

**Summary of Conclusions from Chapter 4: Places**

This document draws together the conclusions from the assessments in Chapter 4 of the draft District Plan Strategy Supporting Document. It includes the findings of the first two out of five rounds of assessment ('Sieves') as follows:

- **Sieve 1: Area Assessments:** each of the 69 Areas of Search shown in Chapter 4 has been assessed against the agreed framework of 21 topics. Informed by this framework, a Sieve 1 dwellings figure is proposed and a rating assigned on that basis. The conclusions are shown in **Table 1** below;
- **Sieve 2: Settlement Evaluations:** assesses the collective impact of combinations of possible growth areas on existing settlements and the wider area. The conclusions are shown in **Table 2** below.

Ratings are based on the balance of planning considerations as contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Ratings are as follows:

- **Pass:** clearly favourable balance, will be carried forward for further assessment in the next Sieve;
- **Marginal Pass:** marginally favourable balance, will be carried forward for further assessment in the next Sieve;
- **Marginal Fail:** marginally unfavourable balance, will be carried forward for further consideration in the next Sieve;
- **Fail:** clearly unfavourable balance, will not be carried forward.

Please read Sections 4.1 to 4.3 of Chapter 4 in order to understand the basis of assessment. For ease of reference, the conclusions shown in Tables 1 and 2 here are drawn from the orange summary boxes at the end of each section within Chapter 4. For further information please refer to the relevant section from Chapter 4. Section references are provided in both tables.

The conclusions of Sieve 1 and 2 are interim findings. A further three assessment sieves will be undertaken in Chapters 5 and 6 to assess the impact of combinations of options in different locations within and beyond East Herts District, assessing compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and various other tasks as explained in the Stepped Approach (Section 1.7). All the findings presented in Chapter 4 and this summary are part of an on-going assessment process, and will need to be considered alongside the findings of subsequent rounds of assessment before a strategy can be proposed.

