

**SHENLEY PARISH COUNCIL COMMENTS ON THE LANDSCAPE STATEMENT OF
COMMON GROUND AGREED BETWEEN GRIGGS (OPTIONS) LTD AND
HERTSMERE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

APPLICATION REFERENCE: P22/0971/OUT

APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/N1920/W/22/331119

SITE ADDRESS AND DESCRIPTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT:

Land Adjacent to 52 Harris Lane, Shenley.

Outline planning application for the erection of up to 37 dwellings with associated landscaping and open space to include access from Harris Lane (Outline Application with Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale Reserved).

1. This document has been prepared on behalf of Shenley Parish Council. It identifies the extent to which the Parish Council agrees and disagrees with matters stated in the Landscape Statement of Common Ground.

MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES AGREE

The submitted LVIA

2. Paragraphs 3 – 6 are agreed.
3. As to paragraph 7, the Parish Council accepts that the LVIA has identified many of the key representative viewpoints from which the Appeal Site should be considered but has additionally identified viewpoint 8 in the evidence of Louise Hooper as a viewpoint which should be considered.
4. Paragraph 8 is agreed.

Designations

5. Paragraphs 9 – 11 are agreed.

Visibility

6. The walking route for the Inspector should include:

- Footpath Shenley 17 to the southwest of Crossoaks Farm
- A circuit of the Harris Lane Playing Fields to include properties in Hillcrest Road, Mead Road, Cage Pond Road and King Edward Road with views towards the site and the view of High Canons
- Rectory Lane and entrance into the playing fields

7. These are shown in Appendix 1 to this document.

8. The walking route need not include London Road or Mimms Lane from which there are no views of the site.

Context

9. Paragraphs 13 – 14 are agreed.

Green Belt

10. The Parish Council agrees with the LPA's position in respect of green belt set out in the landscape statement of common ground. Harm by reason of inappropriate development is addressed in the proof of evidence of Brigid Taylor at 6.3 – 6.6, harm to openness is addressed at 6.7 – 6.16 and harm to the purposes of the green belt including consideration of the green belt assessments is addressed at 6.17 – 6.32. The conclusion on green belt harm is set out at 6.33 – 6.35.

HELAA 2019

11. Paragraphs 23 – 25 are agreed.

Direct Impacts

12. Paragraphs 26 – 28 are agreed save that it is considered that the hedgerow which will be lost has value by virtue of it being of a significant age and that new planting will not (at least in the short to medium term) directly compensate for that loss.

MATTERS ON WHICH THE PARTIES DISAGREE

13. It is agreed that the matters in paragraphs 29 and 30 are in dispute between the parties.

APPENDIX 1 – WALKING ROUTE

