

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
4.1 Green Belt	
4.1	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for the use of Green Belt for development <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapter is not necessary as it repeats the NPPF 2. Plan is contrary to the NPPF and purposes of the Green Belt 3. Site specific objections – why some Green Belt sites have been chosen over others, why certain sites have not been allocated – Green Belt Review findings are disputed 4. Green Belt Review does not assess all small sites on edge of Green Belt villages and therefore the Plan does not assess all reasonable alternatives 5. Plan is contrary to recommendations in the Green Belt Review – all land that does not make a significant contribution should be released, important sites have been allocated for development 6. Plan does not safeguard/remove Green Belt land for future development 7. Loss of Green Belt will harm biodiversity 8. Loss of Green Belt will result in lost agricultural resource 9. Opposition to loss of Green Belt in Bishop’s Stortford, Watton-at-Stone, north and east of Ware, east of Welwyn Garden City, the Gilston Area and east of Stevenage
4.3 Exceptional Circumstances	
4.3	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exceptional circumstances exist to justify release of land from the Green Belt to accommodate

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>housing needs</p> <p>2. Support for land to the west of Sawbridgeworth (south of West Road) – advocates 300 homes</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Failure to remove Westmill Quarry and Landfill Site from the Green Belt in accordance with the Waste Local Plan</p> <p>2. No exceptional circumstances proven for release of Green Belt</p> <p>3. Does not address requirement to balance housing need i.e. Green Belt as a constraint to reduce housing need</p> <p>4. Exceptional circumstances need to be proven for each site</p> <p>5. Housing need does not constitute exceptional circumstances</p> <p>6. Lack of suitable alternatives is not an exceptional circumstance</p> <p>7. No evidence of a lack of suitable sites – land to the north of the district should be considered for a new settlement</p> <p>8. Brownfield land should be used first</p> <p>9. No compensatory Green Belt proposed to replace lost</p> <p>10. Opposition to loss of Green Belt in Bishop's Stortford, Watton-at-Stone, north and east of Ware, east of Welwyn Garden City, the Gilston Area and east of Stevenage</p> <p>11. Incorrect boundary around Spellbrook</p> <p>12. Opposition to altering Green Belt boundary around Tewin</p> <p>13. Green Belt Review evidence base is not sound as it does not consider all smaller alternative sites</p>
4.4 Planning Applications in the Green Belt	
4.4.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Conversion to residential use and replacement of buildings should be permitted</p>
4.4.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	1. Paragraph is not needed as the proposals are not covered by exceptions
4.5 Neighbourhood Planning	
4.5	<u>Objection</u> 2. Green Belt boundaries should be amended only through the District Plan, not left to Neighbourhood Plans, which are only encouraged, not required 3.
Policy GBR1 Green Belt	
GBR1	<u>Support</u> 1. Support for removal from the Green Belt and allocation of land east of Stevenage – if not used it should be safeguarded <u>Objection</u> 1. Adds no additional value to the NPPF policy 2. Green Belt Review evidence base is not sound as it does not consider all alternative sites – land to south west of Sawbridgeworth is cited as an example 3. Plan should remove land from the Green Belt and allocate further land to the west of Sawbridgeworth and around the villages of Hertford Heath, Stanstead Abbots & St Margarets and Watton-at-Stone <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Reference to other benefits of reducing light pollution could be added to the supporting text
4.7 Planning Applications in the Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt	
4.7.1	<u>Objection</u>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	1. No definition of 'material harm'
Policy GBR2 Rural Area Beyond the Green Belt	
GBR2	<u>Objection</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development should be considered on its merits not restricted 2. Adds no additional value to the NPPF policy 3. No justification for applying Green Belt approach to the rural area beyond the Green Belt 4. New builds beyond the Green Belt are considered unacceptable but the Plan proposes new builds on Green Belt land 5. Such a restrictive approach should not be applied when there is a housing shortfall 6. Many of the things restricted would be permitted by the GDPO so do not need planning permission 7. Affords less protection than the 2007 Local Plan Policy GBC2 8. It is not clear if this would preclude development in a village 9. Should be amended to 'Countryside Protection' rather than Green Belt protection policy 10. Should define % and type of affordable homes 11. Should emphasise redevelopment of brownfield land in villages 12. Neighbourhood Plans should not be the only means to accept development in the rural area as they are voluntary and not required