

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL161

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land east of Southgate Road	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5EW
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Oakmere Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	17.40	<b>Current Use</b>	Open countryside in the Green Belt. Fields surrounded by trees
------------------------	-------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to north, west and east of the site, M25 to the south		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is at the edge of the built up area of Potters Bar which is largely substantial semi-detached houses in good sized mature gardens. It forms a band of open countryside around the south eastern part of the town, between the town and the M25.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Not within Hertsmere as it is surrounded by existing homes. Land to the east in Enfield borough is open.		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.07
Floodzone 3	4.36
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	10.78
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	2.44
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.4
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
41	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel meets purpose 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. The parcel has an open and rural character throughout and there is little scope for sub-division. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-1	Fail	0	1	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Low - Medium	Low - Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Yes. Site is landlocked except for the western end, but any access here would be very close to the M25 junction. Potential location of access via Park Avenue is outside applicant's control.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No although the noise and pollution effects of the M25 would need to be assessed and possibly mitigated. Development may not therefore be possible across the whole site.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk, particularly around the entrance to the site off park Avenue.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	No

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development on larger sites. Further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan and there may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--------------------------------	---

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk, particularly around the entrance to the site off park Avenue.
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.Low	Medium	Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
7.06	30dph	40dph
	296	395

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:296</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 186</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:395</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 10</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site has certain on-site constraints. There is a main river in the north east with some associated flood risk and 2 tributaries meeting it from the south. The site is also very close to J24 of the M25, meaning access directly onto Southgate Road may be problematic.</p> <p>Additional access points are being discussed as the access of Park Avenue at the far eastern end of the site is within the floodplain and may not be acceptable. The site promoter has indicated that it is able to acquire properties on Park Avenue, away from the functional flood plain, to create an access which is not within an area of flood risk.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment scored the site strongly overall. However, a smaller parcel adjacent to the settlement assessed for Stage 2, met purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and was therefore recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The site is suitable, available and achievable based on the fact that a site access has been secured since the 2017 Call for Sites. However, the positive resolution of</p>
--	---

discussions on at least one other access point are likely to be required to allow the site to achieve its full potential at site selection stage.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:296

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:395

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL164

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Fenny Slade	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5QS
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Oakmere Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	4.55	<b>Current Use</b>	2 dwelling houses and gardens and paddocks
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Open countryside with occasional farm buildings and isolated commercial premises.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Part of a row of several large detached properties in open countryside just to the south of the M25 surrounded by a small wooded area.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	19/1200/FUL   Extensions at ground, first floor and loft level to convert existing dwelling to 1 x 3 bed & 3 x 2 bed apartments (GRANTED) TP/09/2229 Erection of storage building (r/o Stagg Ridge) (GRANTED ON APPEAL) TP/01/0530 Part two storey, part single storey front and side extensions (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (C3) / Retirement Village

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	Yes	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (estimated)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	11
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	10
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
27	Pass	3	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purpose 1 and 2 and strongly against purpose 3. The parcel is largely open and has a similar rural character throughout. There are no obvious sub-areas which would score less strongly and the parcel should not be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium - High	Medium - High	0	0	High	0	0	High

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt, Local Wildlife Site
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to Potters Bar across the M25 would be difficult
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Local wildlife site Fenny Slade Hill. Some flood risk across the site.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Yes . Pre-application request for advice about replacing one of the existing dwellings and adding a further dwelling submitted 23/2/2017.
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of a small rural site would be viable and the site achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL subject to any site-specific mitigation.
--------------------------------	---

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Local wildlife site Fenny Slade Hill. Some flood risk across the site.
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Low	Other Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
3.41	30dph	40dph
	113	150

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:113</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 3</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:150</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 40</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	---

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The southern part of the site is a designated Local Wildlife Site which has been identified an area of “neutral grassland with damp areas” and sits within a wooded area, although they are not subject to a TPO.</p> <p>The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with the western edge of the parcel being particularly important for preventing ribbon development. As the site lies beyond the M25, a densible green belt boundary for Potters Bar, it was not assessed further at Stage 2.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The scope to deliver a net increase in housing on the site, within the parameters of what would not be regarded as inappropriate development, is considered to be limited given that there are only two existing dwellings on the site. Given this and the wider severance of the site from Potters Bar, the site is unlikely to be acceptable for additional housing.</p>
---	---

However, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:113

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:150

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL177

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Dove Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2RT
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Oakmere Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	5.38	<b>Current Use</b>	Grazing land and woodland
------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to north, west and east of the site, M25 to the south		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	<p>The adjoining residential area of Potters Bar is largely 2 storey terraced houses and flats. The M25 runs along the south side of the site.</p> <p>Despite the site being undeveloped, it has a semi-urban feel, being surrounded by development on 3 sides and the M25 beyond the wooded area in the rear of the site.</p>		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	2.43
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.29
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
39	Fail	0	0	2	0	Weak
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel only meets purpose 2 weakly and does not meet any other purpose, thus it is recommended that it is considered further.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a	'Medium density' mixed	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial	Large-scale warehouse	

half-storey houses	residential			use and employment	Industrial and office blocks	distribution facilities	
Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Unknown
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Proximity of M25 - possible need for noise/pollution mitigation from the motorway into the site, although difference in levels may mitigate this to an extent.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	A large part of the site (south eastern) is woodland and would not be expected to be developable.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	No. Tenant on a grazing licence.		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development on larger sites. Further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan and there may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
-------------------------	---

### Overcoming Constraints



<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	A large part of the site (south eastern) is woodland and would not be expected to be developable.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.Low	Medium	Sustainable Neighbourhoods (Urban Extension)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
4.04	30dph	40dph
	169	226

