

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
<b>General Issues</b>		
10.01	Infrastructure in the villages is already at breaking point without further development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council continues to work with infrastructure and service providers to determine the impact of new development on existing infrastructure in the villages. Financial contributions will be sought for the provision of enhanced/new infrastructure to mitigate the impact of development through S106 legal agreements, as appropriate.</p>
10.02	The proposed level of development in villages will have a detrimental impact on green belt land.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Group 1 villages that are inset from the Green Belt are not required to deliver 10% growth. However, the revised policy does allow for a local Green Belt review in these locations through Neighbourhood Plans. Parish Councils should have regard to the potential impact on the Green Belt when preparing their plans.</p>
10.03	Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation comment that the strategy is not sustainable, villages will die unless they are allowed to expand and forcing the young and old to move to urban settlements because of a lack of suitable housing will turn villages into middle class, middle aged enclaves.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is considered that the revised village strategy provides an appropriate balance between the need to provide new homes in rural locations while also protecting their existing character.</p>
10.04	HCC considers that all the villages listed are historical settlements which contain designated and undesignated assets. The details of any archaeological assessment necessary will be dependent upon the nature of development proposal.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Planning applications will be expected to be supported by the submission of an archaeological assessment where necessary.</p>
10.05	HCC consider that additional dwellings at each village location would not cause any particular traffic issues when considered in isolation. Where the large residential developments are likely to impact on roads known to be heavily congested (Watton-at-Stone, A602 & Standon, A120) consideration may need to be given to provision of financial contributions towards highway improvements.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The Council will continue to work with the Highways Authority to identify solutions to mitigate the cumulative impact of development on the District's highway network. The Council supports the seeking of financial contributions towards highway improvements where appropriate.</p>
10.06	HCC comment that the proposed level of development will produce a requirement for an additional 1FE of school places across the villages. Specific information relating to the	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of village schools to accommodate the pupil yield from new developments. Where village schools</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	requirements for each village has been provided.	need to expand to accommodate additional pupils, financial contributions will be sought through a S106 legal agreement.
10.07	HCC broadly support the stance taken in relation to categorisation.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>
10.08	English Heritage supports a vision that reflects the differing character and often sensitive settings of villages.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>
10.09	There needs to be some reference to provision of new places of Public Worship.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is unlikely that the level of development in villages would, in itself, require the provision of new places of worship. However, the District Plan does encourage the provision of new community facilities subject to certain criteria.</p>
10.10	There needs to be a clearer stated intent that villages remain villages and that development not only within but adjacent to them must be proportionate to the current number of dwellings.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The level of development proposed in villages seeks to ensure that the identity of each village is retained. The policies relating to village development are criteria based; one of the criteria states that development should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the village.</p>
10.11	The maps accompanying the District Plan have not amended the conservation areas following the Conservation Area Assessment.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The Policies Map will be updated to reflect amendments made to Conservation Areas in the District.</p>
10.12	Braughing Parish Council considers that the lack of employment in villages should be a reason to suppress growth at these locations. Development should be focused where employment opportunities are.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The vast majority of development will be delivered in locations that have access to employment opportunities. Villages are required to deliver 500 dwellings over the course of the Plan period to 2033.</p>
10.13	Any village within 4/5 miles of a town boundary or centre of employment should be considered suitable for some development beyond that prescribed for Group 2 Villages.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages. Accessibility to local service/employment centres is one of the criteria used in the assessment, both in terms of actual distance and accessibility by public transport. It is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.14	How does the Council intend to liaise with local Parish Councils regarding the 10% increase?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Where villages are expected to accommodate a 10% increase in housing stock, the Council will encourage and provide advice to Parish Councils in preparing Neighbourhood Plans to deliver this level of growth.</p>
10.15	Some villages have prepared Neighbourhood Plans, others have not. It must be ensured that thoughtful contributions in existing Village Design Statements are given consideration in planning.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Where adopted, Neighbourhood Plans will form part of the development plan for the District and would therefore be afforded significant weight within the planning application process. Village Design Statements do not form part of the development plan but would still represent a material consideration.</p>
10.16	Village identities must be protected by the District Plan.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The level of development proposed in villages seeks to ensure that the identity of each village is retained. A policy decision has been made to restrict development in the villages, given their important role in the overall rural character of the District. The Plan contains a protective policy framework for village development which will ensure the villages retain their identities and that the wider countryside is protected from inappropriate development.</p>
10.17	The Council should look to gain contributions for village parking schemes.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not clear exactly what is meant by village parking schemes. Policy TRA3 (Chapter 18: Transport) concerns vehicle parking provision in new developments whilst the impact of development on existing parking provision is considered through the planning application process.</p> <p>Planning obligations are used as part of the planning application process to address specific planning issues and impacts arising from a development proposal and are intended to make acceptable a development that would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. They cannot be sought to finance solutions to existing issues.</p>
10.18	Parish Councils should have more influence in planning approval process.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Parish Councils are a statutory consultee in planning applications and their comments are considered through the decision-making process. If a Parish Council produces a Neighbourhood Plan, it would become part of the statutory development plan and the policies within it would be used when determining planning applications.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.19	Consideration should be given to the construction of a new “village of today”.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Consideration was given to the potential to deliver new settlements in the earliest stages of plan making. However, it was considered that it would not be sustainable or deliverable to pursue such an approach. Limited development in existing villages can help sustain them by providing new opportunities for young people to access the housing market.</p>
10.20	The Council should look to prioritise those from the local village in allocation of affordable housing.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>In most circumstances, affordable housing is provided to meet a district wide need and therefore, affordable housing is allocated taking account of the Council’s Housing Register and Allocations Policy. Where affordable housing is delivered on a rural exceptions site, a local lettings policy can prioritise allocation to people with a tie to the parish.</p>
10.21	The Council must exhaust all other options before releasing green belt land, this includes directing more development to villages outside of the green belt.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Directing more development to villages located outside of the Green Belt is not considered to be a sustainable approach to development in the District. Most of the villages in the District have a limited range of services and facilities and significant investment in supporting infrastructure would be required to support higher growth. This cannot be proven to be deliverable within the Plan-period.</p>
10.22	The Preferred Options summary document contains statements which are not present in the main document. For example: “unmet housing need from Group 1 villages will be directed to the Gilston development”.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The Preferred Options Summary Document contained information from both the District Plan and the Supporting Document, to ensure that key information was provided in an easily understood format. Notwithstanding this, evidence regarding unmet housing need contained within the Preferred Options District Plan has been superseded by an updated four-authority Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which presents updated evidence regarding housing need.</p>
10.23	The plan needs to take account of all dwellings added since 2011 as this is the date from which growth is being determined.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Agreed. The Plan sets out the housing requirement for the District from 2011-2033 and all dwellings completed since 2011 will contribute to this total requirement.</p>
10.24	Aston Parish Council suggests that there should be a policy with regards to parking in residential areas. Where there is a new development, it should be assessed whether parking for the new development is adequate and also look at the	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Policy TRA3 (Chapter 18: Transport) concerns vehicle parking provision in new developments. The impact of development on existing parking provision is considered through the planning application process.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	impact on existing parking.	
10.25	Site promoter considers that the village hierarchy study is not accurate or consistent.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016.</p>
<b>Development in Villages</b>		
10.26	Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation considers that the total number of dwellings to be provided by Group 1 and 2 Villages should be increased to 1,500 homes. In addition, in those villages not earmarked for development limited infill should be allowed.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process. However, it is considered that the provision of 500 dwellings over the Plan period represents an appropriate balance between the need to provide new housing while protecting the existing character of villages.</p>
10.27	Thorley Parish Council suggests that there should be more development in Group 1 and 2 villages, this would enhance/maintain the vitality of rural communities.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is considered that the provision of at least 500 dwellings in the villages over the Plan period represents an appropriate balance between the need to maintain the vitality of rural communities, and ensuring the protection of the existing character of the District's villages.</p>
10.28	Site promoter suggests table 10.1 should be amended by combining Little Hadham and Hadham Ford, as well as Standon and Puckeridge.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>As the villages of Standon and Puckeridge are contiguous with each other, they have been assessed together in the Final Village Hierarchy Study. As the villages of Little Hadham and Hadham Ford are not contiguous with each other, they have been assessed separately.</p>
10.29	Site promoter and others object to table 10.1 as it should use the most recent census data.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Agreed. As stated below the table, the information will be updated using data from the 2011 Census. This data was not available when the Preferred options District Plan was published.</p>
10.30	Bishop's Stortford Liberal Democrats support section 10.2.1. and 10.2.4.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>
10.31	The introductory text to table 10.1 identifies that "the final number of homes will depend on site availability and suitability", it should also depend upon the capacity of infrastructure to meet the	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. It is considered that the provision of 10% housing growth in non-Green Belt villages is sustainable and deliverable. It is agreed that delivery in excess of this number will be dependent</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	demand that arises.	upon the capacity of infrastructure to meet the additional demand that arises. The wording of the supporting text has been amended to reflect this.
