

Essential Reference Paper B- Schedule of Representations and Officer Responses.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
01/002	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	This land falls within the Roger Evans Masterplanning Study Final Report, 2005 for development of ASR4. EHC did require developers to observe the technical studies.	Noted although the site did not form part of the site that received planning permission for 2,200 homes. In isolation, the site falls below the SLAA threshold of 0.25 hectares.
01/003	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	Support for the draft conclusion.	Support noted and welcomed.
01/007	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	The comment that the site falls within Flood Zone 3 is inaccurate, it has been confirmed that the site is in flood zone 1.	The Council's current Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) shows that the majority of the site lies within Flood Zone 3. However, the SFRA is currently being updated and SLAA assessments can be reviewed to reflect the findings in due course. However, the site is considered unsuitable due to its location within a 'green wedge' of Green Belt land.
01/007	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	The Green Belt review concluded that the "triangle between the railway and Dolphin Way is contained on three sides by development so development within the parcel could not be considered to be sprawl". Having regard to this the site should be removed from the Green Belt through the District Plan process.	Not agreed. While development in this location may not be considered 'sprawl', the site does form part of a wider 'green wedge' that helps to protect the setting and special character of the historic, urban environment of Bishop's Stortford. It is therefore considered that development in this location would be inappropriate. This also reflects the view of the Inspector at the time of the

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
				Examination for the adopted Local Plan 2007.
01/007	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	The address given is misleading it implies that the land forms part of 9 Dolphin Way. The land is in separate ownership and would be better described as "Land adjacent to 9 Dolphin Way" or "Land north of Dolphin Way".	Noted. The address has been updated.
01/010	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	There is a large amount of unused land within this site which is not required by the football club. The existing football pitch/stadium would be retained (albeit re-located within the site), whilst the remainder of the site could be developed for commercial uses.	Noted, the assessment has been updated. Consideration of whether to remove the site from the Green Belt will be presented within the Settlement Appraisal for Bishop's Stortford which will be considered at District Planning Executive Panel on 8 th September.
01/011	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	The draft SLAA spreadsheet should be amended to read: "This site is located within the Green Belt, adjacent to the settlement boundary. There are no other policy constraints and GBR2015 concludes that the site is highly suitable for development". In addition, the statement "Up to 17 dwellings subject to a review of the Green Belt" should be moved to the deliverable with policy change column.	Noted, the site assessment has been updated. However, further consideration of development in this location will take place as part of the Bishop's Stortford Settlement Appraisal.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
01/017	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	The site could accommodate between 53-63 dwellings. The housing proposed could fit alongside the existing housing in Larkspur Close, with the playing fields situated to the north as part of the green finger. As such it is not considered that the release of this site would compromise the role of the green fingers.	Not agreed. It is considered that development would be inappropriate in this location given that it forms part of one of Bishop's Stortford's 'green wedges' which form an integral part of the character of the town.
01/017	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	There is extreme concern about the proposal to designate area owned by the college as Local Green Space. This designation is a threat to the ability of the college to improve sporting facilities (erection of sporting buildings).	This issue would be addressed at the planning application stage. However, it is likely that expansion of school buildings would represent 'very special circumstances' for development in the Green Belt.
01/019	Bishop's Stortford	Site promoter/landowner	Support for the draft conclusion.	Support noted and welcomed.
01/119	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	It is not clear how the figure of 43 dwellings has been derived. Development Brief 2010 sets the vision for a mixed use scheme but gives no indication of housing numbers.	For the purposes of the SLAA, a generic density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been used for sites in Bishop's Stortford. However, it is recognised that this could increase, particularly in town centre locations.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
01/119 01/120 & 01/028	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	The housing developments are welcomed, however due to the close proximity of the developments to the Sainsbury's store, these sites do not justify the creation of new convenience floor space. New convenience stores could undermine the vitality of the town centre.	The evidence base suggests that there is a need for some additional retail floorspace in the District. All three sites are expected to bring forward a mix of uses in accordance with the respective policies contained within the District Plan. The mix of uses will be discussed at the planning application stage.
01/030	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	This site forms a small part of parcel 60a (Green Belt Review). Whilst, parcel 60a as a whole makes contribution to the Green Belt, this is not true for 01/030. 01/030 should accordingly be re-assessed given its lack of visual relationship with the remainder of the parcel.	Not agreed, it is not considered that development in this location is appropriate. This was also the view of the Inspector during the Examination of the adopted Local Plan 2007. In particular, the Inspector states that development of the site would lead to 'a protruding developed wedge, poorly related to the form and pattern of the settlement on the southern edge of the town'. It is not considered that the situation has changed.
01/161	Bishop's Stortford	Planning agent	It is accepted that land adjacent to the railway line has no development potential. However, the eastern part of the site lies outside of the flood plain. Further investigation is ongoing to determine the extent of land that is not subject to flooding, following this a planning application will be submitted. At this stage the	Not agreed. The site in its entirety forms a visual and functional link with the riverscape, and as such, is not considered to be suitable. This position is consistent with the views of the Inspector for the Examination of the adopted Local Plan 2007.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			principal of development should not be ruled out.	