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:169</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 59</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:226</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 116</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>A significant part of the site is covered by woodland which although not currently protected would potentially be assessed for the designation of a Woodland TPO were the site to be brought forward for development. The developable area would be likely to be limited to around 3ha of non-woodland area.</p> <p>There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting most of the open part of the site with the woodland itself affording some additional screening and attenuation from the M25. The motorway is elevated from the site with bunding running parallel to the south east boundary of the site.</p> <p>The site was poorly performing in terms of meeting Green Belt purposes in the Stage 1 assessment and recommended for further consideration for development. As such, it did not need to be considered at Stage 2.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph  
baseline:169

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph  
baseline with increased density multipliers:226

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL216

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land west of Potters Bar station	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2HN
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Furzefield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.28	<b>Current Use</b>	Car Parking. Leaseholder of Albany House rents the spaces for domestic use (92 spaces) rather than used by rail passengers
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential development, offices and PH to the south and west, commercial including Potters Bar Station to the north and east. Residential in Alban House above the station. Site adjoins the station car park and platform area on the eastern side.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Area is mixed with residential, pub, Wyllotts Place complex to the south/west and Potters Bar station and commercial premises to the north/east. The site is in the Potters Bar Darkes Lane town centre.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	<p>23/1003/FUL Redevelopment of existing site to provide residential development (Use Class C3) with commercial space at ground floor (55 UNITS) (Class E) (PENDING)</p> <p>16/1371/PD56 Change of use of 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floors of Albany Gate from Office (Class B1) to Residential (Class C3) to provide 39 flats (PN NOT REQUIRED);</p> <p>TP/11/0175 Change of use to include hand car wash &amp; valet service (GRANTED);</p> <p>TP/88/1355 Extension of existing station car park to produce a net increase of 31 car spaces and diversion of existing public footpath (GRANTED);</p> <p>TP/85/0883 Demolition of existing station booking hall and station master's house, construction of 5 storey office block including new booking hall, rearrangement of station forecourt and car park layout (GRANTED);</p> <p>TP/77/0135 Replacement British Rail car park (263 spaces) (GRANTED).</p>
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

DRAFT

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	1.51
Floodzone 3	8.13
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	9.5
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3.52
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.04
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Close to station platform and rail line
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Significant tree cover at the south end of the site adjacent to the entrance onto Darkes Lane. Potential issues of overlooking to adjacent properties. Some surface water and fluvial flood risk.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	Yes - parking needed for existing Albany House flats. This would need to be resolved if any development of the site was to be allowed. Applicant states there is no reason to suggest why this would not be forthcoming.		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site. However, on other achievability matters, it is subject to being able to provide adequate parking for Albany House and proposed development.
-------------------------	--

### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Significant tree cover at the south end of the site adjacent to the entrance onto Darkes Lane. Potential issues of overlooking to adjacent properties. Some surface water and fluvial flood risk.
---	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Central	Medium	Very high	Urban Brownfield (Mixed)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.28	30dph	40dph
	35	64

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:35</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 35</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:64</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 4</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site is located within Potters Bar Darkes Lane district centre. where residential development would be an acceptable use in policy terms. It is however currently used as car parking for residents of Albany House. It is also in close proximity to a listed building, other residential development. The site is also narrow and Darkes Lane, where the site is accessed from, suffers from flooding.</p> <p>We have received further information in relation to this site and the identified constraints. In terms of parking, some capacity is now available as post-covid travel has not recovered on a consistent basis.</p> <p>Overall impact is thought to be less than substantial on the Old Manor Pub and may be considered acceptable given the opportunity to develop a significant number of units in a highly sustainable location.</p> <p>The site is not in the Green Belt and is previously developed land.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The site is considered available, suitable and achievable. The reservations we had in relation to the site, particularly in terms of loss of parking and proximity to a listed building have been overcome.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:35</p>
---	--



Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:64

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL234a

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Well Cottage, Bentley Heath (Wagon Road)	<b>Post Code</b>	EN4 0PH
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.68	<b>Current Use</b>	Garden
------------------------	------	--------------------	--------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Cricket ground to the west, pub and car park to north, residential to the east. The site lies within the triangle formed by Wagon Road, Dancers Hill Road and the A1000. The Wyevale garden centre lies to the north of Dancers Hill Road.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Largely rural in character with a few individual houses in large gardens, farms, a small residential development at Bentley Heath and a garden centre.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/03/1250 Demolition of house and construction of two storey detached 6-bedroom house with indoor pool and double garage (GRANTED). TP/02/0040 Demolition of existing house and outbuildings and construction of detached 5-bedroom house with indoor swimming pool and detached double garage (GRANTED). TP/07/0058 Demolition and reconstruction of stable block, garage and conservatory (GRANTED); TP/99/0642 Existing use of land as domestic residential curtilage serving Well Cottage (CLE GRANTED); TP/99/0230 Construction of tennis court and 2.77m high chain link fence enclosure (GRANTED).
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	Yes	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	4.17
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3.21
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2.13
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
21	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 1 and 2 and strongly against purpose 3. Although the rurality of the parcel is diminished slightly in the south, the openness of the parcel is not unduly diminished and the parcel broadly maintains an open character, preventing encroachment into the countryside. It is also important for preventing the outward sprawl of London.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
High	High	N/A	N/A	High	N/A	N/A	High

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some areas of surface water flood risk.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of a small rural site would be viable and the site achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL subject to any site-specific mitigation.
--------------------------------	---

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Some areas of surface water flood risk.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Medium	Other Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.58	30dph	40dph
	22	29

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:22</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 22</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:29</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 29</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>There are no specific environmental constraints affecting the site which forms part of an triangular parcel of land bound by Wagon Road, Dancers Hill Road and Barnet Road. The Grade 2 listed Duke of York pub is located within this parcel.</p> <p>The site forms part of a larger Green Belt parcel which itself forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development given its location within the Green Belt. Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:22</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:29</p>
---	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL234b