10.32	10.2.9 should be reworded to read “have no primary school or no scope to expand an existing school”.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Only a few Group 3 Villages have a primary school but it is not necessarily accurate to state that there is no scope to expand them. There may be land available to enable expansion but the expansion of schools in Group 3 Villages would not be considered appropriate given the relative sustainability of Group 3 Villages.</p>
10.33	The 500 dwellings figure fails to take account of the opportunities for infill and brownfield development in Group 2 and 3 Villages.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The revised village strategy allows for limited infilling in Group 2 villages. Limited infilling can also take place in Group 3 villages where such sites are identified within a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<b>VILL1- Group 1 Villages</b>		
10.34	Part II- Site promoter considers that the use of the term “limited small scale development” is not consistent with the objective for Group 1 Villages. A reference to development being proportionate to the relative part of the settlement may be more useful.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The phrase ‘limited small-scale development and infill development’ will be deleted and replaced by the word ‘development’. Part VI (b) of the policy sets out that development should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the village. It is considered that this amendment provides greater flexibility to Parish Councils with regard to how they choose to deliver development in their villages through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
10.35	Part II- Site promoter comments that “limited small-scale development and infill development” is not consistent with 10.2.3 which refers to “Housing growth in these villages will be achieved through the identification of sites within and, where necessary in locations in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt, on the periphery of the built-up area”.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The phrase ‘limited small-scale development and infill development’ will be deleted and replaced by the word ‘development’. It is considered that this amendment provides greater flexibility to Parish Councils with regard to how they choose to deliver development in their villages through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
10.36	Part V- Site promoter states that this is too vague, if the Neighbourhood Planning process is to be followed then the Local Plan policy must state a clear cut-off date for adoption.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Not agreed. As is stated in VILL4, the Council will expect at least 250 homes to be delivered in the first 5 years of the Plan, and the Council will monitor the figures for committed and completed development on an annual basis as part of the Authority Monitoring Report.</p>
10.37	Part VI- Site promoter and others comment that it is anticipated the District Plan will be adopted in	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	2016 meaning that any Neighbourhood Plans are unlikely to be adopted until late 2016/early 2017. This approach would deprive large villages of any development until late 2017.	<p>Until such time that sites are allocated for development through a Neighbourhood Plan, development will be limited to the main built up area of the village as defined on the Policies Map. Therefore, it is not accurate to state that villages would be deprived of any development.</p> <p>In addition, many of the Group 1 Villages are in the process of formulating Neighbourhood Plans and it is envisaged that many of them will be made at a similar time to the adoption of the District Plan.</p>
10.38	Part VI- This should be amended to allow edge of settlement sustainable sites to come forward prior to a Neighbourhood Plan being in place. This will allow more flexibility to allow development to come forward in the short term.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Until such time that sites are allocated for development through a Neighbourhood Plan, development will be limited to the main built up area of the village as defined on the Policies Map. Permitting development in advance of the adoption of a Neighbourhood Plan could undermine the Neighbourhood Planning process , and result in local communities failing to take a proactive role in shaping the future of their areas.</p> <p>Many of the Group 1 Villages are in the process of formulating Neighbourhood Plans and it is envisaged that many of them will be made at a similar time to the adoption of the District Plan.</p>
10.39	Part VI (c)- This is a meaningless comment. The word “contribute” should be replaced by “enhance” or “be in keeping”.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Agreed. The policy wording should be amended.</p>
10.40	Part VI (d) and (f)- These are too restrictive. Most villages will require development on the edge of their settlements in order to meet their needs, there must be acceptance that development will impact on openness and views. Amendment should be made to require applicant to consider open space and views.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. There is an acceptance that development will have some impact on openness and views but it is not agreed that the policy wording is too restrictive. Criterion (d) and (f) seek to ensure that development does not take place on a significant open space or gap important to the form and/or setting of the village, and that development does not unacceptably block important views and/or detract from the openness of the countryside. These issues will be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.41	Landowner suggests the Local Authority should be looking to upgrade as many villages as possible to Group 1 status.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District’s villages, with development directed to the most sustainable (Group 1) villages. The study has identified 8 Group 1 Villages in the District.</p>
10.42	The District Plan continually refers to “minimum” amount of housing required; there is no mention of maximum. This means there is nothing to stop	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The District Plan is positively prepared in conformity with the requirements of national planning</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	developers building thousands of houses.	policy. It is unlikely that the Plan would be found 'sound' at Examination if it sought to impose an arbitrary cap on development in certain locations. However, development proposals that are not considered to be sustainable will be refused through the planning application process.
10.43	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others comment that the policy approach for group 1 villages and other villages does not appear to take account of brownfield sites.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  Not agreed. One of the guiding principles of the District Plan is to 'prioritise the development of brownfield land'. Brownfield sites can be allocated for development through the Neighbourhood Planning process. However, the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) has not identified many brownfield sites that are available and suitable for development in the villages.
10.44	It seems strange that villages such as: Tonwell, Westmill, Cottered, Wadesmill, Colliers End and Datchworth are not included in the proposed expansion given their proximity to major road networks and public transport.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages. Accessibility to local service/employment centres is one of the criteria used in the assessment, both in terms of actual distance and accessibility by public transport. However, of equal importance in the assessment of sustainability is the presence of services and facilities within the actual village. The villages listed have all been identified as Group 2 villages where limited infill development will be permitted.
10.45	Clarification of how the 10% figure was reached is required.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  The 10% figure was initially identified through the Community Right to Build guidance. The figure has been tested through the plan making process, and as a result, is considered to represent a sustainable level of development for the larger villages.
10.46	The 10% figure is too restrictive and rigid as there is no guarantee that 10% can be achieved without detriment to the village. Each village should be considered on its own merits. EHC should use the Call for sites/SLAA study to determine where development can occur.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  It is considered that 10% can be achieved without harming the existing character of the larger villages. The SLAA process does identify that this level of growth is achievable.
10.47	Objection to this policy as it is difficult to see how 10% growth can be met as the current village boundaries are too tightly drawn. If development is allowed to sprawl outside the village it's difficult to see how the requirements of Part VI can be met.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  The village development boundaries simply denote the existing built up area of the village and a 10% growth in the housing stock in the villages will be achieved through the identification of sites within and, where necessary, in locations on the periphery of the built-up area of the village. It is considered that appropriate sites for development can be allocated that accord with the criteria set out in Part VI.
10.48	Site promoter suggests the 10% minimum increase in housing stock is arbitrary and will	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	constrain development. The Community Right to Build has no bearing on assessing the level of growth through Local Plans. Instead the appropriate growth level should be derived from an assessment of each individual village's capacity.	The 10% figure has been tested through the plan making process, and as a result, is considered to represent an appropriate balance between the need to provide new housing while protecting the existing character of villages.
10.49	Site promoter considers that setting an individual figure for each village will encourage the Parish Councils to adopt this as their target in the Neighbourhood Plan and not deliver appropriate scale of development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The 10% figure has been tested through the plan making process, and as a result, is considered to represent an appropriate balance between the need to provide new housing while protecting the existing character of villages. Policy VILL1 states that this is the minimum level of housing growth required in identified Group 1 Villages located in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt.</p>
10.50	Braughing Parish Council suggests that adding 500 houses to group 1 villages would be less sustainable than adding a few more to the towns.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The vast majority of planned development has been directed to the larger settlements. It is considered that the provision of 500 homes in rural locations represents an appropriate balance between the need to provide new housing while protecting the existing character of villages.</p>
10.51	Bishop's Stortford Liberal Democrats and others suggest that Stanstead Abbots and Bayford should be added to this group of villages and the figure increased to 700. Both these villages are sustainable as they have train stations.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages. Accessibility to local service/employment centres is one of the criteria used in the assessment, both in terms of actual distance and accessibility by public transport, including by train services. However, of equal importance in the assessment of sustainability is the presence of services and facilities within the actual village. Therefore, Bayford has been identified as a Group 2 village where limited infill development will be permitted.</p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets has been identified as a Group 1 Village, although the village will not be expected to accommodate an increase in housing stock of at least 10%. The village will be encouraged to consider whether it is appropriate to amend the Green Belt boundary around the village through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate additional development.</p>
10.52	Site promoter considers that the SLAA shows that Group 1 Villages cannot meet the requirement of 500 over the plan period, therefore Group 2 Villages should not be restricted to infill as these settlements can help the District reach the figure.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is agreed that the SLAA has not identified sufficient capacity within the Group 1 Villages identified in the Final Village Hierarchy Study 2016, to meet the requirement for 500 new homes to be delivered over the Plan period. Therefore, the housing requirement of 500 new homes will be met through the counting of completions in all villages, rather than just from Group 1 Villages. In addition, development proposals which are in excess of infill development will be permitted in</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		Group 2 Villages where the development has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
10.53	The 10% housing increase required should be reduced to 5%.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The 10% figure has been tested through the plan making process, and as a result, is considered to represent an appropriate balance between the need to provide new housing while protecting the existing character of villages.</p>
<b>VILL2- Group 2 Villages</b>		
10.54	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council state that some of the Group 2 Villages are close enough to the towns to be considered suitable for more development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages. Accessibility to local service/employment centres is one of the criteria used in the assessment, both in terms of actual distance and accessibility by public transport.</p>
10.55	For Group 2 Villages it is stated development should "Be of scale appropriate to the size of the village" but there is no figure given which leaves the door open to interpretation. Group 2 Villages should have a figure defined.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A large number of Group 2 Villages, of varying sizes and of varying levels of sustainability, have been identified in the District Plan. Within these villages, limited infill development will be permitted, which should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the village. The amount of development that comes forward in this way will depend on site availability and site size so it is not possible to identify a blanket figure for Group 2 Villages.</p> <p>In addition, Group 2 Villages are permitted to bring forward small scale development as identified in a Neighbourhood Plan. If a blanket figure for delivery were to be introduced across all Group 2 Villages, it would effectively make it mandatory for all Group 2 Villages to produce a Neighbourhood Plan. Given that this is an optional tier of planning, and that some Group 2 Villages are very small, it is considered that this would be an onerous requirement on smaller Parish Councils who may not have the funds or expertise available locally, to assist in the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
10.56	Site promoters consider that limited infilling of no more than 5 dwellings is too restrictive it should be deleted from the policy. If maintained this may prevent best use of land. Development in excess of 5 dwellings could be appropriate as long as it would not have a harmful impact on the character of the villages.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Agreed. The reference to 'up to 5 dwellings on each site' should be removed from the policy wording. Development proposals will be considered on a site by site basis in accordance with the criteria set out in the policy.</p>
10.57	Stevenage Borough Council comments that Aston, Benington and Datchworth are Group 2 Villages	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	within the Stevenage and A1 HMA, it is not presently clear how this classification relates to the needs arising from either that part of Stevenage or HMA as a whole.	Stevenage Borough Council has progressed a Local Plan which seeks to meet identified housing needs with its own administrative boundaries. The village development strategy allows for limited infilling within Group 2 villages, however any housing delivered in these locations would help meet East Herts housing needs.
