

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL520b

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                  |                 |                           |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land to the South East of Costco | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8JS                  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey St James Ward             | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Bushey |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |          |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|----------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 6.52 | <b>Current Use</b> | Woodland |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|----------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | The North Western boundary of the site is defined by the A41. Immediately to the south east are a number of commercial uses including vehicle storage. To the west of the site, beyond the Costco site, are residential and leisure uses. To the north west of the site is a large employment site (Otterspool Way), with educational facilities located to the south. Directly north of the site, on the opposite side of the A41, is a hotel and to the east is Bushey Cemetery. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site is located in close proximity to Otterspool Way business park, and abuts the A41 with the Hilton Hotel directly opposite. The David Lloyd centre is directly west of the site. Open fields and recreational grounds are to the south of the site.   |  |  |
| <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> | 520a   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Commercial and Industrial        |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 3.53               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 2.90               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 6.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 3.60               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 2.70               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 3.10               |

### 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 6                      | Pass  | 3                      | 5                           | 0                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>As a whole, the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree.</p> <p>However, a small area south of Little Bushey Lane plays a very limited role in preventing the merging of settlements. It is almost completely enveloped by development and separated from the wider countryside by dense planted buffers along Little Bushey Lane</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

#### 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> |   |
| Low - Medium  | Low - Medium                              | Medium                        | Medium                        | Medium   | Medium - High                                   | Medium - 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>             | 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> | It is located in a woodland. |
| <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 |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | None |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes  |                                     |     |

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

## Overcoming Constraints

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

## 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> | The site promoter has indicated that delivery would be in 1-5 years |
|---|---|

## Conclusion:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment identified that the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree.</p> <p>However, a small area south of Little Bushey Lane plays a very limited role in preventing the merging of settlements. It is almost completely enveloped by development and separated from the wider countryside by dense planted buffers along Little Bushey Lane. The site was not initially assessed as part of the Stage 2 assessment but is being assessed in 2024.</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>An industrial or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>HEL520b would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL811

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                    |                 |                           |
|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land to the West of Gullimore Farm | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8HE                  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey St James Ward               | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Bushey |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |  |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 2.50 | <b>Current Use</b> | Undeveloped land, informal vehicle storage |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Car workshops to the east (Gullimore's Farm), Traveller site to the west and sand storage to the north. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site is surrounded by differing commercial uses based in an informal style.                         |  |  |
| <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> | HEL208  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
|----------------------------------|
| Warehouse and Distribution       |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 25.30              |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 13.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 31.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 28.00              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 22.50              |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 13.30              |

### 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 14                     | FAIL  | 0                      | 3                           | 2                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose 3 and does not meet purposes 1 or 4. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually). There is no obvious scope for sub-division within the parcel and it is recommended that it is not 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-77                  | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 0                           | 0                      | Less Important      |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | The sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | The sub-area is recommended for further consideration.   |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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                        | Medium   | Medium - High                                   | Medium - High  | 0 |

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt and flooding   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | There is possible land contamination based on existing use and surrounding land uses. |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Access is gained from a fairly steep slope.   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | The site lies on a slope towards the A41.   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No  |
| <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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | A detailed access strategy. |
|--|-----------------------------|

### 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> | The site promoter has indicated that delivery would be in 1-2 years |
|---|---|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site has a challenging topography that will need to be addressed with particular reference to access through a detailed design and access statement.</p> <p>The stage 1 Green Belt assessment the parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose 3 and does not meet purposes 1 or 4. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually). There is no obvious scope for sub-division within the parcel.</p> <p>Ste Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development. Site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development.</p> <p>The principal site access/egrees is in the flood zone and would need to be assessed and mitigated considered where required.</p> <p>A warehouse and/or distribution development (B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>HEL811 would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays a less important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-208-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |              |                 |                           |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Elton Way    | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8HA                  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey North | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Bushey |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |        |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 11.5 | <b>Current Use</b> | Vacant |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Commercial, residential and hotel to the north west. Residential and commercial to the south east. M1 to the north, A41 to the south. A cemetery, playing fields and depot site lie to the south of the A41. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The area is crossed by the A41 and M1 and has a variety of mainly commercial uses consistent with accessibility to major transport routes. However much of the area remains open.                            |  |  |
| <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> | HEL811   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | 23/1035/OUTEI - Demolition and redevelopment to comprise B8 use of up to 45,000 sqm gross external, including ancillary offices. (Outline Application to include access with all other matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved). |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

|                                   |
|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>  |
| B8 (Distribution and Warehousing) |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>              | No  |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 3.41               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.46               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 14                     | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 0                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose and does not meet purposes 1 or 4. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually). There is no obvious scope for sub-division within the parcel and it is recommended that it is not 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-77                  | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 0                           | 0                      | Less Important      |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | The sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | The sub-area is recommended for further consideration.   |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## 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                        | 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>       | Yes                   |
| <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> | LWS across Elton Way. |
| <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 |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites, including this particular site, have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

### 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> | The site promoter originally indicated that the site could be delivered within 1-5 years. Since then, a planning application for development of the site has been submitted for a phased development capable of coming forward in distinct and separable phases and/or plots in a severable way. This may have a different delivery timescale from the original promotion, dependent on the developer and/or occupier(s) of any approved development. |
|---|---|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site's main constraint is that there is a level of land contamination. A method statement a remediation will be required at application stage.</p> <p>The stage 1 Green Belt assessment states that the parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose and does not meet purposes 1 or 4. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually).</p> <p>Thee Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is recommended for further consideration.</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>A warehouse and/or distribution development (B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays a less important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL387b

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                 |                            |
|----------------|---|-----------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land North of the Doubletree Hilton Hotel (Safeguarded) | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 5PU                    |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward                             | <b>Parish</b>   | Elstree and Borehamwood CP |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |        |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 1.51 | <b>Current Use</b> | Vacant |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Film Studio to the north and Hotels to south and west.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is an edge of settlement location where the urban area of Borehamwood meets open countryside. Most of the surrounding land has been developed with the site being bounded by the A1 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> | 23/0478/OUT - Application for a flexible (B2/B8) use including ancillary office floorspace, associated parking, loading docks, servicing, landscaping and substation. (Outline Application to include Access with all other matters Reserved). |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Commercial and Industrial        |



Location type (tick relevant box):

|                   |            |
|-------------------|------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b> | <b>PDL</b> |
| No                | 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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>               | No  |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 19.12              |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 19.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 88.50              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 22.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 5.80               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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-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 |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|              |              |              |              |              |        |               |   |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|---------------|---|
| Low - Medium | Low - Medium | Low - Medium | Low - Medium | Low - Medium | Medium | Medium - High | 0 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------|---------------|---|

**Officer Assessment**

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Flooding |
| <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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

**Site Achievability:**

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Sequential test |
|--|-----------------|

**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>The site promoter has submitted an application for development on the site. This would suggest it can be brought forward within the first five years of the plan period.</p> |
|--|---|

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development. Site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development.</p> <p>A development with a large proportion of warehouse and/or distribution development (Use Class B8) would impact on the surrounding landscape. Sites with a medium level of landscape sensitivity will require a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as part of any planning application to determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including any additional structure planting likely required. Layouts/elevations may require amendments in order to fully mitigate any potential landscape issues.</p> <p>The site is suitable under the current planning policy framework. Subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|---|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL809

**Site location / address:**

|                |                             |                 |                         |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land East of Rowley Lane    | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 5PT                 |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward | <b>Parish</b>   | Elstree and Borehamwood |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |              |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 13.80 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | The site has a film studio to the south and agricultural land to the north. There is a mix of residential and industrial land uses to the west, |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site falls on the urban edge of Borehamwood leading to open countryside with film and TV sites being developed to the south of the site.    |  |  |
| <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> | HEL 818   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | 22/1526/FULEI - Development of a film and television production studio (Use Class E(g)(ii)) with ancillary floorspace, backlot, new access arrangements, car parking, landscaping, infrastructure and associated works. |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Film and TV studios.             |

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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>             | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 8.75               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 8.80               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 22.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 5.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 2.00               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 18                     | PASS   | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-47                  | PASS   | 3                      | 1                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | Not 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 |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |   |   |

|   |   |                               |                               |  |   |  |               |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|
| <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 - High  | Medium - High                                   | Medium - High  | Medium - 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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable with a planning application submitted. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|



**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**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> | The site promoter has submitted an application to extend Sky Studios Elstree. This would suggest it can be brought forward within the first five years of the plan period |
|---|---|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main site constraint is that it lies within the Green Belt. The stage 1 Green Belt assessment The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is not 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>New sound stages, offices and ancillary facilities on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL818

**Site location / address:**

|                |                           |                 |                         |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land South of Rowley Lane | <b>Postcode</b> |                         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Shenley Ward              | <b>Parish</b>   | Elstree and Borehamwood |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |              |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 35.01 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | The site has agricultural land to the south and north. There is residential to the west.   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site falls on the urban edge of Borehamwood leading to open countryside with film and TV production facilities further to the south of the site. |  |  |
| <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> | HEL809   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>                             |
|--|
| Film and Television Studios / general employment development |

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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>             | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 4.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.20               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 18                     | PASS   | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-47                  | PASS   | 3                      | 1                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Makes an important contribution to the Green Belt. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | Not 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 |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |   |   |

|   |   |                               |                               |  |   |  |               |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|
| <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 - High  | Medium - High                                   | Medium - High  | Medium - 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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

