

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL152

Site location / address:

Address	Lyndhurst Farm	Post Code	WD6 5NF
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Shenley

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	5.2	Current Use	Derelict landscape contractors yard, commercial turf plantation with no active use
----------------------------	-----	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Open fields to all sides except the south east edge of the site adjoins the northern edge of Borehamwood. Residential frontage to opposite side of Green Street to the east. Gas transfer station to North East.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	To the south of the site is the built up area of Borehamwood, whereas the character in other directions is largely open fields in agricultural use, with Shenley located at some distance to the north.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Adjoining land to the west owned by Wood Hall Estate has been submitted to the Call for Sites		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL359		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>16/0330/OUT Construction of new garden centre and retention of existing landscape contractors yard (WITHDRAWN);</p> <p>TP/02/0269 Demolition of existing buildings followed by construction of one chalet bungalow, one detached tack room including two residential units, one barn, one tractor shed, 23 stables and one store. (REFUSED)</p> <p>TP/00/1040 processing and recycling of existing inert historical material for a temporary period expiring on 3rd August 2001 (Consultation from HCC) (RAISE OBJECTIONS); TP/99/0394 Use of site as waste transfer station (Consultation by HCC) (WITHDRAWN)</p>
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.0
Floodzone 3	0.0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	3.0
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.9
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.5
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0.0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0.0

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
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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-44	Pass	5+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
Recommended	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	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt / Archaeological area
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Yes - Small isolated areas of fuel spills from historic use as a landscape contractor's yard.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	An overhead power line is located at the Northern boundary of the site, with a pylon straddling the site boundary. There is also an adjacent gas transfer station which may limit development.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	The site adjoins Organ Hall Pastures Local Wildlife Site to the SW.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements (over and above CIL) may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
--	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	The site adjoins Organ Hall Pastures Local Wildlife Site to the South West.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
3.9	30dph	40dph
	103	137

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:135</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 25</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:179</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 69</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is located adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site, and is also within 750 metres of a Listed Building, however these constraints alone are not considered to deem the site unsuitable for development.</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 site is located at the southern end of parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing, although this part of the parcel is less important for preventing coalescence between Borehamwood, Radlett and Shenley. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site is not considered suitable other than for appropriate development within the parameters set out in paragraph 154 of the NPPF regarding 'limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land'. It is noted however that previous buildings located on the site have been demolished and so there is no scope for development to fall within this definition.</p> <p>However, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable. Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:103</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:137</p>
---	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL160

Site location / address:

Address	Elstree Gate	Post Code	WD6 1JD
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.42	Current Use	Car Park and offices. This is developed land on the northern edge of the commercial area of Borehamwood.
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Warehouses/ Offices. Office block across Elstree Way to the north has been converted to residential. There is a hotel across Warwick Road to the east of the site		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located in a built-up employment area of Borehamwood. The site is surrounded by B and E Class employment uses on the south side of Elstree Way.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	16/0530/FUL. External works to include new entrance door and canopy. (GRANTED). 15/2224/FUL. External works to Unit 3 to include new entrance door and canopy. (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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	Yes
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	31.81
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	12.1
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Designated Employment Area
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Possibly - Potentially due to its location within a major employment area. Existing B/E class office and industrial uses surround the site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	No

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	there to be any abnormal or other costs which would have the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
--	------

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Transitional	Urban	Very high	Urban Brownfield Flats

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.21	30dph	40dph
	172	304

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:172</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 62</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:304</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 194</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and a hotel and loss of employment land is currently resisted.</p> <p>Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use. The introduction of residential uses would potentially adversely affect the ability of existing neighbouring businesses to operate, under the 'agent of change' principle.</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 not suitable for residential development under current policy, nor when taking into account the character and operational integrity of the surrounding employment area.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers: 0</p>
---	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL166

Site location / address:

Address	1 Elstree Way	Post Code	WD6 1RN
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.66	Current Use	Vacant. Previously warehouse/production unit (B8) with ancillary offices.
------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Employment and a garage adjoin the site. The Elstree Screen Arts College (Formally Elstree Technical College) is opposite, across Elstree Way to the north.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is within the built-up Employment area within Borehamwood. It is surrounded by B Class employment uses to the east and south. Elstree Way Corridor housing area is located to the west of Manor Way. Corner site occupied by 4-storey modern office building and warehouse.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL163		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>18/2111/PD56. Change of use from office (Use Class B1) to residential (Use Class C3) to create 54 apartments. PD56 - Refused Prior Approval</p> <p>18/1758/PD56. Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 54 studio apartments. Withdrawn</p> <p>8/1550/PD56. Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) to create 69 studio flats. Withdrawn</p> <p>18/0922/CLE. Continued use as offices B1(a) (Certificate of Lawful Development Existing). Refuse to Grant Certificate</p> <p>17/1366/PD56. Change of use from office (B1) to residential (C3) (69 studio flats). (REFUSED).</p>
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3) / Mixed Use

DRAFT

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	26.56
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4.04
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2.34
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Designated Employment Area
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Yes - Potentially due to location within a major employment area. Existing office and industrial uses surround the site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes although any residential element would be subject to more detailed assessment in terms of distances from existing employment uses

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.56	30dph	40dph
	69	114

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:69</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 9</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:114</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 4</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is located within the designated Elstree Way Employment Area where the adjoining uses are commercial and a hotel and loss of employment land is currently resisted. Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that residential development of the whole the site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use.</p> <p>The introduction of residential uses across the site would potentially adversely affect the ability of existing neighbouring businesses to operate, under the ‘agent of change’ principle. However, there may be scope to develop along a small part of the Manor Way and Elstree Way frontage without compromising the operational integrity of the industrial estate.</p> <p>Should the designation of the site and surrounding area change then the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</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>
--	---

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

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

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL167

Site location / address:

Address	Manor Point	Post Code	WD6 1EU
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.91	Current Use	Units 1 and 2 are currently used for a laundry and packing warehouse for books and magazines with an ancillary kitchen and dining facilities. Unit 3 is used for a pharmaceutical warehouse.
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Industrial site, warehouses, residential to the south of the site.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Built-up urban area. Employment area. Surrounded by employment uses to east and north. Elstree Way Corridor housing area to the west of Manor Way. Modern residential development in Armstrong Close to the south.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	Unit 1: TP/05/0648. Proposed electricity sub-station screened with stained timber boarding. (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3) / Mixed Use

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	19.19
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.04
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.01
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Designated Employment Area
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Yes - Potentially due to location within a major employment area. Existing B/E class office and industrial uses surround the site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes although any residential element would be subject to more detailed assessment in terms of distances from existing employment uses

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes - relating to the part they own (units 1 and 2). Unit 3 is in separate ownership	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	Unit 3 is under separate ownership. No information submitted since the original promotion to indicate the site in its entirety is available.		
Is the Site available?	Partly.		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.77	30dph	40dph
	109	192

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:109</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 109</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:192</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 82</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	---

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is located within a designated employment area where the adjoining uses are commercial and a hotel and loss of employment land is currently resisted. Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, the nature of many of the surrounding uses is such that the entire site is not, in isolation, suitable for residential use.</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 introduction of residential uses across the site would potentially adversely affect the ability of existing neighbouring businesses to operate, under the ‘agent of change’ principle. However, there may be scope to develop part of the site on the Manor Way and Durham Road frontages without compromising the operational integrity of the industrial estate.</p> <p>However, since the site was originally promoted, there has been no further indication that Unit 3 would be available and presently the site is occupied in its entirety by ClipFine. As such the site is not considered to be available for development.</p>
---	---

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

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

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL204

Site location / address:

Address	Land at Stangate Crescent/ Barnet by-pass	Post Code	WD6 2PP
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.26	Current Use	Grass verge and vegetation forming buffer between housing in Wansford Park and Stangate Crescent and A1
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential and a school		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Residential area of Borehamwood and Saffron Green Primary School adjoin the site to the west. A1 dual carriageway directly adjoining to the east.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
--------------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	No

Constraints Check

Constraint	Within Site Boundary	Constraint	Within Site Boundary
AQMA	Yes	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	Yes
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	5.0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	8.0
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3.0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	3.0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0.0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0.0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Yes – the site is Minor Amenity Land under current policy SADM36
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Proximity of A1 major dual carriageway. Removal of trees and vegetation which currently forms a barrier between existing residential area and the A1 likely to increase noise and air pollution to existing and proposed housing
Are there any other environmental constraints?	None
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	No. Due to the sites use as amenity land, it's extremely narrow width and proximity to the A1 Motorway, the site is not considered suitable

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	there to be any abnormal or other costs which would have the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
--	------

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.07	30dph	40dph
	64	90

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:64</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 4</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:90</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 30</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?

The site is a narrow ribbon of land stretching along the A1 dual carriageway. due to the narrow width of the site, and close proximity to the road, there is unlikely to be an unsuitable level of amenity for future residents due to traffic noise and pollution. Given the shape of the site, there is little potential for mitigation.

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.

Due to this constraint, the site is not considered suitable for its proposed use, and will not progress to site selection stage.

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

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

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL209a

Site location / address:

Address	Land North of Barnet Lane / West of Furzehill Road	Post Code	WD6 2HG
Ward	Borehamwood Hillside Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	12.63	Current Use	Grazing Horses. Much of the site is open field with mature trees around the edge and dispersed across the site. The western end of the site is rougher grassland with more trees across the area.
------------------------	-------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential to the north and east, A41 to the south, Woodcock Hill Village Green to the west		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	This is open land on the edge of built up area. The residential areas to the north and east of the site largely comprise semi-detached housing to the north, with some terraced housing to the east.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No. adjoining land is Woodcock Hill Village Green. Submission also made for an additional site to the west in same ownership (HEL209b) but which does not physically adjoin this site.		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	23/0937/OUT Outline planning application for the erection of up to 220 dwellings, including 50% affordable housing, self-build/custom-build plots, green infrastructure (including public open space, play area, landscape planting and sustainable drainage systems), ecological enhancements to Woodcock Hill Village Green, new multi-modal vehicular access from Furzehill Road, emergency, pedestrian and cycle access from Carrington Avenue, and associated works and development. (Outline Application to include Access, with all other matters reserved). Awaiting Decision TP/80/0797 outline application for housing and open space (REFUSED)
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3), Option for school site, health facilities or extra care facilities

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	2.84
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.18
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
12	Pass	3+	1	3	0	Moderate
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel performs moderately against Green Belt purposes 1 and 3 and more weakly against purpose 2. The parcel forms only a very small part of the gap between Borehamwood and London (Edgware) and makes a limited contribution to preventing coalescence. However, the parcel is very open and, particularly the western area, is rural in character. It plays an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside on the south side of Borehamwood and is not recommended for further consideration.					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-50	Pass	1	1	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	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	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt. The western part of site is local wildlife site Woodcock Hill Fields
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 western and south western part of site is Village Green and local wildlife site Woodcock Hill Fields so would not be able to be built on
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Wildlife site most likely not suitable for development.