10.58	Site promoter considers that this policy is too restrictive, as drafted it will deny smaller settlements in the District the benefits that development can bring in terms of better services and renewed vitality. The policy must be revised to allow development outside of existing limits to development, where it will lead to enhancement or maintenance of services.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. It is the view of Officers that the policy in relation to development in Group 2 Villages should be amended to permit small scale development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, in addition to infill development.</p>
10.59	Hertingfordbury Parish Council questions why there is no definition of Group 2 Villages, yet there is a description of Category 3 Villages.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A description of Group 3 Villages is included as they are not named individually in the policy. It is not considered necessary to include a description of Group 1 and Group 2 Villages as the villages that fall under this categorisation are individually listed in VILL1 and VILL2.</p>
10.60	The group 2 classification for villages inset from the green belt is meaningless as Neighbourhood Plans cannot amend green belt boundaries.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>As identified in the Final Village Hierarchy Study 2016, the only Group 2 village that is inset from the Green Belt is Tewin. Development will be limited to infill development within the existing built up area of the village.</p>
10.61	HCC state that Colliers End, Cottered and Westmill are identified as Group 2 Villages, these settlements do not have a primary school.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages. The study assessed the level of services and facilities in each village, as well as accessibility to local service centres both in terms of actual distance and accessibility by public transport. Whilst these villages do not have primary schools within the village, they are located in relatively close proximity to other villages/towns where education facilities can be accessed.</p>
10.62	Site promoter states that the Local Plan Inspector was assured by the Council that delivery of housing from Category 2 Villages would be carefully monitored, yet this has not happened. This does not instil confidence in the Council's ability to monitor development in villages, in accordance with the housing trajectory.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Dwelling completion figures are collated by HCC on behalf of the Council. HCC has recently established a new monitoring system and the addition of village development boundaries to Group 2 Villages will assist in the accurate reporting of data.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
<b>VILL3- Group 3 Villages</b>		
10.63	GBR1 and GBR2 make reference to “limited affordable housing for local community needs in accordance with policy VILL3”. VILL3 makes no reference to affordable housing, this requires amending to be consistent with GBR1 and GBR2.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Policies GBR1 and GBR2 have been amended and no longer contain a cross reference to Policy VILL3.</p>
10.64	Site promoter considers that this approach is not in conformity with national policy (NPPG, 2014) which states that “All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence”.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District’s villages, with the majority of development being directed to the most sustainable (Group 1) villages. However, in recognition of the fact that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development it is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>
10.65	Site promoter states that there is no justification as to why market priced housing would not be permitted within Group 3 Villages (GBR2 Part (f)). To be financially viable, some market housing is needed to subsidise the affordable housing requirement of rural exception sites in Group 3 Villages.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District’s villages, with the majority of development being directed to the most sustainable (Group 1) villages. However, in recognition of the fact that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development it is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process. In addition, Policy HOU4 has been amended to state that ‘a small number of market homes may be permitted, at the Council’s discretion, where a viability assessment demonstrates that a cross subsidy is necessary to make the scheme viable’ within rural exception affordable housing schemes.</p>
10.66	Infill development should be allowed in Group 3 Villages. This would be in line with national policy and support communities in nearby Group 1 and 2 settlements.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District’s villages, with the majority of development being directed to the most sustainable (Group 1) villages. However, in recognition of the fact that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development it is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>
10.67	Bishop’s Stortford Liberal Democrats disagree with this policy as the outcome would be Parish Councils would be dictating to the District Council as to what the policies should be.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development strategy allows limited infilling in Group 3 villages where such sites are identified through a Neighbourhood Plan. Where Neighbourhood Plans are prepared, they must be</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		in conformity with the policy provisions contained within the District Plan.
10.68	Site promoter considers that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a nearby village. This is not reflected in VILL3.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Village Hierarchy Study has been prepared which assesses the overall level of sustainability of the District's villages, with the majority of development being directed to the most sustainable (Group 1) villages. However, in recognition of the fact that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development it is proposed that Group 3 villages will be identified as suitable locations for limited infill development that is identified through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>
<b>Village Boundaries</b>		
10.69	The village boundaries have been drawn too tightly for Group 1 and 2 Villages, historic buildings and churches have been excluded. There is a high risk of villages developing into densely housed settlements, which are cut off from places such as: Villages halls, shops, public services, schools and religious buildings.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>The criteria based approach to assessing development proposals will ensure that villages are not subject to inappropriate development of a high density, and that development is well connected to the services and facilities located in the village.</p> <p>The village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.70	The Council should re-draw settlement boundaries that positively help prepare sustainable opportunities for development, instead of excluding useful land.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>However, the village development boundaries may be amended through the Neighbourhood Planning process to accommodate development on the periphery of the main built up area of the village.</p>
10.71	Tewin Parish Council supports the retention of village boundaries.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.72	There is currently a complete lack of justification for village boundaries, not to mention a complete lack of evidence to support the proposed boundaries. This is particularly true for Group 2 Villages.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundaries seek to identify the main built areas of these rural settlements where development proposals will be supported in principle. With regard to Group 2 Villages, a development proposal may be considered to be acceptable even if it falls outside of the village development boundary, if it were judged to be limited infilling.</p>
10.73	The villages of Bramfield, Brickendon, Great Amwell, Little Berkhamsted, and Waterford which are currently proposed to be “washed over” ought to have a boundary drawn around their built up area.	<p><b>Proposed amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Bramfield, Brickendon Great Amwell and Little Berkhamsted have been identified as Group 2 Villages and it is proposed that a village development boundary will be drawn around the main built up area of these villages. Waterford remains identified as a Group 3 Village and it is not proposed to introduce a village development boundary here.</p>
<b>VILL4- Neighbourhood Plans</b>		
10.74	Part III- This repeats Part II without adding anything new.	<p><b>Proposed amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Wording of Part III of policy should be amended for clarity by explaining that the Council will continue to monitor the delivery of new homes in the villages in the period 2023-2028 and if a shortfall in delivery is identified, this will trigger a requirement for the Council to identify specific sites for housing through a review of the District Plan.</p>
10.75	Bishop’s Stortford Civic Federation and others consider that the Neighbourhood Plan led approach to development will fail to deliver sufficient dwellings.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Policy VILL4 outlines how the village development strategy will be monitored and the review mechanism that is in place. Where monitoring shows a shortfall in the number of homes coming forward through Neighbourhood Planning in a specific time period, a requirement for the District Council to identify specific sites for development will be triggered.</p>
10.76	Site promoter considers that allocations should be made for the villages as it is not certain that Neighbourhood Plans will come forward. The current approach is the antithesis of forward planning and is not consistent with NPPF. Housing and employment development could be restricted by this policy.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Policy VILL4 outlines how the village development strategy will be monitored and the review mechanism that is in place. Where monitoring shows a shortfall in the number of homes coming forward through Neighbourhood Planning in a specific time period, a requirement for the District Council to identify specific sites for development will be triggered.</p>
10.77	MP Mark Prisk suggests that the Draft Plan	<p><b>Proposed amendment in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	requires amending to indicate that where a village votes to support a Neighbourhood Plan which would result in more homes than previously identified, this will be allowed, regardless of which group the village is.	<p>Agreed. Small scale development proposals which have been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted in addition to limited infill development in Group 2 Villages.</p> <p>In Group 3 Villages, limited infill development which has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted.</p>
10.78	Objection to encouraging Parish Councils to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to allocate land for development. It is natural for Parish Councils to protect their villages from development, therefore it is not realistic to expect Parish Councils to allocate land.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. However, the District Council wants to give Parish Councils the opportunity to empower local people to take a proactive role in shaping the future of the areas in which they live. A number of Neighbourhood Plans are in the process of being formulated, and a number of these are seeking to allocate land for development.</p> <p>However, acknowledging that Neighbourhood Planning is an optional tier of planning, Policy VILL4 outlines how the village development strategy will be monitored and the review mechanism that is in place. Where monitoring shows a shortfall in the number of homes coming forward through Neighbourhood Planning in a specific time period, a requirement for the District Council to identify specific sites for development will be triggered.</p>
10.79	Site promoter considers it is not clear how the villages will deliver development if Neighbourhood Plans fail. A situation could arise where there is a moratorium on house building in the villages until such time as a "Group 1 Village site allocation DPD" is adopted. It could be better to work with local communities now to identify appropriate sites.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Policy VILL4 outlines how the village development strategy will be monitored and the review mechanism that is in place. Where monitoring shows a shortfall in the number of homes coming forward through Neighbourhood Planning in a specific time period, a requirement for the District Council to identify specific sites for development will be triggered.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that it will take some time for the District Council to allocate specific sites for development in the villages. During this time, development will be permitted within the village development boundaries as defined on the Policies Map, so there will not be a moratorium on housebuilding in villages.</p>
10.80	Site promoter highlights that it is suggested redrawing of village boundaries will only take place via Neighbourhood Plans and prior to this development will only be allowed within the boundary. This could lead to cramming of housing.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Development in villages will be considered against a range of criteria which will prevent the 'cramming' of housing within a village.</p>
10.81	Concern raised with regards to the practicality of allowing Neighbourhood Plans to shape development. Parish Councils may not have the necessary skills within their communities and it is not clear what financial resource will be available.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. It is acknowledged that producing a Neighbourhood Plan is an intensive task and that some Parish Councils may choose not to do this. However, the Council will provide advice to Parish Councils in preparing Neighbourhood Plans to deliver housing growth. In addition, many Parish</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		Councils in the District are engaging planning professionals to assist them in formulating Neighbourhood Plans.
10.82	Site promoter questions whether Parish Councils will be offered professional assistance to help prepare Neighbourhood Plans.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council will provide advice to Parish Councils in preparing Neighbourhood Plans to deliver housing growth. In addition, many Parish Councils in the District are engaging planning professionals to assist them in formulating Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
10.83	No parameters are set as to when the monitoring of the housing yield from Neighbourhood Plans will occur. If this policy were to be adopted it would require more prompt reporting of housing delivery than has been the case in recent years with the AMR generally not being published until almost 12 months after the end of the monitoring period.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Dwelling completion figures are collated by HCC on behalf of the Council. HCC has recently established a new monitoring system and the Council usually receives draft completion data 2 months after the end of the monitoring period. This is then usually reported publically through the Authority Monitoring Report in December of each year. Therefore, the Council would be able to identify a shortfall in delivery within 2 months of the end of the monitoring period.</p>
10.84	There is no indication of how the yield from Neighbourhood Plans will be measured. Will it be measured against the 10% per village growth figure or 250 dwelling figure across the District?	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It would be measured against the overall housing requirement for the Villages.</p>
10.85	The policy makes no mention of employment development which policy VILL1 states will also be delivered via Neighbourhood Plans.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Policy VILL4 outlines how housing delivery in the villages through Neighbourhood Planning will be monitored and the review mechanism that is in place. There is not a specific target in the Plan relating to land for employment development in the villages. Therefore, it is not necessary to make reference to it in a policy outlining review and trigger mechanisms.</p>
<b>VILL5- Village Employment Areas</b>		
10.86	Site promoter is concerned that the industrial premises off Netherfield Lane at Stanstead Abbots are not part of the list. The site does lay in the Metropolitan Green Belt, however so do employment sites at Stapleford and Thundridge.	<p><b>No amendment in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to designate the site as an Employment Area as it lies within the Lee Valley Regional Park and the Green Belt and it is not proposed to amend the Green Belt boundary in this location.</p>
<b>VILL6- New Employment Development</b>		
10.87	Buckland and Chipping Parish Council suggest that Group 3 Villages should be added to VILL6. It is essential improved High Speed Broadband is	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This policy has been deleted and proposals for new employment in village locations will be</p>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	provided in rural villages.	considered in accordance with Policies GBR1, GBR2, ED2, VILL1 and VILL2 of the District Plan.