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

**Table 1: Summary of outcomes from Sieve 1: Areas of Search**

Area	Town Areas of Search	Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 1 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 1 Rating	Carried forward to Sieve 2?
<b>Bishop's Stortford – Section 4.4</b>					
1	Within the Existing Built-up Area	4.4.2	1,233	Marginal Pass	Yes
2	North (Sub Area A)	4.4.3	700	Pass	Yes
	North (Sub Area B)	4.4.3	1400	Marginal Pass	Yes
	North (Sub Area C)	4.4.3	400	Pass	Yes
3	East (Sub Area A)	4.4.4	0	Fail	No
	East (Sub Area B)	4.4.4	150	Pass	Yes
4	South (Sub Area A)	4.4.5	800	Marginal Pass	Yes
	South (Sub Area B)	4.4.5	0	Fail	No
	South (Sub Area C)	4.4.5	0	Fail	No
<b>Buntingford – Section 4.5</b>					
5	Within the Existing Built-up Area	4.5.2	67	Pass	Yes
6	South and West (Sub Area A)	4.5.3	0	Fail	No
	South and West (Sub Area B)	4.5.3	500	Marginal Pass	Yes
	South and West (Sub Area C)	4.5.3	120	Marginal Pass	Yes
7	North (Sub Area A)	4.5.4	500	Marginal Fail	Yes
	North (Sub Area B)	4.5.4	0	Fail	No
8	North-East (Sub Area A)	4.5.5	0	Fail	No
	North-East (Sub Area B)	4.5.5	300	Marginal Pass	Yes
9	East	4.5.6	500	Marginal Pass	Yes
<b>Hertford – Section 4.6</b>					
10	Within the Existing Built-up Area	4.6.2	875	Marginal Pass	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Area	Town Areas of Search	Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 1 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 1 Rating	Carried forward to Sieve 2?
11	To the West (Sub Area A)	4.6.3	300	Marginal Fail	Yes
	To the West (Sub Area B)	4.6.3	300	Marginal Fail	Yes
12	To the North (Sub Area A)	4.6.4	0	Fail	No
	To the North (Sub Area B)	4.6.4	0	Fail	No
	To the North (Sub Area C)	4.6.4	100	Marginal Fail	Yes
13	To the South (Sub Area A)	4.6.5	0	Fail	No
	To the South (Sub Area B)	4.6.6	0	Fail	No
	To the South (Sub Area C)	4.6.6	100	Marginal Fail	Yes
	To the South (Sub Area D)	4.6.6	0	Fail	No
<b>Sawbridgeworth – Section 4.7</b>					
14	Within the Existing Built-up Area	4.7.2	111	Marginal Pass	Yes
15	South-west (Sub Area A)	4.7.3	0	Fail	No
	South-west (Sub Area B)	4.7.3	0	Fail	No
16	West (Sub Area A)	4.7.4	200 <u>or</u> 3,000 with a Sawbridgeworth bypass	Marginal Fail (at 200 and 3,000)	Yes
	West (Sub Area B)	4.7.4			Yes
17	North (Sub Area A)	4.7.5			0
	North (Sub Area B)	4.7.5	0	0	No
	North (Sub Area C)	4.7.5	0	0	No
<b>Ware – Section 4.8</b>					
18	Within the Existing Built-up Area	4.8.1	147	Pass	Yes
	North (Sub-Area A)	4.8.2	0 <u>or</u> 200	Fail <u>or</u> Marginal Fail	Yes
	North (Sub Area B)	4.8.2	200 <u>or</u> 1,500	Marginal Pass <u>or</u>	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Area	Town Areas of Search	Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 1 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 1 Rating	Carried forward to Sieve 2?
				Marginal Fail	
20	East (Sub Area A)	4.8.3	0 <u>or</u> 1,300	Fail <u>or</u> Marginal Fail	Yes
	East (Sub Area B)	4.8.3	0	Fail	No
21	South-East (Sub Area A)	4.8.4	0	Fail	No
	South-East (Sub Area B)	4.8.4	0	Fail	No
22	South-West	4.8.5	0	Fail	No
<b>Villages – Section 4.9</b>					
23	Aston (excluding Aston End)	4.9.2	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
24	Bayford	4.9.3	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
25	Benington	4.9.4	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
26	Birch Green	4.9.5	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
27	Braughing	4.9.6	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
28	Brickendon	4.9.7	0	Fail	No
29	Buckland	4.9.8	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
30	Cole Green	4.9.9	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
31	Colliers End	4.9.10	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
32	Cottered	4.9.11	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
33	Dane End	4.9.12	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
34	Datchworth	4.9.13	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
35	Furneux Pelham	4.9.14	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
36	Great Amwell	4.9.15	0	Fail	No
37	Hadham Ford	4.9.16	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
38	Hertford Heath	4.9.17	0	Fail	No
39	Hertingfordbury	4.9.18	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Area	Town Areas of Search	Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 1 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 1 Rating	Carried forward to Sieve 2?
40	High Cross	4.9.19	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
41	High Wych	4.9.20	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
42	Hunsdon	4.9.21	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
43	Letty Green	4.9.22	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
44	Little Hadham	4.9.23	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
45	Much Hadham	4.9.24	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
46	Puckeridge	4.9.25	+ 10%	Pass	Yes
47	Spellbrook	4.9.26	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
48	Standon	4.9.27	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
49	Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets	4.9.28	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
50	Stapleford	4.9.29	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
51	Tewin	4.9.30	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
52	Thundridge	4.9.31	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
53	Tonwell	4.9.32	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
54	Wadesmill	4.9.33	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
55	Walkern	4.9.34	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
56	Waterford	4.9.35	0	Fail	No
57	Watton-at-Stone	4.9.36	+ 10%	Pass	Yes
58	Westmill	4.9.37	+ 10%	Marginal Fail	Yes
59	Widford	4.9.38	+ 10%	Marginal Pass	Yes
<b>Extensions to Adjacent Settlements</b>					
Section 4.10 to 4.13					
60	East of Stevenage	4.10.2	5,000	Marginal Fail	Yes
61	East of Welwyn Garden City	4.11.2	2,000	Marginal Pass	Yes
62	North of Harlow (Sub Area A)	4.12.2	10,000	Marginal Fail	Yes
	North of Harlow (Sub Area B)	4.12.2		Marginal Fail	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Area	Town Areas of Search	Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 1 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 1 Rating	Carried forward to Sieve 2?
	North of Harlow (Sub Area C)	4.12.2	270	Marginal Pass	Yes
63	North of Hoddesdon	4.13.2	0	Fail	No
<b>New Settlements</b>					
Section 4.13					
64	A10 Corridor - North	4.14.2	0	Fail	No
65	A10 Corridor - Central	4.14.3	0	Fail	No
66	A120 Corridor	4.14.4	0	Fail	No
67	A507 Corridor	4.14.5	0	Fail	No
68	A602 Corridor	4.14.6	5,000	Marginal Fail	Yes
69	Hunsdon Area	4.14.7	5,000	Marginal Fail	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