02/005	Buntingford	Site promoter/landowner	It is stated that Buntingford West could be developed in the first five years. There are no infrastructure constraints with regards to utilities or road network. The County Council confirmed the need for a 2FE school site (2014), this proposal includes provision for the school. A site search by HCC failed to identify any other viable alternatives to this site.	It is noted in the SLAA assessment that there is potential for development in this location subject to a review of the settlement boundary. This site will be considered in detail through the Settlement Appraisal for Buntingford.
02/011	Buntingford	Planning agent	The site has an area of 0.7ha and hence the suggested capacity of 83 dwellings is wholly unrealistic. A maximum of 20 dwellings is more viable.	Noted. The figure of 83 dwellings was included in error. This has been amended to 22 dwellings based on a standard density assumption of 30 dwellings per hectare.
03/001 & 03/120	Hertford	Planning agent	There must be serious doubts about these sites. The adopted Minerals Plan notes Rickneys Quarry as a preferred area for mineral extraction and it is national policy not to sterilise minerals by other forms of development. The assumption is gravel extraction will take place in the next few years. In these	The issues regarding minerals extraction in this location will be addressed in detail through the Settlement Appraisal for Hertford. For the high level, strategic SLAA assessment it has been concluded that the sites could come forward subject to a review of the Green Belt.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			circumstances, the sites are unlikely to be achievable.	
03/016	Hertford	Site promoter/land owner	Similar to the Mead Lane Industrial Estate, which was allocated for residential development in the Local Plan Second Review, Dicker Mill is considered more suitable for residential use than employment use. It is within a primarily residential area and is a highly sustainable location. The site is available for development. In addition, existing adopted policies regarding retention of employment areas are out of date.	Not agreed. The existing employment offer in Hertford is limited and the Council's evidence base suggests that existing employment areas should be maintained wherever possible.
03/017	Hertford	Site promoter/land owner	The site is outside the allocated employment area show on the Draft Plan Proposals Map. Similar to the Mead Lane Industrial Estate, which was allocated for residential development by the Local Plan Second Review, this site is considered more suitable for residential use than employment use. It is within a primarily residential area and is a highly sustainable location.	The existing employment offer in Hertford is limited and the Council seeks to maintain existing employment uses where possible. As such the site is considered unsuitable. However, the site is not within a designated Employment Area and so it is recognised that it could become available for re-development in future following satisfactory marketing of the site for continued employment use.
03/152	Hertford	Site promoter/landowner	This site is capable of delivery of 350 dwellings, as opposed to the 300 suggested in the SLAA.	The SLAA identifies the principle of development in this location subject to a review of the Green Belt. However,

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			Although, the site currently lies within the Green Belt, this can be reviewed as part of the emerging District Plan.	more detailed issues such as capacity will be dealt with through the Settlement Appraisal for Hertford.
03/156	Hertford	Site promoter/landowner	The employment categorisation for this site needs reconsidering. As an employment site this area is no longer fit for purpose and it will soon be vacant. Also the site does not enhance the amenity for what is now becoming a residential area.	Not agreed. The existing employment offer in Hertford is limited and the Council's evidence base suggests that existing employment areas should be maintained wherever possible.
04/005	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/landowner and Town Council.	From the comments on 04/005 it would appear that the whole site including the Orchard and County Wildlife Site has been assessed and not just the proposed development area.	Noted. The SLAA assessment has been updated to reflect the smaller proposed development area. However, the Settlement Appraisal for Sawbridgeworth indicates that this site is considered to be less preferable than the proposed allocations in the town.
04/018	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/landowner	The Orchard and County Wildlife Site is only deliverable for community use through enabling development of the retirement home scheme.	Noted. However, residential development of this site is considered to be less preferable than the proposed allocations.
04/006	Sawbridgeworth	Planning agent and Town Council	It has been agreed at officer level that this site be allocated for 175 dwellings, the SLAA should reflect this.	Noted and agreed.
04/008	Sawbridgeworth	Town Council	It is noted that since the review was published EHC's view has changed and the area is now considered	The SLAA considers the merits of the site in isolation. However the assessment does note that there is

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			suitable.	potential for development if considered in conjunction with neighbouring land.
04/010	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/landowner	The assessment of this site is clear that development would not reduce the strategic gap, yet the site is discounted on this basis, this is clearly not a justified approach.	Not agreed. The assessment indicates that further urbanisation of this particularly sensitive parcel of Green Belt should be avoided.