10.88	Part II- Datchworth Parish Council and others suggests that the final word should be premises rather than dwelling.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This policy has been deleted and proposals for new employment in village locations will be considered in accordance with Policies GBR1, GBR2, ED2, VILL1 and VILL2 of the District Plan.</p>
10.89	Part II- Site promoter sees no reason why the ability to expand premises should be limited to those in B1 or B2 uses. Many employment uses undertaken in the green belt are “sui generis”, this policy wording restricts their expansion.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This policy has been deleted and proposals for new employment in village locations will be considered in accordance with Policies GBR1, GBR2, ED2, VILL1 and VILL2 of the District Plan.</p>
<b>Anstey</b>		
10.90	Anstey Parish Council support the categorisation of the village as Group 3.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. However, the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 identifies that Anstey should be included in the Group 2 Village categorisation.</p>
<b>Aston</b>		
10.91	The designation of Aston as a Group 2 Village is supported.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Aston as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.92	Site promoter objects to the boundary drawn around the village. The village boundary is drawn too tightly, therefore continued Group 2 status with this boundary will not bring forward any development. A suggested village boundary is attached.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundary is drawn around the main built up area of the village. Aston is washed over by the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF, limited infilling within the built up area of the village is permitted.</p>
10.93	Alteration/development of existing pubs in Aston could benefit the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Public houses can provide essential community uses in villages and, if they diversify, can provide other useful services. It is essential that any alteration/development is in the interest of the community.</p>
10.94	Aston Parish Council support the village boundary, consequently they will not be creating a	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	Neighbourhood Plan.	Support noted and welcomed.
10.95	Objection to the village boundary as Palletts Orchard (Stringers Lane) is the only parcel of land offered for development to be split by the line.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundary is drawn around the main built up area of the village. Aston is washed over by the Green Belt and in accordance with the NPPF, limited infilling within the built up area of the village is permitted. The boundary has not been drawn to encompass particular sites.</p>
10.96	Aston Parish Council seems to be advocating no development in the village for the plan period. The village needs more affordable housing to allow the younger generations to live in Aston.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Aston is categorised as a Group 2 village and therefore limited infilling within the built up area of the village is permitted. In addition, to meet affordable housing need, rural exception affordable housing schemes may be permitted subject to the criteria set out in Policy HOU4.</p>
10.97	If more affordable housing was available more families could live in the village, this would improve the school run as children would be able to walk to school.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The affordability of housing is a key issue in East Herts. Policies regarding the delivery of affordable housing are set out in Chapter 14 (Housing) of the Plan. Aston is categorised as a Group 2 village and therefore limited infilling within the built up area of the village is permitted. In addition, to meet affordable housing need, rural exception affordable housing schemes may be permitted subject to the criteria set out in Policy HOU4.</p> <p>The benefit of the school being attended by pupils from the village is recognised. It is considered that the policy approach to development in Aston may result in the delivery of additional family sized dwellings, whose occupants may help to sustain the village school.</p>
10.98	Suggestion that there is brownfield sites in Aston End that could enhance the green belt and make a modest contribution to housing figures.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Aston End is categorised as a Group 3 village and therefore limited infilling which has been identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the NPPF permits limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield land which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development. Therefore, it may be possible for the brownfield sites to come forward for development outside of the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>
<b>Bayford</b>		
10.99	It is questioned why Bayford has not been	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	highlighted for more development seeing as it is on the main train line.	The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Bayford as a Group 2 Village. Whilst the village does have a railway station located within walkable distance, it is situated just outside of the village and it is not considered to be safe or practical to access by foot all throughout the year. In addition, the village has a limited range of other services and facilities which supports its categorisation as a Group 2 Village.
<b>Benington</b>		
10.100	The proposed village boundary for Benington appears to exclude large built-up areas.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Benington will available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.101	Site promoter objects to the omission of Hebing End from Group 2 Villages. Hebing End is served by a regular bus service, contains a public house and a church. There are also employment opportunities at agricultural machinery shop and service yard.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The sustainability of Hebing End has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final Village Hierarchy Study. This indicates that Hebing End has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village. It is proposed that limited infill development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted in Group 3 Villages.</p>
10.102	Site promoter considers that Hebing End's close proximity to Benington makes it a more sustainable location. It is considered that Hebing End functions as part of Benington.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that Hebing End is located in close proximity to Benington and that residents have access to a range of services and facilities in this nearby village. However, this sort of relationship is true of many of the Group 3 Villages across the District, and whilst Hebing End may function as part of Benington, it is not considered that this justifies a change in policy approach to development in the village.</p> <p>The sustainability of Hebing End has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final Village Hierarchy Study and this has indicated that Hebing End has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village. It is proposed that limited infill development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted in Group 3 Villages.</p>
10.103	Site promoter highlights that some Group 2 Villages have few facilities within the settlement itself. In these cases the Council considers that the	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Where the Council has considered that the presence of facilities within nearby</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	presence of facilities within nearby settlements improves their sustainability. Comparison is made between Wadesmill and its relation to Thundridge, and the relationship between Benington and Hebing End.	<p>settlements improved the sustainability of a village, this is generally in the context of a village located in close proximity to a town or large village, which provide a wide range of services and facilities. Benington is only identified as a Group 2 Village given its limited offer in regard to services and facilities. Therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that some development in Hebing End would help to sustain the facilities in Benington, residents of Hebing End would need to travel far beyond Benington to access most services to meet their day to day needs. This is not considered to be sustainable development.</p> <p>The sustainability of Hebing End has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final Village Hierarchy Study and this has indicated that Hebing End has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village. It is proposed that limited infill development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted in Group 3 Villages.</p> <p>Thundridge and Wadesmill are villages that are contiguous with each other and are not considered to be an appropriate comparison.</p>
10.104	Site promoter considers that Hebing End performs well in terms of sustainability when compared with Group 2 Villages such as: Birch Green, Cole Green, Letty Green Furneux Pelham, Hertingfordbury, Westmill.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The sustainability of Hebing End has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final Village Hierarchy Study. This indicates that Hebing End has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village.</p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Birch Green, Furneux Pelham, Hertingfordbury, and Westmill have had their categorisation as Group 2 Villages confirmed. However, Cole Green and Letty Green have now been identified as Group 3 Villages.</p>
<b>Birch Green, Cole Green &amp; Letty Green</b>		
10.105	Support for the classification of Birch Green, Cole Green and Letty Green as Group 2.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Birch Green as a Group 2 Village. However, it also identifies that Cole Green and Letty Green should be included in the Group 3 Village categorisation due to the lower level of services and facilities contained within them.</p>
10.106	Hertingfordbury Parish Council considers that Birch Green, Cole Green and Letty Green should all be Category 3 Villages. These villages fit the description given for Category 3.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. However, the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Birch Green as a Group 2 Village. It does, however, identify that Cole Green and Letty Green should be placed in the Group 3 Village categorisation due to the lower level of services and facilities contained within them.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.107	Hertingfordbury Parish Council and Friends of Panshanger Park do not support the village boundary for Birch Green. The proposed envelope does not include any of the village north of the Old Coach Road. The impact of this is that development is only encouraged towards the already congested south of the village. Development to the north of Birch Green is nearer to the sustainable facilities (school, bus stops).	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Birch Green will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.108	The village boundary for Birch Green excludes a small area of car parking on the western boundary that is associated with adjacent housing.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Birch Green will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.109	The village boundary for Birch Green excludes the two largest homes on the eastern edge and the lower halves of four residential gardens this suggests that there are some thresholds relating to residential plot size that have been applied in the drawing of the proposed boundary.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Birch Green will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.110	The Cole Green village boundary excludes: Cole Green Works, Munns Farm and employment premises to the western side of the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Cole Green has now been identified as a Group 3 Village. Therefore, it is no longer proposed to have a village development boundary for Cole Green.</p>
10.111	Site promoter considers that Cole Green should not have a defined boundary and rather should be washed over by the green belt.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Cole Green has now been identified as a Group 3 Village. Therefore, it is no longer proposed to have a village development boundary for Cole Green, and</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		the village will remain washed over by the Green Belt.
10.112	The Letty Green village boundary stops short of the western end of the existing village. There is also one home excluded on the western side of Woolmers Lane.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Letty Green has now been identified as a Group 3 Village. Therefore, it is no longer proposed to have a village development boundary for Letty Green.</p>
<b>Braughing</b>		
10.113	The 10% allocation requires clarification. Braughing has more than likely had a 10% increase since 2011, does this mean Braughing has already met its quota for the plan period?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>No. Braughing, as a Group 1 Village, will be expected to accommodate a minimum 10% growth in housing stock (based on the 2011 census) between the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017 and 31<sup>st</sup> March 2033.</p>
10.114	Braughing should be downgraded to a Group 2 Village due to traffic and flooding concerns	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 sets out the District's most sustainable villages in terms of an assessment of their services and facilities and level of accessibility.</p> <p>As development comes forward in Braughing, planning applications will require traffic impact assessments and will have to abide by the Council's updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). However, it is not considered that these issues would prevent the delivery of 10% growth in Braughing.</p>
10.115	Braughing should not be designated Group 1 status, public transport is inadequate and schools are at capacity.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is recognised that there is restricted public transport within the majority of villages, however, Braughing scores reasonably well in the Final Village Hierarchy Study in terms of accessibility and public transport provision.</p> <p>The District Plan provides a 15 year strategy from the date of adoption. The capacity of schools in the local area is likely to change over this period. HCC have not identified an issue with a 10% growth in housing stock in the village with regard to school capacity.</p>
10.116	Using the Parish Council boundary (rather than village boundary) would give a consistent designation to Braughing allowing more flexible and appropriate development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle. Therefore the village development boundary for Braughing will continue to follow the main built-up area of the village. The Parish Boundary covers a large amount of rural area and a number of different settlements and therefore</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		would be an inappropriate development boundary for Braughing.
10.117	It is questioned why Braughing is a Group 1 Village. Watton-at-Stone has a station and is on a major A-road, Braughing is much more rural, it seems strange to classify these two settlements together.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Village Hierarchy Study assessed the sustainability of villages based on access to services and facilities. The fact that Watton has a train station is reflected in the scoring. However, Braughing does score relatively highly due to the number of services and facilities in the village and as such it is considered appropriate to identify it as a Group 1 settlement.</p>
10.118	The cumulative impact of adjacent developments needs to be considered. The merging of Braughing, Buntingford and Puckeridge must be resisted.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Reference to development needing to have regard to the cumulative impact of development within a locality will be added to the criteria used to assess development in Policies VILL1, VILL2 and VILL3.</p> <p>The development strategy for the District seeks to prevent the merging of settlements. With regard to speculative planning applications, it is highly unlikely that any proposals for large scale development that would threaten the individual identifies of these settlements would be considered sustainable.</p>
10.119	Site promoter supports the designation of Braughing as a Category 1 Village. Land East of Green End is available.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted.</p>
<b>Brickendon</b>		
10.120	There has been no change in the village since 2007, hence there is no planning justification for the downgrading of the village to Group 3 status.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Brickendon has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
<b>Buckland &amp; Chipping</b>		
10.121	Buckland and Chipping Parish Council considers that with large housing developments coming to Buntingford, attention should be given to the impact of these on neighbouring villages. Traffic, sewage, water supply and schooling may all become issues.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
10.122	Site promoter suggests that Buckland and Chipping should be categorised as a Group 2 Village. This is because the settlement is of	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The sustainability of Buckland &amp; Chipping has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	reasonable size and development would support local services and amenities.	Village Hierarchy Study. This indicates that Buckland & Chipping has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village. It is proposed that limited infill development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted in Group 3 Villages.