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	The White House, Dancers Hill Road, Bentley Heath	<b>Post Code</b>	EN4 0PH
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.02	<b>Current Use</b>	1 dwelling and Garden . Vacant or very short tenancies
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the west, open fields with tree and shrub boundaries to north and south, garden centre to east.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Largely rural in character with a few individual houses in large gardens, farms, a small residential development at Bentley Heath and the garden centre.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	16/1982/FUL Demolition of existing house and erection of 3 no. dwellings (GRANTED); Demolition of existing house and erection of 1 pair of 4 bed semi-detached dwellings and 1 detached 4 bed dwelling (REFUSED)
----------------------------------	---

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential



Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	Yes	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	8.07
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
21	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 1 and 2 and strongly against purpose 3. Although the rurality of the parcel is diminished slightly in the south, the openness of the parcel is not unduly diminished and the parcel broadly maintains an open character, preventing encroachment into the countryside. It is also important for preventing the outward sprawl of London.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	
High	High	N/A	N/A	High	N/A	N/A	High

#### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Small area of surface water flood risk, albeit at the lowest level of risk.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

#### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	No. The site is currently vacant or has very short term tenancies		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable and achievable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development. However, any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements (over and above CIL) may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
-------------------------	---

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Small area of surface water flood risk, albeit at the lowest level of risk.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Medium	Other Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.87	30dph	40dph
	33	43

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:33</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 33</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:43</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 43</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>There are no specific environmental constraints affecting the site which adjoins a new development to the west which was previously a small industrial estate. To the east is the site of the former Wyevale garden centre which has since been converted for residential use, separated by an number of TPOs.</p> <p>The site forms part of a larger Green Belt parcel which itself forms the majority of the wider gaps between Greater London and Potters Bar. The parcel maintains the general openness and scale of these gaps.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p>
---	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:33

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:43

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL251

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Former Potters Bar Golf Club	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 1DQ
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	40.22	<b>Current Use</b>	None.
------------------------	-------	--------------------	-------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the east. Industrial (beyond the railway) to the west. Commercial/town centre uses to to the south.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	This site extends from the town centre to open countryside to the the north west of Potters Bar.  Where it adjoins residential dwellings in the south eastern corner, it is close to Potters Bar station, shops on the main Darkes Lane High Street, schools and buses that link to other services and amenities in the surrounding area.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL375		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	3.72
Floodzone 3	16.6
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	25.62
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	13.93
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	8.12
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
47	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3, maintaining the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. Although the west of the parcel has a more semi-urban character, it is important for preventing coalescence with Brookmans Park.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-3	Fail	0	3	2	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement



<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	The train line is situated to the west of the site – noise attenuation measures may be required
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Fluvial and surface water flood risk across parts of the site including the entrance off Darkes Lane.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes, subject to flood risk issues being addressed.

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Yes
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No - there is a break clause in the tenancy agreement which means the owner could achieve vacant possession.		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development on larger sites. Further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan and there may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--------------------------------	---

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Fluvial and surface water flood risk across parts of the site including the entrance off Darkes Lane to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency, LLFA and (due to flood risk at entrance) emergency planning authority.
--	--

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	V.Low	Medium	Urban Brownfield (Mixed)

#### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
12.69	30dph	40dph
	533	711

### Deliverability / Developability:

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:533</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 113</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:711</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 291</p>
---	--

### Conclusion:

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The entrance to the site, which is accessed off Darkes Lane, is located close to the town centre and train station. The Darkes Lane (West) Conservation Area abuts the site to the north and east with the western boundary formed by the East Coast Main Line railway. The site falls within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 and surface water flood zones.</p> <p>The southern part of the site, in particular, is located in a very sustainable location in terms of proximity to the town centre and station.</p> <p>The site forms part of a parcel identified as moderately performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of both fluvial and surface water flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Measures would also be specifically required to address the flood risk at the entrance to the site to ensure that safe access to/from the site can be achieved (including for emergency vehicles) without increasing flood risk elsewhere. This may also require betterment to be achieved on (or off) site.</p>
--	---

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, and flood risk concerns adequately addressed, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:533

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:711

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL361

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Wrotham Park: West of Baker Street	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Furzeffield Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Unparished area of Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	101.94	<b>Current Use</b>	Open Fields, Farm Buildings
------------------------	--------	--------------------	-----------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Solar farm, A1(M) and South Mimms services to the west, residential and school to the east , M25 to the south, open fields/ farm land north		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	This is an edge of settlement location adjoining the western edge of Potters Bar, but being a large expanse of farmland the character is rural open countryside. The M25, A1(M) and South Mimms services are urbanising influences.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	No		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	14/1338/CLE Change of use of agricultural land to allow the parking of vehicles for business purposes (Bridgefoot Farm) (REFUSED); TP/04/0370 Change of use of redundant piggery building to offices (GRANTED); TP/01/1209 Telecommunications mast to replace existing (GRANTED);
----------------------------------	---

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>	Residential, Local centre, new primary school, new parkland, allotments, strategic open space. Part of the site is also being considered for employment purposes.
----------------------------------	---

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	Yes	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	Yes
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.6
Floodzone 3	1.67
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	19.57
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	7.89
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	4.26
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	1.25
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	Good
----------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
35	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores strongly against purpose 3, preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside, but there are a number of identified sub-areas at the edge of Potters Bar which would score less strongly if considered alone.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-9 / SA-12	Fail / Fail	0/0	1/1	4/5	0/0	Strong / Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Sub-area SA9 meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration. Sub-area SA12 meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt.					
<b>Recommended</b>	No / No					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	0

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Sawyers Lane is narrow and congested particularly at school peak times. Access road to Swanland Lane (South Mimms) in the west is proposed
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	Communications tower on site (affects local area only). Overhead power lines across lower part of the site. Site abuts M25. Noise and air quality mitigation measures would be required.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Bridgefoot House Local wildlife site lies within the site. Also adjoins Dugdale Hill Meadows local wildlife site.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	Yes
--------------------------------	-----

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Bridgefoot House Local wildlife site lies within the site. Also adjoins Dugdale Hill Meadows local wildlife site.
--	---

#### Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Low	Sustainable Neighbourhoods (Urban Extension)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
36.85	30dph	40dph
	1271	1695

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:1271</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 440</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 550</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1695</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 480</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 600</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are some environmental constraints affecting part of the site including flood zone (FZ3) and Local Wildlife Sites (Wash Lane and Bridgefoot House) to the far west of the site and pylons/overhead power lines running through the lower part of the site. The southern site abuts the M25.</p> <p>Further studies will be required in order to mitigate the above identified constraints/risks including a noise assessment in relation to the M25, traffic studies, more detailed ecological appraisals and flood risk assessment work.</p> <p>The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment particularly with regard to its role in preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-areas within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. Whilst the fluvial flood risk is down the western boundary, surface water flooding crosses the site in horizontal bands, potentially further affecting the suitability of the site.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments identified above, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and available.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:1271</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1695</p>
--	---



**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL362

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Wrotham Park West Barnet Road East Baker Street I&O	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2EW
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	63.50	<b>Current Use</b>	open fields
------------------------	-------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Baker Street and school to the west, residential to the north, Barnet Road and residential development to the east, M25 to the south.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Whilst the site itself is open and rural in character it is surrounded by Potters Bar to the north and east, and the M25 to the south.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Former Sunnybank School has been submitted to the Call for Sites		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL318		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/93/0429 Use of land for car boot sales on 14 Saturdays per year (REFUSED); TP/03/0676 Change of use of land from informal open space to agriculture (REFUSED)
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>	Residential, local centre, community centre, sports facilities and play provision, primary school, care home, allotments and recreational amenity space, including access from Barnet Road and Baker Street.
----------------------------------	--

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	Yes	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.94
Floodzone 3	4.28
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	11.39
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4.15
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2.32
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
35	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores strongly against purpose 3, preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside, but there are a number of identified sub-areas at the edge of Potters Bar which would score less strongly if considered alone, including:-					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-15	Fail	0	1	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	Medium - High

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Rail tunnel runs under the site
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No. Applicant states development would provide a road link between Baker Street and Barnet Road, with access into the site from both the east and west.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	M25 runs along the southern boundary of the site. Noise and air quality mitigation measures would be required. Pylons and power lines run across the site. East Coast Main Line runs through a tunnel to the east of the site.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk, particularly across eastern part of the site.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development on larger sites. Further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan and there may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--------------------------------	---

## Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk, particularly across eastern part of the site.
--	--

## Estimated development potential - residential

### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Medium	Sustainable Neighbourhoods (Urban Extension)

### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
23.93	30dph	40dph
	933	1244

## Deliverability / Developability:

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:933</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 350</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1244</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 440</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 550</p>
---	--

## Conclusion:

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are no significant topographical constraints across the site but an area of flood risk affects some of the eastern fringe of the site close to Barnet Road. That part of the site also has a railway tunnel with the East Coast Main Line running through it and there are pylons/overhead power lines running along the southern part of the site. The M25 runs along the southern boundary of the site.</p> <p>Various assessments will be required including noise, flood risk, traffic and landscape visual impact assessments. Given the long boundary along the M25 that abuts the site, it is likely a buffer from the developable area will be required.</p> <p>The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment particularly with regard to its role in preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p>
--	---

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and available.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:933

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1244

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL375

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Manor Road	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 1DG
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.92	<b>Current Use</b>	Equestrian use - fields and building. The buildings on the site are used for stabling, tack rooms etc
------------------------	------	--------------------	---

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Railway to the south, golf course to the north and west, residential (Potters Bar) to the east		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The area is at the edge of Potters Bar urban area (mainly semi-detached and detached properties), partly surrounded by the golf course. Although the area is largely open the surrounding residential and railway uses are urbanising influences.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL251 Potters Bar Golf course		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	16/1268/VOC variation of condition 6 by the omission of the words ' by the applicant and their family' following grant of planning permission TP/02/0214 (GRANTED); 17/0859/FUL relocation of 3 no. car parking spaces used in association with equestrian use of land (GRANTED); 88/0065/TP Demolition of 28, 29, 30 Manor Road and erection of 24 x 2 bedroomed flats for the elderly (REFUSED); TP/02/0214 3 loose boxes, improved vehicular access and provision of 3 car parking spaces (GRANTED); TP/88/1565 Demolition of three existing dwellings and the erection of 16 retirement dwellings, wardens accommodation, communal facilities (GRANTED ON APPEAL);
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

#### Constraints Check

Constraint	Within Site Boundary	Constraint	Within Site Boundary
AQMA	No	HSE Consultation Zone	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Geological Site	No
Local Nature Reserve	No	TPO	Yes
SSSI	No	Sand & Gravel Safeguard Area	No
Archaeological Sites	No	Drinking Water Safeguard Area	Yes
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	No	Green Belt	Yes

#### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	Yes
Scheduled Monuments	No
Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site	No
Registered Battlefield	No
Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site	No
Registered Park & Gardens	No
Registered Park & Gardens within 750m of Site	No
Locally Listed Buildings within Site	No



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15.38
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	5.48
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	4.05
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
47	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3, maintaining the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. Although the west of the parcel has a more semi-urban character, it is important for preventing coalescence with Brookmans Park.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-3	Fail	0	3	2	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Access would be at the end of Manor Road cul de sac through existing property. Applicant provides a highways feasibility layout which illustrates that a 4.1m shared surface route can be provided'. There is a telegraph pole across the proposed entrance.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	The site adjoins the railway line – there will be a need to protect any development from noise/vibration.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	TPO covering a number of trees close to access. Some flood Risk across site
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Yes . Feasibility work - highways, drainage and planning. Promoter states that the early market evidence is that this would be an attractive proposition in the market and would be delivered quickly .
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	The use is by the landowner- the promoter understand that the use can be ceased immediately.		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of a small site would be viable and the site achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL subject to any site-specific mitigation.
--------------------------------	---