04/010	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/land owner	Other sites have been identified suitable, subject to removal of Green Belt designation, even where the Green Belt review has found them to be unsuitable. For example, sites 04/006 and 04/013 have been assessed as suitable despite being part of land parcels considered to have low suitability for development in the Green belt review. Site 04/010 has been assessed negatively on the basis of Green Belt designation. This conclusion is inconsistent with the treatment of other sites.	Not agreed. The Green Belt Review did assess very large parcels of land. However, in assessing smaller areas for development, it is considered that the proposed allocations are less sensitive in Green Belt terms than land to the south west of the town. Given the existing narrow gap between Sawbridgeworth and Harlow/High Wych, it is considered that any development in this area would cause significant harm.
04/013	Sawbridgeworth	Planning agent	Using a density of 25DPH the capacity of this site would be 118, considerably less than the 125 figure stated. In addition, the topography of the land appears to have been disregarded. For this reason the site should be listed for no more than 100 units.	Not agreed. Even after taking account of using 1.2 hectares for primary school expansion, there is sufficient land to deliver 125 dwellings.
04/013	Sawbridgeworth	Town Council	It is noted that since the review was	Noted.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			published the scale of involvement on this site has increased from 100 units to a greater figure.	
04/015	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/landowner	The site is largely previously developed land, which was previously allocated for residential development. The inspector saw no reason to reject the proposal on Green Belt grounds and saw merits of retaining a buffer to the east to improve the river landscape and prevent coalescence. There is no justification to consider the site any differently to the inspector.	Not agreed. The Inspector for the Examination of the adopted Local Plan 2007 agreed with the SLAA assessment in that development in this location would be damaging to the integrity of the Green Belt and to its function.
04/015	Sawbridgeworth	Site promoter/landowner	The Esbies site has greater overall merits than the West Road and Kecksys Farm sites. It has close proximity to the railway station, good access to bus services and there is the potential to enhance the nearby conservation area and River Stort landscape.	The Green Belt concerns with regards to this site are considered justified. Land to the north of the town was concluded to have 'high suitability' for development by the Green Belt Review. Development in that location would not cause coalescence issues or harm the environment of the riverscape.
04/056	Sawbridgeworth	Planning agent	Using a density of 25DPH, the capacity of this site would be 63. There is concern raised around whether there has been any published evidence which indicates this site has the capacity for 76 dwellings.	A standard density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been used in the SLAA in relation to sites on the edge of towns, including Sawbridgeworth.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
04/056	Sawbridgeworth	Town Council	It is noted that since the review was published EHC's view has changed and the area is now considered suitable for development.	Noted.
05/001	Ware	Planning agent	A landscape assessment undertaken in 2005 concluded that the site would be capable of development, whilst leaving the character of the surrounding area unchanged. Since that assessment the woodland has had 10 years of further growth, thus enhancing the visual containment of the site. Therefore, it should be acknowledged that the site would not have an impact on Green Belt purpose. The Hertford and Ware Employment Study 2016 portrays that the number of available jobs in the town is decreasing. The Presdales Pit could offer good quality B1 floor space that has easy access to the A10/A414 corridor.	Not agreed. It is considered that any development of this location would cause significant harm to this particularly sensitive parcel of Green Belt which helps to maintain the distinct identities of Ware and Great Amwell.
05/003	Ware	Site promoter/land owner	This site appears to be consistently rejected due to its listed status and the inability of Historic England to reconsider. A historic landscape assessment was undertaken on the site in 2012. The assessment found that the site was now divorced from	The site remains as part of the Historic Park and should be assessed as such. Further detail is provided in the Settlement Appraisal for Ware.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			its parent landscape and divided by the dual carriageway.	
N/A	Ardeley	Planning agent	Ardeley warrants group 2 status in the village hierarchy.	This issue is not addressed by the SLAA.
10/001	Aston	Site promoter/landowner	Planning permission has been granted for 1 detached dwelling but development has not proceeded. The site is more appropriate for 5 or perhaps 10 dwellings (dependant on the building line). The site is still available for development.	Noted. This is reflected in the SLAA assessment.
10/001	Aston	Planning agent	A planning application in 2012 was withdrawn due in part to the loss of parking spaces. Hence, this site is unlikely to bring forward more than 3 dwellings.	Noted. The SLAA is a high level assessment based on a generic density of 25 dwellings per hectare in the villages.
10/003 & 10/004	Aston	Planning agent	These sites would not represent incursions into the countryside. A landscape assessment undertaken in 2014 for the sites does not look to have been given consideration.	Not agreed. It is considered that the Green Belt performs an important function in this location. In addition, the SLAA assessment indicates that development of these sites would not constitute infill development in a Green Belt village.
18/001	Buckland	Site promoter/land owner	Further consideration should be given to this site, taking account of NPPF. The proposed scale of development would be proportionate and appropriate to the existing settlement.	The Council has updated its position on village development. The revised policy will state that limited development can be delivered in Group 3 villages if identified through a Neighbourhood Plan. This could be the case for this site, however for consistency, the site

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
				has not been assessed as it falls below the threshold of 0.25 hectares.
