we also participated at the Examination of the Local Plan (April 2019), in particular in respect of the Hearing session on "Green Wedge". Notwithstanding our Client's specific land interests, these representations have been prepared in objective terms and assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF - 20121) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Para 182 (NPPF, 2012) requires that a Local Plan should be sound, namely that it is: • Positively prepared; • Justified; • Effective; and • Consistent with National policy. We now comment on the Proposed Main Modifications below having regard to the NPPF and NPPG.	Took part at the LP examination, particularly the Green Wedge session. Reps prepared against NPPF (2012) and NPPG.	Noted.
113	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	At the Local Plan Examination we argued, in broad terms, the policy places significant burdens upon and is overly restrictive of new development in the Green Wedge, and that it does not recognise there are some areas that do not contribute towards the roles and functions of the Green Wedge. Furthermore, it was considered (and remains so) that the policy places equivalent and even higher restrictions on development than that placed nationally on Green Belt development.	Green Wedge policy too restrictive and has higher restrictions than national GB restrictions.	This matter has already been considered at the Hearing sessions of the Examination.
114	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	We do not repeat these full arguments here however, the Local Plan is deficient in that flexibility is not being afforded to enable proposals in the Green Wedge to be assessed on a site-by-site basis (as we proposed it should at the Examination). This is important given that the Local Plan is proposing a stepped housing trajectory and is therefore unable to meet its housing needs within the first 5-years of the Plan (up to 2024). Such considerations now become all the more important due to the potential impacts of COVID-19 upon housing supply and the necessity for sites to come forward in the short-term, including in Green Wedge.	Not enough flexibility in Green Wedge policy - e.g. site by site. Important now that Local Plan won't meet housing needs in first 5 years. Pandemic also has impact.	Council stated at Hearings that site-by-site flexibility in the Green Wedge wouldn't be appropriate as piecemeal development could erode the functions and roles of wider areas of Green Wedge. The use of the stepped trajectory acknowledges the housing land supply situation in Harlow, where large and strategic sites will develop out later in the Local Plan period at a higher rate than in the 5 year span. The lowering of the rate in the first 5 years is reflected later in the Local Plan by a rate above the above average supply, required if the requirement were spread uniformly over the whole Local Plan period.
115	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	MM16 now seeks to introduce the following additional text as below: Where development includes replacement uses, redevelopment, extensions or alterations, it must meet all the following criteria: (f) it does not result in a greater negative impact on the roles and functions of the Green Wedges and Green Fingers than the existing development; (g) it does not result in disproportionate additions to the original building(s); and (h) any replacement buildings must be in the same use.	MM16 seeks to introduce new criteria f, g and h.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
116	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	This aspect of the policy acknowledges that redevelopment can occur in Green Wedge and we support this element of it. However, we do not consider that sub-items f) - h) are “justified” or “effective” and are only of relevance to Green Belt (NPPF, para 89) – a higher National policy bar than “Green Wedge”. As above and given the housing shortages facing the Council up to 2024, we would therefore recommend that the above sub-items are deleted and instead the policy affords flexibility to development proposals.	Supports point that redevelopment can occur in Green Wedge. Points f, g and h not justified or effective and are only of relevance to the Green Belt - they should be removed.	Council stated at Hearings that site-by-site flexibility in the Green Wedge wouldn't be appropriate as piecemeal development could erode the functions and roles of wider areas of Green Wedge. These points are similar to the Green Belt restrictions but are bespoke for the Green Wedge.
117	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	In this context, the NPPF allows for limited infilling or partial/complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) in the Green Belt (provided it does not have greater impact on openness). It also includes the test of “Very Special Circumstances” which allows an LPA to make a balanced judgement in respect of the benefits of the scheme against the impact upon the Green Belt. The Green Wedge policy (PL4) above does not afford such opportunities for development even though it carries less significance (in policy terms) than Green Belt. The current wording of Policy PL4 is therefore not “positively prepared”, “justified” or “consistent with National policy” .	Green Wedge does not afford opportunities of redevelopment of brownfield land or a Very Special Circs. test, which are both provided for in national Green Belt policy. Green Wedge policy therefore not positively prepared, justified or consistent with national policy.	Council stated at Hearings that the Green Wedge policy is bespoke to Harlow and its restrictive nature reflects the importance of the Green Wedge in Harlow - both from a historic point of view, but also a socio-environmental one.
118	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	To overcome concerns in terms of soundness, it is recommended that the policy contains a “facilitating clause” allowing for consideration of the roles and functions of the Green Wedge on a site-by-site basis. We therefore suggest the following wording: Development in the Green Wedge will be assessed on a site-by-site basis having regard to the development needs in the District and to the roles and functions of the Green Wedge set out in Policy WE2.	Policy needs facilitating clause for consideration of the roles and functions of the Green Wedge on a site-by-site basis.	Assessment of the roles and functions of the Green Wedge on a site-by-site basis not appropriate, as small sites would inevitably be deemed to perform poorly due to their size. Only large areas of Green Wedge should be assessed in this way, as happened in the Green Wedge Review.
119	Barton Willmore o. b.o. de Merke	_MM16	This would provide a “facilitating” policy which would enable development to occur on specific sites which do not make a contribution to the Green Wedge. This would ensure that the policy is “positively prepared” and “sound”, particularly having regard to the land constraints in the district and the extent in housing need, particularly in the short-term.	Change (ID 119) would ensure policy is positively prepared and sound, considering land constraints and extent of housing need.	Assessment of the roles and functions of the Green Wedge on a site-by-site basis not appropriate, as small sites would inevitably be deemed to perform poorly due to their size. Only large areas of Green Wedge should be assessed in this way, as happened in the Green Wedge Review.
226	Epping Forest District Council	_MM18	The Council would suggest for the sake of clarity and consistency that the wording is amended to make it clear that Policy PL9 relates to both human health and the health of biodiversity assets. PROPOSED CHANGE: For air quality, the acceptability or otherwise of a proposal will be determined with reference to the relevant limit values or National Air Quality Objectives <u>as they relate to human health or biodiversity.....</u>	Additional wording suggested for PL9 to make clear the benefits for human health or biodiversity.	Accept as minor amendment.
103	Essex County Council	_MM19	ECC supports this MM strongly.Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG (alongside those agreed with Environment Agency) These reflect ECC's role as LLFA and comprehensive ECC representations to improve this policy	Strongly supports.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
138	Canal & River Trust	_MM19	<p>The Trust does not support a blanket policy for an 8m set back adjacent to main rivers. This would include the River Stort Navigation, which the Trust owns and is responsible for. It is important that development is designed in a way that is appropriate to its site and setting, with the water addressed at the heart of the design. We consider that these requirements can create 'dead' spaces, that fail to appropriately address the waterspace, and can exacerbate anti-social behaviour. The Town and Country Planning Association's Policy Advice Note Inland Waterways (produced with support from British Waterways, our statutory predecessor) identifies the following as one of the guiding principles for waterside development: It is important that the siting, configuration and orientation of buildings optimise views of the water, generate natural surveillance of water space, and encourage and improve access to, along and from the water.</p>	<p>8m set backs adjacent to main rivers does not provide the flexibility required by the Canal and River Trust.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency requested the 8m set back.</p>
139	Canal & River Trust	_MM19	<p>Whilst we anticipate that this policy is primarily aimed at the development of new residential, commercial or mixed use units, it would also apply to other forms of development. A good example would be a bridge crossing, such as those proposed to support the delivery of the Gilston Garden Town. We have stressed the need for the proposed new Central Stort crossings to include an abutment on the off-side (the Harlow side) that rises out of the river in order to remove the potential for litter and anti-social behaviour to adversely affect the waterway environment and users' enjoyment of it. We would not want to see this prevented by a blanket insistence on an 8m setback.</p>	<p>See ID 138.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency requested the 8m set back.</p>
140	Canal & River Trust	_MM19	<p>Whilst we appreciate that there are benefits to biodiversity in leaving certain areas undeveloped adjacent to waterways, we would note again that our waterways are canalised and provide other functions beyond biodiversity value including for navigation, leisure and active travel along towpaths. We would argue that a blanket 8m setback will not enable the positive interaction, active surveillance or enhancement of character of our waterways that we seek to support these other uses. Our understanding was that the Environment Agency (and Epping Forest Council) had accepted these arguments through the recent Epping Forest Local Plan examination hearings and that the following wording was to be added to a similar policy in the Epping Forest Local Plan: Exceptions may be acceptable for the navigable sections of the River Stort where a smaller buffer would result in a better environment or facilities for users of these multifunctional assets and where it can be demonstrated that there would be no adverse impacts on flood risk, flood defences and the natural environment is enhanced, We suggest that the position proposed in the main modifications on this issue does not constitute the most appropriate strategy, as required by para 182 of the NPPF (2012) and a justified strategy required by para 35 of the NPPF (2019).</p>	<p>Consistency sought with wording proposed in the emerging Epping LP.</p>	<p>The Environment Agency requested the 8m set back.</p>
33	Historic England	_MM20	<p>UNSOUND. Comment: Whilst we welcome the proposed modifications to PL11 (better reveal, heritage statement and optimum viable use) we continue to have a number of concerns in relation to the policy. Historic England continue to suggest that the policy should include a requirement for a desk based assessment or field evaluation to be submitted where proposals affect sites or are within or adjacent to sites of known archaeological interest or sites where there is reason to suggest there is archaeological interest Whilst this is mentioned in paragraph 13.88, it should also be included in policy. Historic England continue to suggest that the final paragraph of the policy relating to enabling development is deleted from the Plan. Enabling development is by nature contrary to the local Plan and so should not be included in the Local Plan. We continue to advise that a policy on heritage at risk rather than enabling development would better achieve the desired outcome. We do however broadly welcome the addition of the sentence to para 13.79 relating to enabling development which refers to Historic England.</p>	<p>See text.</p>	<p>This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.</p>

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
34	Historic England	_MM20	Suggested Change: Historic England continue to suggest that the policy should include a requirement for a desk based assessment or field evaluation to be submitted where proposals affect sites or are within or adjacent to sites of known archaeological interest or sites where there is reason to suggest there is archaeological interest Whilst this is mentioned in paragraph 13.88, it should also be included in policy. Historic England continue to suggest that the final paragraph relating to enabling development is deleted from the Plan. Enabling development is by nature contrary to the local Plan and so should not be included in the Local Plan. We continue to advise that a policy on heritage at risk rather than enabling development would better achieve the desired outcome.	See text.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council is neutral to an amendment on these terms.