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	TPO covering a number of trees close to access. Some flood Risk across site
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	High	Urban Brownfield (Houses)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.78	30dph	40dph
	42	59

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:42</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 42</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:59</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 59</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are no topographical constraints but the site has an irregular shape comprising a main paddock with some associated buildings withand some smaller parcels either side of the rear garden of 29 Manor Road. There is a tributary of the Potters Bar Brook that runs across the site towards the rear that has some flood risk associated with it. It is also adjacent to the railway line on its western boundary.</p> <p>Given the proximity of those smaller parcels to 29 Manor Road, only the main paddock is considered to be potentially capable of accommodating development. The issue of flood risk will need to be addressed from the Ordinary Watercourse crossing the site.</p> <p>The site is part of a parcel identified as moderately performing in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The parcel as a whole maintains the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. A buffer from the watercourse will also be required.</p>
--	---

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments including a flood risk traffic and landscape visual impact assessments, the site could be considered potentially available, achievable and suitable.developable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:42

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:59

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL501

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Site adjoining (Fenny Slade)	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5QS
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Oakmere Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	2.35	<b>Current Use</b>	Agricultural barn, land formerly used as storage and parking
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the north and east, farmland to the west and south		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Small cluster of development in a wooded area just to the south of the M25 that separates Potters Bar from the open countryside.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL164 Fenny Slade		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	<p>22/1720/CLP Erection of new warehouse to facilitate operation of commercial premises          18/2017/CLE Erection of agricultural storage building GRANTED;          17/1247/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and erection of eight 2-storey dwellings REFUSED;          15/2002/FUL Conversion and extensions to existing greenhouse and shed to form a self contained 1 bed dwelling REFUSED;          14/2108/PRAP Erection of storage building GRANTED;          14/1270/PRAP Erection of storage building GRANTED;          TP/09/2229 (Agricultural Prior Determination APPEAL ALLOWED.</p>
----------------------------------	---

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
27	Pass	3	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purpose 1 and 2 and strongly against purpose 3. The parcel is largely open and has a similar rural character throughout. There are no obvious sub-areas which would score less strongly and the parcel should not be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A	N/A	High	N/A	N/A	High

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt, Local Wildlife Site
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Not for vehicles but pedestrian access to Potters Bar across the M25 would be difficult
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Site Fenny Slade Hill
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Unknown
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	None		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable and achievable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development. However, any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements (over and above CIL) may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
--------------------------------	---

#### Overcoming Constraints



<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Site Fenny Slade Hill
--	--------------------------------------

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Medium	Other Villages

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.76	30dph	40dph
	66	88

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:66</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:88</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 28</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is a designated Local Wildlife Site which has been identified an area of “neutral grassland with damp areas”</p> <p>No information has been submitted to demonstrate the site no longer has the attributes to be considered a Local Wildlife Site, which would be required to define a suitable area for development. This is not withstanding its fairly isolated location within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with the western edge of the parcel being particularly important for preventing ribbon development. The agricultural barn does not constitute PDL as defined by the NPPF.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Given that there is little scope to deliver an increase in housing on the site within the parameters of appropriate development, the designation as a LWS and the wider severance of the site from Potters Bar the site is not considered suitable for housing.</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL908

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Oakmere Community Centre	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5NS
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Oakmere Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.40	<b>Current Use</b>	Community Centre
------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Oakmere School, residential dwellings, mainly maisonettes and open fields to the east.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Borders relatively high density housing for an urban fringe location with larger school buildings to the north, giving away to open but heavily tree lined fields to the east.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Potentially
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Potentially, provided any loss of community floorspace could be justified

### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Unknown
Ownership constraints?	Community centre is in use		
Is the Site available?	Not Known as still used for community uses		

### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
-------------------------	--

### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Demonstrate that existing community floorspace is not necessary in this particular location (although there are plans for some reprovision)
---	---

### Estimated development potential - residential

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	Low	Medium	

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.40	30dph	40dph
	19	25

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:19</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 19</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:25</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 25</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is occupied by an existing community centre. There are no environmental constraints associated with the site.</p> <p>The site is a developed urban site with no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development. However, the site would only be deliverable if a suitable replacement facility is found unless it could be clearly demonstrated that there is no requirement for such re-provision, with sufficient accommodation available nearby which meets the requirements of the groups currently using the site.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:19</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:25</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL909

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Potters Bar Fire Station, Mutton Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2HF
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.37	<b>Current Use</b>	Fire Station
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential, cemetery and open space		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Mainly mid density semi-detached housing in urban surroundings with cemetery adjacent in open space to the front of the property		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential



Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0.19
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Potentially
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Not currently	Is there developer interest?	
Ownership constraints?	Site availability is dependent on the relocation of the fire station to serve Potters Bar		
Is the Site available?	Dependent on relocation being justified and alternative provision being provided		

### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	Not currently
-------------------------	---------------

### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	No
---	----

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional	Medium	Medium	

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
	0.37	30dph 27

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:27
	Delivery in 1-5 years 27
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:38
	Delivery in 1-5 years 38
Delivery in 6-10 years 0	
Delivery in 11-15 years 0	

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	Site is currently a fire station. It has no environmental constraints.
	The site is developed and within the settlement boundary of Potters Bar and is therefore not subject to Green Belt designation
	The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.
	The site is potentially suitable, but availability and achievability are dependent on the provision of a replacement fire station elsewhere in a suitable location to serve Potters Bar. To date, no detailed information has been provided on any relocation/reprovision of the fire station
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL910

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	The Park, ESC, High Street	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5AB
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.16	<b>Current Use</b>	Community use
------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Surrounded by retail and other business uses		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Central retail area consisting mainly of 2-4 storey buildings and a mix of retail and service uses		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>			
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential / Mixed Use

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	Yes
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	8.15
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes, subject to any Listed Building requirements/constraints being adhered to

#### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
-------------------------	--

#### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	
---	--

#### Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :



Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Central	Urban	High	

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.16	30dph	40dph
	23	40

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:23</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 23</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:40</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 40</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>A relatively small site fronting onto the High Street by way of a listed building, with a more modern building to the rear.</p> <p>There are no major constraints associated with the site, although the listed building might guide or prevent elements of any redevelopment.</p> <p>The site is not in the green belt.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk Under the current policy framework, the site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 23</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:40</p>
---	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL911

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Elm Court Community Centre, Mutton Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 3BP
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Furzefield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.47	<b>Current Use</b>	Community Centre
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Church opposite, Maisonettes, playing fields and primary school		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Predominantly residential area of 1930's semi-detached dwellings, with the wide avenue of Mutton Lane and surrounding playing fields giving the feeling of a level of openness		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	
----------------------------------	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Community and residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0.08
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Potentially
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Potentially, provided any loss of community floorspace could be justified

#### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	Site is being actively used and there is no current indication of current level of usage. It is noted that the site is being promoted for partial reprovision of community space.		
Is the Site available?	Unknown		

#### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
-------------------------	--

#### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	No
---	----

#### Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional	Medium	High	

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.16	30dph	40dph
	23	40

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:23</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 23</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:40</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 40</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>A relatively small site fronting onto the High Street by way of a listed building, with a more modern building to the rear.</p> <p>There are no major constraints associated with the site, although the listed building may guide or prevent elements of any redevelopment.</p> <p>The site is not in the green belt.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk Under the current policy framework, the site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:</p>
---	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1024-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land North of Mount Way and Manor Way	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	3.12	<b>Current Use</b>	Paddock/open fields
------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential land to the south, agricultural land to the north and west and a sports pitch to the east		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Urban fringe of settlement with detached low density housing to the south, agricultural land to the north and west and a cricket pitch to the east.  The former Potters Bar Golf club is separated from the site to the west by a single field.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	18.7
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	6.84
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2.56
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
47	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3, maintaining the scale and openness of the gap between Potters Bar and Brookmans Park. Although the west of the parcel has a more semi-urban character, it is important for preventing coalescence with Brookmans Park.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-4	Fail	0	1	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	It is unclear how access into the site would be achieved. The site abuts Manor Way and Westwood Close.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	The site slopes moderately down to the stream running through the site and up the other side to a higher point than the site access. There might be some topographical considerations in terms of design, but unlikely to be a major constraint.
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk quite marshy near downstream boundary
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	Unclear how access into the site would be achieved and whether this requires access across third party land		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	Yes
--------------------------------	-----

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Some fluvial flood risk quite marshy near downstream boundary
--	---

## Estimated development potential - residential

### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	Low	Medium	Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension)

### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.34	30dph	40dph
	95	126

### Deliverability / Developability:

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:95</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 35</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:126</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 16</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

### Conclusion:

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site is generally sloping, with fairly steep slopes in parts into a central valley with a watercourse. The land also falls away following the line of the watercourse. Therefore, there might be some additional costs and constraints associated with developing the site a whole. The site has some fluvial flood risk associated with it and surface water flood risk broadly following the line of the watercourse. .</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified that the site is within an area which meets the purpose assessment criteria moderately. At Stage 2, the smaller sub-area, makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and so was recommended for further consideration. It is within the same sub-area as the former Potters Bar golf course site.</p> <p>It is unclear how vehicular access into the site would be achieved. The site abuts Manor Way and Westwood Close and there is presently an unpaved track leading up to a locked gate on Manor Way between two houses. This may provide a means of access into the site but ownership and access rights would need to be clarified by the promoter.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. It is likely the watercourse will need to be modelled in detail.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes and subject to securing access into the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p>
---	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:95

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:126

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1025-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Rydal Mount Lodge	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2BP
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.38	<b>Current Use</b>	C2 (Single dwelling with very large grounds)
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the north east, north and south west. Agricultural land to the south and south east.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of settlement residential character with semi-detached properties to the north, large low density properties to the north and south west and agricultural/open land to the south east.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	PB3- Land South of Potters Bar		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None
----------------------------------	------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	Yes	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Good
-----------------------	------

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
35	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores strongly against purpose 3, preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside, but there are a number of identified sub-areas at the edge of Potters Bar which would score less strongly if considered alone, including:-					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-13	Fail	0	1	2	0	Weak
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly, and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Possible limited contamination due to previous tipping on the site.
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	None
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Possible
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>			
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
--------------------------------	--

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	None
--	------



**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	Medium	Medium	Urban Brownfield (Houses)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.38	30dph	40dph
	19	26

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:19</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 19</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:26</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 26</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site has few constraints. There is a group TPO covering a large area of which the site is at the south eastern corner of- most of the trees are around the site perimeter however. There is also evidence of some tipping that may require a Preliminary Ground Investigation.</p> <p>In the Green Belt Stage 1 assessment the site performs strongly in terms of the overall score. However, in the Stage 2 assessment the sub-area meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly, and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and is therefore recommended for further consideration. The site itself is surrounded by development on three sides and is well screened from Baker Street and SanTERS Lane.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable but this would be insufficient to yield any material increase in the amount of (not inappropriate) residential development under paragraph 154 of the NPPF.</p> <p>However, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:19</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:26</p>
---	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0162-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land South of Barnet Road, Potters Bar	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2SH
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.68	<b>Current Use</b>	Grassland
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-----------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Between residential dwellings to the north east and a caravan park to the south west boundaries. Agricultural land lies the opposite side of Barnet Road to the north west and the M25 is to the south.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Urban fringe on the southern side of Barnet Lane with medium density semi-detached development and caravan site either side and the M25 rising up to the rear makes the site feel relatively enclosed, however, there is expansive agricultural land to the nor		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None.
--------------------------------------	-------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	Partial