20/010	Datchworth	Planning agent	Objection appears to be to the scale of the site. However, this should not preclude consideration being given to the suitability of a smaller development.	Noted. The assessment has been updated to reflect the fact that a smaller scale of development could be more acceptable in Green Belt terms but would not constitute infill development in a Group 2 village.
21/004	Eastwick & Gilston	Site promoter/landowner	Support for the draft conclusion. This site is being jointly promoted with 29/004.	Support noted and welcomed.
22/003	Furneux Pelham	Planning agent	This site forms a small part of a large field. There would be no adverse impact on the agricultural operation by separating it from the field and developing it. Access into the field together with a good landscaping screen along the southern boundary would mitigate any impact from Barleycroft Works.	The assessment has been updated to reflect the revised village strategy wherein development in this location could come forward if identified within a Neighbourhood Plan.
22/004	Furneux Pelham	Planning agent	This site has been sold and is unlikely to still be available.	Noted although the Council doesn't have any information to suggest that the site isn't available.
23/002	Great Amwell	Planning agent	Opposition to the comment that Great Amwell is a small village; in geographical terms it is quite large albeit somewhat sprawling and it includes a range of employment	Not agreed. Development would not constitute infill development in a Group 2 village.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			facilities. Hence, sensitive development of this site would not be out of scale with the village.	
25/001	Hertford Heath	Planning agent	Opposition to the comment that development of the site would be out of scale with the village. Given that Hertford Heath is one of the District largest villages, development of this site would be well within the Council's 10% target for group 1 villages. Consideration needs to be given to the detailed submission of the Vision Statement made in Spring 2014.	Not agreed. Development in this location would represent an unacceptable incursion into the Green Belt. The village is inset from the Green Belt and London Road currently presents a strong Green Belt boundary that should not be breached. While identified as a Group 1 village, Hertford Heath is not required to deliver 10% growth due to a lack of suitable sites.
25/007	Hertford Heath	Planning agent	Having been within the defined village boundary since before the adoption of the current Local Plan there has been plenty of opportunity for this land to be brought forward yet this has not happened. Therefore, it is unlikely to come forward in the future and should not be regarded as achievable.	Noted. This site has now been deleted from the SLAA. It was identified through the Housing Capacity Assessment (HCA) and, as with most HCA sites their availability is unclear. As they are highly unlikely to become available, all HCA sites have been removed from the SLAA.
26/003	Hertingfordbury	Site promoter/landowner	The total area of land being promoted by landowner is circa 100 hectares (within East Herts) and forms part of a larger cross boundary site of 260 hectares. This should be reflected in the SLAA.	Noted and agreed.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
26/003	Hertingfordbury	Site promoter/landowner	The proposed development would be delivered in line with policy HA3 (draft District Plan), hence its designation as an AAS would not limit the suitability of the development. The site is both suitable and available for development during the plan period and should therefore be assessed as “suitable” in the draft conclusions.	Reference to Areas of Archaeological Significance has been removed. The site cannot currently be considered to be ‘suitable’ due to its location within the Green Belt.
26/003	Hertingfordbury	Site promoter/landowner	Response under column “Deliverable with policy change” is endorsed.	Support noted and welcomed.
28/005	Hormead	Planning agent	This site is subject to a planning application for 5 dwellings which is supported by evidence that it is no longer suitable for employment use. The site has not been occupied for 10 years. The SLAA should be amended to include this site for 5 dwellings.	For the purposes of the SLAA it is considered that development in this location is unsuitable. This does not preclude the Council from taking a different decision through the planning application process should other material considerations weigh in its favour.
29/001	Hunsdon	Planning agent	It is accepted that the site would more than double the size of the village if developed in its entirety. Consideration has not been given to bringing forward a smaller site behind development in Tanners Way. It is considered that 40 dwellings are achievable. It has	Noted. The site has been re-assessed and the conclusion now indicates that the south eastern section of the site could be suitable for small scale development subject to inclusion in a Neighbourhood Plan.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			been noted that “a small scale of development could be considered by the Parish Council as part of the work on the emerging Neighbourhood Plan”. This should be noted in the SLAA.	
29/001 , 29/002 & 29/019	Hunsdon	Parish Council	Support for the draft conclusions.	Noted although the assessment for 29/001 has been updated to reflect that the site could come forward through a Neighbourhood Plan.
29/003	Hunsdon	Parish Council	Support for this site, however it is questioned whether 30 houses could be built in this area. This density would not be appropriate for this part of the village.	Noted. The SLAA has used a generic density assumption of 25 dwellings per hectare for village sites.
29/003	Hunsdon	Planning agent	Industrial units on the site currently provide income for a business located there which would be lost if residential development was to come forward. Concerns raised over the numerous land ownerships.	Noted. The conclusion has been amended to ‘Developable with policy change’ in order to reflect the fact that the site is not necessarily available due to its current use, and that it would need to come forward through a Neighbourhood Plan.
