

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
<b>10.1 Introduction</b>	
10.1	<u>Objection</u> 1. There is no section in the Plan that considers the infrastructure in villages. The IDP should also refer to infrastructure requirements in villages.
10.1.2	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. New village developments bring incoming people who do not assimilate into the rural way of life. Leads to commuter settlements and dilution of the community.
10.1.4	<u>Objection</u> 1. This paragraph suggests housing development will only be for younger residents which is discriminatory. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Facilities have closed for a number of reasons. New development won't bring them back.
<b>10.2 Development in Villages</b>	
10.2	<u>Support</u> 1. Support expressed for the principle of the policy. <u>Objection</u> 1. The housing requirement for at least 500 dwellings to be delivered in the villages is too restrictive and will fail to deliver sufficient rural housing to meet housing needs. 2. Villages should provide 1,500 dwellings in total. 3. Query as to the likelihood of the figure for villages being met when specific sites are not allocated for development. 4. Objection to the methodology used in the Village Hierarchy Study. The existing population of the villages or location of employment areas has not been considered in the assessment and

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>constraints to development haven't been considered appropriately.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Village Hierarchy Study doesn't consider 'village clusters'.</li> <li>6. Many villages are unsustainable locations for further development.</li> <li>7. Concern that villages are developing into small towns.</li> <li>8. Concern over the lack of infrastructure in villages.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Query as to why village hierarchy has changed from the preferred options version of the Plan.</li> <li>2. Road infrastructure needs to be improved in villages so that they are able to cope with additional traffic.</li> </ol>
10.2.1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Villages will die as vibrant communities as facilities will not be supported without growth.</li> <li>2. People do not always need to live in urban areas as home working has become more feasible</li> </ol>
VILL1	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Policy does not adequately provide for growth in villages.</li> <li>2. The Sustainability Appraisal does not satisfactorily consider the reasonable alternative distribution of a greater amount of development to the villages.</li> <li>3. The growth figure of 'at least 10% increase in housing stock' is arbitrary and unjustified.</li> <li>4. The application of a blanket 10% growth figure for Group 1 Villages in the Rural Area beyond the Green Belt fails to take into consideration the unique character of different villages.</li> <li>5. Villages should not be grouped together in three categories; each village should be looked at individually to see if it contains the right characteristics for development.</li> <li>6. Giving a housing requirement to the villages will lead to speculative development on village boundaries.</li> <li>7. Site allocations, with specified numbers of dwellings to be delivered, should be made in Group 1 Villages to provide certainty of development.</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>8. Allocations should not be devolved to Neighbourhood Plans as there is no obligation on Parish Councils to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>9. Part III of the policy is unsound as Green Belt boundaries cannot be altered through Neighbourhood Plans. Changes to Green Belt boundaries are a strategic matter which should be addressed through the District Plan rather than delegated to Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>10. Object as there is no mention in the policy to the essential requirement for the demonstration of exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt alterations.</p> <p>11. Part VII of the policy is too subjective.</p> <p>12. Part VII of the policy should be amended to make reference to development proposals seeking to optimise dwelling provision. Low density housing development should be discouraged.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Query as to how 10% figure was reached for development in Group 1 Villages.</p> <p>2. Query as to how development will be phased over the Plan period.</p> <p>3. Query as to how infrastructure capacity will be determined if villages exceed their minimum housing number.</p>
VILL2	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support expressed for Part II and Part III of the policy.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Policy is too restrictive with regard to only permitting infill development in Group 2 Villages.</p> <p>2. Group 2 Villages should be allocated a specific housing target.</p> <p>3. Limited infilling should be defined.</p> <p>4. Suggest modification to policy to permit small scale development in Group 2 Villages with a good range of public transport services.</p> <p>5. Suggest modification to permit the partial or complete redevelopment of brownfield land or small extensions to the settlement boundary where the scheme is providing affordable housing</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>as part of a rural exception scheme.</p> <p>6. Policy just adds more development to the edges of Group 2 Villages which do not have the infrastructure to cope.</p> <p>7. Part IV of the policy is too subjective.</p>
VILL3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. No guarantee that Neighbourhood Plans will be bought forward which would prevent any development in Group 3 Villages.</p> <p>2. More emphasis needs to be given to the redevelopment of brownfield sites in Group 3 Villages.</p> <p>3. Only permitting limited infilling in these villages will reinforce the lack of sustainability and will deliver no community benefits.</p> <p>4. Part III of the policy is too subjective.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. A Neighbourhood Plan Group would be able to define a development area in a Group 3 Village in a less restricted manner than it could within a Group 2 Village.</p> <p>2. Further clarity is required as to what a Group 3 Village is.</p>
