

Essential Reference Paper B

Site Reference	Parish	Respondent	Issue	Officer Response
	Ware	Site Promoter/Landowner	New site submitted.	The site is on the edge of Ware and will be assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA
04/010	Sawbridgeworth	Site Promoter/Landowner	This site was not included in the Round 3 assessment.	The site is on the edge of Sawbridgeworth, and as such, will be assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA.
	Anstey	Site Promoter/Landowner	The proposal to identify Anstey as a Group 2 village is supported. However, the response to 07/001 rejects the site on the basis of it being a Category 3 village.	Noted. The SLAA is an assessment at a specific point in time and should be updated on an annual basis. Anstey is identified as a Category 3 village in the adopted Plan and in the Preferred Options District Plan. While it has been identified as a Group 2 village in the Interim Village Hierarchy, it would be premature to give this draft study more weight than adopted policy.
	Aston	Parish Council	All sites are outside of the proposed village boundary which is supported by the Parish Council. The sites all perform an important Green Belt function.	Noted.
10/003, 10/004	Aston	Site Promoter/Landowner	The identification of Aston as a Group 2 village is supported. However both sites are suitable for modest development	Neither site would constitute limited infill development in accordance with Category 2/Group 2 policy.
12/001, 12/002 & 12/003	Bengeo Rural	Parish Council	The Parish Council would have no objection to development of 12/002 but would not support 12/001 or 12/003.	Noted. The SLAA concludes that all three sites are considered to be inappropriate for development given their location on the edge of Category 3 villages.
13/018	Benington	Site Promoter/Landowner	The proposed village boundary should be amended to include site 13/018.	The role of the SLAA is not to identify appropriate village boundaries but to assess sites against existing and proposed policy. Village boundaries can be considered through a Neighbourhood Plan should the Parish Council wish to prepare

				one.
15/001	Braughing	Parish Council	This is a greenfield site actively used for agriculture. The views across the field from the village are important. This would represent ribbon development and would not be supported by the Parish Council	Noted. It is up to the Parish Council to decide which sites are allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan in order to facilitate the provision of 10% growth, and it might be that there are other suitable sites that have not been considered by the SLAA. Such sites would need to be considered in light of adopted and emerging planning policy.
15/005	Braughing	Parish Council	This is a greenfield site lying outside of the development boundary. There is a current application for 8 dwellings which is less than the SLAA capacity figure.	For consistency, the SLAA assessments for village sites have been based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is acknowledged that applications may come forward based on alternative density assumptions.
15/007	Braughing	Parish Council	This is a greenfield site which is being considered through the Neighbourhood Plan. Development would require a change to the village boundary.	Noted.
15/009	Braughing	Parish Council	This is a brownfield site within the village boundary which is being considered through the Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted.
	Braughing	Parish Council	There doesn't appear to be as much capacity in the village as initially thought. Consideration needs to be given to how this affects its proposed Group 1 status.	The scoring of services and facilities within the Interim Village Hierarchy Study indicates that Braughing is one of the more sustainable villages in the District. The SLAA provides an initial assessment of land availability. The assessments indicate that there are opportunities for the village to provide for 10% growth as envisaged by the emerging District Plan. In addition HCC has stated that the Primary school has some capacity in all year groups and also has the potential to expand to 1FE if required. Based on this evidence, it is

				considered appropriate to maintain Braughing as a Group 1 village.
18/001	Buckland and Chipping	Parish Council	Support for draft site assessment. Site could be suitable for one or two affordable homes.	Noted.
19/003	Cottered	Site Promoter/Landowner	Support for draft conclusion	Noted.
20/010	Datchworth	Site Promoter/Landowner	Datchworth should be excluded from the Green Belt. This site could be suitable for development.	Datchworth is a Category 2 village under adopted policy and, on the basis of the scoring in the Village Hierarchy Study, will remain as Group 2. This site would not represent infill development and is therefore unsuitable.
	Eastwick and Gilston	Parish Council	The Parish Council broadly supports the assessment of suitability for the sites within the parish. It is noted that the full capacity of a strategic scale of development in this location would not be required within the Plan period.	Noted. Work is ongoing through the District Plan with regards to the potential for strategic scale development in this location. It is noted that a scheme of 10,000 dwellings could not be provided in its entirety within the Plan period.
21/001	Eastwick and Gilston	Site Promoter/Landowner	Agree that the site is Available and Achievable and that it may be suitable for a strategic scale of development. However the site is also suitable for small scale development.	Not agreed. The site is located within the Green Belt on the edge of Gilston, a Category 3 village. It is therefore not suitable for small scale development.
21/009	Eastwick and Gilston	Site Promoter/Landowner	Support for draft assessment although site could also be suitable for standalone development as well as part of a wider strategic scheme.	Noted. The site boundaries for the Gilston Area development will be identified in a Development Plan Document (DPD).
22/003, 22/004	Furneux Pelham	Site Promoter/Landowner	The scope for development in Category 2 villages should be increased. Both sites could be suitable for development.	Not agreed. Category 2/Group 2 policy enables the delivery of limited infill development. Development of these sites would not conform with this policy approach.
23/001	Great Amwell	Site Promoter/Landowner	This site should be removed as it is no longer available.	Noted and actioned.