49	Cllr Simon Carter	_MM22	There is an anomaly in the proposed modifications which discriminates against people with disabilities, contrary to the Equality Act 2010. On the one hand, all new properties should (my emphasis) meet Part M4(2) but only if the developer deems them affordable. On the other, in MM14, developments that exceed the minimum standard for insulation by 19% will be supported. So there is an immediate and regulatory excuse for developers to claim that accessible homes are unaffordable as they have to meet far more stringent insulating requirements, in excess of building regulations and of other planning authorities.	Modification discriminates against people with disabilities as should the development be made unviable by this policy, the developer does not have to comply.	On adoption the Local Plan will have been subject to a whole plan viability assessment as required, which should strengthen this policy requirement. Any reduction will need independent viability assessment from the developer.
50	Cllr Simon Carter	_MM22	According to a recent report by Habinteg Housing Association, 'Insight Report: A forecast for accessible homes', "In London the chances of finding a new home of either accessible and adaptable standard or wheelchair dwelling standard is one new accessible home for every 24 people. In the East of England, there is one new accessible home for every 52 people". https://www.habinteg.org.uk/localplans/ There is a clear need for more accessible homes to be met through new developments – the NHS estimates there are some 1.2 million wheel chair users in the UK.	There is a clear need for more accessible homes to be met through new developments – the NHS estimates there are 1.2 million wheel chair users in the UK.	Noted. Policy requires all dwellings to be adaptable and a proportion, where there is evidence, to be wheelchair accessible.
51	Cllr Simon Carter	_MM22	Developers often claim that accessible homes are more expensive to build than 'normal' homes, yet this has yet to be proved. Developers meet a higher standard in London and therefore have the experience to deliver higher numbers on a regular basis. Why should people living outside London be discriminated against? It is difficult to reconcile an optional approach to meeting a real and practical need against having to substantially exceed a more arbitrary target of 'insulation'. Where is the fairness in that? Both are important, but why is one more important than the other? There are many ways to reduce CO2 emissions, but only one way to provide proper housing for disabled people. In MM22 Policy H5 paragraph (a) must be amended to 'all new properties must be at least Building Regulations Part M4(2) . . . We might then get some equity for wheelchair users and other people with disabilities.	Building accessible homes being more expensive has yet to be proven. H5(a) to be amended (see text).	Noted. Policy H5 (a) <u>does</u> require all dwellings to be M4(2) standard.
104	Essex County Council	_MM22	<i>Specifically new paras after 14.25:</i> ECC supports this MM strongly Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG	Strongly supports.	Noted.
170	Harlow Conservative Group	_MM22	Suggested recommendation 5. In MM22 Policy H5 paragraph (a) should be amended to 'all new properties must be at least Building Regulations Part M4(2) . . .'	H5 paragraph (a) should be amended to 'all new properties must be at least Building Regulations Part M4(2).	Policy H5 (a) <u>does</u> require all dwellings to be M4(2) standard.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
105	Essex County Council	_MM23	Support. No ECC reps made previously. However, ECC supports these changes in the interests of meeting housing needs across all sections of the community. ECC also supports the feature whereby these requirements apply to all residential schemes. Proposed changes link to the evidence base and are therefore justified and effective	Supports.	Noted.
77	Home Builders Federation	_MM25	Whilst we support the proposed modification to H9 we would recommend removing the term major which the Council are no doubt aware has a specific legal and policy definition when used in relation to sites. The amended modification should read: "Housing sites of greater than 50 dwellings must include the provision of fully serviced plots for self or custom build housing within each phase to ensure as far as possible the continuous availability of such plots throughout the development". This amendment whilst small will ensure that there is no conflict with regard to the size of development that will be expected to address policy H9.	Policy H9 uses the term 'major' which has a specific meaning in planning terms, when the policy refers to sites of 50 dwellings. Edit policy to remove reference to major.	The Council is content with this amendment.
37	Sport England	_MM29	Support is offered for the proposed new policy L4 and its reasoned justification on health and well-being.	Support for Plan.	Noted.
38	Sport England	_MM29	First the principle of including a policy which seeks development and growth to have a positive impact on health and well-being is supported as this would accord with paragraph 91 of the NPPF.	Support for Plan.	Noted.
39	Sport England	_MM29	Second, criteria a, b and f of the policy are particularly supported as they would align with Sport England's planning objectives and would help support the provision of infrastructure to support sport and physical activity and good quality design which encourages physical activity. The specific references in the implementation section to the Essex Design Guide, the Essex-wide Health Impact Assessment guidance and Sport England's Active Design guide are especially welcome as they all include guidance and how developments can create environments through design which encourage physical activity.	Support for Plan.	Noted.
106	Essex County Council	_MM29	ECC supports this MM strongly. Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG This policy area has particular importance to ECC and the hope is that the policy and all supporting elements will be endorsed as currently proposed	Support for Plan.	Noted.
141	Canal & River Trust	_MM29	The Trust welcomes the addition of policy L4. However, we would suggest that consideration is given to whether the expectations on developers could be clearer. For example, rather than simply 'considering the impacts' and 'having regard to' 'infrastructure required to encourage physical exercise', should a developer be required to contribute to enhancements where a need is indicated in the council's evidence base or the assessments carried out to support the application? As a provider of strategic green infrastructure within the area, we would welcome discussions with the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town team about the proposed Health Framework.	Policy L4 is welcomed but could be clearer.	The Council will expect developers to contribute towards infrastructure in appropriate circumstances.
107	Essex County Council	_MM30	ECC supports this MM strongly.Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG	Support for Plan.	Noted.
142	Canal & River Trust	_MM30	The Trust supports the changes proposed to Policy IN1	Support changes to the policy.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
227	Epping Forest District Council	_MM30	The Council supports the clarification provided by this Main Modification but would suggest that this should be strengthened in order to support the modal shift ambitions of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. PROPOSED CHANGE: Major development proposals should investigate-identify ways to reduce the use of the car and promote alternative ways to travel and this should be detailed in a supporting Travel Plan.	Change "investigate" to "identify" to strengthen modal shift ambitions.	Accept as minor amendment.
108	Essex County Council	_MM32	ECC supports this MM strongly.Changes reflect those sought by ECC and agreed in SOCG	Support for Plan.	Noted.
109	Essex County Council	_MM33	<i>Specifically addition of text starting "Where the submission of a viability assessment...":</i> Support. <i>NB If Inspector not minded to support ECC's preferred position of incorporating ECC recommended policy (see the following table row for this) ECC would support this change as currently proposed in MM33.</i> <i>New text as proposed to address viability matters considered beneficial in clarity / approach and an improvement on the previous policy references on viability. See next row for ECC substantive position on this policy matter</i>	Modification supported but ECC maintain their position on recommending an alternative policy to Policy IN6, which is considered to be clearer.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
110	Essex County Council	_MM33	Object: ECC remain of view that policy scope, approach and comprehensiveness considered insufficient. Therefore, it is again recommended to replace Policy IN6 with the policy proposed previously by ECC, to ensure coverage and approach are comprehensive and clearer. It is noted that the first paragraph only reiterates national policy within NPPF 2019. Similarly, the second paragraph serves mainly to describe standard means of securing requirements (through use of planning conditions / planning obligations) and via on site / off site provision mechanisms. Elements missing from the policy include: • Requirements for infrastructure provision to be either adequate and sustainable or made adequate and sustainable over time through development proposals; • Requirement for applicants to work positively with the council / all relevant parties in this matter; • Requirements to address cumulative development impacts and references to relevant published policies and guidance; • A rigorous structured basis to addressing any necessary exceptions to the policy requirements; • Glossary to capture full breadth of infrastructure types. This is both in interests of Plan users and to help ensure that the substantial challenge of delivering planned HGGT growth sustainably with the sum of combined infrastructure necessary See response to MM11 in earlier table row. Combine elements of Policy SIR1 dealing with general infrastructure / planning obligations requirements (i.e. the first 5 clauses) with those in Policy IN6 Replace existing Policy IN6 with comprehensive policy proposed by ECC. The single policy (can be viewed in ECC's hearing statement on this matter at https://www.harlow.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Essex County Council - Matter 3 and 7.pdf)	See ID 110.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
181	Places for People	_MM33	Places for People believe that IN6 should be expanded to outline the nature and type of contributions that will be sought, from what types of development and over what period, set out the anticipated relationship with CIL, and should recognise that in calculating contributions the local planning authority should take account of existing infrastructure deficiencies. Given that Housing Infrastructure Fund recycling will depend, in part, on the strength of the policy framework it is disappointing that a stronger planning policy platform has not been promoted.	IN6 should be amplified, the relationship with CIL and existing deficiencies should be included.	The Harlow IDP sets out the detailed requirements for the Harlow area.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
35	Historic England	AMs	<i>Note: Historic England also provide some supportive comments regarding the Additional (Minor) Modifications, which were not formally part of the consultation.</i>	Support certain AMs.	Noted.