29/003	Hunsdon	Planning agent	The comment that the site is currently designated as an employment area is factually incorrect.	The assessment states that the site is not a designated Employment Area.
29/004	Hunsdon	Parish Council	This site is Green Belt and good quality farming land it should remain this way.	Strategic scale development in this general location will be considered through the Gilston Area Settlement

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
				Appraisal which will be presented to District Planning Executive Panel on 8 th September.
29/004	Hunsdon	Site promoter/land owner	Support for the conclusion. The site is being promoted together with 21/004 for a joint allocation of circa 10,000 homes.	Noted.
29/005 , 29/015 , 29/018 & 29/020	Hunsdon	Parish Council	EHDC has already granted outline planning permission for these sites.	Noted. The assessments have been updated.
29/017	Hunsdon	Parish Council	This site should not be considered part of the scheme north of Harlow. It is north of the historic settlement which contains the village church, Hunsdon House and Nine Ashes, and as such it should remain as part of Hunsdon.	Reference to a strategic scheme has been removed.
29/017	Hunsdon	Parish Council	This proposal has serious implications for the surface water drainage in an area which is prone to flooding.	The Councils records show that only small areas of the site are at risk from surface water flooding. However this issue will be considered through the current planning application.
29/017	Hunsdon	Planning agent	The SLAA comment under "Available" is misleading as the use of the site as a crane depot had ceased by 1990 and there has been	Noted although for the purposes of the SLAA assessment, employment was still the previous use. This issue will be considered through the current

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			no active use for several years.	planning application.
29/021	Hunsdon	Parish Council	The SLAA mapping shows parcels 29/021A and 29/021B, however the spreadsheet only refers to 29/021, this makes the assessment comments unclear.	The site was submitted in its entirety, therefore the mapping is incorrect and will be amended.
29/021	Hunsdon	Parish Council	This site could not support 50 houses, this figure is inappropriate and out of keeping with other development nearby.	Noted, this has been changed to 30 dwellings for consistency with other assessments.
29/021	Hunsdon	Planning agent	It is not clear from the SLAA mapping which parcel of land this reference refers to. The northern site (north of The Rectory/east of Tudor Close) was included as a recreation ground as part of a planning application for a new chapel for Hunsdon Parochial Church Council. Hence the area is not available. The southerly sites would lead to outward sprawl of the village.	It is considered that part of the site adjoining the current boundary could be suitable for up to 30 dwellings subject to inclusion in a Neighbourhood Plan.
29/021	Hunsdon	Site promoter/landowner	This site is considered capable of accommodating 40 dwellings, landscaping and infrastructure. Concern is raised that the site can only come forward through	A Neighbourhood Plan is currently in the early stages of preparation. The site can be considered through this process. The Gilston Area development is being progressed

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			amendment to the settlement boundary through the Neighbourhood Plan process. This particular Neighbourhood Plan could be very complicated due to the Gilston/Harlow North proposals. There is a concern the site could become delayed or lost within the wider Harlow North/Gilston discussions.	separately through the District Plan.
29/022	Hunsdon	Parish Council	This site is Green Belt and should remain so. However, this location has certain advantages over the development of other SLAA sites closer to the village settlement.	Noted.
31/004	Little Hadham	Planning agent	The site has been sold since it was promoted through call for sites and may no longer be available.	Noted although the Council has no information to suggest that the site is no longer available.
31/004	Little Hadham	Planning agent	The capacity of the site would be significantly less than 30 dwellings. Access issues also need to be resolved and involve crossing third party land.	Noted. However following further consideration of this site, the assessment has been updated to state that it is unsuitable.
31/004 , 31/006 & 31/028	Little Hadham	District Councillor	There are references to Little Hadham being a Group 1 village, however in the latest village hierarchy it has been downgraded to Group 2. This requires amending.	Noted. At the time of the stakeholder consultation the emerging village strategy was unclear. It is now proposed that Little Hadham will be identified as a Group 2 village. Therefore the assessments have been

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
				updated to reflect this.
33/004	Much Hadham	Planning agent	Support for the draft conclusion.	Support noted and welcomed.
33/004 & 33/012	Much Hadham	Parish Council	It should be stated that ribbon development is a further reason why these sites are unsuitable, as it would be contrary to VILL1 VI (e) of the Preferred options.	Given the location of existing buildings it is not considered that development of these two sites would be wholly unreasonable, particularly given the existing built form of Much Hadham and Hadham Cross. However, it is for the Parish Council to determine which sites are favourable through the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.