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	Yes	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	8.08
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.15
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
37	FAIL	0	0	2	0	Weak
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	Scores weakly against Green Belt purposes and has little connection with the wider Green Belt. Could be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	N/A					
<b>Recommended</b>	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

<b>storey houses</b>				<b>use and employment</b>			
Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	Medium - High	High	High

### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Unknown
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Difference in ground levels between A1000 and main part of site may pose some challenges in securing access to the site although this may not be insurmountable.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	Close to M25 but not adjacent, although the noise and pollution effects of the M25 would need to be assessed. Significant screening to south would be required. Detailed noise and pollution assessment may be required. Pylons adjacent to the site.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	No
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of a small site would be viable and the site achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL subject to any site-specific mitigation.
--------------------------------	---

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	No
--	----

### Estimated development potential - residential

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban	Medium	Low	Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.58	30dph	40dph
	28	37

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:28
	Delivery in 1-5 years 28
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:37
	Delivery in 1-5 years 37
Delivery in 6-10 years 0	
Delivery in 11-15 years 0	

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is located close to the M25 but at a lower level than the motorway. There are pylons adjacent to the site. Access from Barnet Road may be difficult due to sharp level changes between the road and the site, as well as within the site itself, which sits above Barnet Road on a plateau.</p> <p>If access could be established, aA detailed noise assessment is likely to be required to confirm suitability of the site but the existence of houses and Gypsy and Traveller pitches on either side, would indicate that the location is potentially suitable for residential accommodation.</p> <p>The site was identified as poorly performing in terms of meeting Green Belt purposes in the Stage 1 assessment and was recommended for further consideration for development; as such it was not assessed at Stage 2.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The site is considered potentially suitable, available and achievable, subject to assessment at site selection stage.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:28</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:37</p>
--	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0318-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Former Sunnybank School, Potters Bar	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 2NH
<b>Ward</b>	Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	2.84	<b>Current Use</b>	Former School
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential development on three sides, agricultural land to the south		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of settlement suburban character. Mainly surrounded by low to medium density bungalow development, including Oakroyd Avenue to the west, part of the Royds Conservation Area which consists of detached and semi-detached bungalows		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	PB3		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	18/1475/OUT, Demolition of existing Sunnybank School building and former caretaker's house, removal of hardstanding areas, and development of up to 30 new homes with associated access arrangements and ancillary works. (Outline application to include access, all other matters reserved), Decided Decision: Appeal Dismissed
--------------------------------------	---

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential



Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	Yes

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	1.46
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
35	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores strongly against purpose 3, preventing encroachment into an area of very open countryside, but there are a number of identified sub-areas at the edge of Potters Bar which would score less strongly if considered alone, including the below sub area.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-16	Fail	0	0	0	0	Weak
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly, and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration					
<b>Recommended</b>	Yes					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats	Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial	Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution	Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement

<b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b>	<b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b>	<b>'Medium density' flats</b>	<b>'Higher density' flats</b>	<b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b>	<b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b>	<b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b>	
Medium	Medium	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	Not a significant constraint, but the site does slope upwards from the entrance to a plateau
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	No known environmental constraints- possible asbestos in school building/s
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Past Interest
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	No		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

<b>Is the Site achievable?</b>	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the site is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs will primarily be covered by CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of part of the site, although any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. However, the site promoter has not indicated there to be any abnormal or other costs which would have the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development.
--------------------------------	--

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	No known environmental constraints- possible asbestos in school building/s
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban	Medium	Low	Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.18	30dph	40dph
	57	76

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:57</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 57</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:76</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 16</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	---

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site adjoins the Royds Conservation Area and as proposed would be accessed via Field View Road although additional pedestrian and cycle access could be achieved via Meadow Way and Sunnybank Road. The site promoter had previously indicated that the existing community facility (Pupil Referrals Unit) would be retained, but the facility has since been relocated to Hatfield.</p> <p>A SEND school is included in the promotion, located on the southern half of the site. This has decreased the site area used for housing calculations</p> <p>Although the site forms part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment, HEL318 forms one of a small number of sub-areas as being of less significance. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>There is a significant quantum of previously developed land and buildings on the site which could potentially be re-developed as not inappropriate development under paragraph 154 of the NPPF. This could potentially yield around 20 units.</p>
---	--

However, were justification to exist to amend the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to the necessary technical assessments, the site can be considered to be suitable, achievable and available. For a greater quantum of development.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:57

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:76

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1023-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	197 Darkes Lane, Potters Bar	<b>Postcode</b>	EN6 1DQ
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Unparished area of Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.12	<b>Current Use Class(es)</b>	Vacant LA owned Care Home (C2)
----------------------------	------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Darkes Lane primary shopping area to the west and residential to the east, with court style residential medium rise development the opposite side of Darkes Lane to the north.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Urban character in a transitional area between large low density residential development and the primary shopping area of Darkes Lane constituting mid-rise development and a court style retirement complex opposite, of a similar height (5/6 storeys)		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>			

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b>	Ref. No: TP/06/1544 Redevelopment of site to provide part 3 and part 4 storey residential care home. (Application for Outline Planning Permission) (Refused) Ref. No: TP/78/0062 Erection of Single Storey Rear Extension and Alterations (Approved) Ref. No: TP/69/1460 Erection of 8 flats (Refused)
---	--

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
N	Y

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	NNo
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	No
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated)</b>
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	Yes

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Within Site Boundary	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	Yes	54.48
Floodzone 3	Yes	35.22
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	Yes	36.00
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	Yes	17.45
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	Yes	10.45
Reservoir Flooding	No	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment						

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment						
Recommended						



## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	The site is a locally listed building
Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	None
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

## Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available	Yes	Is there developer interest	No
Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available	None		
Is the Site available	Yes		

**Site Achievability:**

<b>Is the Site achievable</b>	Yes
-------------------------------	-----

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	None
--	------

**Estimated development potential - residential****(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional	Higher	High	Urban Brownfield (Flats)