87	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	AMs	We also note that the associated Schedule of Additional (Minor) Modifications (March 2020) document, includes references to the updated PAH position in paragraphs 5.38 and 5.39 of the Local Plan for consistency, as agreed in the SoCG.	AMs include updated PAH position.	Noted.
52	Cllr Joel Charles	Background	I welcome the further opportunity to contribute to the development of Harlow's Local Plan. In June 2014, I submitted a written response to the Local Plan consultation setting out my concerns. The Local Plan has evolved significantly since my original response so I want to set out my current concerns about the plan, specifically the impact on Old Harlow.	Concerned primarily with Old Harlow. Commenting again now as plan has evolved.	Noted.
15	Harlow Alliance Party	Consultation Process	It is clear from the outcome of the Examination of Harlow Council's Local Plan that it was deeply flawed in the way that it was prepared, information was not available on time and consultation with residents was woefully lacking. Evidence of this can be seen for example from the huge number of changes that have had to be made to the Plan, the amount of new information that became available during and after the Examination took place and the deletion of seven sites on which homes were to be built. The arrogance shown by both local Political Parties, with a 'we know best attitude', indeed one Councillor saying in public that they did not consult residents further because it would not have made any difference just shows how out of touch those running Harlow Council are with residents.	Local Plan consultation was flawed and lacking, shown by the number of mods needed.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
40	Cllr Michael Garnett	Consultation Process	I submit that Harlow District Council has failed in its duty to consult properly with the local population by choosing to go to a Regulation 19 consultation which concentrated on the technical elements of the plan process whereas a section 18 process would have allowed an open debate particularly around the proposed growth locations identified and more specifically the East of Harlow Development.	Failed to consult properly, particularly regarding East of Harlow.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
53	Cllr Joel Charles	Consultation Process	Harlow Council has failed to properly consult local residents about the true scale of development proposed in the current version of the Local Plan. The council chose to conduct a Regulation 19 consultation which focused narrowly on the technical elements of the plan process that will govern development up to 2033. It is surprising that Harlow Council refused to pursue a full Regulation 18 process to allow open debate about, in particular, the proposed growth locations for new housing developments. This has meant that Harlow Council has failed to achieve buy-in from the local community to the draft plan. Many residents in Old Harlow have been left confused by the approach taken by the council and the lack of communication about one of the most important governing documents that will shape the town's future for decades to come.	Failed to consult properly, particularly regarding location of new housing.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
149	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	It is, of course, important that Harlow Council has an up-to-date local plan to provide structure for the future development and growth of the town, preventing speculative and uncontrolled development, but it should not be at any cost and residents should have been involved at every stage of its development.	Local Plan provides structure for future growth. Residents should have been involved at every stage.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
150	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	Overarching the whole of the local plan process, the Conservative Group feels that Harlow Council has completely failed in its duty to properly consult local residents about the true scale of development proposed in the current version of the Local Plan. By choosing to prematurely conduct a Regulation 19 consultation they focused narrowly on only the technical elements of the plan process that will govern development up to 2033.	Failed in duty to properly consult residents. Focused on technical elements through Reg 19 process.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
151	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	It was both surprising and sad that Harlow Council refused to pursue a second Regulation 18 process to allow open debate about, in particular, the proposed growth locations for new housing developments.	Sad that there was no second Reg 18, particularly for growth locations.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
154	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	This is a common theme with the council's approach to the draft plan and a key criticism we would like to raise in this consultation. There has been a distinct failure on the part of Harlow District Council to properly involve and consult with residents of the town. There was no real effort to engage with residents, largely leaving them to find out about the consultations instead of being proactive and encouraging people to participate in the planning of the future of their town. The level of response to the Reg 18 and Reg 19 consultations were the result: 126 and 74 respectively. We believe that it is not the case that residents of Harlow do not care about their and the town's future, it is that they did not know about the consultations.	Limited engagement with residents. Low level of responses to consultations.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
155	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	Across many wards there is a very low level of awareness of the Local Plan. By not consulting properly, Harlow Council has failed to achieve any buy-in from the local community. Many residents have been left confused by the approach taken by the council and the lack of communication about one of the most important governing documents that will shape the town's future for decades to come.	Failed to achieve buy-in from local community. Many residents left confused.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
157	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	This lack of consultation also extends to neighbouring authorities. There has been poor communication with neighbouring authorities under the duty to cooperate. This has meant that other potential growth sites have not been properly considered to meet Harlow's overall dwelling supply target over the next 30 years.	Poor communication with other authorities. Other potential growth sites therefore not considered.	The Inspector was satisfied that the duty to cooperate process was sound. Evidence Base studies were prepared to evaluate which strategic sites in and around Harlow would be most appropriate.
168	Harlow Conservative Group	Consultation Process	Suggested recommendation 3. The Planning Inspector should request that Harlow Council conduct further consultation with residents about the potential implications of the identified strategic housing sites before any implementation commences.	Inspector should request Council undertakes further consultation with residents prior to implementation of Plan.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
172	Cllr Michael Hardware	Consultation Process	There has been a distinct failure on the part of Harlow District Council to properly involve and consult with residents of the town. There was no real effort to engage with residents, largely leaving them to find out about the consultations instead of being proactive and encouraging people to participate in the planning of the future of their town. The level of response to the Reg 18 and Reg 19 consultations were the result: 126 and 74 respectively. It is not that the residents of Harlow do not care about their future, it is that they did not know about the consultation.	No real effort to engage with residents. Low level of responses to consultations.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
173	Cllr Michael Hardware	Consultation Process	In my ward, Staple Tye, there is a very low level of awareness of the local plan. By not consulting properly, Harlow Council has failed to achieve any buy-in from the local community. Many residents have been left confused by the approach taken by the council and the lack of communication about one of the most important governing documents that will shape the town's future for decades to come.	Failed to achieve buy-in from local community. Many residents left confused.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
120	Barton Willmore o.b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	On behalf of our Client, Powerrapid Ltd ("Powerrapid"), we hereby submit representations in relation to the emerging Harlow Local Development Plan. Our Client has land interest at London Road North, an area of land that forms part of the Harlow Enterprise Zone and the London Road North Local Development Order area. Powerrapid is committed to delivering a high-quality employment development at the Site and are grateful for the opportunity to provide comments on the emerging Local Plan.	Rep relates to London Road North, covered by the London Road North LDO in the Enterprise Zone.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
121	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	Powerrapid welcomes the progress made on the emerging Local Plan and the Council's ambition for Harlow to 'regain its reputation as a place of aspiration, innovation and prosperity' over the plan period. The comments made as part of these representations are designed to further Chapter 8 of the emerging Local Plan (Economic Development and Prosperity Strategy), with a particular focus on emerging Policy ED1 (Future Employment Space).	Welcome progress made in Local Plan and ambition for Harlow to regain reputation for aspiration, innovation and prosperity.	Noted.
122	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	Policy ED1 provides for the allocation of employment floorspace within the emerging Local Plan for the Plan period up to 2033. It is the sole policy of the Plan which details employment land allocations for the next 13 years within Harlow. The Policy makes provision for a total of 20 hectares of B1 employment floorspace across three sites, the distribution and capacity of these sites is as follows: <i>TABLE INSERTED - SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION</i>	Distribution and scale of employment allocations described.	Noted.
123	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	Our Client's land interest is identified as forming part of Site ED1-2, London Road. The emerging Local Plan recognises the location advantages of Harlow (i.e. located between London and Cambridge) and the economic benefits this brings, stating that: Harlow is set in a unique position with excellent strategic transport links to economic opportunities in London to the south, Cambridge to the north and international destinations via Stansted Airport. This places the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town centrally between a leading world city and one of the highest ranking universities. The emerging Local Plan also recognises that, as a result of its location, the district is attracting Life Science and MedTech, advanced manufacturing, ICT and digital industries. The development of Harlow Enterprise Zone, the relocation of Public Health England and the expansion of the Princess Alexandra Hospital are all identified as strengthening this growth sector.	Strategic location of district in the London-Stansted-Cambridge Growth Corridor acknowledged.	Noted.