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	No. Tenant on short term lease		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	The western and south western part of site is Village Green and local wildlife site Woodcock Hill Fields so would not be able to be built on
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
5.41	30dph	40dph
	292	411

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:292</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 182</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:411</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 26</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The western side of the site forms part of Woodcock Village Green and is also a Local Wildlife Site (Woodcock Hill Fields) supporting a range of grassland and scrub species. A TPO (387/1997) covers a large number of trees across the site including mainly individual Oaks as well as various groups and woodland areas containing a variety of species.</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 makes up a large proportion of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel identified in the Stage 1 assessment. The parcel was identified as playing an important role in preventing encroachment into the countryside south of Borehamwood. However, the Stage 2 assessment recommended further consideration of the site (only in conjunction with the adjoining sub-area to the west)</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, none of the site would be suitable for development due to its Green Belt designation. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, part of the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:292</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:411</p>
--	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL217

Site location / address:

Address	Manor Place	Post Code	WD6 1WG
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.55	Current Use	Industrial warehouse units
------------------------	------	--------------------	----------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Commercial premises to the north south and east, with residential properties to the southeast and west		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	<p>The site adjoins the edge of a designated employment area to the east characterised by purpose built premises in a variety of commercial uses. It lies within the EWCAAP area where residential led regeneration is being encouraged.</p> <p>The site lies within Opportunity Area 12 where residential development not exceeding 2.5m high, of a density between 50 and 80 dwellings per ha is encouraged.</p>		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>TP/77/0459. Continued use as offices and stores. (DETERMINED).</p> <p>TP/81/0799. Erection of 2 warehouse units and 2 industrial units. (DETERMINED).</p> <p>TP/82/0521. Continued use of structure on roof for experimental purposes. (DETERMINED).</p> <p>TP/84/0015. Change of use of Unit B from light industrial to warehouse. (DETERMINED).</p> <p>TP/84/0737. Change of use from light industry to warehouse. (DETERMINED).</p> <p>22/1597/FUL. Retrospective change of use from B8 storage and distribution to B2 general industrial to include insertion of chimney flues to roof structure(retrospective application). GRANTED</p>
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

DRAFT

Location type (tick relevant box):

Greenbelt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Greenbelt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	9.88
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.18
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No - access from Manor Way
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	The site adjoins commercial premises but it lies within an area identified as an opportunity area for residential development in the EWCAAP
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?	No
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.47	30dph	40dph
	66	116

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:66</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:116</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site comprises 4 commercial units in one building, located at the edge of the EWCAAP area where it adjoins the designated Elstree Way Employment Area. Mitigation against disturbance from neighbouring uses will be required.</p> <p>The site lies within EWCAAP Opportunity Area 12 for residential development. Access is available off Manor Way.</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 suitable, available and achievable for residential development, and can progress to site selection stage.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:66</p>
--	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:116

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL341

Site location / address:

Address	Allum Lane West	Post Code	WD6 3NN
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	2.29	Current Use	Limited use for storage and grass cutting
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Cemetery to the south, residential to the east, road and open fields to the north, Elle Dani stables to the west		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	This is an edge of urban areavillage location which is largely rural in character despite its relative proximity to the built-up area of Elstree and Borehamwood.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	The site is close to other sites submitted to the Call for Sites but does not now physically adjoin since changes to these original submissions have been made.		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	17/1271/CLE Confirmation of existing sheds and surrounding land within the application site for use as non-agricultural purposes(REFUSED); 17/1272/CLE Retention of existing sheds. Certificate of Lawful Development (Existing) (GRANT)
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	3.46
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.33
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.02
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
8	Pass	3+	5	3	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	Although the parcel scores strongly against purpose 2, there are two identified areas which might score less strongly if considered alone:					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-52	Pass	3	5	2	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-eastern part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	High	High	High	High	High	N/A

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'?	The cemetery adjoins the site but is not necessarily an issue. The site is close to the existing household waste recycling centre civic amenities site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Archaeological 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?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	The storage use is by the landowner and the grass cutting by a third party under licence- the applicant states that the licensed use can be ceased immediately.		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.72	30dph	40dph
	93	131

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:93</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 33</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:131</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 21</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site has been promoted independently of other land parcels nearby to the south of Allum Lane. The land adjoins the cemetery and an archaeological site and is relatively close to the household waste recycling centre, for which mitigation may be required.</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>Development of the wider site would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework forming part of a highly performing parcel under the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the far north eastern part of the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further but that would not include this particular site.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the residential part of the site could be suitable, available and achievable.</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:93