**Table 2: Summary of Outcomes from Sieve 2: Settlement Evaluations**

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
<b>Bishop's Stortford</b> Section 4.3.6	<b>Scenario A</b> 4,700	Marginal Fail	The Sieve 1 Figures (Areas 1-4) add up to approximately 4,700 dwellings. The Sieve 2 assessment found that Bishop's Stortford has a strong position within the District and sub-regional settlement hierarchy, including a Principal Town Centre with potential for further expansion, potential for economic development and prosperity, access to the M11 and Stansted Airport, relative lack of environmental constraints, and potential for clear long-term Green Belt boundaries offered by the A120/A1184 roads on three sides. However, balanced against these findings are possible constraints including capacity of the local road network, capacity of the wider road network including the Little Hadham congestion hotspot on the A120 to the east, and the lack of schools capacity to accommodate future growth (see Scenario C below). Additionally, the impact of growth in Uttlesford District will need to be considered further.	Yes
	<b>Scenario B</b> 3,900	Marginal Pass	This scenario omits 800 dwellings to the south (Sub-Area A), on the basis that further work may indicate that a Sawbridgeworth bypass is needed to alleviate pressure on the A1184 as a result of development to the south of Bishop's Stortford. Other considerations are similar to those in Scenario A.	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
	<p><b>Scenario C</b> No new secondary schools site</p>	<p>Fail</p>	<p>The Sieve 1 assessment identified lack of secondary schools capacity as a key impediment to future growth within the Bishop's Stortford Schools Planning Area (which also includes Sawbridgeworth). Scenario A explains that Bishop's Stortford has many potential advantages as a location for future growth. If development at Bishop's Stortford is considered necessary, a scenario which does not provide for the expansion of secondary schools capacity to provide for some future growth is not considered reasonable when assessed against the requirements of the NPPF. The Hadham Road Reserve site is not sufficiently large to provide additional schools capacity for future growth, and a larger secondary schools site is therefore required in order to meet NPPF requirements for plan-making, irrespective of the decision-making (planning application) process in the context of the Local Plan 2007.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Buntingford</b> Section 4.4.7</p>	<p><b>Scenario A</b> 2,000</p>	<p>Marginal Fail</p>	<p>The Sieve 1 figures for Buntingford (Areas 5-9) add up to 2,000 dwellings. However, Sieve 2 suggests that this level of development would be out of scale with the capacity of the town centre, which performs the function of a Minor Town Centre, and the function of the town in the settlement hierarchy. However, <b>if</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified elsewhere within the district, then large-scale development in Buntingford could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to</p>	<p>Yes</p>