124	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	Powerrapid does not disagree with this assessment and is encouraged by the attractiveness of Harlow to the market and by the growth it is experiencing. Our Client is, however, concerned that the emerging plan makes no provision for new industrial and distribution floorspace (use classes B2 and B8), and that by failing to provide for these uses, the Council are missing an opportunity for further economic growth, and failing to capitalise on Harlow's excellent location between London and Cambridge and in close proximity to Stansted Airport. The emerging Local Plan makes reference to the West Essex and East Hertfordshire Assessment of Employment Needs, which was prepared on behalf of East Herts District Council, Epping Forest District Council, Harlow Council and Uttlesford District Council and published in October 2017. The report concludes that across the four authority areas, between 10 and 24 hectares of B1 office floorspace and 68 hectares of B2/B8 industrial floorspace should be provided between 2016 and 2033. In the case of Harlow, the Report indicated a requirement for an additional 4 hectares of B1 office space and an additional 16 hectares of B2/B8 industrial space up to 2033.	Concern about distribution of industrial floorspace.	The Council's consultants, Hardisty Jones, undertook an Assessment of Employment Needs in West Essex and East Hertfordshire and concluded whilst there is also a need to accommodate growth in the B1b ,B1c and B8 sectors there is a need to accommodate an expansion of the economy. It is considered appropriate, therefore, to promote and encourage growth in those sectors that accord with the Councils economic regeneration objectives as well as those that have already relocated to or expanded in the town. However, It is also considered that a review of the Plan post adoption will consider whether contingencies need to be put in place to provide for unforeseen employment needs, including those that could arise from the potential consequences of the Covid 19 pandemic.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
125	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>The emerging Local Plan recognises the findings of the Report but goes on to state the following at paragraph 8.11: The Local Plan has identified sufficient land to meet this requirement through the delivery of the Enterprise Zone and through undeveloped sites at Templefields and The Pinnacles. These sites, along with the Enterprise Zone, have been identified for B1 uses in order to develop the Economic and Prosperity strategy for Harlow and to satisfy the strategic demand for growth sectors in the Garden Town. (Emphasis Added).</p> <p>It is apparent therefore that, whilst the Council have accepted the need for a total of 20 hectares of employment floorspace over the Plan period, they have failed to recognise that approximately 75% of the need is for B2 and B8 space and have instead chosen to provide 100% of the requirement as B1 office space, contrary to the identified need. This is concerning as the Council appear to have been blind-sided by a desire to deliver growth in the science and MedTec sectors. As drafted, policy ED1 provides no flexibility for B2 and B8 uses to come forward in the event that the demand for B1 uses does not come to fruition in the way that the Council envisages.</p>	Policy not flexible.	The HLDP has been prepared to reflect the identified economic development needs of the area including those sectors that are being encouraged and promoted within the existing Enterprise Zones, as well as the requirements of those organisations and businesses that have recently chosen to relocate to the town, including Public Health England and together with the future employment opportunities and likely needs associated with the provision of a new Princess Alexandra Hospital in the area. The policy does positively support flexible employment in these sites whilst ensuring they respond to the target growth sectors and the premium nature of these strategic locations.
126	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>It is also troubling that rather than introduce an element of flexibility into the Plan, the schedule of Main Modifications which forms part of this Consultation, appears to narrow the scope of employment provision by placing additional emphasis on the restrictions to the London Road allocation, stating the following within the explanatory text: London Road, which forms part of the Enterprise Zone, has been specifically identified to facilitate the Research and Development sector of the local economy, warehouse and general industrial uses on this site will, therefore, be resisted.</p> <p>Powerrapid consider that, at the very least, Policy ED1 should provide a mechanism for alternative uses to B1 offices (i.e. B2/B8), in the event that demand for B1 uses stalls or it can be demonstrated that there is a pressing need for uses other than B1. Powerrapid consider that, in its present form, the Plan would be found unsound as it fails to account for all aspects of the employment requirement and as such fails to meet the needs of future residents.</p>	Policy not flexible.	The HLDP has sought to provide a balance between need and the wider regeneration aspirations of the district that has been reinforced by the Governments designation of the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town. As noted in the response to the MM's "that there is likely to be sufficient provision for B1, B2 and Data Centre B8 uses over the majority of the emerging Plan period" but as stated above there will be an opportunity to review the policies of the Plan and, if appropriate, amend in order to ensure a flexible response in order to accommodate unforeseen needs.
127	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>In addition to the concerns set out above, Powerrapid is conscient that the aforementioned Employment Needs Assessment dates to 2017, with the Council's Employment Land review dating back to January 2013. Set against this context, Powerrapid has commissioned an independent Supply and Demand Report for Employment Uses within Harlow. This Report is enclosed at Appendix 1 of this letter. <i>SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION</i></p>	Independent study has been commissioned by respondent.	The HLDP has been informed by a range of evidence assembled through the course of its preparation, nevertheless following adoption it will be subject to review that reflects the plan, monitor and manage approach to plan making, and this will provide an opportunity to assess whether the policy approach will need to be revised.
128	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>The Report (prepared by Cushman & Wakefield and dated February 2020) assesses the prospective future level of real estate demand across the potential employment uses and the capacity and suitability of Harlow's existing stock and the development sites to meet any such demand. The Report utilises market activity data from 2010 onwards and is considered to represent the most up-to-date assessment of employment land and employment land need within the District.</p> <p>The Report quantifies the level of employment space available and considers this in terms of the years of supply that is available, by use class. For ease of reference, this information is set out below: <i>SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION</i></p>	Employment Land Review (February 2020) commissioned by respondent, using market data from 2010.	The HLDP following adoption will be subject to review that reflects the plan, monitor and manage approach to plan making, and this will provide an opportunity to assess whether the policy approach will need to be revised.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
129	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>The above table demonstrates that there is likely to be sufficient provision for B1, B2 and Data Centre B8 uses over the majority of the emerging Plan period. However, the evidence does also points towards a precarious position for the development open B8 uses. A position which has the potential to worsen in the event that some of the existing B8 sites are given over to other employment uses.</p> <p>The findings set out within the Cushman & Wakefield report highlight the inherent need for flexibility within the plan in order to accommodate for open B8 uses. Furthermore, the Report also highlights that this could be addressed without harming the Council's growth aspirations and the desire for high-end, high-tech occupiers.</p>	Independent study has been commissioned by respondent.	As noted in the response the respondent acknowledges "that there is likely to be sufficient provision for B1, B2 and Data Centre B8 uses over the majority of the emerging Plan period. However, the evidence does also points towards a precarious position for the development open B8 uses. A position which has the potential to worsen in the event that some of the existing B8 sites are given over to other employment uses. " but as stated above there will be an opportunity to review the policies of the Plan and, if appropriate, amend in order to ensure a flexible response in order to accommodate unforeseen needs.
130	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>In addition to the above, the Report also demonstrates that B8 uses have consistently been the strongest performing asset class within Harlow over the past ten years and that there is a significant risk that that the current level of supply will be insufficient to meet the level of demand in the short to medium term, and will not meet the identified need over the Plan period. Powerrapid consider that the economic contribution B8 uses make to the economy of Harlow are significant and warrant inclusion in the emerging Local Plan – especially if Harlow is to deliver on its growth ambition. It is considered that if the Council does not take steps to address this and provide for open B8 uses then prospective occupiers are likely to choose other locations in the region over Harlow in order to meet their occupational requirements.</p>	B8 uses are an asset to Harlow.	Through a future review of the Plan the Council will seek to ensure that sites are identified at appropriate locations to meet specific needs for which there is a demonstrable demand.
131	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>Powerrapid welcomes Harlow Council's progress with the preparation of a new Local Plan and the recognition of Harlow as an area that will accommodate ambition and growth in the period to 2033. Powerrapid shares the Council's ambitions for the Harlow and the Harlow Enterprise Zone and is seeking to deliver an employment generating development of the highest quality at London Road North.</p>	Welcomes progress of Local Plan and recognition of Harlow as area for ambition and growth. Seeks to deliver highest quality employment development at London Road North.	Noted.
132	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	<p>Whilst not wanting to stifle the ambitions of the Council, concerns remain that the emerging Local Plan, as written, has not fully considered the needs of Harlow, and has missed an opportunity to capitalise upon Harlow's location and attractiveness to the manufacturing and logistics sectors. An area which has seen the strongest performance (when assessed against other employment related asset classes) over the past 10 years.</p>	Concerns that LP doesn't fully consider needs of Harlow and misses opportunity to capitalise on Harlow's attractiveness to manufacturing and logistics.	Through the assessment of the socio-economic and environmental characteristics throughout the preparation of the plan it is considered appropriate, therefore, to promote and encourage growth in those sectors that accord with the Councils economic regeneration objectives as well as those that have already relocated to or expanded in the town.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
133	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	In order to aid the preparation of a sound and robustly prepared Local Plan, Powerrapid has commissioned an independent assessment of employment land and supply within Harlow. The report is clear that Harlow benefits from an appropriate supply of land for B1, B2 and Data Centre (B8) uses but has a precarious supply of land for Open B8 uses. This is despite evidence of strong performance and demand over previous years. The assessment point to an urgent need to redress the supply of employment land in order to avoid other locations in the region being selected over Harlow for new business and employment premises (and the benefits that are associated with employment generating development).	Harlow has a precarious supply of Open B8 uses.	At the CPO Inquiry last year in Harlow, Powerrapid stated that they were willing and able to develop the land in accordance with the LDO which was indicative of their recognition that there was a shortage of B1. This was a major factor in the Inspector dismissing the CPO. Also it is noted that B1 uses have already been lost to B8 in Harlow and we need to look at the employment land that has been converted from B1 to B8 use - Pitney Bowes, now Poundland and the GSK South site 250,000 sq ft of high quality laboratory space now converted into B8 by Stoford, but only 50% occupied, so there is B8 capacity in the town. The comment does not factor in the Council's desire to respond to this loss of space by focussing the Enterprise Zone on higher level B1 uses.