23/002	Great Amwell	Site Promoter/Landowner	Sensitive development in this location would not be out of scale with the village.	Not agreed. Development would impact on a key strategic Green Belt gap in this location.
23/003, 23/008, 23/016	Great Amwell	Site Promoter/Landowner	While located in Great Amwell parish, these sites would contribute to the need to Stanstead Abbots.	Agreed. However Stanstead Abbots could not provide for 10% growth as envisaged by the emerging District Plan. These sites could still come forward as infill development.
25/001	Hertford Heath	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site could be suitable for development and a Vision Statement has been prepared to demonstrate that development of 67 homes is deliverable and acceptable in landscape terms.	Not agreed. Development in this location would not be in conformity with either adopted or emerging policy as it would not constitute small scale development and would represent an unacceptable incursion into the countryside.
26/002	Hertingfordbury	Site Promoter/Landowner	This site is no longer being promoted and should be deleted from the SLAA.	Noted. The assessment for this site has been deleted.
26/010	Hertingfordbury	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site is incorrectly identified as being unsuitable. Emerging policy should not be referred to as this could change.	Staines Green is identified as a Category 3 village within both adopted and emerging policy and development is therefore unsuitable in this location.
27/001	High Wych	Site Promoter/Landowner	This site was not included in the Round 3 assessment.	The site was not assessed as planning permission has been granted on site and so the principle of development has already been accepted. For clarity and transparency the final version of the SLAA will list all submitted sites, including those that have not been assessed for various reasons.
	Hormead	Site Promoter/Landowner	Site 28/005 is the subject of a current application. The principle of development has been accepted by Development Management officers	Permission has not been granted at present. The assessment for this site may need to be reviewed through an annual review of the SLAA.
	Hunsdon	Parish Council	Infrastructure needs to be improved to cope with extra development	It is recognised that village locations have much more limited services and facilities than the main settlements in the District. The emerging District Plan recognises this

				and requires provision of 500 dwellings within the more sustainable villages. This represents just over 3% of the total identified need for the District. As a Group 1 village, Hunsdon is required to provide for 10% growth which equates to 37 dwellings.
	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The fails to recognise the feasibility of proposals, focussing purely on the planning policy context.	The role of the SLAA process is identified within national policy. It is a high level strategic assessment which is based on adopted and emerging policy. In terms of village development, it is the role of Neighbourhood Plans to provide a more in depth assessment of sustainability in order to identify the most appropriate sites for allocation.
29/001	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The draft site assessment is supported	Noted
29/001	Hunsdon	Site Promoter/Landowner	It is recognised that development of the site in its entirety would be inappropriate. However a smaller scale of development could be appropriate.	The SLAA assesses sites as they are submitted. A smaller scale of development could be considered by the Parish Council as part of work on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
29/002	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The draft site assessment is supported	Noted
29/003	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The draft site assessment is supported although the site may not be able to provide 30 houses	For consistency, the SLAA assessments for village sites have been based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is acknowledged that applications may come forward based on alternative density assumptions.
29/003	Hunsdon	Site Promoter/Landowner	It is incorrect to state that the site is an Employment Area. The site may not be Achievable due to redevelopment costs.	The assessment states that the site is in employment use but is not a designated Employment Area. Comments on achievability are noted, however there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the site is not Achievable at this stage.
29/004	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The site is within Green Belt and	Noted.