<b>Colliers End</b>		
10.123	The village boundary for Colliers End is incorrect, it omits two of the oldest houses in the village as well as the church. If infilling is going to occur it will be difficult to squeeze them into such a tight boundary.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Colliers End will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
<b>Cottered</b>		
10.124	Site promoter suggests that land at Stocking Hill should be included within the settlement boundary.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Cottered will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
<b>Datchworth</b>		
10.125	Datchworth Parish Council supports the categorisation of Datchworth as a Group 2 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Datchworth as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.126	Datchworth Parish Council suggests the addition of "(h) Not generate traffic that by its quantity or size will be inappropriate for the existing highways within and serving the village. Highway improvements to serve new development in the village will not be permitted other than as a result	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Datchworth has been identified as a Group 2 Village where limited infill development will be permitted. It is not considered that this level of development will have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Nevertheless, this issue will be considered through the planning application process.</p>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	of and associated with a Neighbourhood Plan process” to VILL 1,2 and 6.	It is not considered appropriate to require highways improvements to serve new development to be associated with the Neighbourhood Planning process, given that Neighbourhood Planning is an optional tier of planning. Whilst a Neighbourhood Plan could set out potential mitigation measures in relation to the highway impact of new development, such matters would be primarily dealt with through the planning application process.
10.127	Parking is an issue in Datchworth, there needs to be more off-street parking.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Policy TRA3 (Chapter 18: Transport) concerns vehicle parking provision in new developments. The impact of development on existing parking provision is considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.128	The Datchworth village boundary is incorrect. The boundary should be amended to include properties to the south and west of Datchworth Green.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Datchworth will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
<b>Eastwick &amp; Gilston</b>		
10.129	Eastwick & Gilston Parish Council are concerned that Gilston has been designated as a Group 3 Village with no mention of the 230 dwellings underway at Terlings Park.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The sustainability of Gilston has been assessed using the criteria used in the Final Village Hierarchy Study. This indicates that Gilston has been correctly identified as a Group 3 Village.</p> <p>The development at Terlings Park consists of the redevelopment of a vacant brownfield site within the Green Belt and the planning application was considered principally in relation to Green Belt policies rather than policies guiding village development. It is not considered that the redevelopment of Terlings Park will change the identification of Gilston as a Group 3 Village.</p>
<b>Great Amwell</b>		
10.130	Great Amwell Parish Council and others support the identification of Great Amwell as a Category 3 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. However, the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 identifies that Great Amwell should be included in the Group 2 Village categorisation.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.131	The transport infrastructure (public transport, roads, trains) is at capacity.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village where limited infill development will be permitted. This is in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of development on the highway network is being considered by ongoing transport modelling work. Where required, mitigation schemes have been identified that will help support identified levels of growth. The District Plan also seeks to encourage the provision and use of sustainable transport.</p>
10.132	Site promoter objects to the downgrading of Great Amwell to a Group 3 Village. Local Plan inspector in 2007 said “I consider this village to be large enough, and of a form, to accept infilling. It has a school, a public house, a village hall and is close to the variety of facilities in Ware to warrant Category 2 status”. Nothing has changed since to warrant the downgrading.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.133	Site promoter considers that lack of employment opportunities is not a reason to deny Great Amwell Group 2 status. The village benefits from significant employment based around the garden centre and industrial premises off Furlong Way. In addition, good public transport offers opportunities to work in other areas (Hertford, Hoddesdon, London).	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.134	Site promoter considers that limited school capacity is not a reason to deny Great Amwell Group 2 status. The proposed boundary is unlikely to produce more than a modest amount of infilling which would not challenge the capacity of the primary school.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.135	Site promoter considers that the preservation of historic character is not a reason to deny Great Amwell Group 2 status. Conservation area status does not preclude infill development subject to existing character being preserved.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.136	Site promoter considers that flood risk is not a reason to deny Great Amwell Group 2 status. The	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	land within the village boundary lies outside the flood plain.	Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.
10.137	Site promoter considers that concern over wildlife sites is not a reason to deny Great Amwell Group 2 status. The land within the boundary is already developed and hence infilling would not impact on wildlife sites.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.138	Site promoter considers that coalescence with adjacent settlements is not a reason to deny Great Amwell group 2 status. Subject to defining the boundary tightly around the built up areas, there is no risk of coalescence with Ware, Stanstead Abbots or Hoddesdon.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.139	Many object to the proposal for a new Waitrose at the current Van Hages Garden Centre, on grounds of highways impact and further development fears.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>This proposal was previously considered through the planning application process. The District Plan does not seek to facilitate a proposal of this nature.</p>
10.140	Site promoter suggests that if the scoring in the village hierarchy was accurate Great Amwell would sit amongst the group 1 villages. Community facilities and employment were ranked as red when they should have been scored as green.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Great Amwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
<b>Hertford Heath</b>		
10.141	Site promoter objects to the downgrading of Hertford Heath to a Group 2 Village. Local Plan inspector in 2007 said "This large village has had a defined boundary for some years. Even without an allocated site for development with its wide range of facilities, it is properly designated Category 1".	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Hertford Heath has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.142	Site promoter considers poor and irregular bus service is not a reason to deny Hertford Heath Group 1 status. There is a regular bus service between Hertford and Hoddesdon (641).	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Hertford Heath has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.143	Site promoter considers poor access to the A10 is not a reason to deny Hertford Heath Group 1 status. The B1197 runs through the heart of the village with good connections to the A414 and the A10.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Hertford Heath has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.144	Site promoter considers lack of employment opportunities is not a reason to deny Hertford Heath Group 1 status. There are reasonable employment opportunities nearby including: public houses, village shop, garages, industrial area North East of Hoddesdon, Foxholes Business Park, Foxholes Farm and Haileybury College.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Hertford Heath has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.145	Site promoter considers limited primary school capacity should not restrict Hertford Heath from being a Group 1 Village. The new all through school at Simon Balle will relieve pressure on the village primary school.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Hertford Heath has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.146	Hertford Heath village boundary is drawn too tightly and they are very few infilling opportunities remaining.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundary for Hertford Heath is identical to the Green Belt boundary as the village is inset from the Green Belt. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Hertford Heath in the District Plan. However, the Council will encourage Hertford Heath Parish Council to consider whether it is appropriate to amend their Green Belt boundary through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate additional development.</p>
<b>High Cross</b>		
10.147	Objection to the classification of High Cross as a Group 1 Village, the village has very few facilities.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, High Cross has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.148	Site promoter considers that the High Cross village boundary is drawn too tightly to accommodate any additional development. Land behind the Coachworks to the east should be included within the boundary. Also the access and car park to the Coach Works Industrial Estate needs to be	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	included.	Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for High Cross will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.
10.149	Site promoter supports the classification of High Cross as a group 1 village.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. However, following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, High Cross has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.150	Site promoter suggests land owned by St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance is available to contribute to the housing need of this district.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<b>Hunsdon</b>		
10.151	Support for the designation of Hunsdon as a category 1 village. 0.33ha of land South of Tanners Way should be allocated for development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Hunsdon as a Group 1 Village. Land will be allocated for development in Hunsdon through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>
10.152	Site promoter suggests 2.02ha of land owned by St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance (near to Acorn Street) is available to contribute to the housing needs of the district.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<b>Little Hadham &amp; Hadham Ford</b>		
10.153	Little Hadham Parish Council and others believe that the village should not be allocated as a Category 1 Village.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Little Hadham and Hadham Ford have been identified as Group 2 Villages.</p>
10.154	The sieving process should have identified Historic Assets as red not amber as the majority of the village is within a conservation area and Little Hadham has many grade 2 buildings.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Little Hadham, much like a number of the other villages in East Herts, has a wealth of Historic Assets and is covered by a Conservation Area. Any development in the village would need to ensure that such assets are retained and their setting protected.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.155	Little Hadham Parish Council and others consider that the sewage is an issue that needs resolving before further development. The sieving process should have identified waste water impact as red not amber. When storm conditions occur, surface water is discharged into the waste water infrastructure.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of the existing wastewater infrastructure to accommodate increased demand from new development. Thames Water has not indicated that the level of growth proposed could not be accommodated in the village with regard to wastewater infrastructure.</p>
10.156	The sieving process should have identified Designated Wildlife Sites (DWS) as red not green as there is a DWS within the village boundary which is the Old Chalk Pit, west of Albury Road.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Little Hadham, much like a number of the other villages in East Herts, has areas of environmental importance. Any development in the village would need to ensure that such assets are retained and their setting protected.</p>
10.157	The sieving process should have identified land availability as red not green as the village boundary is extremely tight.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Little Hadham has been identified as a Group 2 Village where limited infilling will be permitted. A number of sites adjacent to the village development boundary have been submitted for assessment through the SLAA, and the conclusion reached in the SLAA is that there are suitable sites available for development. The village development boundary could be amended through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites for development.</p>
10.158	Little Hadham Parish Council considers that high flood risk in the village means that the village should not be Category 1.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment would need to be submitted as part of a planning application for development in areas at risk of flooding. In addition, any development proposals would need to have the support of the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Nevertheless, following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Little Hadham and Hadham Ford have been identified as Group 2 Villages.</p>
10.159	Little Hadham Parish Council considers infrequency of bus services and the doubt around upgrades to the 351 service means that Little Hadham should not be a Category 1 village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Little Hadham and Hadham Ford have been identified as Group 2 Villages.</p>
10.160	Little Hadham Parish Council considers that the school is unlikely to be able to absorb the 10% growth, this will mean children will have to travel out of the village for schooling.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of village schools to accommodate the pupil yield from new developments. HCC have not indicated that the level of growth proposed could not be accommodated in the village with regard to</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		<p>education capacity. Where village schools need to expand to accommodate additional pupils, financial contributions will be sought through a S106 legal agreement.</p> <p>Nevertheless, following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016; Little Hadham and Hadham Ford have been identified as Group 2 Villages.</p>
10.161	Little Hadham Parish Council and others consider that there is a lack of community facilities in the area, there are no shops, the post office is likely to close in the future and medical facilities are lacking.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study identifies Little Hadham and Hadham Ford as Group 2 Villages.</p>
10.162	The designation of Little Hadham as a Category 1 Village is supported.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. However, following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, High Cross has been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.163	There is doubt as to whether Little Hadham will produce a Neighbourhood Plan. The only site in Little Hadham that is suitable is 0.66ha of land east of Ashcroft Farm, this should be included within the village boundary.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Little Hadham Parish Council have submitted a request to designate the parish as a neighbourhood area for the purpose of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016; Little Hadham has now been identified as a Group 2 Village and the village development boundary can be amended through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to identify sites to accommodate small-scale development proposals.</p>
<b>Little Berkhamsted</b>		
10.164	Little Berkhamsted Parish Council support the designation of Little Berkhamsted, Howe Green and Epping Green as group 3 villages.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016; Little Berkhamsted is to be classified as a Group 2 village. Little Berkhamsted is considered to have a level of services and accessibility that is similar to other Group 2 villages. Howe Green and Epping Green will remain as Group 3 villages.</p> <p>Support noted. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Howe Green and Epping Green as Group 3 Villages. However, it also identifies that Little Berkhamsted should be identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
<b>Much Hadham</b>		
10.165	Much Hadham Parish Council raise concerns that large areas outside of the village curtilage are unprotected e.g. Kettle Green Road and West of Widford Road.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Areas outside of the village development boundary are covered by Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt policy which seeks to limit development in such locations.</p>
10.166	Much Hadham Parish Council comments that obvious areas of infill have been explicity protected by being designated as Areas of Archaeological Significance (AAS). The AAS combined with the proposed village boundary appear to be placed such that housing is driven to one area, constituting a major development, which the Parish Council are opposed to.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Development is not precluded in areas designated as being of archaeological significance. However, planning applications will be expected to be supported by the submission of an archaeological assessment.</p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development. The village development boundary for Much Hadham is based on the boundary contained in the Local Plan 2007.</p>
10.167	Much Hadham Parish Council considers that the school is oversubscribed.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of village schools to accommodate the pupil yield from new developments. HCC have not indicated that the level of growth proposed could not be accommodated in the village with regard to education capacity. Where village schools need to expand to accommodate additional pupils, financial contributions will be sought through a S106 legal agreement.</p>
10.168	Much Hadham Parish Council considers flooding to be an issue in the village which will only worsen with additional development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A Flood Risk Assessment would need to be submitted as part of a planning application for development in areas at risk of flooding. In addition, any development proposals would need to have the support of the Environment Agency.</p>
10.169	Much Hadham Parish Council considers that drainage and sewage systems cannot cope with additional development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of the existing wastewater infrastructure to accommodate increased demand from new development. Thames Water has not indicated that the level of growth proposed could not be accommodated in the village with regard to wastewater infrastructure.</p>
10.170	Much Hadham Parish Council considers that the	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	village has no facility to cater for residents of other religions.	It is not considered that the provision of 10% growth in Much Hadham would require the delivery of new places of worship.