### 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> | The site promoter has indicated the land could be brought for development within the first five years. |
|---|--|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main site constraint is that it lies within the Green Belt. The stage 1 Green Belt assessment The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is not recommended for further consideration.</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>The development of sound stages and other commercial development on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL394

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                  |                 |                                |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Cranborne Road Industrial Estate | <b>Postcode</b> | EN6 3JN                        |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Potters Bar Furzefield Ward      | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Potters Bar |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |                    |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 2.48 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural Field |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Cranborne Industrial estate to east and south east, fields to south west, west and north, solar farm to north east.   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is an edge of settlement location where open countryside meets the built up area of Potters Bar. A large area to the north is covered by a solar farm which detracts from the overall rural character of the 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> | TP/07/1115 Construction and operation of a waste transfer station for biodegradable waste (Granted) |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Commercial and Industrial        |

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>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>             | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 16.90              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 1.60               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.00               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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-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 |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|        |        |               |               |               |      |      |   |
|--------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|---|
| Medium | Medium | Medium - High | Medium - High | Medium - High | High | High | 0 |
|--------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|---|

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Yes (although safeguarded in the current plan)  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No, but possible due to adjacent scrapyards and industrial uses   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | A watercourse would need to be spanned and it would be at the end of an already congested employment road |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No, not for proposed use  |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Watercourse sensitive to pollution and is a potable water supply  |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Potentially, subject to any ground surveys and remediation work required.                                 |

### Site Availability:

|  |      |                                     |    |
|--|------|-------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b> | Yes  | <b>Is there developer interest?</b> | No |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | None |                                     |    |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes  |                                     |    |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable; the site has been safeguarded for employment development in the last two Local Plans. The site promoter has not submitted any information in relation to any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken |
|--------------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

### 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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The principle of development has previously been accepted on the site due to its safeguarding in the current and previous Local Plans. Technical work would be required alongside any planning application to take account of any contamination from neighbouring uses, the sensitivity of the watercourse to pollution (there have been pollution incidents from current uses) the increased costs of spanning the watercourse and increased traffic concerns on the employment estate.</p> <p>These could be overcome through geo environmental investigation, feasibility studies incorporating the bridge crossing, traffic studies and possible mitigation measures.</p> <p>The site is no longer in the Green Belt having been previously removed from it and safeguarded for development.</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> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL806

**Site location / address:**

|                |                               |                 |                                    |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land East of Furzeffield Wood | <b>Postcode</b> | EN6 3JN                            |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Potters Bar Furzeffield Ward  | <b>Parish</b>   | N/A Unparished area of Potters Bar |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |         |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|---------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.15 | <b>Current Use</b> | Parking |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|---------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Forest to the west, otherwise surrounded by employment uses of Cranborne Industrial Estate  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Largely character of industrial/warehouse estate development with large units, broken by the green expanse of forest bordering the estate to the west |  |  |
| <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> | 21/0265/CLE Continued use of land for open storage and vehicle parking (GRANTED)<br><br>18/1581/CLE Continued use of land for Car parking and open storage (REFUSED) |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
|----------------------------------|
| Office                           |

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>      | Yes                         | <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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | No                          | <b>Green Belt</b>                       |                             |

### 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>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 0.00               |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 6.00               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.30               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.00               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 46                     | Fail                           | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderately          |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | No                             |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

#### 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-7                   | Fail   | 0                      | 1                           | 1                           | 0                      | Weakly              |
| <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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| '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 |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|        |        |               |               |               |      |      |   |
|--------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|---|
| Medium | Medium | Medium - High | Medium - High | Medium - High | High | High | 0 |
|--------|--------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------|------|---|

**Officer Assessment**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Yes- Green Belt                                  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | Possible- vehicle storage and car park currently |
| <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> | No   |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes  |

**Site Availability:**

|  |   |                                     |    |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b> | Apparently with no identified constraints, but owner is stating 11-15 years for development | <b>Is there developer interest?</b> | No |
| Ownership constraints?                           | None  |                                     |    |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes   |                                     |    |

**Site Achievability:**

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

### 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> | 11-15 years |
|---|-------------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is currently a small area for vehicle storage and car parking. No apparent environmental constraints, although there is potential for some contamination given present use.</p> <p>A preliminary contaminated land assessment is likely to be required, but no other environmental assessment.</p> <p>Site is within a Green Belt parcel that performed moderately is the stage 1 assessment, but the site is small and adjacent to existing settlement and is bordered on the other side by a large forest limiting the potential for encroachment and loss of openness.</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 by the need for additional employment land, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|---|



**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL814

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                      |                 |                                  |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land South East of Junction 24 (M25) | <b>Postcode</b> | EN5 4LD                          |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Potters Bar Oakmere Ward             | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area near Potters Bar |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |  |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 11.08 | <b>Current Use</b> |  |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|--|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | M25 and junction 24, detached dwellings, farm and school and agricultural land  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Rural site separated from Potters Bar by M25, but junction and motorway in particular detract from the otherwise rural setting. |  |  |
| <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> | No |
|----------------------------------|----|

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

| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
|----------------------------------|
| Warehouse and Distribution       |

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>                              | No                          |
| <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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | No                          | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>               | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 1.70               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.60               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.40               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 33                     | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| '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 | 0 | 0 | High                      | 0 | 0 | High |

### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Yes, 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>       | Potentially the M25, but mitigation for employment use should be possible. |
| <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>                    | Not as such, but cross boundary site between Hertsmere and Enfield Borough |                                     |    |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes  |                                     |    |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Site is agricultural fields bound by the M25 to the north of the site. There are no major environmental constraints, apart from the possible requirement for a buffer or physical boundary from the M25.</p> <p>The site spans two boroughs, so a co-ordinated approach would be required to bring this site forward.</p> <p>The parcel covering the site performed strongly in Green Belt terms in the Stage 1 assessment.</p> <p>Further to this, a warehouse and/or distribution development (B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</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, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider employment need, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable. However, given the Green Belt and landscape sensitivity analysis, the site would be unlikely to be amongst the initially favoured sites.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL171

**Site location / address:**

|                |                               |                 |                         |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land North of Centennial Park | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3BE                 |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree Ward                  | <b>Parish</b>   | Elstree and Borehamwood |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |   |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 3.40 | <b>Current Use</b> | Unused paddock land<br>(historically in arable use) |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Centennial Industrial Park to the south, Composers Park/Elstree Hill Open Space to the east, Aldenham reservoir and The Fisheries PH to the north, Water Front/Lismirrane commercial premises to the west.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The area to the north of the A411 is mainly open and rural in character, with several institutional developments - school, laboratory etc and small amounts of development within Aldenham Country Park providing visitor and sports related facilities. However the A41, M1, Water Front and Lismirrane commercial premises and Centennial Park are urbanising influences. The site is separated from Elstree village by open space. |  |  |
| <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> | 22/2147/OUT - Erection of industrial / distribution floorspace (Use Class E/ B2 / B8), a flexible office/hub building (Use Class E), new vehicular access, and associated provision of car and cycle parking and landscaping. (Outline Application to include Access, all other Matters Reserved) |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

|  |
|--|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>                 |
| Mixed: (Class E, B2 and B8 Logistics Floorspace) |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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> | Yes   |
| <b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 33.60              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 21.70              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 18.60              |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 5                      | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 0                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>As a whole, the parcel meets purpose 2 strongly, maintaining the gap between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village which is of a small scale.</p> <p>However, the south of the parcel around Centennial Business Park has an urban character in contrast to the wider parcel, and is relatively strongly bounded by dense planted features, as well as A- roads to the east and south. As it is already completely</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

#### 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-66                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | 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                 | High   | 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>       | 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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development although the proposal submitted for this site is linked to remediation work required for Aldenham Reservoir, for which there are upfront and ongoing maintenance costs. Any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**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:</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years</p> |
|---|--|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main site constraint is that it lies within the Green Belt. The stage 1 Green Belt assessment As a whole, the parcel meets purpose 2 strongly, maintaining the gap between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village which is of a small scale.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is not 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>A warehouse, Commercial and/or distribution development (E/ B2/ B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL238

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                 |                        |
|----------------|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | <b>Land adjacent to Dagger Lane, A41 and Elstree Road</b> | <b>Postcode</b> | <b>WD6 3AU</b>         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | <b>Elstree Ward</b>                                       | <b>Parish</b>   | <b>Unparished area</b> |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |               |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 17.39 | <b>Current Use</b> | Vacant Fields |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Lismirrane and Waterfront Industrial Parks to the south of the site (across Elstree Road), Aldenham Country Park to the east and the Bio Products Lab to the north across Dagger Lane, A41 and M1 to the west. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Pockets of development within countryside but urbanising influences of Elstree, Centennial Park, commercial development and Bushey close by, as well as M1 and A41.  |  |  |
| <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> |
| Commercial and Industrial        |

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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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> | Yes   |
| <b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 15.00              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 4.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 1.20               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 9                      | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-74                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | 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  | 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>       | 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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

### 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> | Not stated. |
|---|-------------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main site constraint is that it lies within the Green Belt. The stage 1 Green Belt assessment states the parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria moderately and has been assessed to make a important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is not 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>A warehouse, commercial and/or distribution development (E/ B2/ B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays an important role. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL503