*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

<b>Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference</b>	<b>Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)</b>	<b>Sieve 2 Rating</b>	<b>Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives</b>	<b>Carried forward to Sieve 3?</b>
			meet objectively assessed housing need on a district-wide basis. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.	
	<b>Scenario B</b> Fewer than 2,000	Marginal Pass	Sieve 2 suggests that a substantially lower number for Buntingford is preferable, although further work will be required in order to recommend a suitable figure. Scenario B still implies some Greenfield development on the fringes of the town, but at a level consistent with the capacity and function of Buntingford (especially the High Street/Town Centre), and compatible with the character and setting of the town.	Yes
<b>Hertford</b> Section 4.5.6	<b>Scenario A</b> 1,700	Marginal Pass	The Sieve 1 Figures for Hertford (Areas 10-13) add up to around 1,700 dwellings. Hertford is the County Town, located on the A10/A414, and has a number of employment areas. Hertford has a Secondary Town Centre which provides for convenience and limited comparison shopping. Therefore Hertford appears a suitable location to accommodate some future development. However, balanced against these findings are a number of constraints including the limited expansion potential of the town centre, the slow road connection to the M25 through Broxbourne Borough (which limits the attraction of the town as an employment location), capacity of the local and wider road network, and a more minor role in the settlement hierarchy than other settlements such as Welwyn Garden City and	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
			Bishop's Stortford. As elsewhere in the district, there is a lack of schools capacity in the town and this will need to be addressed as part of any development strategy.	
	<b>Scenario B</b> More than 1,700	Fail	Sufficient evidence has been accumulated through the first two sieves to suggest that development options above 1,700 dwellings in Hertford are not realistic. There are a number of difficult long-term constraints to development at Hertford for development above that figure. Although Hertford has two railway stations there are transport bottlenecks on the A414 through the town, and access from the north and south is constrained by highways infrastructure. Provision of a southern bypass would be greatly complicated by engineering challenges, and it would be environmentally damaging. To the east development options are constrained by the Meads flood plain and coalescence with Ware. To the west options are constrained by areas of ancient woodland and the strategic gap with Welwyn Garden City.	No
<b>Sawbridgeworth</b> Section 4.6.6	<b>Scenario A</b> 300	Marginal Pass	The Sieve 1 Figures for Sawbridgeworth (Areas 14-17) add up to around 300 dwellings. Sawbridgeworth functions as a Minor Town Centre, and there is very limited employment offer in the town. Residents of Sawbridgeworth are reliant on Harlow and Bishop's Stortford for most of their needs. Scenario A would not require significant new infrastructure but there may be local issues which require further investigation.	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
	<p><b>Scenario B</b> 3,100</p>	<p>Marginal Fail</p>	<p>Large-scale growth would increase the financial viability of a bypass, which would be needed to alleviate pressure on the A1184 and constrained by the Stort Valley floodplain. Development options to the south are constrained by a need to maintain the strategic gap with Harlow, and to the east by the capacity of the level crossing and the A1184. The least constrained options for growth are to the west and (to a lesser extent) the north. If large-scale growth were necessary in Sawbridgeworth, this would need to occur to the west and north, accompanied by the provision of a new bypass. Scenario B may be feasible but would be out of scale with retail and employment provision and other facilities of the existing town. However, <b>if</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified elsewhere within the district then large-scale development in Sawbridgeworth could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need on a district-wide basis. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Ware</b> Section 4.7.7</p>	<p><b>Scenario A</b> 350</p>	<p>Marginal Pass</p>	<p>The Sieve 1 Figures for Ware (Areas 18-22) add up to around 350 dwellings. Ware functions as a Minor Town Centre and there is little expansion capacity. The narrow High Street is a noted congestion hotspot. Travel south along the A10 is slow as it runs through Broxbourne Borough to the M25. Although GSK is a major employer, the remaining employment offer in the town is limited.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
			<p>Scenario A would involve small-scale Greenfield development to the north of the town as well as within the Built Up Area. It would not require significant new infrastructure but there may be local issues which require further investigation.</p>	
	<p><b>Scenario B</b> 1,700</p>	<p>Marginal Fail</p>	<p>Large-scale growth at Ware would be constrained to the west and south by the strategic gap with Hertford. Large-scale growth to the north would require a new northern link road to the A10 avoiding the town centre congestion hotspot. It would also require a new edge of-town sewer to the east to serve development to the north in order to avoid prolonged disruption caused by upgrades to the existing sewer, which runs under the High Street. Provision of an eastern sewer would require consent from the landowners. As elsewhere in the district, there is a lack of schools capacity in the town and this will need to be addressed as part of any development strategy for large-scale growth at this location.</p> <p>Scenario B may be feasible but would be out of scale with retail and employment provision and other facilities of the existing town. However, <b>if</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified elsewhere within the district then large-scale development in Ware could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need on a district-wide</p>	<p>Yes</p>