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:131

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL347

Site location / address:

Address	Wrotham Park Land off Cowley Hill	Post Code	WD6 5NA
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Shenley

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	65.39	Current Use	Agriculture, stables and open fields
------------------------	-------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	School and residential to south, residential to west (across Cowley Hill), open countryside and farmland with occasional cottages to north and east
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Site is located adjacent to the built up area of Borehamwood, with an urban area to south and west, and gently undulating open countryside and farmland to remaining sides.
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Site adjoins Well End Lodge
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL369

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>17/2493/OUT Outline planning application for the provision of a 2 form entry primary school to include access (GRANTED);</p> <p>17/2494/OUT: Outline planning application for the erection of 58 dwellings to include access and layout. (GRANTED)</p> <p>20/2141/FUL. Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 16 dwellings together with associated parking, amenity space and access from Cowley Hill.(Amended plans and Description - increase in number of units). (GRANTED)</p>
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3), School, play areas, open space

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5.83
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.25
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.54
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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-46	Pass	3	1	3	0	Moderate
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but southern part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Southern part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No, although one of the proposed access points is on Potters Lane which is narrow.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Pylons and power lines cross the site
Are there any other environmental constraints?	The site adjoins local wildlife sites Birchwood (Silver Hill) and Silver Hill Woodland strip and Wood next to Well End Road
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	The site adjoins local wildlife sites Birchwood (Silver Hill) and Silver Hill Woodland strip and Wood next to Well End Road
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
25.83	30dph	40dph
	891	1188

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:891</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 350</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1188</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 440</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 550</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>There are three Local Wildlife Sites adjacent to northern boundary (Wood next to Well End Road) and eastern boundary (Birch Wood and Silver Hill Woodland). Cowley Farm buildings are locally listed with locally listed Well End lodge immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary. A significant number of watercourses run across the site which slopes from north east to south west.</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>Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the southern part of the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be considered suitable, achievable and available.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:891</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1188</p>
--	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL359

Site location / address:

Address	Land north of Stapleton Road	Post Code	WD6 5
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Shenley

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	14.72	Current Use	Agricultural
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	--------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Open fields to all sides except the southern edge of the site which adjoins the northern edge of Borehamwood		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	This is an edge of settlement location. To the south is the built up area of Borehamwood whereas the character in other directions is largely open fields in agricultural use.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Adjoining land to the north east has been submitted to the Call for Sites		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL152		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

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

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
30	Pass	3+	3	5	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. It does not meet purpose 4. There is however scope for sub-division in the north-west of the parcel adjoining Radlett. This area, bounded by dense wooded to the east and south, the edge of Radlett to the west and Shenley Road to the north, is relatively small in scale and makes only a limited contribution to the gap between Radlett and Shenley (purpose 2). Furthermore, it is visually more connected to the settlement edge and has a limited relationship with the wider countryside to the east. It is recommended that this subarea is considered further.					
	0					

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-44	Pass	5+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
Recommended	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	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No although the only vehicular access would be off Stapleton Road
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	An overhead power line is located at the northern boundary of the site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	The majority of the site is Local Wildlife Site Organ Hall Pastures. The Wildlife site needs an up to date assessment based on information submitted with by the site promoter.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes subject to any de-designation of the Local Wildlife Site.