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                 |                 |
|----------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land adjacent to Lismirrane Industrial Estate | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3BG         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree Ward                                  | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |                                     |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 5.16 | <b>Current Use</b> | Dog kennels, stables and phone mast |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Centennial Industrial Park to the east, Lismirrane Employment area and vacant site to the north, A41 and M1 along south west boundary.   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The area to the north of the A411 is mainly open and rural in character, with several institutional developments - school, laboratory etc. and small amounts of development within Aldenham Country Park providing visitor and sports related facilities. However the A41, M1, Waterfront and Lismirrane commercial premises and Centennial Park are urbanising influences. The area is separated from Elstree Village by open land. |  |  |
| <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> | 23/0439/FUL - Demolition and redevelopment comprising of E(g)(iii) (Industrial Processes), B2 (General Industry) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) uses with ancillary offices and associated access, car parking, servicing areas and landscaping. (Original Description) (Awaiting Decision) |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Commercial and Industrial        |



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> | No                          |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>      | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 26.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 14.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 11.20              |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 5                      | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 0                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>As a whole, the parcel meets purpose 2 strongly, maintaining the gap between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village which is of a small scale.</p> <p>However, the south of the parcel around Centennial Business Park has an urban character in contrast to the wider parcel, and is relatively strongly bounded by dense planted features, as well as A- roads to the east and south. As it is already completely</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

#### 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-78                  | Fail   | 0                      | 1                           | 2                           | 0                      | Weakly              |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | The parcel makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and is 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                             | 0                             | 0                             | Medium - High  | 0   | 0  | Medium - 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> | Areas of surface water flooding. |
| <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 |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial and industrial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Sequential and potentially exceptions test to address flood risk. |
|--|---|

### 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> | The site promoter has submitted an application for development on the site. This would suggest it can be brought forward within the first five years of the plan period. |
|---|--|

### Conclusion:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main site constraint is that it lies within the Green Belt. The stage 1 Green Belt assessment states As a whole, the parcel meets purpose 2 strongly, maintaining the gap between Elstree and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village which is of a small scale. The site also has pylons cutting through the centre of the site causing difficulty in terms of developable area.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment states that the sub-area meets purpose assessment criteria weakly and has been assessed to make a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is 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. The site is further noted to have a brook running through it which causes flooding concerns.</p> <p>A warehouse, commercial and/or distribution development (E/ B2/ B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework due to the site's location within the Green Belt, where it plays a less important role. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

|                       |                |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| <b>Site reference</b> | HEL604a/HEL801 |
|-----------------------|----------------|

**Site location / address:**

|                |                   |                 |          |
|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Elstree Aerodrome | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3AR  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree           | <b>Parish</b>   | Aldenham |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |                    |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 4.50 | <b>Current Use</b> | Employment E/B2/B8 |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Elstree aerodrome airfield, farmhouse, reservoir and agricultural fields/paddock  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Area is generally rural in nature but is interspersed by a number of larger built developments including the Haberdashers' schools, employment area at Hilfield Reservoir as well as the airstrip itself. |  |
| <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> | <p>17/1510/CP8CF Erection of 2 new hangers. (RAISE NO OBJECTIONS)</p> <p>17/0192/PRAP Erection of a modular building comprising ancillary offices &amp; training rooms (Prior Notification).</p> <p>16/0630/PRAP Erection of a modular building comprising ancillary offices &amp; training rooms (Prior Notification)</p> |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Specialist                       |

**Location type (tick relevant box):**

|                           |            |
|---------------------------|------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b>         | <b>PDL</b> |
| Yes (Key Green Belt Site) | Yes        |

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                      | N/A                         | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | N/A                         |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>          | N/A                         | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | N/A                         |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>      | N/A                         | <b>TPO</b>                              | N/A                         |
| <b>SSSI</b>                      | N/A                         | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | N/A                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>      | N/A                         | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | N/A                         |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | N/A                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated)</b> |
|--|---|
| <b>Listed Building within Site</b>                       | N/A   |
| <b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>               | N/A   |
| <b>Conservation Area</b>                                 | N/A   |
| <b>Conservation Area within 750m of Site</b>             | N/A   |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments</b>                               | N/A   |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>           | N/A   |
| <b>Registered Battlefield</b>                            | N/A   |
| <b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>        | N/A   |
| <b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>                     | N/A   |
| <b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens within 750m of Site</b> | N/A   |
| <b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>              | N/A   |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | 0                  |
| 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 9                      | FAIL  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchetts Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration 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> |     |
| N/A   | N/A                                       | N/A                           | N/A                           | N/A  | N/A   | N/A  | N/A |

#### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Potentially not as site is within envelope of Key Green Belt Site (SADM24)  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | Potential for some given current uses   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | No  |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | Obviously the airstrip is neighbouring, so any uses would have to be ancillary to that, or at least compatible in terms of noise. |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | No  |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Should be suitable, although there are no details of exact employment use proposed  |

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development, ancillary or complimentary to the aviation function of the site, on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|



**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is currently occupied by a number of businesses, including a café, storage units, offices, hangars and general commercial. There are no major constraints to development, but clearly the noise of the airfield may limit suitable uses.</p> <p>The site is in the Green Belt. It is was assessed at Stage 1 as being moderately performing in the overall scoring. However, as a Key Green Belt site, this designation takes precedence in Green Belt terms.</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>This site has not been assessed as part of the landscape sensitivity assessment.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, limited development is permissible as it is a Key Green Belt site and a certain amount of aviation development could also be undertaken under permitted development rights. However, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of commercial development, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for additional growth which is ancillary or complimentary to the main function of the site,</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL802

**Site location / address:**

|                |                         |               |            |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land between A41 and M1 |               |            |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward      | <b>Parish</b> | Unparished |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |              |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 6.04 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Surrounded by A41 and M1 with agricultural fields beyond on all sides  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Aside from the surrounding roads, the area has a largely rural feel, surrounded by farmland and isolated/separated from Bushey |  |  |
| <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> |
|----------------------------------|
| Warehouse and Distribution       |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>             | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 4.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 2.00               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 1.40               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 42                     | FAIL  | 0                      | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and strongly against purpose 3. It plays an important role in maintaining the openness of the countryside and preventing encroachment, and also maintains the overall scale of the gap between Potters Bar and London Colney. No distinct sub-areas have been identified for assessment and 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 |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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  | Medium                                    | Medium - High                 | Medium - High                 | Medium - High  | High  | High   | Medium - High |

### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Yes, 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>       | Adjacent to M25, but mitigation should be possible given employment end use. |
| <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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Access not identified, but should be possible for reasons outlined above |
|--|--|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The M25 is located, in particular, in close proximity to the site, but road is raised above the site. Any mitigation necessary from noise or airborne pollution should be possible for employment use.</p> <p>The site is within the Green Belt and in the Stage 1 assessment it was considered to have performed strongly overall against the Green Belt score.</p> <p>A warehouse and/or distribution development (B8) on the site would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including areas of additional structure planting likely required. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</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, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider need for employment, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL804

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                      |                 |            |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Home Farm, Aldenham Road,<br>Elstree | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3AZ    |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree                              | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |        |                    |   |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|---|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 0.92Ha | <b>Current Use</b> | Residential property and Vehicle Storage, repairs and sales |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|---|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Meadows, fields and forest in the grounds of Home Farm in the immediate vicinity   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Despite being situated on a farm in a rural location, the site is close to the northern and western boundaries of the farm, with the large complex of buildings forming the Haberdashers Aske Girls School just beyond the boundary. Much of the remaining land surrounding the site is open grazing land and the Home Farm Registered Park and Garden |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No (it is within the wider BNG site HEL1048)   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | 21/1410/FUL Development within the curtilage of a Listed Building. Demolition of some existing buildings and erection of new office hub buildings in their place. Extension of an existing building, external and internal alterations and conversion to office space, a café and a function room. Associated landscaping and parking. Alterations to the existing highway access. (Decision: Grant Permission) |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

|                                     |
|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>    |
| Employment uses (warehouse/storage) |

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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

| <b>Constraint</b>  | <b>Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated)</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>                     | Yes   |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 16.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 8.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 5.30               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 2.10               |

## 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 10                     | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | Although the wider parcel meets purposes 2 and 3 moderately, the very south of the parcel at the edge of Elstree, south of the well-established planted buffer, makes a very limited contribution to preventing encroachment as it has been subject to various built developments. Additionally, it is of a small scale and forms only a small, less essential part of the wider gap with Radlett. This sub-area should be considered further to ensure consistency with the non-Green Belt area to the south of the A411. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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 |               |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|
| Medium - High                                  | Medium - High                      | 0                      | 0                      | Medium - High   | 0  | 0   | Medium - High |

### Officer Assessment

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Green Belt  |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | Potential for contamination given current uses and numerous vehicles stored on site   |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | No  |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | No  |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | No  |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | Site is covered by the wider Registered Park and Garden designation. TPO wood on the north eastern boundary and watercourse touching part of the eastern boundary |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | Yes   |

### Site Availability:

|   |                 |                              |     |
|---|-----------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Has the owner said the site is available? | Yes             | Is there developer interest? | N/A |
| Ownership constraints?                    | No (Farm owned) |                              |     |
| Is the Site available?                    | Yes             |                              |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                         |     |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Is the Site achievable? | Yes |
|-------------------------|-----|