			should remain so.	
29/005, 29/015 and 29/020	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The area is most unlikely to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan for housing. It is unsuitable due to drainage problems and access issues.	It is up to the Parish Council to decide which sites are allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan in order to facilitate the provision of 10% growth, and it might be that there are other suitable sites that have not been considered by the SLAA. Such sites would need to be considered in light of adopted and emerging planning policy.
29/017	Hunsdon	Parish Council	Strongly disagree that this site should be considered as part of a wider strategic scheme. This area should not be integrated with major development. There are surface water drainage issues in the area.	Noted. The site boundaries for the Gilston Area development will be identified in a Development Plan Document (DPD). However, impact on existing settlements will be a key consideration.
29/017	Hunsdon	Site Promoter/Landowner	There is a current application for this site for 14 dwellings and is suitable for development. It is inaccurate to state that the land may not be available as it is in employment use as such a use ceased in circa 1990.	Not agreed. Development of the site would be contrary to policy. It is recognised that employment ceased on site some time ago but for the purposes of the SLAA it should still be assessed as being previously in employment use.
29/019	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The draft site assessment is supported	Noted
29/021	Hunsdon	Parish Council	Agree that the recreation ground should be retained but possibly land to the south should be assessed separately.	Noted. The SLAA primarily assesses sites submitted to the Council through the Call for Sites process. It is up to the Parish Council to decide which sites are allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan in order to facilitate the provision of 10% growth, and it might be that there are other suitable sites that have not been considered by the SLAA. Such sites would need to be considered in light of adopted and emerging planning policy.
29/021	Hunsdon	Site Promoter/Landowner	It is not intended that the entire	Noted. The assessment for this site has

			site area would be developed. An alternative smaller site area has been submitted.	been removed. The new site area will be assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA.
30/002	Little Berkhamsted	Site Promoter/Landowner	The Council has acknowledged that Green Belt release is required in order to meet the Districts housing need. This site is suitable for market housing development or a rural exceptions development.	While Green Belt release will be required, it is important that this occurs in sustainable locations. In general terms, development in this location would be contrary to adopted and emerging policy. The site may be suitable for rural exceptions affordable housing but the principle of this would need to be discussed with the Development Management team.
31/002	Little Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	The assessment should be updated to reflect the fact that Little Hadham has been identified as a Group 1 village in the emerging District Plan. Reference should also be made to the application for the bypass which will reduce flood risk. It cannot be said that the entire site is unsuitable for development.	While it is acknowledged that Little Hadham is identified as a Group 1 village in the Preferred Options Plan, it is currently a Category 2 village in the adopted Local Plan. In addition the Interim Village Hierarchy Study, which will inform the District Plan moving forwards, also identifies the village as Group 2. It is noted that the bypass would introduce flood alleviation measures and the assessment has been updated to reflect this. The SLAA assessment can only assess the extent of land submitted. However, it is likely that development on any part of the site would be contrary to current and emerging policy wherein limited infill development is considered to be appropriate.
31/004	Little Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site may no longer be available as it has been sold	Noted. There is currently no evidence to suggest the site is no longer available, however this may need to be considered through an annual review of the SLAA.
31/007	Little Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	A smaller site area is now being promoted in this location which should replace the original submission.	Noted. The assessment for the original site area has been deleted. The new site area will be mapped and assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA.

31/006 & 31/028	Little Hadham	Ward Member	The assessments should be amended to reflect the fact that the Interim Village Hierarchy identifies the settlement as Group 2.	Noted and agreed.
33/002	Much Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	This site has planning permission and site preparation work has commenced. It should therefore be removed.	Noted and agreed.
33/004	Much Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	The labelling of the sites in this location on GIS mapping is confusing. Development of this site should be considered suitable.	The labelling of the sites on GIS will be looked at. However, this site is slightly isolated from the main built up area of the village and is outside of the village boundary. It is therefore considered to be unsuitable.
33/015	Much Hadham	Site Promoter/Landowner	A smaller site area has been submitted for consideration as an alternative option. It is not appropriate at this stage to disregard sites due to amount of development when there is uncertainty about the emerging District Plan policies. There is also a shortage of sites in Much Hadham. Leaving rural development to Neighbourhood Plans is not a sound approach as it does not provide certainty of delivery.	The smaller site area will be assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA. The SLAA is a high level strategic assessment which considers adopted and emerging planning policy. It is therefore appropriate to regard a site as unsuitable if the scale of growth would be contrary to policy. The SLAA indicates that there is potential to provide for 10% growth in Much Hadham as envisaged by the emerging District Plan. However it will be for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites to achieve this. In a recent meeting with an Inspector, the Councils proposed approach to rural development was supported.
33/016	Much Hadham	Parish Council	Parish Council considers that the assessment of suitability should make reference to the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt	Noted and agreed.
33/016	Much Hadham	Parish Council	Support for draft assessment	Noted.
	Much Hadham	Parish Council	It should be stated that all sites in Much Hadham are within the catchment area of the River Ash	None of the sites assessed through the SLAA are located within the Flood Zones identified by the Environment Agency.