134	Barton Willmore o. b.o. Powerrapid	Employment	It is clear that the Council needs to reconsider its development strategy with regard to the provision for employment land and that additional flexibility is required to provide for further opportunities for B2 and B8 uses - in order to achieve a strengthened and diverse local economy. Whilst the emerging Local Plan achieves the overall quantum of employment development required for the Plan period, Policy ED1, as written, overtly constrains the use of the land that falls within the Enterprise Zone at London Road North. The report included at Appendix 1 <i>SEE ORIGINAL SUBMISSION</i> demonstrates that the existing sites which make up the employment allocations (including our clients land at London Road North), are capable of accommodating greater flexibility - including B2 and B8 uses - without undermining the ambitions of the Enterprise Zone or the Local Plan. Moreover, such an approach would providing a range of employment generating uses that would complement Harlow's ambition to be a place of 'aspiration, innovation and prosperity.'	Development strategy needs to be reconsidered regarding provision for employment land.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
148	Natural England	Environment	We welcome the references to the requirements of net gains for biodiversity.	Welcome biodiversity net gain requirement.	Noted.
163	Harlow Conservative Group	Environment	The Conservative Group continues to have serious reservations about the Local Plan. Harlow Council has been able to balance urban development with the need for green spaces in the past but the administration's plan is a threat to the vision that has held true for decades.	Concern about loss of green spaces.	Sites were assessed through the SHLAA, considering factors such as presence of environmental assets and, where appropriate, the outcomes of the Green Wedge/Belt Review. This matter was explored at the hearing sessions of the Local Plan Examination.
90	Epping Upland Parish Council	Environment (Green Belt)	Our concerns are that included in the plan is substantial erosion of the green belt and loss of farmland.	Loss of GB and farmland - concerning.	Evidence Base studies were prepared to evaluate which strategic sites in and around Harlow would be most appropriate, considering factors such as impact on the Green Belt and sensitivity of the landscape.
229	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL10)	We are pleased to see that the majority of our comments have been taken on board.	Pleased that comments taken on board.	Noted.
230	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL4)	We note and support the amendments made in regard to our remit.	Support amendments.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
231	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL5)	No further comments to make.	No further comment.	Noted.
232	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL7)	We note and support the amendments made in regard to our remit.	Support amendments.	Noted.
235	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL7)	Whilst we support the policy and are pleased to note that biodiversity net gain has been included, we recommend that this wording is added to to further strengthen the policy and add clarity. This should help with implementation, as applicants should be quantifying the net gain required for their development via the appropriate metric. We would therefore recommend adding to the text reference to ensuring a net gain in biodiversity through using the most up to date biodiversity metric.	Biodiversity net gain should be quantifiable and text should be amended accordingly.	Text could be added to Implementation saying "net gains in biodiversity should be measured using up-to-date national biodiversity metrics".
236	Environment Agency	Environment (Policy PL7)	Although we support the amendments made, we think that the new paragraph in section PL9 Implementation (after para 13.55 - page 114) should strike out 'high risk development proposal within a vulnerable groundwater area' as the sentence implies that this can always be mitigated against. It might not always be possible to mitigate high-risk developments proposed in a vulnerable groundwater area, for example, Source Protection Zone 1 (which has a 50 day travel time for groundwater/pollutants to reach an abstraction point). Although we will take into consideration all possible options to minimise the risk to groundwater, there are some types of development which even with mitigation measures, are considered too risky to be located there because we simply can't control all potential future mishaps occurring.	Strike out " high risk development proposal within a vulnerable ground water area" from new para after 13.55. It is not always possible to locate high risk development in these areas as there is always the possibility of a mishap.	Matter for the Inspector's consideration.
144	Natural England	Environment (Policy WE3)	We do, however, have some concerns regarding the wording used for policy WE3. Under the heading of 'Nationally Designated Wildlife Sites' the policy sets out 4 criteria (marked a to d) which would allow development to be supported. These 'tests', particularly a) that development would be supported if it is required in connection with the management or conservation of the site, c) imperative reasons of overriding public interest and d) no suitable alternatives are those set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and as such are more appropriate for 'Internationally Designated Wildlife Sites'. We advise that plans should distinguish between the hierarchy of sites and offer policies commensurate with the level of protection.	Four tests in WE3 for nationally designated wildlife sites more suitable for international sites. Plans should distinguish between hierarchy of sites with policies relevant to protection level.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
145	Natural England	Environment (Policy WE3)	Natural England notes that in policy WE3 the main modification advises that the Epping Forest Mitigation Strategy must be in place by the time of the local plan adoption. In general Natural England supports this approach and this is in accordance with our previous advice. We note, however, that in this case very limited development within the Harlow district is proposed within the current recreational Zone of Influence for Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and preliminary reading of further survey work suggests that there is unlikely to be a significant expansion of the Zone of Influence for the foreseeable future. See also our previous advice relating to air quality.	Natural England (NE) comment on the wording within Policy WE3 relating to the need to agree the Mitigation Strategy for the Epping Forest SAC before the Adoption of the Harlow LP. NE note the very limited development within the current recreational Zone of Influence and a significant expansion of the Zol is unlikely based upon the findings of recent survey work. NE's previous advice on air quality is unchanged.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
146	Natural England	Environment (Policy WE3)	The inspector for nearby Broxbourne Local Plan in his 'Report on the Examination of the Broxbourne Local Plan' dated the 14th of April 2020 took the view that it would not be reasonable to require the mitigation strategy to be in place before the plan is adopted as it was being prepared by a 3rd party and that he was nevertheless satisfied that the necessary mitigation measures would be delivered. Whilst in that case Natural England contested that Broxbourne, as a competent authority under the Habitat Regulations, should jointly take responsibility for the mitigation strategy we do recognise the difficulties this poses. With regards to Harlow specifically, given that its district boundary is further away from the SAC than Broxbourne's and that the local plan allocates negligible levels of development in the south of the district we consider it a matter for the inspectors discretion as to whether the requirement for the mitigation strategy is proportionate provided that he is satisfied that any required mitigation remains deliverable.	NE refer to the approach adopted by the Inspector appointed to examine to the Broxbourne LP in respect of the Epping Forest SAC.	Noted.
147	Natural England	Environment (Policy WE3)	Paragraph 3 of MM10: Policy WE3a Implementation states that "In terms of air quality, it is estimated that 99% of all additional vehicle movements through Epping Forest SAC during the plan period will arise from growth in Epping Forest district rather than the neighbouring authorities including Harlow." Natural England does not hold data on the above but instinctively this feels unlikely to be true and advises that it is checked. We say this without prejudice to the rest of the paragraph and if that is indeed what the modelling shows – we are not raising any concerns.	Detail to be checked regarding the scale of vehicle movements through the Epping Forest SAC.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
189	East Herts District Council	Garden Town (Policy HGT1)	3.6East Herts questioned the legal basis for Policy HGT1 applying to developments outside of Harlow's administrative boundary during the pre-submission consultation in May 2018. The Inspector's List of Matters and Questions (EX0006) then covered the issue in Matter 3, question 3.2. In response Harlow Council in their Hearing Statement: EX0012 proposed a modification to the text to rectify this issue.	Policy HGT1 relates to development beyond HDC's boundaries, the legal basis for this has already been raised (May 2018).	Noted.
190	East Herts District Council	Garden Town (Policy HGT1)	3.7It is noted that neither the recommended modification, nor one similar to it, appears to have been carried forward into the main modifications document or the minor modifications document. East Herts Council requests that the modification included in Harlow Council's Hearing Statement is included in the final plan to ensure that Policy HGT1 is sound.	Soundness of HGT1 remains a key concern without the requested change.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
13	Harlow Alliance Party	General	In these unprecedented times it is clear that it cost of mitigating the pandemic will be over £123bn. If we are to survive without stupendous borrowing it will take in excess of 5 years to reach some kind of financial recovery. This together with the fact unemployment is going to rise to new record levels will make the aspirations in our Local Plan to be unachievable within the expected time frame. One has to ask is the current plan realistic to meet the needs of our community in light of the length of time we are to be under the influence of the pandemic. The Local Plans for all local authorities involved with the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town have large amounts of residential properties proposed (admittedly some so called affordable). Who is going to be able to afford these when businesses are likely to fail and many people in Harlow and surrounding areas will be unemployed?	Effects of pandemic - Local Plan now unachievable? Who is going to afford residential properties when businesses fail and there is unemployment?	Local Plan will be reviewed within five years of adoption, including evidence base which would consider current economic conditions.
16	Harlow Alliance Party	General	HAP is pleased to see many of the changes made to the Plan. There seems to be no doubt that the objections raised by HAP, supported by hundreds of residents, to the proposals to build on many green field sites around the town were accepted by the Inspector. Keeping the golf course within the Green Belt is also to be applauded.	Pleased to see many changes to the Plan, including building on green field sites and keeping golf course as Green Belt.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
25	Historic England	General	We have several outstanding areas of concern. 1. The first relates to Policy HGT1. The Inspector (17.12.19) had indicated that you should use Historic England’s wording. 2. Secondly, for policy HS2, we continue to have concerns at the lack of detail in relation to site allocations and policy wording. 3. Thirdly, in relation to policy HS3, the Inspector (17.12.19) had again indicated that you should use Historic England’s wording. 4. Fourth, in relation to policy PL11, we continue to suggest that the reference to enabling development should be removed and the Plan should include a policy to address Heritage at Risk. All of these issues are addressed in more detail in the accompanying Appendix A.	Summary of concerns - detailed more in specific comments.	Noted.
26	Historic England	General	Finally, we should like to stress that this opinion is based on the information provided by the Council in its consultation. To avoid any doubt, this does not affect our obligation to provide further advice and, potentially, object to specific proposals, which may subsequently arise where we consider that these would have an adverse effect upon the historic environment. If you have any queries about any of the matters raised or consider that a meeting would be helpful, please do not hesitate to contact me.	Opinions based on Council info. Further advice may be provided.	Noted.