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
			<p>basis. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.</p>	
	<p><b>Scenario C</b> 3,150</p>	<p>Marginal Fail</p>	<p>Scenario C involves 1,300 dwellings to the east in addition to 1,700 to the north. Under this scenario, a Ware northern bypass would be needed in order to provide access to the A10 from development to the east. As under Scenario B, a new eastern sewer would be required, although this would form part of the new development rather than running through undeveloped land. Other issues are similar to those under Scenario A.</p> <p>Scenario B may be feasible but would be out of scale with retail and employment provision and other facilities of the existing town. However, <b>if</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified within the district then large-scale development in Ware could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need on a district-wide basis. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Villages</b> <b>Section 4.8.39</b></p>	<p><b>Scenario A</b> Small-scale development in villages without substantial local</p>	<p>Pass/Marginal Pass/Marginal Fail</p>	<p>Scenario A involves 10% dwellings growth at each of the following villages over the 20 year plan period:</p> <p><i>Bayford, Birch Green, Braughing, Buckland, Cole Green, Colliers End, Cottered, Dane End, Furneux Pelham, Hadham Ford, High Cross, Hertingfordbury, High Wych, Hunsdon, Letty Green, Little Hadham, Much Hadham,</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
	constraints, amounting to around 900 dwellings in total		<p><i>Spellbrook, Standon &amp; Puckeridge (Combined), Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets (Combined) Tewin, Thundridge &amp; Wadesmill (combined), Walkern.</i></p> <p>This level of development meets the requirements of the NPPF in terms of balancing the need to preserve the character of villages with some growth to address local housing needs. Further consideration will need to be given to a policy framework, taking account of the role of Neighbourhood Planning within the strategic framework of the District Plan, as set out in the NPPF. This will include consideration of a suitable basis for formulation of a target for each village, whether based on the census or other source.</p> <p>The following villages will not be carried forward for further assessment because of local constraints (Sieve 1) and in-combination constraints (Sieve 2):</p> <p><i>Benington, Brickendon, Datchworth, Hertford Heath, Great Amwell, Stapleford, Tonwell, Waterford.</i></p>	
	<b>Scenario B</b> No development	Fail	This scenario is not considered reasonable because it would not meet any of the housing needs of the villages and would not comply with the NPPF.	No

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
<p><b>Stevenage</b> Section 4.9.3</p>	<p>Development to the east</p>	<p>Fail</p>	<p>Stevenage Borough Council's future growth options are constrained by the administrative boundaries with East Herts and North Herts. Until recently, Stevenage Borough Council pursued a strategy of growth to the north and west in North Herts, in accordance with the East of England Plan. Therefore the majority of the available evidence base relates to growth to the west. However, recent officer-level meetings between the two Councils have not indicated any proposals for a strategy of growth to the east. Sieve 1 identified the impact on the Beane Valley as a major constraint to development to the east. Given the width of the valley, a Green Infrastructure Strategy would not be able to effectively mitigate impacts on the openness of this sensitive landscape, and development beyond the valley would be too distant to form a coherent part of the town. Sieve 2 addresses wider issues such as the orientation of the town towards the west, including the town centre, the railway line and the A1(M), and employment areas. Sieve 2 concludes that these factors seriously undermine the credibility of a coherent whole-town approach including development to the east. The findings of Sieve 1 and Sieve 2 suggest that there are a number of preferable alternative locations elsewhere within East Herts which could meet objectively assessed development needs within the wider sub-regional context.</p>	<p>No</p>

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
<p><b>Welwyn Garden City</b> Section 4.10.3</p>	<p><b>Scenario A</b> 2,000 to the east within East Herts</p>	<p>Marginal Pass</p>	<p>Relatively few local constraints were identified at this area in Sieve 1. Sieve 2 suggested that Welwyn Garden City has a strong position within the sub-regional settlement hierarchy, including a Main Town Centre with potential for further expansion, potential for economic development and prosperity given access to the A1(M) and Hatfield Business Park, relative lack of environmental constraints, and potential for clear long-term Green Belt boundaries offered by the A414. However, the feasibility of development in this area depends on the aspirations of the landowner and Welwyn Hatfield Council's emerging development strategy. However, <b>if</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified elsewhere within the district then large-scale development east of Welwyn Garden City within East Herts District could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need on a district-wide basis. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Harlow</b> Section 4.11.3</p>	<p><b>Scenario A</b> 10,000 dwellings north of Harlow</p>	<p>Marginal Pass</p>	<p>There are a range of positive and negative impacts for this scenario. Positive effects could include potential contribution to 'transformational growth' and regeneration of Harlow, contribution to economic development and the housing needs of the sub-region including East Herts District, and opportunities for good design and sustainable infrastructure provision from comprehensive planning at</p>	<p>Yes</p>