33/013 & 33/014	Much Hadham	Parish Council	Housing numbers to the suggested density would represent a huge intensification of highways usage, for which New Barns Lane and the junction with B1004 could not handle. Thus it must be recognised that accessibility is an issue that has no feasible solution. The sites should be assessed as “No” under deliverable with policy change as the NP would not be able to amend the boundary to include these sites, as they have no development potential.	The SLAA is a high level assessment based on generic density assumptions. More detailed issues need to be considered through the Neighbourhood Planning process. However the assessments have been updated to indicate that access issues would need to be overcome.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
33/015	Much Hadham	Parish Council	Housing numbers to the density suggested would represent huge intensification of highways usage, for which Kettle Green Lane and the junction with B1004 could not handle. Thus it must be recognised that accessibility is an issue that has no feasible solution.	The SLAA is a high level assessment based on generic density assumptions. More detailed issues need to be considered through the Neighbourhood Planning process. However the assessment already indicates that access issues would need to be overcome.
33/015 a	Much Hadham	Parish Council	There is no suitable access to this site. It is dependent on prior development approval for the remainder of the Old Station Yard (33/016) and this ought to be noted.	The SLAA is a high level assessment based on generic density assumptions. More detailed issues need to be considered through the Neighbourhood Planning process. However the assessment already indicates that access issues would need to be overcome.
33/015 a	Much Hadham	Much Hadham residents (petition)	Opposition to this site being developed as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction would be detrimental to the rural character and approaches to a village that is renowned for its visual character. • All approach roads are congested. • It is a valuable green space and there are numerous and rare species of bat that use this area as habitat. 	Noted. It is the role of the Parish Council to determine favourable sites through the Neighbourhood Planning process.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
33/016	Much Hadham	Parish Council	The SLAA should recognise that this site has been classified as not for development by the Hertfordshire Ecological network mapping project. It should be noted that this site is a listed habitat within S41 of the NERC Act and should not be developed.	The SLAA assessments take into account a range of policy constraints. However, further consideration of constraints would need to take place as part of the more detailed site assessment process. In this case, this would take place through the Neighbourhood Plan process.
N/A	Much Hadham	Parish Council	VILL 1 of the Preferred Options states that development outside the village boundary would be prevented until an NP is made. This means that development of any SLAA sites in Much Hadham will not commence until the NP is in place.	The draft policy does state that development should be limited to the existing urban area of a village until a Neighbourhood Plan is in place. However, when planning applications are submitted other material considerations should be considered. The fact that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of land at present is given significant weight in favour of development proposals.
35/004	Standon	Planning agent	Given the level of opposition to this site, particularly with regards to the fact the proposal is for 101 dwellings (close to the target for the whole settlement), it is extremely unlikely that the site will prove acceptable by local residents and be included in neighbourhood plan.	The does provide the potential meet the 10% growth requirement for Standon and Puckeridge. However, it is the role of the Parish Council to determine the most suitable sites to achieve this.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
35/017	Standon	Planning agent	The comments under suitability are supported. However, the capacity potential of this site is higher than the figure of 23. The current layout of 29 dwellings confines all development to flood zone 1.	Noted. The SLAA has used a generic density assumption of 25 dwellings per hectare for village sites.
35/036	Standon	Planning agent	This site is much better related to the existing High Street than either 35/004 or 35/016 and would bring forward modest development more likely to be absorbed into the community.	It is noted that the site is well related to the existing settlement, particularly as a result of recent development. However, the site is part of a Scheduled Monument designation and development should be avoided.
35/036	Standon	Planning agent	Whilst it is correct to state that the site is part of a scheduled monument, the same designation applies to all the historic core of the village including 35/016 and most of 35/004. Hence it is not logical to imply that this designation is a constraint to development of 35/036 and not to 35/004 and 35/016.	Site 35/004 is not within a Scheduled Monument Designation. Part of 35/016 is, but the SLAA assessment for that site indicates that development would be inappropriate in that location.
36/002	Stanstead Abbots	Site promoter/land owner	Given the high sustainability of Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets it is not considered that the Green Belt and Lee Valley Regional Park designations should be seen as automatic barriers to development.	The Council recognises that a review of the Green Belt is necessary in order to meet housing needs. However development of the Lee Valley Regional Park should be avoided. A number of sites around the village also lie in Flood Zone 3.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
36/002	Stanstead Abbotts	Site promoter/land owner	The site has been identified within flood zones 1 and 2, with a small parcel in flood zone 3a.	Not agreed. The majority of the site is Flood Zone 2 with small areas of Flood Zone 3.
36/007	Stanstead Abbotts	Planning agent	Support for the recognition that the site is well related to the village boundary. It is not accepted that location within the Green Belt automatically makes it unsuitable for development.	Agreed. However the site also lies in the Lee Valley Regional Park which is considered to be a significant constraint to development.
36/007	Stanstead Abbotts	Planning agent	Reference to a comprehensive submission that considers the principle of development within the Lee Valley Regional Park.	The content of this document is noted. However, it is the view of the Council at this stage that development within the boundaries of the park should be avoided.