### Overcoming Constraints

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| What would be needed to overcome constraints? | N/A |
|---|-----|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Site is concentrated around the complex of Home Farm commercial and residential units. The main residential complex is listed, with a few ancillary buildings also listed, so any redevelopment would need to take account of the setting of the listed complex. Part of the site may be contaminated, given the large areas of vehicle storage and associated activity. There is also the Park and Garden designation that washes over the farm complex, but the site boundary is concentrated around the curtilage of existing buildings, so is unlikely to affect the designation.</p> <p>There is a woodland TPO and a watercourse on part of the site boundary, but these do not encroach into the site and the watercourse meanders away from the site boundary at the built developments nearest point.</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>A small office or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) on the site would potentially have some landscape impact. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment may be required and layouts/elevations will need to be designed to mitigate any potential landscape issues.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable, which would give a certain level of scope for this site. The remote location of the site may impact on the scale of commercial development which would be acceptable in planning policy terms. As such, to realise the full scope of the promotion, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in this location; amendments to the Green Belt boundary would not be a realistic option.</p> |
|--|---|

**Site location / address**

|                |                           |                 |                                |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land east of Southgate Rd | <b>Postcode</b> | EN6 5EW                        |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Potters Bar Oakmere Ward  | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Potters Bar |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |                         |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 17.40 | <b>Current Use</b> | Open countryside/fields |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------|

**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> |
| Commercial or 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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | No                          | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>              | No  |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 4.44               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 4.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 10.70              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 2.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 1.40               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | N/A                |

## 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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 |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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 |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|              |              |        |               |        |               |               |   |
|--------------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------|---------------|---------------|---|
| Low - Medium | Low - Medium | Medium | Medium - High | Medium | Medium - High | Medium - High | 0 |
|--------------|--------------|--------|---------------|--------|---------------|---------------|---|

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | No  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No  |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | 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. |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | Residential development along Park Avenue on the long north western boundary, which could potentially require mitigation in design.   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Flood risk from the watercourse on the northern boundary potentially also covering the intended access from Park Avenue   |
| <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> | The site has been promoted for commercial or residential development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b></p> | <p>Fluvial flood risk mitigation, particularly around the entrance to the site off park Avenu, or a new access point.</p> |
|---|---|

**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>1-5 years.</p> |
|--|-------------------|

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <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, particularly for larger heavy goods vehicles.</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>A development with a large proportion of warehouse and/or distribution development (Use Class B8) would impact on the surrounding landscape. Sites with a medium level of landscape sensitivity will require a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment as part of any planning application to determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including any additional structure planting likely required. Layouts/elevations may require amendments in order to fully mitigate any potential landscape issues.</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 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.</p> |
|---|--|



Site location / address:

|                |  |                 |                                |
|----------------|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land South of Barnet Road, Potters Bar | <b>Postcode</b> | EN6 2SH                        |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bentley Heath & The Royd Ward          | <b>Parish</b>   | Unparished area of Potters Bar |

Site size / use:

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

Surrounding area:

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Between residential dwellings to the north east and a Gypsy and Traveller site 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 north |  |  |
| <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> |
| Office (E Class) or 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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | No                          | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>             | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 13.50              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.30               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | N/A                |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | N/A                |

## 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 37                     | 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 should 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-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 |   |
| Medium  | Medium                             | 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>             | Difference in ground levels over a short distance 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>                    | No  |
| <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> | The site has been promoted for commercial development or residential development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | N/A |
|--|-----|

**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>1-5 years</p> |
|--|------------------|

**Conclusion:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <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, a 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 removal altogether from the Green Belt; as such it was not assessed at Stage 2.</p> <p>A small office or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) on the site would have a very limited landscape impact and is not expected to be a constraint to development.</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> |
|---|---|

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                  |                 |          |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land north of Little Bushey Lane | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8HB |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey St James Ward             | <b>Parish</b>   | Bushey   |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |        |                    |       |
|------------------------|--------|--------------------|-------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 3.9 Ha | <b>Current Use</b> | Field |
|------------------------|--------|--------------------|-------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Various land uses including Costco and car park, sports grounds, a large events venue, gym, music school and open land.   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Character of the area is a semi-rural mix of large scattered institutions and public buildings between the residential areas of north Bushey and Bushey village. Travelling along Little Bushey Lane towards around the access there are large hedgerows on both sides screening development and giving a feeling of enclosure. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | There are previously promoted neighbouring sites to the north and south, however, the Met Police Sports Ground to the south, has not been promoted for a number of years. HEL520a to the north, which is currently a Costco, was previously promoted for additional office space for the national operation of Costco.          |  |  |
| <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> |
|----------------------------------|
| Employment Use (data centre)     |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>              | No  |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 6.81               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 4.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 11.40              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 7.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 6.10               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 4.60               |

## Agricultural Land Classification

|                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| <b>Classification</b> | Very 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 6                      | Pass  | 3                      | 5                           | 3                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>As a whole, the parcel meets purposes 1 and 3 moderately and purpose 2 strongly. In particular, it plays an important role in maintaining the narrow gaps between Watford, Bushey Heath/Bushey Village, North Bushey and Elstree.</p> <p>However, a small area south of Little Bushey Lane plays a very limited role in preventing the merging of settlements. It is almost completely enveloped by development and separated from the wider countryside by dense planted buffers along Little Bushey Lane. This area is effectively contained within Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and has a more urban character, thus playing a more limited role in relation to purpose 3.</p> <p>Overall, it would make limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes if considered alone and is recommended for further consideration as a sub-area.</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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-62                  | Fail  | 0                      | 0                           | 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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| '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 |   |
| Low - Medium  | Low - Medium                       | Medium   | Medium                 | Medium  | Medium - High   | Medium - High                                 | 0   |

### Officer Assessment

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Yes, Green Belt.              |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | Yes, historic fill operations |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | No                            |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | No                            |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | Pylons and power lines        |
| 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? | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. However, any significant site-specific mitigation, remediation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

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

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>There are various constraints affecting the northern part of the site, with Hillfield Brook and associated flood zone close to northern boundary, as well as pylons/overhead power lines. The site promoter has indicated that the site was subject to historic fill operations by the previous owners and a preliminary desktop study has been submitted. It indicates that the site operated as a landfill from 1979-1984 and that there may be potential hazardous ground gas and inorganic material on site, possibly causing pollution to the watercourse on the northern site boundary. This will clearly require more detailed on-site investigation if this site were to be brought forward for development at any future stage.</p> <p>The site forms part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, playing an important role in maintaining a gap between Watford and Bushey. However, 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> <p>An office, industrial or commercial development would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were this to change the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL817

**Site location / address:**

|                |  |                 |         |
|----------------|--|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Rectory Farm (Smaller Employment Site) | <b>Postcode</b> | WD7 9DE |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Shenley Ward                           | <b>Parish</b>   | Shenley |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |             |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 3.4Ha | <b>Current Use</b> | Agriculture |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Church, churchyard and Clore Shalom school to north, residential to west (across Shenleybury which abuts the site), woodland to south and fields and woodland to east |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Edge of village location where open fields and woodland meet residential development at Porters Park  |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | Larger site, within the same ownership, surrounding this site to the north, south and east has promoted for residential-led development                               |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | HEL236 (a & b)  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | TP/05/0845 All weather and grass gallops (REFUSED);<br>TP/85/0368 relocation of agricultural dwelling (GRANTED);<br>TP/90/0303 Outline application to provide health resort and golf course (REFUSED)<br>TP/92/0201 Use of land for health resort and golf club (REFUSED) |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Commercial/Employment            |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>              | No  |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 9.70               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 6.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 4.20               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | N/A                |

## 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 18                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-32                  | Fail   | 0                      | 1                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | 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 |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |   |   |

| '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 |   |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Medium   | Medium                             | Medium - High          | Medium - High          | Medium - High   | High                                     | High  | 0 |

### Officer Assessment

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Green</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> | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | No  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--------------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | N/A |
|--|-----|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>This smaller area of Rectory Farm is relatively constraint free. The TPO designations, ancient woodland and archaeological site that impacts upon the wider site, do not impact on this location.</p> <p>However, an office or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</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>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The site makes up a portion of parcel 18 in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment which as a whole scored strongly against purpose 3 (Protection of the countryside). The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL820

**Site location / address:**

|                |                              |                 |         |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land north of Salisbury Hall | <b>Postcode</b> | AL2 1BU |
| <b>Ward</b>    | N/A                          | <b>Parish</b>   | Shenley |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |        |                    |             |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 14.1Ha | <b>Current Use</b> | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | M25 is situated on the northern boundary, Salisbury Hall and Farm to the south, also housing an aircraft museum. Open fields lie to the east and west, with Watford Training Ground and associated facilities just beyond the western boundary                               |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The character of the areas is largely open and rural, punctuated by the large hall/museum complex and training grounds and associated facilities of both Watford and Arsenal football clubs. The M25 and London Colney directly to the north west add an urbanising element. |  |  |
| <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>  |
| Mixed Use: B2 (General Industrial), B8 (Storage and Distribution) and E (Commercial, Business and Services) |



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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

### 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>             | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments</b>                               | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>           | No  |
| <b>Registered Battlefield</b>                            |   |
| <b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>        |   |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 10.80              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 1.40               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.80               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | N/A                |

## 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 18                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should 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 use and employment | Large-scale commercial and office blocks                                  | Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|               |        |   |   |        |   |   |        |
|---------------|--------|---|---|--------|---|---|--------|
| storey houses |        |   |   |        |   |   |        |
| Medium        | Medium | 0 | 0 | Medium | 0 | 0 | Medium |