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	The majority of the site is Local Wildlife Site Organ Hall Pastures. The Wildlife site needs an up to date assessment based on information submitted with by the site promoter.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
9.57	30dph	40dph
	373	498

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:373</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 263</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:498</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 113</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The majority of the site is designated as Local Wildlife Site (Organ Hall Pastures). An ecology assessment submitted on behalf of the site owner concludes that the ecological value of the majority of the site is moderate, due to its use as arable land, although there are recognised to be some valuable habitats. Further consultation with HCC ecology would be needed to corroborate this view.</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 located at the southern end of a parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to a detailed full review technical assessment of the Habitat Survey and PEAs (which would need to be updated as it was previously undertaken in 2017), the residential part of the site could be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:373</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:498</p>
---	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL371

Site location / address:

Address	Old Haberdashers Sports Ground	Post Code	WD6 4PY
Ward	Borehamwood Brookmeadow Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	4.13	Current Use	Sports Ground (private)
------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The area is residential, characterised by terraced and flatted development		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	16/0341/FUL 170 residential units (WITHDRAWN)
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	26.48
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	4.06
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.14
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	The site is designated open space under SADM34
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?	No

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	No	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	Yes		
Is the Site available?	Unknown. The site has been promoted by the leaseholder rather than freeholder of the site (Hertsmere Borough Council)		

Site Achievability:

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

	there to be any abnormal or other costs which would have the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.54	30dph	40dph
	100	139

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:100</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 100</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:139</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 29</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?

There are no significant physical constraints to development on the site: several trees close to the boundary are protected; access would be available from Croxdale Road which runs along the southern edge of the site; design would need to take into account the impact on adjoining residential properties.

The site is located within the urban area of Borehamwood where residential development would be an acceptable use in policy terms. It is however a designated Open Space under policy SADM34. Whilst the application has been submitted by developers on behalf of the leaseholder, the Council as freehold owner has not indicated that the site would be available

The site is currently occupied by the Old Haberdashers Association and apart from the question of whether the Council as freeholder would release the site, there is a requirement both from the OHA and under Policy CS19 for a suitable replacement sports ground to be identified. An alternative site has been submitted as part of the call for site submission, however it has not been established that this site would be suitable for this use. The availability of the site is not therefore established.

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 cannot currently be considered available for development and is therefore not suitable available and achievable under the current HELAA methodology. Given that the site's deliverability is reliant on changes to the policy framework, the timescale for this site is currently unknown. Were development to be allowed on this site, it is likely that the requirement to incorporate public open space into a scheme would reduce this capacity significantly.

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

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

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL388

Site location / address:

Address	The Point Borehamwood	Post Code	WD6 1EH
Ward	Borehamwood Hillside Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.88	Current Use	Leisure uses - bingo, cinema, gym. Car park on roof.
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Retail with flats above to the north, All Saints church and graveyard to the east, residential to the south and west.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is at the edge of Borehamwood town centre; a mix of uses and forms of development characterise the area including retail, offices, residential and community facilities.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	As the freehold owner of The Point, HBC could potentially seek to bring forward the site with the adjacent 80 Shenley Road (former Natwest Bank) which was recently acquired by Hertsmere BC.		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3) / Mixed Use

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	4.75
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.34
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Existing public car park would need to be replaced in any development
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No. Car park is currently accessed off Furzehill Road
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	No
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the residential-led development of a site in Borehamwood town centre is likely to be viable and achievable subject to the mix of uses being sought on the site and any on or off-site infrastructure requirements. There would be unlikely to be any BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
-------------------------	--

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.75	30dph	40dph
	121	227

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:121</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 11</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:227</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 117</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	---

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is mostly located within the Borehamwood town centre boundary where residential development could be an acceptable use in policy terms. The site is however currently occupied by the Reel cinema, Gala Bingo, and a private gym which are important town centre leisure facilities; the reprovion of leisure facilities would be likely sought on the site as part of any mixed use redevelopment.</p> <p>The site is surrounded by existing development, including residential, retail, and All Saints Church and graveyard. The adjacent 80 Shenley Road building has now been purchased by HBC and this offers the potential to bring forward a more comprehensive scheme in the future, potentially increasing the scope to optimise both the use of the site and the viability of any comprehensive redevelopment. Whilst there are no significant physical constraints to development, however, the relationship to adjoining uses and the need to retain public parking provision would limit the development options available.</p> <p>The site has flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The site would be suitable for a residential-led development under the current policy framework subject to compliance with Local Plan town centre policies.</p>
---	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:121