				However, more detailed assessment work should occur through the Neighbourhood Planning process, including a consideration of issues such as surface water flooding.
	Much Hadham	Parish Council	The density of development on each site may be less than the SLAA envisages as seen with the Station Yard site.	For consistency, the SLAA assessments for village sites have been based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is acknowledged that applications may come forward based on alternative density assumptions.
	Standon	Parish Council	Hertford Heath and Stanstead Abbots have been downgraded to Group 2 due to lack of land availability and primary school capacity. Standon and Puckeridge is in the same situation.	Not agreed. The SLAA demonstrates that there is potential capacity in Standon and Puckeridge to provide for 10% growth. In addition, HCC has advised that Roger De Clare First School has some capacity and there is potential to expand if required. It is therefore considered appropriate to maintain Standon and Puckeridge as a Group 1 village.
	Standon	Parish Council	The Parish Council states that there are flooding issues (river, sewer and surface water) in Standon Parish. Development of land that is susceptible to flooding should be avoided. There is also a need for a Standon bypass.	Noted. The SLAA is a high level strategic assessment. However it does take into account river flooding based on the Environment Agency Flood Zone data. Other forms of flooding are difficult to predict and therefore harder to consider. However it is for the Parish Council to identify suitable sites within the emerging Neighbourhood Plan which could consider such issues. HCC will be consulting on possible route options for a bypass of Standon in due course.
	Standon	Parish Council	The Parish Council would only support windfall in Colliers End.	Noted. Colliers End is currently identified as a Category 3 village and in terms of emerging policy is identified as a Group 2 village wherein only limited infill development is appropriate.
35/003	Standon	Parish Council	This site currently has permission	Noted. The need to amend the boundary

			for one dwelling. If built then access could not be achieved to provide further development without amending the village boundary.	has been stated in the site assessment.
35/004	Standon	Parish Council	The current application is for substantially more than the capacity noted in the SLAA assessment. If this was approved this would more than meet the 10% growth figure.	The figure of 146 dwellings in the assessment is the 10% growth figure for Standon and Puckeridge. It is noted that the site could provide a greater scale of development. It is noted that, should the application be approved, further allocations would be unnecessary.
35/016	Standon	Parish Council	The site is of high archaeological value and would require extensive works. The northern part of the site lies within the original 'band of interest' for a Standon bypass.	Noted.
35/017	Standon	Parish Council	Sewer flooding and flooding of the Puckeridge Southern Tributary are issues	Noted. In general terms, development should not exacerbate flooding issues. However, these detailed issues should be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
35/017	Standon	Site Promoter/Landowner	The assessment is supported although the capacity is likely to be approximately 30 dwellings.	Noted. For consistency, the SLAA assessments for village sites have been based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is acknowledged that higher densities may be appropriate on certain sites.
35/036	Standon	Site Promoter/Landowner	Object to the assessment for this site. It is within a Scheduled Monument designation but so are 35/016 and 35/004.	Not agreed. The whole of the site is a Scheduled Monument whereas 35/004 is not covered by that designation at all. The assessment for 35/016 recognises that development within the area designated as a Scheduled Monument would be inappropriate.
35/037	Standon	Parish Council	Consideration should be given to achieving safe access.	This issue should be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan and planning application process.

36/007	Stanstead Abbotts	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site is not unsuitable due to its location within the Green Belt and the Lee Valley Regional Park.	Not agreed. While the current status of the settlement means that the Green Belt designation could be overcome, it is still currently unsuitable on this basis. However, the sites location within the LVRP cannot be overcome.
37/003, 37/016	Stanstead Abbotts and St Margarets	Site Promoter/Landowner	The sites should be discounted due to their location in Flood Zone 3.	37/003 is in Flood Zone 2 and therefore maybe suitable subject to the sequential test. However, 37/016 is within Flood Zone 3 and it is recognised that development would be subject to the Exception test and therefore should not be considered appropriate at this stage. The assessments for 37/016 and 37/005 have therefore been amended.
40/001	Tewin	Site Promoter/Landowner	The land should be considered for modest residential development which would also allow for school expansion.	While Tewin is currently a Category 1 village, the site is unsuitable due to its Green Belt location. It is also considered that development would result in an unacceptable incursion into the countryside.
40/003, 40/004	Tewin	Site Promoter/Landowner	Both sites could be suitable for development with a review of the Green Belt boundary.	While Tewin is currently a Category 1 village, the sites are unsuitable due to their Green Belt location. It is recognised that this could be overcome through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan, however Tewin has been identified as a Group 2 village within the emerging District Plan and therefore development would not constitute infill development.
40/003, 40/007	Tewin	Site Promoter/Landowner	It is not clear whether these sites are still available	Noted. While the Council currently has no evidence to suggest that the sites are no longer available, this may need to be considered through a review of the SLAA.
40/003 and 40/008	Tewin	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site was initially supported for development within the adopted Local Plan 2007 and, while it did not form part of the final plan, the	While it is noted that the site was supported by the Council previously, this was on the basis of Tewin being a Category 1 village wherein small scale