10.171	Site promoter supports the village boundary of Much Hadham and the classification of the settlement as a Category 1 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Hunsdon as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.172	Site promoter suggests 0.23ha of land at Walnut Close is in line with all of the requirements of VILL1 Part VI.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<b>Spellbrook</b>		
10.173	Sawbridgeworth Town Council questions why the village is not included within Sawbridgeworth. The two settlements share the same community facilities and economic environment.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that Spellbrook and Sawbridgeworth share the same community facilities and economic environment, the village is not included within Sawbridgeworth as it is a distinct settlement, separated from the town by an expanse of Green Belt land, where a different approach to development is justified.</p>
10.174	Sawbridgeworth Town Council state that Spellbrook lies within the Parish of Sawbridgeworth and has no individual identity, hence it would be unable to create a Neighbourhood Plan.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that Spellbrook lies within the parish of Sawbridgeworth but it is considered that it does have an individual identity, and is a distinct settlement to Sawbridgeworth. The village has been included in the neighbourhood area designation agreed for the purposes of Neighbourhood Planning, submitted by Sawbridgeworth Town Council. It is envisaged that that the Sawbridgeworth Neighbourhood Plan will include policies specific to Spellbrook, acknowledging its village character and the way the village functions.</p>
<b>Standon &amp; Puckeridge</b>		
10.175	The schools in and around Puckeridge are at full capacity, before additional development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed development strategy for the villages has had regard to the ability of village schools to accommodate the pupil yield from new developments. HCC have not indicated that the level of growth proposed could not be accommodated in the village with regard to education capacity. Where village schools need to expand to accommodate additional pupils, financial contributions will be sought through a S106 legal agreement.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.176	Traffic is a constant issue which will worsen if further development goes ahead. There seems to be no consideration of traffic created in Standon due to development in Bishop's Stortford.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Hertfordshire County Council throughout the plan making process on transport matters. The County Council does not consider that the level of growth envisaged will lead to an unacceptable impact on the local highway network. An initial consultation on a potential bypass for Standon and Puckeridge was undertaken earlier in 2016.</p>
10.177	The Little Hadham Bypass will just push traffic further west through Standon.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council has worked closely with Hertfordshire County Council throughout the plan making process on transport matters. The County Council does not consider that the level of growth envisaged will lead to an unacceptable impact on the local highway network. An initial consultation on a potential bypass for Standon and Puckeridge was undertaken earlier in 2016.</p>
10.178	The doctors are struggling to meet the demands of their current patients.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>New development in the village will be required to make suitable financial contributions towards health services to mitigate the impact of development, as deemed appropriate.</p>
10.179	Various parts of Puckeridge have been subject to flooding. There is concern that developers are not making a contribution to help alleviate flooding.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Development should be delivered in accordance with the guidance contained in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. In terms of surface water flooding, new development should help to alleviate these issues through careful design and the use of sustainable drainage techniques.</p>
10.180	HCC would object to the inclusion of any part of Scheduled Monument 75 within any development proposal.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan in order to deliver 10% growth in the village. Such proposals would need to be in general conformity with the policies contained within the District Plan. As such, proposals that would harm a Scheduled Monument are highly unlikely to be considered sustainable.</p>
10.181	Further development could have an impact on the chalk aquifer rivers such as the River Rib.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not considered that 10% growth in Standon and Puckeridge would impact negatively on the quality of the river environment.</p>
10.182	Site promoters support the identification of Standon and Puckeridge as a group 1 village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>
10.183	Standon Parish Council suggests that land both	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	sides of Cambridge Road/land south of the former Congregational Chapel to Vintage Corner (Puckeridge) should be included within the development boundary.	It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development. However, the village development boundary can be amended through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate development.
10.184	Standon Parish Council considers that development anywhere outside of the recommended areas at Cambridge Road should be avoided due to highways constraints.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan that allocates sites and delivers 10% housing growth in Standon & Puckeridge.
10.185	Standon Parish Council suggests that all development north of the village boundaries should be refused until Neighbourhood Plan is in place.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  Prior to adoption of the District Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan for Standon & Puckeridge, development proposals will be considered against the policies contained in the adopted Local Plan 2007 and national policy.
10.186	Standon Parish Council considers that a new roundabout is required at the brow of the hill in the centre of Cambridge Road to enable traffic to access recommended sites. Mitigation is also required at the junction of Cambridge road with the A120.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  Such schemes would be addressed through the planning application process, in consultation with Hertfordshire County Council.
10.187	Standon Parish Council believes that a Standon bypass should be planned now to alleviate A120 traffic.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  The County Council held an initial consultation on a potential bypass in early 2016.
10.188	Standon Parish Council suggests that the sewers need enlarging to deal with the extra 150 dwellings.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  Such schemes would be addressed through the planning application process, in consultation with Thames Water.
10.189	Standon Parish Council considers that flood risk needs resolving, flood storage areas should be provided.	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  New development should help alleviate surface water flooding issues through careful design and the use of sustainable drainage techniques.
10.190	Standon Parish Council supports the full 40% affordable dwellings quota for developments in the Parish. No reduction upon developer's application	<b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b>  The policy provides the starting point for negotiations through the planning application process.

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	should be allowed.	Viability issues can mean that 40% is not achievable on certain sites.
10.191	Standon Parish Council recommends application of Section 106 for developments in the Parish.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>New development would need to make financial contributions in accordance with the Councils Planning Obligations SPD and HCC's Toolkit.</p>
10.192	Site promoter considers that land at Café Field should be allocated through the District Plan.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Land will be allocated for development in Standon &amp; Puckeridge through the Neighbourhood Planning process</p>
<b>Stanstead Abbots &amp; St Margarets</b>		
10.193	Stanstead Abbots lies on a flood plain, has an assessment been carried out to analyse whether development in the village will increase flood risk in other settlements downstream?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>New development should help alleviate existing flooding issues through careful design and the use of sustainable drainage techniques and this would ensure that there is no increased flood risk to settlements downstream from Stanstead Abbots.</p> <p>In addition, residential development within Flood Zone 3b is not considered appropriate in accordance with national policy.</p>
10.194	<p>Site promoter suggests Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets should be re-assessed and placed in the Group 1 classification. Local Plan Inspector (2007) confirmed Category 1 status to be appropriate. For the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to a railway station.</li> <li>• Good connections to road network.</li> <li>• Wide range of local shops.</li> <li>• Good local services (GP, dentist, school).</li> <li>• Source of employment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Comments noted. Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets has been identified as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.195	Site promoter considers 1.32ha of land North of Marsh Lane is suitable and should be allocated.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to determine whether it is appropriate to amend the Green Belt boundary through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate development.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.196	Site promoter states that the village should have its own chapter with settlement specific policies.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village is no longer considered a 'main settlement' and has therefore been identified as a Group 1 village. As such, it is covered by Policy VILL1 in the District Plan.</p>
10.197	Site promoter considers that education constraints should not restrict growth in Stanstead Abbots. HCC have a statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places are provided to meet local needs. There is currently no evidence which suggests it is not feasible to create additional school capacity.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 Village. It is recognised that education capacity can vary over the course of the Plan period and, as such, has not been considered when identifying village categorisation.</p>
10.198	Site promoter highlights that the Council's strategy supporting document suggests that Stanstead Abbots is at risk of flooding from the River Lea and the New River. The New River is a canal and not a recognised source of flood risk.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. However in terms of fluvial flooding, Environment Agency flood zones are used. These are reflected in the Council's updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
10.199	Site promoter considers the fact that the village is located within flood zones 2 and 3 should not automatically preclude residential development. There is no reference in the Draft Plan to the flood risk sequential test.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. Flooding issues should be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.200	Site promoter considers suitable development would not be likely to have an impact on Amwell Quarry SSSI, Hertford Heath SSSI or Rye Meadows Ramsar Site.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. This would be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.201	Site promoter considers that the Edge of Settlement Assessment tested large scale major developments which would have led to coalescence of settlements. It is far more likely that suitable development around Stanstead Abbots would compromise minor urban extensions.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which allows development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.202	Development will be required in the village to ensure existing facilities and services continue to thrive in the future.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate. Development within the settlement boundary is also acceptable subject to the</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		criteria identified within Policy VILL1.