<b>10.3 Village Development Boundaries</b>	
10.3.1 & 10.3.2	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Limited number of infill sites have been identified within existing village boundaries meaning it is unlikely sufficient development will come forward to meet housing need. Sites on the edge of villages should be permitted.</p> <p>2. Fixed development boundaries seek to unduly restrict development. This is contrary to the NPPF which only seeks to restrict the development of isolated dwellings in the countryside.</p> <p>3. Group 1 Villages should not have development boundaries drawn around them.</p> <p>4. Development adjacent to a Group 2 Village boundary should not be automatically deemed appropriate.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Development boundaries should be deleted for villages washed over by the Green Belt and the NPPF should be used to determine sustainable development.</li> <li>6. Sites which have had recent planning approvals have been excluded from the development boundaries.</li> <li>7. Objection to village boundaries due to exclusion of land/specific sites.</li> </ol>
10.3.3	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Encouraging villages to make amendments to the Green Belt boundary is unsound.</li> <li>2. Restriction on Group 2 Villages located in the Green Belt to alter their development boundaries is unduly restrictive and must be removed for the plan to be in line with the NPPF.</li> </ol>
<b>10.4 Neighbourhood Plans</b>	
VILL4	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No guarantee that Neighbourhood Plans will be bought forward which would restrict development in the rural area. Site allocations, with specified numbers of dwellings to be delivered, should be made to provide certainty of development.</li> <li>2. There is no appropriate mechanism for delivery of development in villages where communities choose not to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>3. Policy cannot be relied upon to deliver 500 dwellings so this figure should not be included in the housing trajectory.</li> <li>4. Development of Neighbourhood Plans can take many years and does not offer a short or medium prospect of delivery of housing, and may result in the Council being unable to maintain a 5 year housing supply.</li> <li>5. Policy seems to set a ceiling of 500 dwellings to be bought forward in the villages.</li> <li>6. Concern that there will be no intervention by the Council in the event of under delivery of housing until 2022 at the earliest.</li> <li>7. The monitoring and review process enshrined in Parts II and III of the policy are too time</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>consuming and will lead to a failure of the Plan to meet the housing target. Suggested modification to state that where monitoring demonstrates a shortfall in delivery, the presumption in favour of sustainable development will apply.</p> <p>8. Object to the District Council allocating sites for development in villages as this does not take into account the unique character of villages.</p> <p>9. Neighbourhood Plans should be allowed to amend village development boundaries.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. The Local Education Authority need to be involved at the early stage of Neighbourhood Plan preparation to ensure there are enough local school places to meet demand.</p> <p>2. Clarification is required regarding a discrepancy between the wording of VILL4 and DPS3.</p> <p>3. Difficulty highlighted of bringing forward sites in a Neighbourhood Plan that straddle two adjacent parish areas.</p>
<b>10.6 Retail, Leisure and Community Facilities in the Villages</b>	
10.6	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. There are no plans to facilitate the introduction of new facilities to villages if existing facilities are lost</p>
<b>Village Specific Comments</b>	
<b>Anstey</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Objection to village categorisation. Anstey should be identified as a Group 3 Village.</p>
<b>Aston</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Objection to development boundary.</p> <p>2. Green Belt criteria should be used to determine appropriate boundary.</p> <p>3. Aston will be unable to meet its housing need.</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development.
<b>Bayford</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Query regarding Group 2 categorisation considering its access to a rail station.
<b>Brickendon</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Query regarding Group 2 categorisation considering its access to Bayford rail station.
<b>Birch Green</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. <u>Objection</u> 1. Villages 'washed over' by the Green Belt do not require development boundaries. 2. Objection to development boundary.
<b>Bramfield</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to village categorisation. Bramfield should be identified as a Group 3 Village.
<b>Braughing</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. 2. Support minimum housing requirement of 35 dwellings. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to village categorisation. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	2. The village school could be expanded. 3. Concern about impact of development on sites of archaeological importance. 4. Air pollution issues due to lorry movements on B1368.
<b>Colliers End</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary
<b>Cottered</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development.
<b>Dane End</b>	
	<u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary.
<b>Datchworth</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary.
<b>Great Amwell</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u>



Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	1. Specific sites proposed for development.
<b>Hadham Ford</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support village categorisation.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Site allocations should be made in the village to meet local housing need.</p> <p>2. Objection to development boundary.</p> <p>3. Objection to village categorisation. Hadham Ford should be identified as a Group 1 Village.</p> <p>4. Small scale development should be permitted in the village.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</p> <p>2. Query regarding the village being called Hadham Ford rather than The Ford.</p>
<b>Hebing End</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Objection to village categorisation. The village should be included as part of the categorisation of Benington as a Group 2 Village.</p>
<b>Hertford Heath</b>	
	<p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</p> <p>2. No capacity to expand village school.</p>
<b>High Cross</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <p>1. Support village categorisation.</p> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Village should not be constrained in terms of growth as it is not in the Green Belt and has good</p>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>access to higher order settlements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Objection to village categorisation. High Cross should be identified as a Group 1 Village.</li> <li>3. Objection to village categorisation. Employment area and newly created open space in the village should be taken into consideration in assessment.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> <li>2. Well planned moderate growth in the village could bring in additional facilities which would support a Group 1 Village categorisation.</li> <li>3. Considered that the school has capacity to accommodate more growth.</li> <li>4. The village has already received in excess of a 35% increase in housing stock.</li> </ol>
<b>Hunsdon</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support village categorisation.</li> </ol> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to village categorisation.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> <li>2. Village has already accommodated a 10% growth in housing stock through approved planning applications.</li> <li>3. Concern that village will merge with Hunsdonbury and Widford.</li> <li>4. No capacity to expand village school.</li> </ol>
<b>Little Berkhamstead</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to village categorisation. Little Berkhamstead should be identified as a Group 3 Village.</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
<b>Little Hadham</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support village categorisation.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Query regarding the village being called Little Hadham instead of The Ashe.</li> </ol>
<b>Much Hadham</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support village categorisation.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> <li>2. No capacity to expand village school.</li> </ol>
<b>Spellbrook</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to development boundary.</li> <li>2. Spellbrook should not be considered in isolation of Sawbridgeworth.</li> <li>3. Unrealistic to expect Spellbrook to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> </ol>
<b>Standon and Puckeridge</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support village categorisation.</li> <li>2. Support for minimum housing requirement of 146 dwellings.</li> </ol> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to development boundary.</li> <li>2. Concern that the growth figure for development in the village is not capped.</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>3. Village is being overdeveloped compared to other Group 1 Villages.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> <li>2. No capacity to expand village school (Roger De Clare)</li> <li>3. Improvements need to be made to sewerage capacity.</li> </ol>
<b>Stanstead Abbots and St Margarets</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to village categorisation. Village should be categorised as a distinct settlement that lies between the main towns and the villages.</li> <li>2. Site allocations should be made in the village.</li> <li>3. Green Belt boundary around the village should be amended to accommodate development.</li> <li>4. Objection to any proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary that would encroach on Great Amwell.</li> <li>5. Lack of education capacity should not be a constraint to growth. HCC has a statutory duty to provide more school places.</li> <li>6. Flood risk should not be a constraint to development and meeting the housing need of the village.</li> </ol> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</li> <li>2. No capacity to expand village school.</li> </ol>
<b>Tewin</b>	
	<p><u>Support</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support village categorisation.</li> </ol> <p><u>Objection</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objection to village categorisation. Tewin should be identified as a Group 1 Village.</li> </ol>

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	2. Objection to development boundary. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development.
<b>Thundridge &amp; Wadesmill</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to village categorisation. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development.
<b>Walkern</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to development boundary. <u>Other Comments and Observations</u> 1. Specific sites proposed for development. 2. No capacity to expand village school.
<b>Watton-at-Stone</b>	
	<u>Support</u> 1. Support village categorisation. 2. Support for redevelopment of brownfield sites in the village. <u>Objection</u> 1. Objection to proposals to amend the Green Belt boundary. 2. Site allocations should be made in the village.

Section/ Paragraph /Policy	Summary of Responses (Support/Objection/Other Comments and Observations)
	<p>3. Village should deliver a full 10% increase in housing stock.</p> <p>4. Decision regarding the amount of housing to be delivered in the village should not be left to the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>5. Development would damage the quality of life for local people.</p> <p>6. Development would reduce the gap between the village and Stevenage.</p> <p><u>Other Comments and Observations</u></p> <p>1. Specific sites proposed for development.</p> <p>2. The village school could be expanded.</p> <p>3. Infrastructure in the village is severely constrained.</p>
<b>Widford</b>	
	<p><u>Objection</u></p> <p>1. Objection to development boundary. Development boundary defining the main built up area of the village will shortly be incorrect as it omits two areas which are being/will be developed.</p> <p>2. Cricket ground should not be designated as a facility for Open Space, Sport and Recreation as it is not a public recreation facility.</p>