37/002	Stanstead Abbotts	Site promoter/landowner	The site should be released from the Green belt and allocated for between 140 and 300 dwellings. Or it could become part of a larger development combining this site with land immediately adjacent to the east of the A1170. In Green Belt terms the site when compared to competing Green Belt sites (Gilston, East of WGC and North and East of Ware) performs a lesser Green Belt function. Landowners are willing to undertake a more detailed landscape and visual critique, in which a mitigation strategy for minimising the coalescence of the	It is not agreed that this site performs a less significant Green Belt function than other locations listed. This is a particularly sensitive parcel of Green Belt, given that it prevents coalescence of multiple settlements. As such development should be avoided.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			site with Hoddesdon could be presented.	
N/A	Stanstead Abbots	Site promoter/land owner	Objection to the demotion of Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets to a group 2 village. The SLAA is incorrect to dismiss development given the settlement scores significantly higher than all other villages in terms of sustainability.	It is noted that this is the most sustainable village in the District in terms of services and facilities, and as such, has been identified as a Group 1 village. However, given the constraints that exist, it is not considered appropriate to require 10% growth in this location.
40/001	Tewin	Planning agent	This land warrants careful attention as it provides the only opportunity to expand the school during the plan period. In 2013 Tewin Cowper C of E was listed as having no expansion potential, however it was stated: "Possible expansion potential, if adjacent land not in HCC ownership allocated in LDF. Need to investigate further". It is disappointing three years later this has not been investigated.	Tewin is identified as a Group 2 village within the District Plan. As such, development in this location would be contrary to policy.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
40/003 40/008	Tewin	Site promoter/land owner	Promotion of land, given sustainability of site and the overall sustainability of Tewin as a village. The site has previously been identified as being suitable for rural exceptions development.	The merits of this site are noted, as is the fact that it was previously identified by this Council as a proposed allocation as part of work on the adopted Local Plan 2007. However, Tewin is identified as a Group 2 village within the District Plan, and as such a review of the Green Belt is not appropriate in this location.
40/003	Tewin	Site promoter/landowner	The site does not have one owner as stated, it is important to note that the site is divided into two separately owned sections.	Noted.
40/003	Tewin	Site promoter/landowner	There are other sites that are adjacent to group 2 villages that have been suggested as suitable for development. For example, 10/001, 10/007, 19/003, 31/004, 31/007, 31/006, 31/028.	The site assessments for these locations indicate that they either represent limited infill development in a Green Belt village, or they are in non-Green Belt locations where sites could be brought forward through Neighbourhood Plans. This site is not considered limited infilling in a Green Belt location, and could not come forward through a Neighbourhood Plan. This site would not be in conformity with Group 2 policy.
40/004	Tewin	Planning agent	This site should be carefully considered for development through a review of the Green Belt boundary.	The site would not constitute limited infilling in a Group 2 village.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
40/005	Tewin	Planning agent	This site seems to have disappeared from the SLAA. A site plan is attached.	The site was omitted at an earlier stage as it falls below the threshold of 0.25 hectares used in the SLAA.
N/A	Tewin	Site promoter/landowner	Tewin should be a group 1 village instead of a group 2 village. The only reason given for Tewin not being a group 1 village is that the SLAA does not identify any capacity in Tewin, which would be the case at present as the village boundary has been drawn too tightly. This answer is insufficient to deny Tewin group 1 status. The village has close proximity to Welwyn Garden City, a primary school with available places and local commercial/industrial employment opportunities, therefore Tewin should have group 1 status.	This issue is not addressed through the SLAA. However, the emerging Village Hierarchy Study identifies that based on the scoring assessment of services and facilities, Tewin should be Group 2.
41/002	Thorley	Site promoter/landowner	This site is simply listed as 'residential', when in reality the proposals are likely to compromise Residential, Affordable housing, Employment, Education, a Local Centre and Open Space. We would be grateful if you could update this entry to reflect the mix of uses at Whittington Way.	Noted and agreed.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
42/002	Thundridge	Planning agent	Opposition to the failure to upgrade Thundridge to a group 1 village as identified by the Local Plan inspector. Therefore, the SLAA conclusion is also objected to.	This issue is not addressed through the SLAA. However, the emerging Village Hierarchy Study identifies that based on the scoring assessment of services and facilities, Thundridge/Wadesmill should be Group 2.
42/009	Thundridge	Planning agent	This site was deleted by the Local Plan Inspector previously because there were serious constraints to using North Drive for access. This situation has not changed. Hence, the site should not be included in the SLAA for up to 18 dwellings.	Given that High Cross is now identified as a Group 2 village, this site is now considered to be unsuitable.
42/010 & 42/011	Thundridge	Planning agent	Support for the conclusion that these sites are suitable for employment use. However, concern is raised that these sites should be brought forward through a Neighbourhood Plan. At the time of writing Thundridge Parish Council have not requested to have any part of its administrative area designated for Neighbourhood Planning purposes. These sites should be brought forward through the District Plan for certainty and deliverability.	The Council is not proposing to allocate village sites through the District Plan. Neighbourhood Plans will deliver the limited amount of growth proposed for rural locations. This is considered to be a reasonable approach.