10.203	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council supports the stance to not allocate land North of St Margarets Road and West of pumping station on Hoddesdon Road.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed.</p>
10.204	Site promoter considers that a settlement should not be relegated to a lower category, with the greater restrictions which would apply, merely because of the current lack of an identifiable site. Sites suitable for development may appear over the plan period in larger villages (Stanstead Abbots).	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth</p>
10.205	Site promoter considers that land at Netherfield Lane should be included within the boundary. This site could provide housing for elderly persons, meaning no extra pressure would be put on the schools.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundary for Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets is identical to the Green Belt boundary as the village is inset from the Green Belt. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets in the District Plan. However, the Council will encourage the Parish Councils to consider whether it is appropriate to amend their Green Belt boundary through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate additional development.</p>
10.206	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council oppose any infilling of green belt land in the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village is inset from the Green Belt with the village development boundary being identical to the Green Belt boundary. Development outside of the village development boundary, within the Green Belt, would be considered to be inappropriate unless 'very special circumstances' were proven.</p>
10.207	Stanstead Abbots Parish Council supports the Group 2 designation.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted. However, the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 identifies that Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets should be included in the Group 1 Village categorisation.</p>
10.208	Site promoter suggests land North of the A414 at Stanstead St Abbots and St Margarets (Parcel 1) and South of the A414 bordering Hoddesdon (Parcel 2) are suitable for development and should be included within village boundary.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village development boundary for Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets is identical to the Green Belt boundary as the village is inset from the Green Belt. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Stanstead Abbots &amp; St. Margarets in the District Plan. However, the Council will encourage the Parish Councils to consider whether it is appropriate to amend their</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		Green Belt boundary through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan to accommodate additional development.
10.209	Site promoter acknowledges that the settlement is constrained to the north and south by environmental designations. The west of the settlement is covered by archaeological designation, which would be examined during a planning application. This should not be a reason for restricting development at this stage.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Stanstead Abbots and St Margaret's has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth</p>
10.210	Site promoter suggests that allowing development in the village will bring forward section 106 funds which can go towards a new school site.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that new development within the village could generate financial contributions towards the provision of a new school. However, there would need to be a significant level of development in the village to provide the funds to acquire a new site and fund construction. It is not considered that such a level of development would be sustainable in this location.</p>
<b>Tewin</b>		
10.211	Tewin Parish Council and others support the identification of Tewin as a Group 2 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Support noted and welcomed. The Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016 confirms the identification of Tewin as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.212	Tewin Parish Council comments that the school has limited potential to expand because of land ownership issues and highway constraints. This could have led to Tewin being downgraded from a marginal fail at sieve 2, to a fail at sieve 2a.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016. This identifies Tewin as a Group 2 Village. Tewin is the only Group 2 Village inset from the Green Belt and limited infill development within the village development boundary will be permitted. This level of development is not envisaged to require an expansion to the school.</p>
10.213	Tewin Parish Council queries the assessment of highways and vehicular access as green. Taking long term construction traffic into account Tewin could have warranted a red assessment.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016. This identifies Tewin as a Group 2 Village. Tewin is the only Group 2 Village inset from the Green Belt and limited infill development within the village development boundary will be permitted. Highways and vehicular access is considered to be adequate to accommodate this level of development.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.214	Tewin Parish Council raises concerns that Tewin may lose some of its existing community facilities through the plan period.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Limited infilling within the village development boundary would help to sustain existing services and facilities in the village.</p>
10.215	Tewin Parish Council raises concerns that Tewin may lose its bus service through the plan period.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. Limited infilling within the village development boundary would help to sustain existing services and facilities in the village.</p>
10.216	Tewin Parish Council queries the assessment of Waste Water impact as green. This fails to take account of incidents on two branch sewers in Tewin, including the contamination of newly built housing.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This identifies Tewin as a Group 2 Village. Tewin is the only Group 2 Village inset from the Green Belt and limited infill development within the village development boundary will be permitted. This level of development is not envisaged to have an unacceptable impact on the wastewater infrastructure in the village.</p>
10.217	Site promoter and others object to Tewin not being a Group 1 Village. The situation does not seem to have changed since the 2007 Local Plan, where Tewin was identified as Category 1 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This identifies Tewin as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.218	Objection to Tewin receiving a 'red' ranking in the traffic light assessment for bus services, access to rail service, and employment potential.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This identifies Tewin as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.219	Site promoter highlights that in 2007 the school was undersubscribed, therefore if there are any capacity issues now, it is believed that this has been created by taking admissions from outside of Tewin.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is recognised that education capacity can vary over the course of the Plan period and, as such, has not been considered when identifying village categorisation.</p>
10.220	There is ample room to expand the school, within the school site without encroaching on to other land.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. However, Tewin is the only Group 2 Village inset from the Green Belt and only limited infill development within the village development boundary will be permitted. This level of development is not envisaged to require an expansion to the school.</p>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.221	Tewin should be a Group 1 Village in order to allow the correct type and mix of housing to be provided. Currently there are too many 4/5/6 bedroom houses and not enough affordable 2/3 bedroom houses.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Tewin as a Group 2 Village.</p> <p>Tewin is the only Group 2 Village inset from the Green Belt and only limited infill development within the village development boundary will be permitted. A Neighbourhood Plan could include a policy on housing type and mix, as long as it is based on robust evidence.</p>
10.222	Site promoter considers that 1ha of land east of Upper Green Road should be included within the village boundary. It can deliver between 15 and 33 dwellings.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village is inset from the Green Belt with the village development boundary being identical to the Green Belt boundary. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Tewin in the District Plan. Development outside of the village development boundary, within the Green Belt, would be considered to be inappropriate unless 'very special circumstances' were proven.</p>
10.223	The Tewin village boundary has been drawn so tightly that it will not allow for any development to come forward over the plan period. The boundary needs adjusting to allow for some affordable and marketable housing.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village is inset from the Green Belt with the village development boundary being identical to the Green Belt boundary. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Tewin in the District Plan. Development outside of the village development boundary, within the Green Belt, would be considered to be inappropriate unless 'very special circumstances' were proven. Rural exception affordable housing schemes are considered to be appropriate development in the Green Belt.</p>
10.224	Site promoter considers that 1.49ha of land adjacent to Cowper C of E School should be included within the village boundary, the land could be used to help the school expand.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The village is inset from the Green Belt with the village development boundary being identical to the Green Belt boundary. The Council is not proposing to amend the Green Belt boundary around Tewin in the District Plan. Development outside of the village development boundary, within the Green Belt, would be considered to be inappropriate unless 'very special circumstances' were proven. There is currently no identified need to expand the village school.</p>
10.225	The village primary school is not serving merely local children. If there was development, school places could be taken up by local children, meaning less travel and congestion.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that many village schools serve pupils that live beyond the village, and the benefit of the school being attended by pupils from the village is recognised with regard to congestion issues. However, this does not constitute the 'very special circumstances' that are</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		required to justify development in the Green Belt.
10.226	Site promoter considers that Tewin Wood should have a development boundary drawn around it rather than being “washed over” by the green belt.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Tewin Wood has been identified as a Group 3 settlement and it is therefore appropriate for it to be washed over by the Green Belt.</p>
<b>Thundridge</b>		
10.227	The Thundridge village boundary has been drawn to exclude houses in Poles Lane. There are 50 houses on Poles Lane, a pub and a hotel.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Thundridge will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
10.228	Site promoter objects to the failure to upgrade Thundridge/Wadesmill to a Category 1 Village. Local Plan Inspector 2007 concluded that the Category 2 classification is flawed because the villages have: a school, village shop, hotel, employment opportunities, bus services and close proximity to Ware.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Thundridge &amp; Wadesmill as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.229	Site promoter comments that the inability of the school to expand was identified as a constraint leading to the village not warranting Group 1 status. This is surprising given that HCC in 2013 said that school capacity would not be an issue with 10% growth. In addition, Puller Memorial School in High Cross is undersubscribed.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Thundridge &amp; Wadesmill as a Group 2 Village. It is recognised that education capacity can vary over the course of the Plan period and, as such, has not been considered when identifying village categorisation.</p>
10.230	Site promoter considers that the village boundary should include the factory site on the east of C183 (Thundridge Business Park- VILL5). Land behind the factories (north of Woodlands Road) would appear to offer potential for development.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
		Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Thundridge will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.
<b>Tonwell</b>		
10.231	Tonwell will benefit from new homes. Small pockets of new housing will bring new families, who will give an injection of life to the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Tonwell has been identified as a Group 2 Village where limited infill development is permitted. In addition, small-scale development identified within a Neighbourhood Plan will be permitted.</p>
<b>Wadesmill</b>		
10.232	Site promoter considers that land to the rear of Rennesley Farm should be included within the village boundary.	<p><b>Potential amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the intention that village development boundaries delineate the main built up area of the village where development proposals will be supported in principle, in accordance with Policies VILL1 and VILL2. They do not seek to make a judgment as to the overall extent of the village or seek to allocate sites for development.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the village development boundaries are currently under review and the final boundary for Wadesmill will be available to view on the Policies Map in due course.</p>
<b>Walkern</b>		
10.233	Many object to the classification of Walkern as a Group 1 Village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Walkern as a Group 1 Village.</p>
10.234	The roads in and around Walkern (High Street, B1037) cannot take any increase in traffic. Expansion of the village and other areas such as Buntingford will increase congestion.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Congestion on Walkern High Street at peak times is caused by parked cars rather than weight of traffic. It is not considered that this issue should result in a change in categorisation for the village. The impact of development on the highway network will be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.235	Additional development in Walkern will have a detrimental impact on the green belt.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Walkern is not located within the Green Belt.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.236	Walkern is directly under the flight path to Luton, noise pollution is a major issue.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Walkern lies outside the area of concern as defined by noise contour maps. The area is also outside flight safety zones.</p>
10.237	Infrastructure in Walkern has reached its limits (Medical facilities, shops, community facilities), this restricts additional development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Walkern as a Group 1 Village.</p> <p>New development in the village will be required to make suitable financial contributions towards health services to mitigate the impact of development, as deemed appropriate. It is considered that new development will help to sustain existing shops and community facilities in the village.</p>
10.238	Public transport is very poor. Commuters are unable to use public transport, therefore residents are dependent on travelling by car.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Walkern is served by a bus service which enables access to Stevenage and other locations. It is recognised that rural areas are largely dependent on cars for travel. As such, the amount of development proposed to be delivered in the villages is 500 dwellings.</p>
10.239	Walkern is located at the bottom of a valley which leads to the roads flooding severely, this restricts further development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>New development should help alleviate existing flooding issues through careful design and the use of sustainable drainage techniques. However, residential development within Flood Zone 3b is not considered appropriate in accordance with national policy.</p>
10.240	There are limited employment opportunities in Walkern meaning people have to travel to Stevenage, this restricts further development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Walkern is served by a bus service which enables access to Stevenage and other locations. It is recognised that rural areas are largely dependent on cars for travel. As such, the amount of development proposed to be delivered in the villages is 500 dwellings.</p>
10.241	Development to the North East of Stevenage (planned by North Herts District Council and Stevenage Borough Council) combined with East Herts plans will lead to Walkern merging with Stevenage.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The District Plan does allocate land to the east of Stevenage for 600 homes. However, the strategic gap between the settlements will be maintained.</p>
10.242	Parking is very limited in Walkern, vehicles from the school have to park in nearby roads leading to	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	residents losing spaces. Further development will exacerbate this issue.	It is unlikely that new residents of Walkern should need to drive to the primary school. At present a number of pupils reside in Stevenage. Limited development in the village may help redress this issue thereby reducing the number of cars parked outside the school at peak times.