### 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? | 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? | Unknown |
| Ownership constraints?                    | No  |                              |         |
| Is the Site available?                    | Yes |                              |         |

### Site Achievability:

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable? | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | N/A |
|--|-----|

### 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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site in question is currently an agricultural field with a small group of trees in the centre. There are no recorded constraints for the site, although it does fall within a mineral consultation area for Sand and Gravel.</p> <p>However, an office or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</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 area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were this to change the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL1036d

**Site location / address:**

|                |                              |                 |          |
|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land north of Stephenson Way | <b>Postcode</b> | WD23 2AH |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey North Ward            | <b>Parish</b>   | Bushey   |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |     |                    |                                |
|------------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 8.6 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural land and pastures |
|------------------------|-----|--------------------|--------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | There is no built development directly adjacent to the site boundary, but a golf centre and a power station lie to the north west across the River Colne. There is also a farm complex to the south west, adjacent to the northern residential edge of North Bushey, and a large warehouse/commercial unit is situated directly to the east of residential area. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site sits in a narrow gap between North Bushey and Watford residential areas. Much of this gap is characterised by meadow/pastures and forest, which is predominantly the River Colne floodplain, of which the west half of the site is covered by.  |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | Stephenson Way physically separates the two sites, but the same promoter is promoting an area opposite, to the south of Stephenson Way   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | HEL 1036b  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>  |
|-----------------------------------|
| Employment (mainly B8, Warehouse) |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>             | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments</b>                               | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>           | Yes   |
| <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>              | Yes   |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 62.79              |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 43.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 25.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 0.30               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | N/A                |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 66.30              |

## 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 22                     | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 3                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>The parcel scores strongly against purpose 2. It plays an important role in maintaining the very narrow gap between Watford and North Bushey, which is very small in physical scale. Although the parcel does not meet purpose 1, it is noted that, at a more strategic level, it is physically very close to Watford and forms part of a broader Green Belt area that prevents its outward sprawl. Additionally, there is very little development throughout and the parcel plays a role in preventing the encroachment of development into the countryside.</p> <p>There is no obvious scope for sub-division and it is recommended that the parcel is not considered further.</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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 |   |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Medium   | Medium                             | Medium                 | Medium - High          | Medium - High   | Medium - High                            | High  | 0 |

### Officer Assessment

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Yes, 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? | The main environmental constraint is the large area of flood risk, but there is no indication development is planned for that area. |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | Yes   |

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable? | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------|--|

### Overcoming Constraints



|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | N/A |
|--|-----|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site currently has a group of utility buildings on it with the neighbouring B&amp;B cut out of the site boundary. There is an extensive flood plain covering the western and north western half of the site from the River Colne. There is no development planned for this area however, with the indicative development in the eastern 'triangle' of land.</p> <p>Site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development. However, the floodplain in this location is clearly defined and the planned development is indicated to be well away from the floodable area.</p> <p>A warehouse or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) would impact on the surrounding landscape. A site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is likely to be required as part of any planning application to determine the level of risk and set out required mitigation, including any additional structure planting likely required. Layouts/elevations will need to be designed to mitigate any potential landscape issues.</p> <p>The area is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its Green Belt status. Were this to change the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1036b-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                   |                        |          |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land at Stephenson Way,<br>Bushey | <b>Post Code</b>       | WD23 2AH |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey North Ward                 | <b>Unparished area</b> | Bushey   |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |              |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 8.81 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Ancient woodland (North), Residential (South), Industrial (East) and Local Park (West).  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Mainly open space to the north and west with residential to the south and east and Otterspool employment Area (mainly industrial) to the north 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> | TP/01/0882 Development of a Park and Ride facility comprising 600 car parking spaces; new highway access from Stephenson Way (A4008); new highway access for buses and cycles from Bushey Mill Lane; new internal access roads and pedestrian and cycle routes; building incorporating waiting and other customer and operational facilities; landscaping works including balancing pond and landscaping bunds and other associated works and facilities.(Amended plans received 8/7/02). WITHDRAWN |
|----------------------------------|---|

**Use(s) proposed by owner/developer :**

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Residential (C3), Employment     |

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

#### Constraints Check

| Constraint                                | Within Site Boundary | Constraint                              | Within Site Boundary |
|---|----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <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>    | No                   |
| <b>Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                  | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                  |

#### Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

| Constraint   |     |
|--|-----|
| <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>           | Yes |
| <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 |
|---|--------------------|
| <b>Floodzone 2</b>                        | 0                  |
| <b>Floodzone 3</b>                        | 0                  |
| <b>Surface Water Flooding Low Risk</b>    | 4.27               |
| <b>Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk</b> | 1.95               |

|                                  |      |
|----------------------------------|------|
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk | 1.04 |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day       | 8.24 |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day       | 8.97 |

### Agricultural Land Classification

|                |           |
|----------------|-----------|
| Classification | Very 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 22                     | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 3                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores strongly against purpose 2. It plays an important role in maintaining the very narrow gap between Watford and North Bushey, which is very small in physical scale. Although the parcel does not meet purpose 1, it is noted that, at a more strategic level, it is physically very close to Watford and forms part of a broader Green Belt area that prevents its outward sprawl. Additionally, there is very little development throughout and the parcel plays a role in preventing the encroachment of development into the countryside. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

#### 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-76                  | Fail                                  | 0                      | 1                           | 2                           | 0                      | Weakly              |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | 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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| '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 |   |
| Medium  | Medium                             | Medium   | Medium - High          | Medium - High   | Medium - High   | High  | 0   |

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt, & Powerlines  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | None  |
| <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> | No  |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes although the employment element is subject to vehicular access being deemed acceptable off Bushey Mill Lane, in the absence of access into the site from Otterspool Way or Stephenson Way |

**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  |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes |                                     |     |

**Site Achievability:**

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | <p>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.</p> <p>The site has also been promoted for commercial development on the basis that such development would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development, although the existence of pylons and power lines has the potential to impact on this. More widely, however, recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements, including any resiting of power lines, may require additional viability work to be undertaken for any employment-related development.</p> |
|--------------------------------|--|

**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     | Low                | Low           | Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension) |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 6.61   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 238                       | 317   |

**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:238</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 168</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:317</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 207</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|---|---|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site pylons/overhead power lines running across of the site. The site is also located within the Green Belt</p> <p>The land is identified as part of a strongly performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment forming part of the essential gap between Bushey and Watford. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>The site has low level 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 suitability of the site for employment development, as part of any mixed use allocation, is likely to be dependent on whether vehicular access can be safely achieved via Bushey Mill Lane, in the absence of any means of access from Otterspool Way or Stephenson Way.</p> <p>A commercial development on part or all of the site could have a significant and potentially greater impact on the surrounding landscape than residential development, and would require a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and</p> |
|--|---|

materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for commercial development.

Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location the site would be suitable, available and achievable for development subject to satisfactory resolution of existing constraints and appropriate design.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:238

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:317

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1039-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                        |                 |         |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | 203-205 Watling Street | <b>Postcode</b> | WD7 7AQ |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward     | <b>Parish</b>   | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                              |   |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.19 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Vacant land (former petrol filling station and Regency House) |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|---|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Commercial uses and residential uses. Railway line to rear.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Town centre, with nearby mixed use retail, other business and residential uses, but development densities are lower than might be expected in a typical town centre.<br><br>The site adjoins Radlett Gardens, a small public open space directly to the south, and is surrounded by the Radlett North Conservation Area to the north, south and west, although the site is excluded from the CA. |  |  |
| <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 (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | 18/0479/FUL - Demolition of existing building (Regency House) and removal of existing petrol filling station (Radlett Service Station). Erection of a part 3/ part 4 storey building to provide offices (Class B1) and ancillary flexible co-working, retail, communal and/ or leisure uses on the ground floor (classes A1, A2, B1, D1 or D2) with two levels of basement car parking, cycle parking, refuse storage and public realm improvements, Grant Permission |
|---|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Office                           |



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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <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>                                 | 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 14.20              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 2.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 8.70               |

## 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-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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | None.   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | Unknown, however given the past use of the site as a petrol filling station there is the potential for contamination.   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | No  |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | Site slopes steeply to rear, away from Watling Street. There is approximately a one-storey drop from Watling Street down to the level of the railway line behind. |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b> | Railway line adjoins the site to the rear   |
| <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> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available</b> | No  |                                    |     |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>   | Yes |                                    |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

### 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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is a former petrol filling station, so the site may be contaminated. It adjoins the railways line to the rear, which will need to be mitigated in the design of any office development.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk (surface water flooding) 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 for employment use, and a planning application has already been granted for an office building on the site, which indicates its suitability for the proposed use.</p> <p>The site is also potentially suitable for residential use. It is in a town centre location, with close proximity to public transport links, and it directly adjoins a recent development of residential flats on Watling Street to the north.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1041-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                 |                         |
|----------------|---|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | The Waterfront Business Park,<br>Elstree Road | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3BS                 |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree Ward                                  | <b>Parish</b>   | Elstree and Borehamwood |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                                  |         |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 1.91 | <b>Current Use<br/>Class(es)</b> | Offices |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|---------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Industrial to the west and south east with open space, including Aldenham Reservoir to the north east. |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Mainly agricultural land with pockets of industrial sites.   |  |  |
| <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> | HEL-1040-22, HEL503  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Relevant Planning history (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | 23/0547/FUL   Demolition of all existing buildings; Enabling works and site clearance; Construction of buildings (Use Class B2/B8 including ancillary office provision); associated highway, access, parking, landscaping and other ancillary works.   Caspian And Tasman House Elstree Road Elstree (Decision Pending) |
|---|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Employment (B2/B8)               |