42/014	Thundridge	Planning agent	Support for the draft conclusion that this site is suitable for 22 dwellings. However, concern is raised that this site should be brought forward	The Council is not proposing to allocate village sites through the District Plan. Neighbourhood Plans will deliver the limited amount of growth proposed for

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			through a Neighbourhood Plan. At the time of writing Thundridge Parish Council have not requested to have any part of its administrative area designated for Neighbourhood Planning purposes. To ensure deliverability this site should be allocated in the District Plan.	rural locations. This is considered to be a reasonable approach.
42/017	Thundridge	Planning agent	This site was deleted by inspector previously because there was no satisfactory access available to the site. Nothing has changed. Hence the sites should not be included in the SLAA for up to 20 dwellings.	High Cross is identified as a Group 2 village. Therefore this site is now considered to be unsuitable as development would not constitute limited infilling.
42/034	Thundridge	Planning agent	This site should not be included in the SLAA for up to 30 dwellings on the basis the constraints to access along North Drive cannot be overcome.	High Cross is identified as a Group 2 village. Therefore this site is now considered to be unsuitable as development would not constitute limited infilling.
43/002 & 43/003	Walkern	Parish Council	These sites are located in Green Belt land that acts as a buffer between Stevenage and Walkern to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence. Green belt review did not call for this site to be developed.	Noted. Strategic development in this location is considered through the East of Stevenage settlement appraisal.
43/002 & 43/003	Walkern	Parish Council	Infrastructure nearby to this site is insufficient. Increase in road congestion, destruction of green corridors and impact on the Beane Valley are all reasons this site is	Noted. Strategic development in this location is considered through the East of Stevenage settlement appraisal.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			unacceptable.	
43/009	Walkern	Parish Council	Planning inspector has granted permission for up to 85 homes, this requires amendment.	Noted
43/009	Walkern	Planning agent	The site was granted outline planning permission on appeal for up to 85 dwellings. The SLAA entry of up to 47 houses considerably underestimates the capacity.	
43/010 & 43/011	Walkern	Parish Council	Parish Council has no intention of reviewing its current village boundary. Following permission of 85 dwellings (43/009), it is clear Walkern has already exceeded its housing quota for up to 2031.	Noted.
43/010 & 43/011	Walkern	Site promoter/land owner	Both sites remain available, deliverable and developable with immediate effect.	Noted.
45/003	Watton-at-Stone	District Councillor	Although this site is below the threshold, it should be included as it is effectively derelict.	Not agreed. This threshold has been used throughout the SLAA. However smaller sites can still be considered through the Neighbourhood Plan process. In accordance with national policy, suitable brownfield sites should be brought forward for development before greenfield/Green Belt sites are considered.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
45/004	Watton-at-Stone	Planning agent	Support for the draft conclusion.	Support noted and welcomed.
N/A	Watton-at-Stone	District Councillor	Sites at Mill Lane, Watton-at-Stone and Moat Farm House, Perrywood Lane, Watton-at-Stone have been suggested for inclusion in the SLAA.	The sites have not been submitted through the Call for Sites process. However, Parish Councils are not limited to considering SLAA sites only through Neighbourhood Planning. It is recognised that other sites might be suitable for development. In accordance with national policy, suitable brownfield sites should be brought forward for development before greenfield/Green Belt sites are considered.
47/011	Widford	Site promoter/landowner	It is incorrect to state that this site is not deliverable or developable with a policy change. If the site was removed from the countryside it would clearly be developable and deliverable in policy terms.	Widford is identified as a Group 2 village. As such development in this location would not constitute limited infilling. However, the assessment has been updated to state that the site could come forward if identified within a Neighbourhood Plan for Widford.
47/011	Widford	Site promoter/landowner	Widford is currently identified as a category 2 village but it is noted that Preferred Options identifies Widford as a group 1 village suitable for accommodating 10% growth. This 10% could not be accommodated on brownfield land and would require greenfield release. There are also advantages of developing	Widford is identified as a Group 2 village. As such development in this location would not constitute limited infilling. However, the assessment has been updated to state that the site could come forward if identified within a Neighbourhood Plan for Widford.

Site Ref	Settlement	Respondent	Issue/Comments	Officer Response
			larger sites (land South of Martlets), as such sites can contribute to infrastructure delivery.	
47/011	Widford	Site promoter/landowner	The identification of Widford as a category 2 village is not supported. It is not recognised that Widford functions as a group village with Much Hadham and Hunsdon. These villages are connected by public transport, footways and the B1004/B180. It is incorrect to disregard the interaction between the villages. Rescoring of Widford with amendments would qualify Widford as a category 1 village.	This issue is not considered by the SLAA.