			Inspector suggested that it should be considered as part of the next Local Plan process. The Green Belt Review suggested that the Green Belt could be rationalised in this location – this advice has been ignored. The principle of rural exceptions development has already been accepted.	development would be acceptable. If considered against Category 1 village policy, the site is unsuitable due to its Green Belt location. Through work on the emerging District Plan, Tewin is now proposed as a Group 2 village where limited infill development is appropriate. Given that development of the site would not represent infill development, it is considered unsuitable. The SLAA assesses the suitability of sites for general market housing. The consideration of providing rural exceptions affordable housing is separate from Plan making.
40/022	Tewin	Parish Council	The postcode is not local to the site	This is an extremely large site, the eastern part of which does appear to lie within the given postcode area.
40/022	Tewin	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site is considered to be both deliverable and developable.	Not agreed. The site is poorly related to the existing settlement, is situated within the Green Belt and development would result in an unacceptable incursion into the countryside.
	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	Leaving rural development to Neighbourhood Plans is not a sound approach as it does not provide certainty of delivery.	In a recent meeting with an Inspector, the Councils proposed approach to rural development was supported.
	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt policy is not in conformity with the NPPF and should not be considered in the SLAA	The SLAA takes into account adopted and emerging policy and the approach to Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt is consistent in both. It is therefore appropriate to consider this policy approach within the SLAA.
42/001, 42/004, 42/006, 42/007, 42/008, 42/009,	Thundridge	Parish Council	The Parish Council states that High Cross has already catered for more than 10% growth in 2015/16, and therefore should not be identified as a Group 1 village.	Currently, planning applications are considered in light of the adopted Local Plan which identifies High Cross as a Category 1 village. The SLAA assessments have been prepared on that basis. However, in terms of emerging

42/010, 42/011, 42/014, 42/017, 42/032, 42/034,				policy, the Interim Village Hierarchy Study identifies High Cross as a Group 2 village wherein only limited infill development is appropriate – the SLAA assessments would therefore need to be reviewed in future to reflect that change. On this basis High Cross would not be required to provide for 10% growth between 1 st April 2016 and 2031.
42/002, 42/003, 42/005, 42/012, 42/013, 42/030, 42/033, 42/035	Thundridge	Parish Council	The Parish Council see no justifiable reason to change the village boundary and agree that the sites are unsuitable.	Noted.
42/009	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	The site has no suitable access and so should not be considered potentially suitable.	It is recognised that there are access issues and that this was recognised by the Local Plan Inspector in 2007. However, it is possible that this could be overcome.
42/010, 42/011	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	Agreed that these sites are suitable for employment use but there is no commitment from the Parish Council to bring a Neighbourhood Plan forward.	Currently, planning applications are considered in light of the adopted Local Plan which identifies High Cross as a Category 1 village. The SLAA assessments have been prepared on that basis. However, in terms of emerging policy, the Interim Village Hierarchy Study identifies High Cross as a Group 2 village - the SLAA assessments would therefore need to be reviewed in future to reflect that change.
42/014	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	The assessment is welcomed but there is no commitment to bring forward a Neighbourhood Plan.	Currently, planning applications are considered in light of the adopted Local Plan which identifies High Cross as a Category 1 village. The SLAA assessments have been prepared on that basis. However, in terms of emerging