45	Cllr Michael Garnett	General	Harlow Council’s Proposed New Local Plan process has been flawed from the very start as residents are largely unaware of the planning implication of this proposed Replacement Local Plan. There are a number of unanswered questions about the strategic intention of the Council to deliver its housing growth locations and the administration has not been open with the public about the scale of change that will be implemented if the current version of the proposed replacement Local Plan is adopted without this amendment.	Failed to consult properly, particularly regarding scale of change.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
60	Cllr Joel Charles	General	Conclusion: Harlow Council’s Local Plan process has been flawed from the very beginning. Residents are still largely unaware of the planning implications contained in the current version of the Local Plan. There are several unanswered questions about the strategic intention of the council to deliver its proposed housing growth locations and the administration has not been clear with the public about the scale of change that will be implemented if the current version of the Local Plan is adopted. I hope that the Planning Inspector is able to request further clarity and hold Harlow Council to account for the lack of consideration, communication and strategic vision to deliver a Local Plan that is desirable and achievable. Below are two specific recommendations that I hope the Planning Inspector is able to accept.	Failed to consult properly, particularly regarding location of new housing. Inspector should request further clarity and hold Council to account for lack of strategic vision.	The Council undertook public consultation at all stages in the preparation in accordance with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and Government legislation and guidance.
143	Natural England	General	Natural England welcomes the progression of Harlow Local Plan and is in general satisfied that the modifications proposed are appropriate.	Generally satisfied with modifications.	Noted.
152	Harlow Conservative Group	General	We, as an opposition group, have opposed the Harlow Local Plan and the Epping Forest Local Plan over the last decade. We still strongly feel that development should not be on green belt or green wedges within Harlow, and not to the south or south west of the town in Epping Forest. We have consistently made these points at council meetings and working groups during that period but as the opposition we have been powerless to change the council’s path.	Development should not be on Green Belt or Green Wedges or to the south/south west of the town.	The Council is duty bound to prepare a statutory local plan for its area having regard to a range of socio-economic and environmental considerations and the careful evaluation of development options in order to accommodate identified development needs. Evidence Base studies were prepared to evaluate which strategic sites in and around Harlow would be most appropriate. The Green Wedge Review and Green Belt Review ensured the areas of Green Wedge and Green Belt which are performing well have been preserved.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
156	Harlow Conservative Group	General	Apart from the lack of leadership from the council and the lack of meaningful consultation, the Local Plan, as it stands, aims to exacerbate divisions within Harlow.	The Local Plan exacerbates divisions within Harlow.	The Local Plan aims to accommodate clearly identified local development needs for residents, businesses and visitors, while providing the required infrastructure and protecting environmental assets.
169	Harlow Conservative Group	General	Suggested recommendation 4. Harlow Council should publish all its written communications with neighbouring authorities under the duty to cooperate in the interests of transparency.	Council should publish all written communication with neighbouring authorities under the DTC.	The details of how the Duty to Co-operate were complied with are set out in the DTC (Reg 22) statement which was submitted as part of the Examination.
171	Cllr Michael Hardware	General	Although it is important that a council has an up-to-date local plan to provide the structure for the future development and growth of the town, it should not be at any cost.	Local Plan provides structure for future growth but it should not be at any cost.	The Plan has been prepared to take into account a range of socio-economic and environmental considerations relevant to Harlow balanced against the duty placed on the Council by the Government to have an up to date development plan in place in order to accommodate identified needs.
183	East Herts District Council	General	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DECISION: That Harlow Council be informed that in respect of the Harlow Local Plan, East Herts Council: (a) Submits this report as its response to Harlow Council's Harlow Local Plan: Main Modifications Consultation; and (b) Notes specifically, the omission of a main modification in relation to Policy HGT1.	Note omission of main mod relating to HGT1.	See detailed relevant comments.
184	East Herts District Council	General	3.1 Harlow Local Plan: Pre-Submission Publication proposes to accommodate 9,200 new homes over the plan period 2011-2033. The identified housing supply exceeds the Council's full objectively assessed housing need (FOAN) of 7,409 homes (2017 SHMA Establishing the Full Objectively Assessed Need) and as such ensures that there is contingency/flexibility within the proposed development strategy.	Background info on Local Plan.	Noted.
185	East Herts District Council	General	3.2 The consultation documents contain a number of main modifications to the Harlow Plan. Main modifications propose to adjust the way the housing requirement is addressed across the plan period by introducing a stepped trajectory. A stepped trajectory is appropriate where delivery is likely to increase towards the latter stages of the plan period; as is the case with the Harlow Local Plan. This approach is supported in principle by East Herts.	Background info on Local Plan.	Noted.
186	East Herts District Council	General	3.3 The majority of the Harlow Local Plan modifications will not have a direct impact on East Herts. The proposed strategic sites for growth in Harlow are situated to the east of the town and the Plan also allocates a number of smaller housing sites within the town's urban area, these remain consistent with the pre-submission version of the Plan which this Council supported.	Majority of mods will not have direct impact on East Herts. Housing sites remain consistent with Pre-Sub version.	Noted.
187	East Herts District Council	General	3.4 The cumulative impacts of the development proposed in Harlow will have an impact on the wider housing market area but this continues to be addressed through the modifications which support major new infrastructure such as Junction 7a of the M11 and through the facilitation of the potential relocation of Princess Alexandra Hospital.	Wider impacts of development to be addressed through major new infrastructure.	Noted.
191	East Herts District Council	General	3.8 Overall, East Herts Council supports the Local Plan's intention to meet its objectively assessed housing needs, including the positive approach taken to reviewing the Green Belt to identify land for such development purposes. East Herts Council further supports Harlow Council's commitment to joint working to address the collective needs of the housing market area in terms of key infrastructure, employment and housing needs.	Support approach to OAHN, GB review and joint working.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
192	East Herts District Council	General	3.9East Herts Council would like to affirm its commitment to working with Harlow Council in its Plan-making process, not least through continued engagement in the Co-operation for Sustainable Development Officers Group and Members Board, the Garden Town Board and Harlow and Gilston Garden Town.	Affirms commitment to working with Harlow.	Noted.
193	Epping Forest District Council	General	EFDC is in support of the Local Plan and welcomes the growth aspirations it sets out. EFDC acknowledges the positive and on-going collaborative working with Harlow District Council (HDC) under the duty to cooperate and through the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT).	Supports Local Plan and growth aspirations within it. Acknowledges the positive and ongoing collaborative working under the DtC and through the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT).	Noted.
206	Epping Forest District Council	General	Summary In summary, EFDC continues to support Harlow's Local Plan, but considers that there are a number of amendments, in particular to the proposed trajectory for the East of Harlow site, that are considered necessary. The attached Appendix sets out some further amendments to the Main Modifications proposed alongside a reasoned justification for the changes required.	Supports Harlow's LP. Proposed East of Harlow trajectory needs amending.	Harlow Council is content that the trajectory as set out in the SoCG submitted to HDC examination is appropriate. Document ED20. The Council will continue to monitor and pursue action where appropriate, in order to ensure delivery in accordance with the outcomes of the future Housing Delivery Test.
21	Harlow Alliance Party	Gypsies and Travellers	Where will the Elizabeth Way traveller site be re-located?	Relocation of traveller site.	There are no proposals to relocate the traveller site on Elizabeth Way.
22	Harlow Alliance Party	Housing	Whilst one of the Plans main objectives must be to meet the housing need of a growing population, there is no undertaking to ensure that homes are built specifically for older residents, in the form of bungalows or complexes. In a survey carried out by The Harlow Alliance Party, over 80% of those responding want see such homes built in the town. This would free up homes that are larger than the needs of existing residents and make best use of the existing housing stock in the town.	Policy needed to provide homes for older residents, particularly bungalows.	HLDP includes policy Policy H5 Accessible and Adaptable Housing, which supports the provision of older persons housing. Developers will assess the type of dwelling to meet needs identified in the Local Plan.
24	Harlow Alliance Party	Housing	Whilst the council have expressed a wish to see 30% of all new homes being 'affordable', the 'get out clauses' in the Plan make it all too easy for developers to avoid building homes in such numbers, evidenced by recent Planning Applications. The plan should clearly state that unless a developer comes forward with a scheme which meets the 30% affordable criteria then the application will be refused. It has been recently been suggested by the government that affordable housing requirements should be relaxed so as not to stop developments because the developer is unable to meet the cost. HAP is not supporting this view.	The Plan makes it too easy for developers to not provide 30% affordable housing. The plan should allow applications to be refused if 30% is not provided.	Policy H6 Housing Mix specifies that affordable housing should be part of the types of housing provided.H8 Affordable Housing sets the minimum level of 30%. On adoption the Local Plan will have been subject to a whole plan viability assessment as required, which should strengthen the 30% requirement. Any reduction will need independent proof from the developer. Policy IN6 requires there to be a viability review to meet the affordable housing need over the lifetime of the development.
67	N Wilkinson, The Roydon Society	Housing	We were pleased to see amendments have been made in regards to parking provision which was one of the comments the Society had. One comment on the amended plan was the reduction of housing provision in the hatches, garage sites etc, reduced from over 1000 to just over 800. Where will the 200 odd houses now be allocated to make up the total number for Harlow?	Loss of housing sites, how will this loss be made up?	The number of commitments, completions and allocations exceeds the housing requirement by around 14%, this difference absorbed that loss.