10.243	Internet connections and communications in the village require updating before additional development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Council is supportive of providing improved communications infrastructure, particularly in the villages.</p> <p>The Connected Counties programme is an established programme which works with BT to improve broadband connectivity across rural areas in Hertfordshire. Walkern is included in the programmes second rollout phase, the Superfast Extension Programme (SEP). The indicative timetable for rollout can be viewed at <a href="http://www.connectedcounties.org/news/2015/may/superfast-extension-programme-confirmed-in-herts">http://www.connectedcounties.org/news/2015/may/superfast-extension-programme-confirmed-in-herts</a>.</p>
10.244	Electricity and gas supplies will be put under extra stress due to this development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The utilities providers have been engaged in the plan making process and have not objected to the proposed level of growth.</p>
10.245	Air pollution is already a major issue in Walkern.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Mitigation of this issue should be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.246	The footpaths in Walkern are too narrow, any increase in the traffic will have an impact on this dangerous situation.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not considered that this is an issue which should prevent development in the village.</p>
10.247	The school in Walkern is already at capacity before additional development. Any increase in population would also put further pressure on the middle and secondary schools in Buntingford.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Education capacity can vary over the course of the Plan period and, as such, has not been considered when identifying village categorisation. However, it is understood that, at present, a number of pupils attend the village school that reside in Stevenage, so additional development in the village may help redress this issue.</p> <p>Walkern falls within the Stevenage school planning area and therefore any increase in the population will be considered in the context of education planning in Stevenage rather than Buntingford.</p>
10.248	Stevenage Borough Council comments that Walkern and Watton-at-Stone are Group 1 Villages	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	that fall within the Stevenage and A1 HMA. It is not presently clear how targets for these villages relate to the needs arising from either that part of Stevenage or HMA as a whole.	Stevenage Borough Council has progressed a Local Plan which seeks to meet identified housing needs with its own administrative boundaries. Any housing delivered in Walkern would contribute to meeting East Herts housing needs.
10.249	Development to the rear of Moors Ley and Stevenage Road should not be allowed due to sewage, flooding and highways constraints.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan that delivers 10% housing growth in Walkern.</p>
10.250	Development in the village will be to the detriment of wildlife habitats and woodland.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan that delivers 10% housing growth in Walkern. In doing so, the Neighbourhood Plan needs to demonstrate how the impact on sites of environmental importance has been avoided or mitigated.</p>
10.251	Site promoter supports classification of Walkern as group 1 village. Land off Aubries is available.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. This site has now received planning permission for development.</p>
10.252	Site promoter suggests land at Winters Lane should be brought forward.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan that delivers 10% housing growth in Walkern.</p>
<b>Watton-at-Stone</b>		
10.253	HCC suggests that the inclusion of Watton-at-Stone school within the village boundary would assist in achieving planning permission for any development that would be required to enable the provision of additional school places to meet the demand from proposed development. Others comment on the difficulties of expanding the school due to its green belt location.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Green Belt chapter now states that expansion of schools will form the 'very special circumstances' required to allow development in the Green Belt.</p>
10.254	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others believe development is not possible in the village because of green belt constraints.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Based on an assessment of services and facilities, Watton-at-Stone has been identified as a Group 1 village. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
10.255	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council states that Land to the rear of Motts Close should not be developed due to green belt constraints.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Watton-at-Stone. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.256	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others have doubts whether Land to the west of Walkern Road could be developed, due to: highways and access issues, pedestrian access constraints, green belt impact, wildlife damage and land ownership difficulties.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Watton-at-Stone. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.257	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council considers that education is a considerable concern in the village, given past and proposed development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Education capacity can vary over the course of the Plan period and, as such, has not been considered when identifying village categorisation.</p>
10.258	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others raised concerns about the level of traffic and congestion in the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Much of the congestion in the village at peak times is caused by parked cars rather than weight of traffic. It is not considered that this issue should result in a change in categorisation for the village. The impact of development on the highway network will be considered through the planning application process.</p>
10.259	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council considers that the GP surgery is at full capacity and cannot handle an increase in population.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>New development in the village will be required to make suitable financial contributions towards health services to mitigate the impact of development, as deemed appropriate.</p>
10.260	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others object to site adjacent to Great Innings North.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Watton-at-Stone. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.261	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council has no confidence in being able to devise a Neighbourhood Plan. The	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	need for the Neighbourhood Plan to be in line with the District Plan means that no way forward can be seen.	The Parish Council is now progressing a Neighbourhood Plan which will be in conformity with the District Plan.
10.262	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others are concerned that extra development will have a detrimental impact on the parking situation in the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Parish Council is now progressing a Neighbourhood Plan which will be in conformity with the District Plan. This may provide an opportunity to address the parking situation in the village.</p>
10.263	Landowners are committed to working with the Council should development of 3ha of land located between the High Street and railway to the North West of the existing Village Boundary be necessary through the District Plan process.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Noted. It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Watton-at-Stone. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.264	The A602 is a major problem, traffic regularly backs up the Watton bypass in both ways. A bypass is required around Hooks Cross and the section towards Ware is too narrow.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The County Council are proposing significant online improvements to the A602 which should enhance traffic flow at peak times.</p>
10.265	Development will increase the amount of crime in the village. It is requested to see the crime figures.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is not considered that this is a sufficient reason to prevent development in Watton-at-Stone. Any new development should be designed in order to reduce the potential for crime as well as the fear of crime.</p>
10.266	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council feel injustice that the Gatekeeper Meadow development will not count towards the targets in the plan, as it was delivered during this current plan timeframe. Others suggest that at least the 26 extra houses built at the site should count towards Watton-at-Stone's target.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Gatekeeper Meadow development will count towards the overall housing requirement for the District. As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.267	Watton-at-Stone Parish Council and others comment that the Gatekeeper Meadow development is a visible eyesore, has poor parking, narrow roads and is generally unpleasant and cramped. If there is additional development in the village, how are the residents supposed to have any confidence in the quality of design?	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan can address issues of design. The District Plan also includes policies that requires development to be of a high quality design.</p>
10.268	Watton-at-Stone should only be subject to infill	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p>



Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	development of 25-30 homes over the plan period.	As it is inset from the Green Belt, the village is not required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.
10.269	The plan says group 1 villages may be permitted limited, small scale and infill development, the suggested 85 dwellings at Watton-at-Stone in not limited or small-scale.	<p><b>Proposed amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The phrase ‘limited small-scale development and infill development’ will be deleted and replaced by the word ‘development’. Part VI (b) of the policy sets out that development should be of a scale appropriate to the size of the village. It is considered that this amendment provides greater flexibility to Parish Councils with regard to how they choose to deliver development in their villages through the formulation of a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Nevertheless, as Watton-at-Stone is inset from the Green Belt, the village is no longer required to deliver 10% growth. However, a local Green Belt review which would facilitate development on the periphery of the village could be undertaken through a Neighbourhood Plan where appropriate.</p>
10.270	Any further development in Watton should avoid making a visual impact on the landscape.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is the role of the Parish Council to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan for Watton-at-Stone. However, proposals for any development should consider potential impacts on the landscape.</p>
10.271	The electrical supply in the village cannot handle any more development.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>The utilities providers have been engaged in the plan making process and have not objected to the proposed level of growth.</p>
<b>Westmill</b>		
10.272	Westmill Parish Council objects to the classification of the village as Group 2. The village was Category 3 in the last District Plan and should remain so. Since the plan was adopted there has been no increase in facilities in the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>An up to date assessment of village sustainability has been carried out and the Final Village Hierarchy Study was presented to the District Planning Executive Panel on 25th August 2016. This confirms the identification of Westmill as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.273	Westmill Parish Council highlights the sieving process that noted “development could potentially contribute to an improved bus service”. This is unlikely to occur as Westmill’s bus stop is underused. The stop is directly on the A10 and is a	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that the bus stop is located on the A10, some distance away from the built up area of the village. It is considered unlikely that development in Westmill would result in an improved bus service to the village.</p>

Issue Number	Issue	Officer Response
	long walk from the village.	
<b>Widford</b>		
10.274	Widford Parish Council and others consider that the classification of the village as a Group 1 will lead to developers building large 4/5 bedroom houses suitable for commuters. Widford should remain Group 2 where it can support its residents.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Widford has now been identified as a Group 2 Village. A Neighbourhood Plan could include a policy on housing type and mix, as long as it is based on robust evidence.</p>
10.275	Widford Parish Council comments that the village, has such limited facilities (no shops, post office or GP surgery) this means the village should be classified as Group 2.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Widford has now been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.276	Widford Parish Council has limited parking and bus services, meaning the village should be classified as Group 2.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Widford has now been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.277	Widford Parish Council considers that there is very little industry/employment in the village, meaning it should be classified as Group 2.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Following further consideration of the village development strategy and publication of the Final Village Hierarchy Study August 2016, Widford has now been identified as a Group 2 Village.</p>
10.278	Widford Parish Council and others suggest that smaller, more affordable housing is required in the village.	<p><b>No amendment to Plan in response to this issue</b></p> <p>Widford is categorised as a Group 2 village and therefore limited infilling within the built up area of the village is permitted, as well as small-scale development identified in an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. A Neighbourhood Plan could include a policy on housing type and mix, as long as it is based on robust evidence. In addition, to meet affordable housing need, rural exception affordable housing schemes may be permitted subject to the criteria set out in Policy HOU4.</p>