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> | No                          |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>      | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>               | 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> | Yes   |
| <b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 19.10              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 5.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 1.30               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 0                  |

### Agricultural Land Classification

|                |      |
|----------------|------|
| Classification | Good |
|----------------|------|

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

| Parcel number   | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 5               | 0                      | 5                           | 2                           | 0                      |
| 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 |
|------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-66            | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| Stage 2 Comment  | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not 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 |   |
| Medium - High   | Medium - High                      | N/A  | N/A                    | Medium - High   | N/A   | N/A   |   |

**Officer Assessment**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt                             |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | No                                     |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | No                                     |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | No                                     |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b> | None                                   |
| <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> | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | None |                                    |     |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes  |                                    |     |

**Site Achievability:**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for B2/B8 development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------------|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|



**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> | 1-5 Years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site consists of office buildings which appear to be largely vacant. There is no evidence of contamination on site and there are no other major environmental constraints to development, although surface water flood risk is fairly extensive across parts of the site; as such, it 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>As the site currently consists of offices, being PDL land, it can be redeveloped under current policy for a development on a similar scale and of similar massing. However, the wider Green Belt parcel meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and is therefore not recommended for removal from the Green Belt.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL803

**Site location / address:**

|                |                    |                 |          |
|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Hilfield Farm      | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8DD |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward | <b>Parish</b>   |          |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |     |                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 2.5 | <b>Current Use<br/>Class(es)</b> | Commercial and Employment<br>Uses |
|----------------------------|-----|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring<br/>land uses</b>  | Residential (South-west), Agricultural (remaining)                           |  |  |
| <b>Character of<br/>surrounding<br/>area –<br/>landscape,<br/>townscape</b>              | Mainly agricultural land surrounding the site with access off Hilfield Lane. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a<br/>larger site?</b>                   | No   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including<br/>site reference if applicable</b> | N/A  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Relevant<br/>Planning history<br/>(include<br/>unimplemented<br/>permissions,<br/>non-confidential<br/>enforcement<br/>issues)</b> | <p>19/0264/PD56O   Change of use of agricultural building to Class B8 (storage and distribution).   Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD – Prior approval not required</p> <p>Change of use of buildings for commercial use (B8)<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD – TBD</p> <p>Retrospective proposal for regularisation of the removal of two single storey buildings with a replacement single storey commercial barn.<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD – TBD</p> <p>Replacement of commercial building (referred to as 'Building 5'). Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing).<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD – TBD</p> <p>Demolition of 2 x dilapidated single storey timber framed storage buildings and construction of replacement single storey building for commercial use.<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD – GP</p> <p>Retention of replacement commercial barn.<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD - GP</p> <p>Ref. No: 21/1664/FUL</p> <p>Demolition of 2 x storage units and erection of single storey warehouse to facilitate 5 x storage units and toilet facilities with associated parking.<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD - Refused</p> <p>Ref. No: 20/2147/FUL</p> <p>Continued use of units 4, 11, 20 and 21 at Hilfield Farm for storage use (Class B8).<br/>Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing).<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD - GP</p> <p>Ref. No: 20/1644/CLE</p> <p>Change of use of agricultural building to Class B8 (storage and distribution).<br/>Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD</p> |
|---|---|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>Ref. No: 19/0264/PD56O<br/> Development of an energy storage system for a temporary period of 20 years from date of first import/export of electricity to include a battery storage compound, electricity compound, fencing underground cabling and other associated works, hedgerow and tree planting and new access from Hilfield Lane. (Outline Application with all matters reserved)<br/> Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD<br/> Ref. No: 18/1587/OUT<br/> • Continued use of buildings 2, 3, 9, 13, 19 and Yards 7 &amp; 23 for individual commercial use. Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing)<br/> Hilfield Farm Hilfield Lane Aldenham Watford Hertfordshire WD25 8DD<br/> Ref. No: 17/2489/CLE   Received: Thu 21 Dec 2017   Validated: Tue 02 Jan 2018   Status: Decided</p> |
|--|--|

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

| Proposed Development Type             |
|---------------------------------------|
| Employment (Commercial or Industrial) |

**Location type (tick relevant box):**

| Green Belt | PDL |
|------------|-----|
| Yes        | Yes |

**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                           | No                   |
| SSSI                      | No                   | Sand & Gravel Safeguard Area  | No                   |
| Archaeological Sites      | No                   | Drinking Water Safeguard Area | No                   |
| Airport Safeguarding Area | Yes                  | Green Belt                    | Yes                  |

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

| Constraint                          | Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated) |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | N/A                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 2.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | No                   | N/A                |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | N/A                |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | N/A                |

#### 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 9                      | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration 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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| '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 |   |
| Medium - High   | Medium - High                      | N/A  | N/A                    | Medium - High   | N/A   | N/A   | Medium - High                             |

### Officer Assessment

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | No         |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | No         |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | No         |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</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> | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | None |                                    |     |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes  |                                    |     |

**Site Achievability:**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent commercial scheme applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------------|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The owner of the site has confirmed that the site is available, and can be considered for further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>The site's main constraint is that it is located in an isolated and relatively inaccessible location.</p> <p>The stage 1 Green Belt assessment states that the parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration and the parcel should not 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>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location the site would be suitable for development.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1038-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                      |                 |          |
|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | NAWT, Tylers Way     | <b>Postcode</b> | WD25 8WT |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Bushey St James Ward | <b>Parish</b>   |          |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                              |                |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|----------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 1.66 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Animal Shelter |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|----------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Industrial (West), Cemetery (South), Agricultural (North and East).                          |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Mainly open space and agricultural land surrounding the site with a wooded area to the west. |  |  |
| <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 (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | TP/11/1581   Demolition of existing animal welfare centre and construction of purpose designed animal welfare and re-homing centre, reception and headquarters building, staffing accommodation building, long term dog kennels and cat intake isolation building, isolation kennels building, dog intake isolation kennels/cat observation building and dog observation kennels/kitten block building and associated landscaping. (Application to extend time limit following approval of TP/08/0972 dated 27/08/2008)   National Animal Welfare Trust Tylers Way Watford WD25 8W 23/1731/FUL - Hybrid application for phased development; Full application for re-provision of National Animal Welfare Trust facilities including widening of existing access, car parking, and associated works. Demolition of all existing buildings upon completion of new facilities, and Outline permission for 4,264 sqm (GEA) of commercial buildings (Class B2 - General Industry / B8 - Warehousing and Distribution/ Class E (G) (iii) Industrial Processes, with ancillary offices) with all matters reserved other than Access. |
|---|---|

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

|  |
|--|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>                       |
| Employment (B8), Re-provision of Animal Welfare centre |

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>              | No  |



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 4.45               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 3.70               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 11.90              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 7.60               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 6.20               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | No                 |

### 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 14                     | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 2                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose 4 and does not meet purposes 1 or 3. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually). There is no obvious scope for sub-division within the parcel and it is recommended that it is not 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-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 |   |
| Low - Medium  | Low - Medium                       | Medium   | Medium                 | Medium  | Medium - High   | Medium - High                                 |   |

## Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt, Floodzone 2 and 3  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | No   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | The land slopes down quite steeply towards the M1.   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b> | The reprovision of the animal welfare centre within the site may be incompatible with the commercial uses proposed on the site, given that the former is a potentially sensitive noise receptor. |
| <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> | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No  |                                    |     |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes |                                    |     |

## Site Achievability:

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for B8 development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any |
|-------------------------------|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--|--|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

**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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The main constraint on the site is that it is located in Floodzone 2 and 3 and has surface water flooding which is addressed below. The site may also prove difficult to utilise for industrial development due to the topography of the land.</p> <p>The re-provision of the animal welfare facility within the site may not be compatible with certain commercial activities, given the potential for noise and disturbance to the animals.</p> <p>As the site is partly PDL it would be suitable under the current policy framework for development subject to impact on the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment identified much of the parcel within which the site is located as scoring moderately against purpose 2 (coalescence of settlements). However the site was not considered as part of the Stage 2 assessment. It did score moderately overall in Stage 1.</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 available and achievable for development subject to any environmental concerns around the siting of the Animal Welfare facility being addressed. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location the site may be suitable.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-519a-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                  |                 |         |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land at Bell Lane, London Colney | <b>Postcode</b> | AL2 1DE |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Shenley Ward                     | <b>Parish</b>   | Shenley |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                              |             |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 4.27 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Open fields |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | M25, Football Training Grounds, Residential, Electric Substation  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Semi-rural, flanked by Bell Lane and M25. Residential to the south consists of semi-detached dwellings. |  |  |
| <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 (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | 15/1287/FUL, Erection of a ground mounted solar photo-voltaic array and associated infrastructure, Refused. |
|---|---|

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

|  |
|--|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>                     |
| Employment (Class E, B2 and B8 Logistics Floorspace) |

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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>               | No  |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 28.30              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 14.80              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 8.80               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 0                  |