153	Harlow Conservative Group	Housing	The Labour administration, however, has changed path and on several occasions. Initially, it agreed with the Conservative view of opposing development to the south and south west of Harlow and submitted an objection to Epping Forest's Local Plan consultation to that effect. It then had to bring that back to full council to reverse the decision and remove the objection, again without consultation with the public.	Harlow Council's formal position with regards to emerging proposals within EFDC has varied over time; the respondent considers the scope of public consultation on these matters to be inadequate.	No comment appropriate.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
158	Harlow Conservative Group	Housing	Furthermore, discussions with neighbouring authorities over the Local Plan and the progression of the Harlow & Gilston Garden Community have been very much one-sided: the administration has failed to secure any sharing of the benefits of development, such as affordable housing, council tax and New Homes Bonus. This in the full knowledge that Harlow will have to endure the pressure on its infrastructure, including: education, health, traffic and pressure on our town centre, issues over which we will have no control or influence.	Failure to secure the sharing of benefits of development.	The Council has and will continue to work with its partners to deliver the Local Plan, meeting the socio-economic and environmental needs of the district. However, some of these matters are beyond the scope of the Local Plan.
159	Harlow Conservative Group	Housing	There is an anomaly in the proposed modifications which discriminates against people with disabilities, contrary to the Equality Act 2010. On the one hand, all new properties should meet Part M4(2) but only if the developer deems them affordable. On the other, in MM14, developments that exceed the minimum standard for insulation by 19% will be supported, which appears to provide a regulatory excuse for developers to claim that accessible homes are unaffordable as they have to meet far more stringent insulating requirements, in excess of building regulations and of other planning authorities. Meeting the real and practical needs of disabled people should not be in effect "optional".	Modification discriminates against people with disabilities as should the development be made unviable by this policy, the developer does not have to comply.	On adoption the Local Plan will have been subject to a whole plan viability assessment as required, which should strengthen this policy requirement. Any reduction will need independent proof from the developer.
165	Harlow Conservative Group	Housing	There is a clear need for more accessible homes to be met through new developments and the Local Plan should reflect this.	Need for more accessible homes to be met through new developments and the Local Plan should reflect this.	Policy H5 of the Local Plan provides for accessible homes in new developments.
167	Harlow Conservative Group	Housing	Suggested recommendation: 2.All housing allocation sites that have been recommended for removal by the Planning Inspector should be given the appropriate protection to avoid consideration as potential housing sites in the future.	Deleted sites should be given protection.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration.
237	Environment Agency	Housing (Policy H10)	No further comments to make.	No further comments.	Noted.
14	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure	Another issue that must be addressed is how will the government fund the necessary infrastructure to facilitate the transport and community projects without any money left in the pot?	Uncertainty expressed regarding central government funding for infrastructure having regard to the exceptional levels of government expenditure during the pandemic.	Local Plan prepared having regard to detail in IDP, however Council will have regard to local and national issues emerging in future. Additionally, for info: On 11 March the BUDGET 2020 announced that Harlow would be a recipient of infrastructure funding, this has been confirmed as £172M of Housing Investment Grant to support forward funding and early delivery of infrastructure in the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
17	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure	Many sentiments expressed within the Plan are at best aspirational. Few if any of those involved in producing the Plan and that of The Harlow and Gilston Garden Town can provide services themselves, whilst the capital costs for new schools, health centres and leisure and cultural services may be built, it is another matter when it comes to providing short, let alone long term revenue funding for these services and getting staff to work in them. Residents have for years complained about the lack of services within the town, waiting times at doctors surgeries, poor bus services, reduced council services, reduced school funding and the reduction in library services to name just a few. The existing residents of Harlow can only make judgements about this Plan from past experience, many will look on this Plan with deep concern for the towns future.	Concern expressed regarding reduction in local services over many years. Questions if the LP/the HGGT can be the vehicles to deliver transformational growth and regeneration. Content of the Plan perceived as subjective and lacking in credibility.	The LP and the HGGT both have Visions for the future for long term change and sustainable growth for Harlow and the surrounding area. The three LPs for the HGGT have been prepared against the 2012 NPPF and policy preparation for the garden communities has been done on a collaborative basis. Joint MoUs between partners provided a common approach and guidelines for the work programme across the housing market area and functional economic market area, with specific attention to addressing key challenges in the planning and delivery of strategic infrastructure networks and the safeguarding of both the natural and historic environment.
68	Avison Young o.b. o. National Grid	Infrastructure	Following a review of the above Development Plan Document, we have identified that one or more proposed development sites are crossed or in close proximity to National Grid assets: SIR1-5 Parndon Wood Cemetery Extension - Gas Transmission Pipeline, route: MATCHING GREEN TO RYE HOUSE <i>Illustrative plan attached.</i>	Site constraint.	This will be taken into consideration at the planning application stage for the cemetery expansion.
166	Harlow Conservative Group	Infrastructure	Suggested recommendation 1. The Planning Inspector should pause the Local Plan process and request that Harlow Council undertake a new comprehensive analysis of the infrastructure requirements needed for all the identified housing growth locations. A new indicative strategic planning assessment for the whole town should be produced at the very least.	Recommendation to pause the Examination and review infrastructure requirements for the whole town.	The Council has produced an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and collaborated with its neighbours on a Harlow & Gilston Garden Town Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will be reviewed on a regular basis..
182	Harlow Steel Band	Infrastructure (Co_MMunity Facilities)	I am a member of Harlow Steel Band and we are based at the Lutheran Church in Tawneys Road. If this building is knocked down, we will be homeless. We have a lot of equipment and need storage and practice space. Also, where are the members of the Church supposed to worship??	Allocated site HS2-5 for 35 dwellings in the modified policy. Where will existing users be relocated?	The Council would seek the retention of community facilities, where possible, as part of any redevelopment proposals.
78	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	Infrastructure (Health)	These representations build on our previous submissions on the Local Plan Pre-submission Publication Draft (May 2018) and written and oral evidence presented to the related Examination in Public (EIP) in March/April 2019 together with the signed Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between PAH and Harlow District Council dated 17th April 2019. 1. The background to PAH's position is set out in detail in the submissions referred to above and relates to the need to urgently re-provide and redevelop its existing acute Hospital and related services currently located on the 12.2 hectare Campus site at Hamstel Road in Central Harlow.	Reps build on previous submissions. Urgent need to redevelop existing acute hospital.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
79	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	Infrastructure (Health)	<p>2. In 2019, PAH's Trust Board approved the recommended development option for the relocation of the existing Hospital to a green field site in East Harlow adjacent to the programmed new M11 Motorway Junction J7a. This decision was recently ratified by the Department of Health (DoH), subject to clarifying a number of points, and confirmation of final Treasury funding is expected in June 2020. Also, the existing mental health services may additionally co-relocate from the main Hospital to the new site. This would enable the existing site to be comprehensively planned and redeveloped for housing, whilst optimising the number of new homes to be delivered.</p> <p>3. Consequently, PAH is progressing related enabling works in support of its planning strategy for the preferred development option. This is to enable momentum on the related Business Case process to be maintained, with a view to securing planning permission for the new Hospital in 2021 and commencing development in Autumn 2022. Part of this strategy includes the redevelopment of the existing Hospital site for housing, which would be redeveloped post 2022 to provide up to approximately 550 homes.</p>	PAH approved recommended development option for relocation of existing Hospital. PAH is progressing related enabling works relating to preferred development option.	Noted.
80	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	Infrastructure (Health)	<p>4. If circumstances dictate that the preferred Hospital relocation could not take place, PAH would then need to embark on a redevelopment programme and re-provide services on the existing site. This fall-back option would be guided by a new masterplan prepared by the Trust and agreed with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and may involve freeing up some potentially surplus land for approximately 100 new homes. Recognition for this scenario was also requested to be identified in the new Local Plan at the EIP and was agreed as part of the SoCG.</p> <p>5. The new Hospital site falls within Epping Forest District and forms part of a strategic planning policy allocation in the 2017 Submission draft Epping Forest Local Plan, which is also at an advanced stage of preparation.</p>	Scope of contingency planning should PAH stay in Harlow.	Noted.
81	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	Infrastructure (Health)	6. The preferred development option comprises the construction of a new 'state of the art' local acute hospital, as part of a health and well-being campus, to be fully integrated and linked with the wider Harlow and Gilston Garden Town (HGGT), which it will serve. PAH has an aspiration to design and build the most technological advanced Hospital in the Country and wishes to work with all associated partners including Harlow District Council to help deliver it. Therefore, the general reference in the proposed Local Plan Main Modifications to helping to facilitate the provision of the new Hospital and redevelopment of the existing site for approximately 550 homes, along with the fall-back development in situ scenario, is warmly welcomed.	PAH will work with partners to deliver new state of the art hospital. Local Plan helping to facilitate new hospital is welcomed.	Noted.
82	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	Infrastructure (Health)	<p>7. Support is also given to the inclusion of healthcare facilities as part of necessary infrastructure to be included within developer contributions associated with new development.</p> <p>8. Our representations set out below reflect the development strategy explained in this statement and also raise a small number of additional detailed considerations. Support is given to the references to PAH's strategy for the preferred and fall-back development options including the housing site allocation.</p>	Support inclusion of healthcare facilities are part of necessary infrastructure to be included within developer contributions. Support references to PAH's strategy for the preferred and fall-back development options.	Noted.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
164	Harlow Conservative Group	Infrastructure (Health)	There are some potential positive infrastructure developments. The Conservative Group supports the preferred site for a new Harlow Hospital because it is a once in a generation opportunity to improve healthcare provision in the town. The Conservative Government's decision to invest in the Enterprise Zone and the new headquarters for Public Health England in Harlow are significant milestones for the town, but the Labour council administration is failing to provide the leadership required to integrate these huge investments into the town, and ensure the support they need.	Commentary regarding progress with regards to investment by central government across the wider area .	No comment appropriate.