				policy, the Interim Village Hierarchy Study identifies High Cross as a Group 2 village wherein only limited infill development is appropriate – the SLAA assessments would therefore need to be reviewed in future to reflect that change. On this basis High Cross would not be required to provide for 10% growth between 1 st April 2016 and 2031.
42/025	Thundridge	Parish Council	The land is outside of the boundary and forms an important green space	While the site is outside of the boundary, it is considered to be potentially suitable for limited infill development in a Green Belt village in accordance with the NPPF, subject to land ownership issues.
42/035	Thundridge	Site Promoter/Landowner	There is not a designated Wildlife Site in this location. The site is well related to the village centre and it is not clear why the boundary does not include this site. The site represents infill development and is not overly visible. Development is supported by neighbours and the Parish Council.	There is currently a Wildlife Site designation covering the site. The village boundary has been drawn tightly around the main built up area of the village and so excludes this site. It is therefore considered to be unsuitable.
43/002 & 43/003	Walkern	Parish Council	Both sites are vital buffers between Stevenage and Walkern. The Green Belt Review doesn't support these sites.	Noted.
43/009	Walkern	Parish Council	This site is currently subject to a planning application for up to 85 homes. Development of this scale runs contrary to villagers wishes. Infrastructure is insufficient.	Noted. The previous application was refused by East Herts Council, partly on the basis of scale. As noted in the SLAA assessment, development of up to 47 dwellings, based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare, would not conform with Category 1/Group 1 village policy but could provide an opportunity to provide 10% growth as envisaged by the emerging District Plan.

43/010 & 43/011	Walkern	Parish Council	The Parish Council is not reviewing the current village boundary. The sites fall outside the boundary and within the conservation area.	It is up to the Parish Council to decide which sites are allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan in order to facilitate the provision of 10% growth, and it might be that there are other suitable sites that have not been considered by the SLAA. Such sites would need to be considered in light of adopted and emerging planning policy.
43/013	Walkern	Parish Council	There is no evidence that this is a realistic development due to ownership and access issues	The site is considered to be 'developable' in year 6 onwards of the plan period due to the fact that ownership is an issue and the site is not currently available. However, this issue could be resolved.
43/016	Walkern	Parish Council	There is no evidence that this is a realistic development due to ownership issues	The site has now been removed from the assessment as it falls below the threshold of 0.25ha as identified within national policy.
	Wareside	Site Promoter/Landowner	New site submitted	The site is on the edge of Ware, the majority of which lies within Wareside Parish. The site will be assessed through Round 4 of the SLAA
44/001, 44/005, 44/006	Wareside	Parish Council	Ware Town Council would have serious and wide ranging concerns regarding impact of a 3,000 dwelling scheme on the town	Noted. The emerging District Plan identifies this area as a Broad Location for the delivery of between 200 to 3,000 homes. This will be assessed further as work on the Plan continues.
45/001	Watton-at-Stone	Parish Council/Ward Member	The site has been identified for up to 10 dwellings. However, it is considered to be suitable for up to 20 dwellings.	Noted. For consistency, the SLAA assessments for village sites have been based on a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. It is acknowledged that higher densities may be appropriate on certain sites.
45/001	Watton-at-Stone	Site Promoter/Landowner	Updated wording provided by HCC.	Noted and accepted.
	Watton-at-Stone	Parish Council/Ward Member	Derelict land at Mill Lane which is currently in employment use and land at Great Innings North may	These sites were not submitted to the Council through the Call for Sites process and therefore have not been assessed in

			be suitable for residential use	the SLAA. It is up to the Parish Council to decide which sites are allocated through a Neighbourhood Plan in order to facilitate the provision of 10% growth, and it might be that there are other suitable sites that have not been considered by the SLAA. Such sites would need to be considered in light of adopted and emerging planning policy.
46/001	Westmill	Parish Council	Support for draft site assessment although the site should not be considered to be achievable for a number of reasons.	The assessment of achievability is primarily in relation to economic viability. There is no reason to suggest a scheme in this location would be unviable, however in any case, the site is not considered to be suitable.
	General	Site Promoter/Landowner	Concern that Development Management decisions do not reflect SLAA conclusions for certain sites	The plan making and planning application processes are separate. In coming to a decision on a planning application, a wider range of factors must be considered, including the fact that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of land.
	General	Site Promoter/Landowner	Concern that some sites have not been assessed on the basis that they are too small whereas other similar sized sites have been assessed.	Agreed. Planning Practice Guidance suggests that sites over 0.25ha should be included in a SLAA assessment. The Round 3 assessments have therefore been amended to reflect this threshold.
	General	Parish Council	Achievability has not been defined so this is difficult to comment on.	Noted. Achievability is effectively an assessment of financial viability.