## Agricultural Land Classification

|                       |           |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| <b>Classification</b> | Very 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 49                     | Fail   | 0                      | 1                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>Although the parcel scores weakly against purpose 2, playing only a limited role in preventing the merging of settlements, it maintains a strong level of openness immediately to the south of London Colney, meeting purpose 3 moderately by preventing encroachment into open countryside.</p> <p>The parcel is not recommended for further consideration as there is no scope for sub-division to identify weaker performing areas and the parcel of a similar character throughout.</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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 |        |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|--------|
| Medium   | Medium                             | 0                      | 0                      | Medium  | 0  | 0   | Medium |

### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?  | Green Belt   |
| 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? | Close proximity to M25                                 |
| Are there any other environmental constraints?   | Some areas of surface water flood risk across the site |
| 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 / indications that the site may not actually be available | No  |                             |     |
| Is the Site available   | Yes |                             |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

### 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> | 1-10 Years |
|---|------------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site mainly comprises open grassland with a residential property in the north east part of the site. There are no other major environmental constraints.</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 situated within a strongly performing parcel of the Green Belt when assessed against the Purpose score in the Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment. It was not assessed as part of the stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. 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> |
|--|---|



**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0600-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                     |                 |                       |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Address</b> | Charleston Paddocks | <b>Postcode</b> | EN6 3ND               |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Shenley Ward        | <b>Parish</b>   | South Mimms and Ridge |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                                  |   |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 3.29 | <b>Current Use<br/>Class(es)</b> | Residential dwelling and associated outbuildings and driveway in south west corner. Remainder of site is paddock. |
|----------------------------|------|----------------------------------|---|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | A watercourse and the South Mimms motorway service station, including the Ramada Hotel, South Mimms Police Station and National Highways Regional Operations facility to the north. The Mimmshall Brook corridor, Wash Lane and agricultural land (arable) to the east.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Notwithstanding the adjacent motorway services, the site is located within a mixed commercial and agricultural area. To the east and south the landscape is gently undulating, mainly arable farmland sub-divided by established treed hedgerows. To the north and west however, development at the South Mimms Service Station and the M25 subtract from the otherwise rural location |  |  |
| <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 (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | 23/1049/OUT - Site clearance and demolition of existing structures and redevelopment for B8 (Warehousing and Distribution) use. Works to include: hard and soft landscaping, enabling works, drainage, services and associated infrastructure. (Outline Planning Application with all matters reserved).<br>Charleston Paddocks St Albans Road South Mimms Potters Bar Hertfordshire EN6 3ND<br>Status: Awaiting decision |
|---|---|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Warehouse and distribution       |

Location type (tick relevant box):

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b> | <b>PDL</b>    |
| Yes               | 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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>              | No  |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 8.43               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 2.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 31.80              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 7.90               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 4.50               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 36                     | Fail   | 0                      | 1                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores weakly against purpose 2 and moderately against purpose 3. The parcel does not meet purposes 1 or 4. The north of the parcel in particular is important for maintaining the overall openness of the countryside and preventing encroachment. However, an identified sub-area at South Mimms Services, south and west of Wash Lane, makes a limited contribution to this and to the wider purposes. It is recommended that this area 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-18                  | 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 |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |   |   |

| '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 |               |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|
| Medium - High                                  | Medium - High                      | 0                      | 0                      | Medium - High   | 0  | 0   | Medium - High |

### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt. SADM25 indicates that the site will be held in reserve for activities relating to the management, operation and maintenance of the strategic road network.<br><br>The applicant indicates that neither the motorway service provider, nor strategic road stakeholders took forward an interest in the site when it was marketed, demonstrating that it is not required for such uses. They also indicate that National Highways (then Highways England) have previously confirmed they did not have an interest in the Site. |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | Phase I Geoenvironmental & Geotechnical Site Assessment report indicates: Made Ground – Expected locally within the south-western portion of the Site to depths of approximately 1.0 m below ground level are considered the main sources of potential hazard  |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | Potential difficulty due to narrow road.   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | No. The site slopes gently downwards from north west to south east towards the watercourse and Wash Lane on the eastern boundary of the site.  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b> | None   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>   | Potential for greater increase in heavy goods traffic is greater for more 'standard' B8 uses such as storage and distribution. Road infrastructure in and around the services may not currently be sufficient for these proposals.   |
| <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 |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No  |                                    |     |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes |                                    |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are |
|-------------------------------|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|--|--|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

### 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> | 1-5 years |
|---|-----------|

### Conclusion:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site currently consists of a large dwelling/farmhouse, with associated buildings possibly for equestrian use, and a large paddock area. There are several potential environmental constraints, including a Local Wildlife Site to the east, possible air quality issues from the M25 and flooding in the eastern part of the site, the current submission omits the most severe area of flood risk from the site boundary.</p> <p>It is established that road infrastructure around the services requires upgrading and mitigation measures may be required prior to development of this site for more general B8 type uses.</p> <p>The site meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly in the stage 2 assessment and makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt and is 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 being promoted for commercial use and is not suitable for more residential development given its location adjoining South Mimms Services and other commercial uses.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were (1) the impact on the Green Belt and the current requirement for the site to be held in reserve for SRN-related operational development considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering commercial development and (2) the sequential and potentially exception test passed in relation to flood risk, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0805-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                    |                 |          |
|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Slade Farm         | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3AD  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward | <b>Parish</b>   | Aldenham |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                              |   |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|---|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 1.03 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Agricultural Buildings, some being used for commercial uses |
|------------------------|------|------------------------------|---|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Agricultural land from the north west to north east, Haberdsher's School grounds on the opposite side of Butterfly Lane to the south/south east. Businesses in neighbouring land still part of the farm to the west, including a car repair garage.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Rural feel, isolated from other development in the countryside. Larger open fields to the north give a feeling of openness with long views across the countryside. However, the forested area adjacent to the site across Butterfly Lane prevents the site from feeling completely open all the way around |  |  |
| <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> | None |
|---|------|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Employment                       |

Location type (tick relevant box):

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b> | <b>PDL</b>    |
| Yes               | Yes (Partial) |

**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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>             | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments</b>                               | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>           | Yes   |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | No                   | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 19                     | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 5                           | 3                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The Parcel meets Purposes 2 and 4 moderately, maintaining the historic setting of Radlett and the overall scale and openness of the gap between Radlett and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. It also plays a particularly important role in preventing encroachment into an area of particularly unspoilt countryside. There are no identified sub-areas that would score less strongly against the purposes and it is recommended that the site is not 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-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 |               |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---|--|---|---------------|
| Medium - High                                  | Medium - High                      | 0                      | 0                      | Medium - High   | 0  | 0   | Medium - High |

### Officer Assessment

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?  | Green Belt  |
| Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?             | Potentially some, as it is an existing yard including vehicle storage, with other ancillary farm uses/machinery |
| 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 | Yes |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | None |                             |     |
| Is the Site available   | Yes  |                             |     |

### Site Achievability:

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|------------------------|---|

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | None |
|--|------|

### 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> | 1-5 Years |
|---|-----------|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site currently consists of agricultural and commercial uses with areas of hardstanding in between. There are unlikely to be any significant environmental constraints, but a geo-environmental assessment may be required given existing uses.</p> <p>The site lies within the Green Belt and the stage 1 assessment scores the parcel that the site sits within as moderately performing against the overall Purpose score.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>The site is being promoted for commercial use and already has an element of this, alongside the original agricultural use. It is therefore partially suitable under the current policy framework and has permission for demolition and slightly larger rebuild of an existing unit. However, the remote location of the site may impact on the scale of commercial development which would be acceptable in planning policy terms. As such, to realise the full scope of the promotion, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in this location; amendments to the Green Belt boundary would not be a realistic option.</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1012-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                         |                 |          |
|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Pages Farm, Dagger Lane | <b>Postcode</b> | WD6 3AU  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward      | <b>Parish</b>   | Aldenham |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                              |  |
|------------------------|-------|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 10.03 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Agricultural and associated buildings and Cattery. |
|------------------------|-------|------------------------------|--|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Airfield including various associated buildings to the north (Elstree Aerodrome) agricultural/paddock to the east and north east, parkland (Aldenham Park) to the east, sewage works to the south and Reservoir (Hillfield) to the west, with the Bioproduct building |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Elstree Aerodrome directly to the north with various ancillary uses and the Bioproducts building complex directly to the south contribute to a semi-rural feel. The reservoir helps gives the impression of openness looking west away from the main buildings.       |  |  |
| <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> | TP/07/1570- Use of existing brick stables for use as a small cattery (Approved)<br>TP/05/0566- Removal of Condition 1 to allow retention of mobile home at Pages Farm (Approved)<br>TP/05/0130- Removal of Condition 1 to allow retention of mobile home (Withdrawn)<br>TP/02/1003- Retention of mobile home used in association with livery business (Approved)<br>TP/94/0362- Siting of one mobile home to provide staff accommodation (Approved)<br>TP/83/0268- Erection of 7 Loose Boxes, Tack Room and Office (Approved) |
|---|---|

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

|                                       |
|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b>      |
| Employment (Commercial or Industrial) |

Location type (tick relevant box):

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b> | <b>PDL</b>    |
| Yes               | Yes (Partial) |