*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
			<p>'Garden City' scale (NPPF Paragraph 52). Negative impacts may include the impacts on nearby settlements in East Herts, impact on the landscape and character, deliverability and viability of large-scale infrastructure such as an M11 link road. Impacts on the Stort Valley could be mitigated by implementation of a suitable Green Infrastructure network. Further assessment of possible mitigation strategies will be required. <b>If</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified within the district then large-scale development, whether as an urban extension north of Harlow or a free-standing new settlement (see below), could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need, including unmet needs of adjoining areas. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.</p>	
	<p><b>Scenario B</b> No development north of Harlow</p>	<p>Marginal Pass</p>	<p>If suitable alternative growth locations can be identified within the district, then this may be a reasonable option. However, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to be able to demonstrate at Examination in Public that they have seriously addressed various requirements including the Duty to Co-operate, and consideration of the unmet needs of adjoining authority areas.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p><b>Scenario C</b> 270 at Terlings Park</p>	<p>Marginal Pass</p>	<p>This proposal relates to a planning application for development at a designated brown-field location in the Stort Valley but outside the flood risk area. Key</p>	<p>Yes</p>

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

<b>Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference</b>	<b>Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)</b>	<b>Sieve 2 Rating</b>	<b>Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives</b>	<b>Carried forward to Sieve 3?</b>
	only		considerations include whether a mixed-use development is possible at this location given its separation from Harlow and relatively small scale, and whether a appropriate sustainable transport measures can be delivered.	
<b>Hoddesdon</b> Section 4.12.3	Development in the strategic gap between Hoddesdon and East Herts settlements	Fail	Based on Broxbourne Council's submission to East Herts Council's Issues and Options consultation, there is a shared understanding between both Councils in respect of unacceptable intrusion into the strategic gap at Area 63: North of Hoddesdon. The role of Broxbourne and Hoddesdon will need to be considered further as part of the wider context for an emerging development strategy for East Herts. This will include consideration of NPPF requirements including the Duty to Co-operate, and other options open to Broxbourne Council to provide for any unmet housing need.	No
<b>New Settlements</b> Section 4.13.8	<b>Scenario A</b> 5,000 at Hunsdon Area only	Marginal Fail	Sieve 2 showed that, although there could be potential for longer-term consideration of new settlements within East Herts, the lack of infrastructure and unknown land availability mean that the only possible option within the twenty-year plan period could be in the Hunsdon Area. This area is in single landownership and actively promoted. There would be considerable infrastructure delivery challenges associated with this option. <b>If</b> suitable alternative growth locations cannot be identified elsewhere within the district, then large-scale	Yes

*This document presents the first two out of five rounds of assessment, and should be understood as work in progress. Development at the locations shown may or may not become part of the final strategy, depending on the remaining three rounds of assessment (See Chapter 4, sections 4.1-4.3).*

Location and Chapter 4 Section Reference	Sieve 2 Figure (dwellings)	Sieve 2 Rating	Explanation of Sieve 2 Alternatives	Carried forward to Sieve 3?
			development, whether as an urban extension north of Harlow or a free-standing new settlement, could be needed in order to comply with NPPF requirements to meet objectively assessed housing need, including unmet needs of adjoining areas. On that basis this option will be carried forward to Sieve 3.	
	<p><b>Scenario B</b> New settlement in the A602 Corridor</p>	Fail	Sieve 2 suggested that while there is an existing railway station and transport corridor linking Stevenage and Hertford, land availability is uncertain and infrastructure delivery issues are uncertain. Given the balance of considerations, there are other locations with the district which would be preferable within the twenty-year plan period.	No