188	East Herts District Council	Infrastructure (Policy SIR1)	3.5East Herts Council further welcomes and supports the retention of the Policy SIR1 that identifies land use implications for a number of key pieces of infrastructure including the River Stort Crossings.	Retention of Policy SIR1 welcomed.	Noted.
233	Environment Agency	Infrastructure (Policy SIR1)	No further comments to make.	No further comment.	Noted.
18	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure (Transport)	HAP have held numerous public meetings in 2019, from which it is clear that most people are not aware of the plans to expand Harlow, which in reality means building thousands of homes on the other side of Harlow's boundary, destroying Green Belt land which is effectively Harlow's but lies in neighbouring authorities. The one thing that has been mentioned time and time again is the pressure on Harlow's road system that the huge increase in the number of homes and thus population the area will see in the next 13 years and beyond. Car manufacturers are not spending billions of pounds to develop electric and driverless cars with an expectation that in the future most journeys will be taken using public transport or by walking or cycling.	Public unaware of plans to expand Harlow, roads will not cope with increase in homes.	The potential impact of development has been considered throughout the preparation of the HLDP, including the various public consultation stages, and at the subsequent hearing sessions associated with the Examination of the Plan. Policies and proposals set out in the Plan aim to address any potential impacts. Work is now commencing on the new M11 J7a and Gilden Way enhancement works. Also see ID14.
19	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure (Transport)	The document shows changes to the transport corridors but gives no explanation for why these changes have been made.	Transport corridors not explained.	These are indicative routes at this stage. This matter was considered at the Examination hearings. Final design including potential adjustments to routing are subject to the detailed design and delivery of the STC.
20	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure (Transport)	It would appear ludicrous to not include some of the existing estates along the Water Lane route for the Sustainable Transport as it would relieve pressure on the overall traffic congestion along Southern Way which will suffer from those entering the town from development to the South and Eastern boundaries. There is no detail about what work will be done along these corridors to enhance what is already there.	Neighbouring estates should be included in Sustainable Transport Corridors.	The Sustainable Transport Corridors described in the HLDP aim to facilitate sustainable access into Harlow from the strategic housing sites on the edge of the district. Where appropriate new cycling and footpath access will be provided to facilitate access to the existing neighbourhoods in Harlow, including employment areas, and where necessary existing routes enhanced. The capacity of the local and strategic highway network has been assessed by the highway authorities and the levels of growth and regeneration have been modelled and tested.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
23	Harlow Alliance Party	Infrastructure (Transport)	The present cycleway in Harlow is the envy of most towns in the country but much of it is in a very poor state of repair and there are parts which need to be connected together. Without an undertaking to remedy these issues, it seems very unlikely that there will be any increase in their current use, which is a crucial element in trying to mitigate increased congestion on the town's roads.	Poor condition of existing cycleways.	In conjunction with Essex County Council, the policies and proposals set out in the HLDP aim to enhance cycle and footpath links across the town which will be supplemented by the initiatives being developed to develop the Sustainable Transport Corridors and to encourage modal shift. This includes investment to enhance existing provision.
63	Steve Dean	Infrastructure (Transport)	I would like to comment on chapter 11 SIR1, as follows. There appears to be no consideration for how the existing roads will be able to cope with the extra traffic from new housing developments. I think it is unreasonable for you to rely on Harlow residents to immediately changing their modes of transport so, unless you improve the existing road system, we will have a situation where the existing roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic from the new developments.	Existing roads do not have capacity, need to be improved.	Both Gilden Way and A414 are being upgraded to cope with the additional development, and work on new M11 J7a has commenced. In addition the STC and HGGT proposals will promote a modal shift to secure more sustainable transport movements in accordance with the transport hierarchy.
91	Epping Upland Parish Council	Infrastructure (Transport)	We are also unable to see how the transport infrastructure will cope with the increased extension.	Unable to see how transport infrastructure will cope.	The potential impact of development has been considered throughout the preparation of the HLDP. The Policies and proposals set out in the Plan aim to address potential transport impacts, especially through the delivery of Sustainable Transport Corridors, in order to promote modal shift. The comment relates to sites in the EFDC area.
36	Highways England	Infrastructure (Transport)	We have reviewed your proposed modifications, as these are minor and mostly just make the plan more in line with other parts of the plan and or national policy. Very few affect transport matters and those that do are very unlikely to result in an impact upon the strategic road network. We are satisfied the proposed modifications will not in any way affect our conclusions on your proposed plan and our previous comments remain unchanged.	Support changes.	Noted.
92	Thames Water	Infrastructure (Water)	We have been liaising with the Council and adjoining boroughs in relation to sewerage infrastructure requirements to support growth in and around Harlow and will continue to do so in order to ensure that the growth proposed is supported by any necessary wastewater infrastructure.	Have been liaising with Councils regarding sewerage infrastructure requirements to support growth.	Noted.
93	Thames Water	Infrastructure (Water)	<p>It is noted that the changes to Policy HS1 include an increase in potential housing development over the plan period from 9,200 to 10,620 homes.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the surplus allows for flexibility, possible slippage of large sites and for some permissions to lapse. However, if all the 10,620 homes were to come forward over the Local Plan period this could impact on the capacity of sewage infrastructure including treatment capacity at Rye Meads Sewage Treatment Works. As such, Thames Water would seek to continue close engagement with the local authority and developers, together with other adjoining local authorities, following the implementation of the new Local Plan. Such engagement will be essential in order to monitor development coming forward and the rates of delivery and ensure that the impacts on sewage treatment and network infrastructure are fully understood with necessary upgrades programmed accordingly.</p>	Higher housing number could impact on capacity of sewage infrastructure. Continue engagement with authorities.	Noted. Even if housing numbers increase, Thames Water has a legal requirement to meet the infrastructure requirements. Attention is drawn to the SoCG between HDC and TW (EX0019) which is the outcome of longstanding, active, continuous and constructive collaboration to safeguard and enhance the water environment. HDC and TW will continue to monitor completions. There are modifications to Policies PL10, IN6 and SIR1 which reflect the points mentioned in the SoCG. Early engagement with TW prior to the submission of planning applications will be actively encouraged by HDC.

ID	AUTHOR	MM/TOPIC	TEXT	TEXT SUMMARY (yellow = change requested)	COUNCIL OFFICER COMMENTS
64	Peter Boam	Map 6.b	<p>I would like to put forward a comment on behalf of the Greenway Business Centre that has been providing space for start-up and growing businesses since 2005. During this period we have enabled a large number of people to start and to grow their businesses. This has contributed to the ongoing success of Harlow and it is something of which we are very proud.</p> <p>Budding entrepreneurs can choose whether to operate from an office, a studio or a workshop. Workshops, sometimes seen as industrial units, in particular are extremely popular, perhaps because we are the only company in the town to offer this particular facility. We would like to provide more but we are constrained by a lack of space.</p>	Greenway Business Centre provides workshops in Harlow for entrepreneurs and would like to provide more.	Noted.
65	Peter Boam	Map 6.b	<p>I enclose a scan of map 6b reinstated green belt upon which I have cross hatched a small portion adjacent to our boundary. The land cross hatched is overgrown, has no overlooking windows, no residential properties nearby and no convenient public access. Commercial buildings border the land on three sides. The fourth side is open. The value of this land as green belt is very limited. This land is referred to in or around paragraph 10.8 on P81 of the local plan.</p> <p>Conversely it is the only area that could potentially available for us to expand the number of workshops. A greater number and variety of workshops than we currently offer would enable more people to start and to grow their businesses.</p>	Small portion of site b.ii could be used for expanding workshops. Value of this portion of GB land is limited.	The whole of site b.ii performed poorly in the Green Belt Review which is why it was originally identified for removal from the Green Belt.
66	Peter Boam	Map 6.b	<p>We urge most strongly that the inspector considers again the balance between leaving this land in its current derelict unloved state and its clearly potential social value as the site of an extension to the Greenway Business Centre.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the land in owned by Harlow Council and so if it were to be released from the green belt the whole development value would accrue to the public purse.</p>	Inspector to consider potential social value of this site as an extension to the workshops.	This is a matter for the Inspector's consideration but the Council would not be opposed to the limited expansion of employment provision in this location.
83	Lawson o.b. o. Princess Alexandra Hospital	MM14	<p>9. Concern is raised and clarification sought for the intended inclusion of a policy requiring construction standards to be in excess of current Building Regulations provisions for sustainable design and energy efficiency. This could have both procedural and viability implications concerning how the LPA may determine planning applications and how development may be affected. In short, planning policy should not seek to determine or duplicate matters that are addressed through separate legislation, i.e the Building Act 1984 in this instance.</p> <p>10. Also, if higher construction standards are sought to be imposed, this may have viability consequences for development schemes, particularly in the current economic climate and therefore, any such policy would require a degree of flexibility to be built in to avoid potentially and unnecessarily stifling development. Therefore, further clarification and refinement is considered to be needed regarding Policy PL3.</p>	Planning policy should not seek to determine/duplicate Building Regs matters. Higher construction standards could have viability consequences.	To clarify, the supporting text should say development which exceeds the minimum requirements will be encouraged . Next bit could say "Where the developer exceeds the minimum standards, the amount by which the minimum standards should be exceeded is preferably at least 19%.