**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>      | Yes                         | <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>    | No                          |
| <b>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>             | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments</b>                               | No  |
| <b>Scheduled Monuments within 750m of Site</b>           | Yes   |
| <b>Registered Battlefield</b>                            | No  |
| <b>Registered Battlefield within 750m of Site</b>        | No  |
| <b>Registered Park &amp; Gardens</b>                     | Yes   |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | No                   | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 7.50               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 1.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 0.30               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | No                   | 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 9                      | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration 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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 'Low-density' two/two and a half-                                       | '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 |   |
|   |                                    |  |                        |   |   |   |   |

|                      |               |   |   |               |   |   |               |
|----------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------|---|---|---------------|
| <b>storey houses</b> |               |   |   |               |   |   |               |
| Medium - High        | Medium - High | 0 | 0 | Medium - High | 0 | 0 | Medium - High |

### Officer Assessment

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | No         |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | No         |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | No         |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</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> | No |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No  |                                    |    |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes |                                    |    |

### Site Achievability:

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <p><b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b></p> | <p>None</p> |
|---|-------------|

**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>1-5 years</p> |
|--|------------------|

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The site consists of various farm related buildings with associated activities, such as stables, barns, temporary living accommodation as well as a cattery. Given these activities, it is possible that some on site contamination may exist, but aside from that there are no specific environmental constraints associated with the site.</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>In terms of the Green Belt, this parcel performs moderately against the main Purposes in the Green Belt Stage 1 Assessment - it has not been assessed as part of the stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt. The site is also in an isolated location in the countryside, not immediately adjacent to an existing settlement; the remote location may impact on the scale of commercial development which would be acceptable in planning policy terms. As such, to realise the full scope of the promotion, exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated in this location; amendments to the Green Belt boundary would not be a realistic option.</p> |
|---|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL816

**Site location / address:**

|                |  |                 |                 |
|----------------|--|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Address</b> | <b>Mercure Hotel and adjacent land</b> | <b>Postcode</b> | <b>WD25 8HU</b> |
| <b>Ward</b>    | <b>Bushey St James Ward</b>            | <b>Parish</b>   | <b>Aldenham</b> |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |       |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 7.30 | <b>Current Use</b> | Hotel |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Gypsy and Traveller site to the north, fast food restaurant to the north west, bound by the A41 to the south west, with a small group of industrial units to the south and the M1 to the east  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Area dominated by the main transport routes of the A41 and M1 which provide a certain level of enclosure to the site. Generally low density mixed, but mainly industrial development is prevalent, aside from the existing taller Mercure Hotel on site. |  |  |
| <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><b>Ref No: 21/1718/OUT</b><br/>Demolition and redevelopment to comprise B8 (Storage and Distribution) use of up to 14,865 sqm gross external, including ancillary offices. Associated car parking; creation of servicing areas, waste, refuse, cycle storage, lighting and substation; and for the laying out of the buildings; routes and open spaces within the development; and all associated works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; provision of attenuation infrastructure, engineering operations. (Outline Application with Access, Appearance, Landscape, Layout &amp; Scale Reserved)<br/><b>Decision: Grant Permission</b></p> <p><b>Ref No: 22/0853/EI1</b><br/>Request for screening opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment - Screening).</p> <p><b>Ref No: 22/1117/OUT</b><br/>Demolition and redevelopment to comprise B8 (Storage and Distribution) Use of up to 30,000 sqm gross external, including ancillary offices. In addition to the above the Development will include car parking; creation of servicing areas and provision of associated services, including waste, refuse, cycle storage, lighting and substation; and for the laying out of the buildings; routes and open spaces within the development; and all associated works and operations including but not limited to: demolition; earthworks; provision of</p> |
|----------------------------------|--|



|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | attenuation infrastructure, engineering operations. (Outline Application with Access, Appearance, Layout, Scale and Landscaping Matters Reserved).<br><b>Decision: Permission linked to S106</b> |
|--|--|

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

| Proposed Development Type                        |
|--|
| Mixed: (Class E, B2 and B8 Logistics Floorspace) |

**Location type (tick relevant box):**

| Green Belt | PDL |
|------------|-----|
| Yes        | Yes |

**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                           | No                   |
| SSSI                      | No                   | Sand & Gravel Safeguard Area  | No                   |
| Archaeological Sites      | No                   | Drinking Water Safeguard Area | No                   |
| Airport Safeguarding Area | Yes                  | Green Belt                    | Yes                  |

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

| Constraint                                 | Within Site Boundary (unless otherwise stated) |
|--|--|
| 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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 2.68               |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 1.10               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 17.40              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 6.30               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 4.30               |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 2.00               |

#### 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 14                     | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 2                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel scores moderately against purpose 2 and scores weakly against purpose and does not meet purposes 1 or 4. It plays an important role in preventing ribbon development along the A41, which would reduce the scale of the gap between North Bushey and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village (both physically and perceptually). There is no obvious scope for sub-division within the parcel and it is recommended that it is not 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-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 |   |
| Low - Medium  | Low - Medium                       | Medium   | Medium                 | Medium  | Medium - High   | Medium - High                                 | N/A                                       |

### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Potentially as the area is washed over Green Belt, but |
| 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? | Possible asbestos issue from demolition of hotel       |
| 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? | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | N/A |
|--|-----|

**Deliverability / Developability:**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed?</b> | 1-5 years |
|--|-----------|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site consists of the Mercure Hotel and a semi-open area of green space/woodland to the south east. There is also Hilfield Brook on the eastern boundary, but the flood risk to the site is limited from it.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment will be required to assess the fluvial flood risk in more detail, and an contamination assessment in relatio to the Mercure Hotel demolition.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment identified that the parcel meets purposes moderately overall. It did not form part of the Stage 2 Assessment.</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>An Industrial or commercial development (Use Class B2, E) would have a significant impact on the surrounding landscape, requiring a site specific Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prior to any allocation in the plan. This will identify potential impacts and set out required mitigation, including required areas of additional structure planting. Layouts, building heights and materials/colours will require further consideration, including potential use of a design code, to mitigate any potential landscape issues. Sites unable to adequately mitigate landscape impact are unlikely to be considered suitable for development.</p> <p>This site would not be currently suitable for the extent of the proposals submitted, although the massing of the hotel would be included in terms of replacement structures. For more extensive proposals, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with paragraph 136 of the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site would be suitable, available and deliverable land for employment purposes.</p> |
|--|--|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0507-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                  |                 |         |
|----------------|------------------|-----------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Kendal Hall Farm | <b>Postcode</b> | WD7 7LG |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Elstree Ward     | <b>Parish</b>   |         |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                              |  |
|------------------------|-------|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 61.72 | <b>Current Use Class(es)</b> | Part storage yard for Network Rail. Historic leisure use in association with old Country club, agricultural fields |
|------------------------|-------|------------------------------|--|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Rail line to the east, Kendal Wood to the west, school to the south west, agricultural fields to south, scrub and cricket pitch to north   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is a rural setting close to the southern edge of Radlett. The area largely comprises of fields in agricultural use. A school and the Tabard sports ground are located close by but the area is otherwise largely undeveloped. |  |  |
| <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 (include unimplemented permissions, non-confidential enforcement issues)</b> | None |
|---|------|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Specialist                       |

Location type (tick relevant box):

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| <b>Green Belt</b> | <b>PDL</b>    |
| Yes               | Yes (partial) |

**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>Airport Safeguarding Area</b> | Yes                         | <b>Green Belt</b>                       | Yes                         |

**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>           | Yes   |
| <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                         | Within Site Boundary | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | Yes                  | 33.00              |
| Floodzone 3                        | Yes                  | 29.98              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | Yes                  | 38.37              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | Yes                  | 19.44              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | Yes                  | 10.26              |
| Reservoir Flooding                 | Yes                  | 30.04              |

## 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 13                     | Pass  | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 1                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | <p>The parcel performs moderately against purposes 1 and 2, and strongly against purpose 3. It makes a weak contribution to purpose 4 due to the limited linkages between the Green Belt and Radlett's historic core. However, there are no readily recognisable sub-areas which could be recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>In particular, the north of the parcel has a very open and rural character and has limited visual interaction with the surrounding settlement. This area plays an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside, and maintains the overall scale of the gap between Radlett and Borehamwood.</p> |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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                             | Medium - High                 | Medium - High                 | Medium - High  | High  | High   | 0 |

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>  | Green Belt  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination, pollution, poor ground conditions or hazards?</b>             | No  |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>   | Applicant states access would be available via private road off Watling Street. Details have not been provided. |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>  | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours' which would be unsuitable in relation to the proposed use?</b> | Rail line runs along the eastern boundary of the site. Mast in north east corner of site                        |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>   | Adjoins Kendal Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west.  |
| <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 |
| Ownership constraints / indications that the site may not actually be available | No  |                                    |    |
| <b>Is the Site available</b>  | Yes |                                    |    |

### Site Achievability:

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable</b> | The site has been promoted for employment development on the basis that this would be achievable. The site promoter has not indicated that there are there any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development; recent employment applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites have not presented viability as a barrier to development. However, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. |
|-------------------------------|---|



### Overcoming Constraints

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints / Any other comments / Summary</b> | Adjoins Kendal Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west. |
|--|--|

### 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> |  |
|---|--|

### Conclusion:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Notwithstanding its Green Belt designation, the site itself is not subject to any substantial environmental constraints. However the proximity of the rail line immediately to the east, the telecommunications mast in the north east corner, and flood zone at the southern edge would limit the developable area and require mitigation.</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>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development, forming part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as strongly performing, maintaining the gap between Borehamwood and Radlett. The possibility of providing adequate access to the site has not yet been demonstrated.</p> <p>For the purposes of the HELAA, the site can be considered suitable were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and access issues were to be satisfactorily resolved. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.</p> |
|--|---|