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.12	30dph	40dph
	13	19

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:13</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 13</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:19</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 19</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site consists of a large detached dwelling from the 1920s that is locally listed. There is an extensive garden to the rear and paved driveway to the front.</p> <p>The built development is locally listed and any planning application will need to demonstrate justification for its loss.</p> <p>The site is not in the green belt.</p> <p>The site is indicatively showing a significant level of flood risk and would be unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. However, new, more detailed modelling has been undertaken for the Potters Bar Brook to accompany the potential allocation at Potters Bar Golf Course. This does show a reduction in flood risk which may extend to this site.</p> <p>The site is suitable, available and achievable, provided the issues surrounding flood risk are resolved and sufficient justification is given for the demolition of the locally listed building.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 13</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline: 19</p>
--	--

Site location / address:

<b>Address</b>	Canada Life Place, Potters Bar	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5BA
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

Site size / use:

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.85	<b>Current Use</b>	Office and Retail uses
------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------------

Surrounding area:

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Supermarket and associated car park to the west, bowls and cricket club to the north west, former sheltered accommodation to the north and other town centre uses the opposite side of the High St, A1000.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Site is situated on one of the two commercial town centres in Potters Bar, with associated mixed retail and service uses, and generally medium density surrounding development.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>			

Planning status:

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None.
----------------------------------	-------

Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential, employment and retail

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	Yes
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	No
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	No

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

#### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the site is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs will primarily be covered by CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site, although any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. However, the site promoter has not indicated there to be any abnormal or other costs which would have the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development.
-------------------------	--

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	No known environmental constraints
--	------------------------------------

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional	Higher	High	Urban Brownfield Flats

#### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.54	30dph	40dph
	165	240

### Deliverability / Developability:

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:165</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 55</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>16+ years: 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:240</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 130</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>16+ years: 0</p>
---	---



**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The potential development site currently occupies a prominent position on the corner of Potters Bar High Street and Mutton Lane. There are no known site constraints and it is in a sustainable location. The site is not in the green belt.</p> <p>Current leases run until 2026 on the office building and 2031 on the retail units. However, given the size of the site, and particularly if Maple House (the tall building) was to be retained, development could begin within 5 years. The office buildings are not fully occupied but the plans include the retention/conversion of Maple House and provision of office space and redeveloped retail units.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. However it is at the lower end of the scale and is therefore likely to pass the sequential and exception test.</p> <p>It is currently suitable and achievable and we be available for development within the next couple of years.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 165</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline: 240</p>
--	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL700

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Potters Bar High Street Renegeration	<b>Post Code</b>	EN6 5BE
<b>Ward</b>	Potters Bar Parkfield Ward	<b>Unparished area:</b>	Potters Bar

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	2.18	<b>Current Use</b>	Bus Garage
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Commercial development immediately to the east with some residential on upper floors. Local shopping parade on the opposite side of the High Street. Open space and football club ground to the west and south west.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Urban mixed use area of Potters Bar along the northern part of the High Street. Area characterised by a range of densities with a mix of retail and other town centre uses, commercial and residential use with two large parks nearby offsetting the more urban character of the High Street..		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	None.
----------------------------------	-------

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer (tick and complete relevant box):**

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
None proposed by the landowner.

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Green Belt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
No	Yes

**Constraints Check**

<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>	<b>Constraint</b>	<b>Within Site Boundary</b>
<b>AQMA</b>	No	<b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>	No
<b>Ancient Woodland</b>	No	<b>Local Geological Site</b>	No
<b>Local Nature Reserve</b>	No	<b>TPO</b>	No
<b>SSSI</b>	No	<b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Archaeological Sites</b>	No	<b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>	Yes
<b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b>	No	<b>Green Belt</b>	No

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

<b>Constraint</b>	
<b>Listed Building within Site</b>	Yes
<b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>	Yes
<b>Conservation Area</b>	No
<b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments</b>	No
<b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield</b>	No
<b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>	No
<b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b>	No
<b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>	Yes

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	7.53
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3.33
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.21
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	N/A
----------------	-----

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 1 Comment	N/A					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stage 2 Comment	N/A					
Recommended	N/A					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats		Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial			Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution		Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement
'Low-density' two/two and a half-	'Medium density' mixed residential	'Medium density' flats	'Higher density' flats	Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial	Large-scale commercial and office blocks	Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities	

storey houses				use and employment			
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Yes, Hollies Way is designated as a Locally Significant Employment Area.
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Possible contamination given industrial use and long standing bus garage on the site
Are there any access difficulties?	Should not be; current access to industrial estate is single track but could be reconfigured if redeveloped as a whole
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No but within the site an industrial Estate contains a number of vehicle repair workshops.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

### Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	No	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	No		

### Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	Unknown
-------------------------	---------

### Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Sites would need to become available elsewhere to accommodate existing businesses. Suitable provision would need to be made, on or off-site, for the bus depot.
---	---

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Central	Urban	High	Urban Brownfield Mixed

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.64	30dph	40dph
	231	412

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:231
	Delivery in 1-5 years 0
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	16+ years: 231
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:412
	Delivery in 1-5 years 19
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
Delivery in 11-15 years 0	
16+ years: 412	

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The two adjacent sites of the bus garage and industrial estate occupy a significant plot in a built up area of Potters Bar and present a potentially significant, long-term brownfield opportunity should alternative accommodation become available for the existing occupiers of the site.</p> <p>There is likely to be contamination given the current site uses that will need to be investigated, both from asbestos roofs and in the ground.</p> <p>The site itself has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The site will be suitable for the end use providing potential contamination issues are resolved. However, the land is currently not available and achievable, with the bus site owner currently having no alternative site and the industrial estate being well used by a number of vehicle repair businesses</p> <p>Capacity subject to change to policy framework and the land becoming available, at 30dph baseline:231</p> <p>Capacity subject to change to policy framework and the land becoming available, at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:412</p>
--	--