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:227

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL506

Site location / address:

Address	South of Allum Lane ADJ to HEL341	Post Code	WD6 3NL
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.44	Current Use	Parcels G and D are a former caravan park, now unused and overgrown. Parcel E is garden to residential properties. HEL341 (parcel A) is considered separately under its own assessment
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Recycling centre, cemetery, Elle Dani equestrian centre, open fields. Bordered by Allum Lane to the north		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Area is in the gap between Borehamwood/Elstree and Elstree village to east and west, with open countryside to the north and south.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL393		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>TP/89/0966 Change of use from former mobile home site to tree contractors depot and erection of temporary office/equipment store;</p> <p>23/1525/E11 Request for screening opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment - Screening). EIA not required.</p>
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential, Cemetery extension on HEL341

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0.67
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	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
8	Pass	3+	5	3	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	Although the parcel scores strongly against purpose 2, there are two identified areas which might score less strongly if considered alone:					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-52	Pass	3	5	2	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-eastern part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	High	High	High	High	High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	Sites are in a variety of ownerships. Access in the area of the recycling centre is in an area that suffers from surface flooding and is also sloping.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Recycling centre. Telecommunications tower.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Archaeological area (parcel B and part of A – HEL341)
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Unknown	Is there developer interest?	Unknown
Ownership constraints?	The parcels making up the area covered by the submitted masterplan are in a variety of ownerships, including Hertsmere Borough Council, Housing Association, and privately owned.		
Is the Site available?	Unknown		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Archaeological area (parcel B and part of A – HEL341)
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.22	30dph	40dph
	66	93

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:66</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:93</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 33</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<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>It is unknown whether the site is available for development, and therefore cannot progress to site selection stage.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0</p>
--	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL507

Site location / address:

Address	Kendal Hall Farm	Post Code	WD7 7LG
Ward	Aldenham East Ward	Parish	Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	5.62	Current Use	Part storage yard for Network Rail. Historic leisure use in association with old Country club, field
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	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		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	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.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Care Village, Special Needs Housing for Young Adults, Market Housing), Nuserly School

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	2
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	5
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	7

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
13	Pass	3+	3	4	1	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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.					

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 - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	Medium - High	High	Medium - High

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	Applicant states access would be available via private road off Watling Street. Details have not been provided.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Rail line runs along the eastern boundary of the site. Mast in north east corner of site
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Adjoins Kendal Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west. Some flood risk across parts of the site albeit primarily at lower levels of risk.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Adjoins Kendal Wood Local Wildlife Site to the west. Some flood risk across parts of the site albeit primarily at lower levels of risk.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
4.22	30dph	40dph
	133	177

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:133</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 23</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:177</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 67</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<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. although it has been indicated by the promoter that this would be via an existing private road off Watling Street. This would likely need to be upgraded.</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</p>
--	---

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.
Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:133

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:177

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL514

Site location / address:

Address	Radlett Park Golf Course	Post Code	WD6 3AB
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	75.02	Current Use	North is pasture, centre is golf course, southern part vacant scrub
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Farms and schools to west, farmland to north, railway line to east, open space, spinney and residential to south east, allotments to south west		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located in the area between Watling Street and the railway west of Borehamwood. The site is largely rural in character with farms/equestrian facilities and schools but otherwise mainly given over to agriculture and, in the central part, a go		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>TP/87/1337 change of use from agricultural to use as part of a golf course (REFUSED);</p> <p>TP/88/1207 alteration and extension of existing course and construction of new 18 hole Golf course (REFUSED); TP/09/0751 Construction of new two storey clubhouse & new covered driving range (GRANTED);</p> <p>TP/04/1164 Erection of a 1256 square metre single storey "Dutch Barn" for exercising and schooling of horses in wet weather (REFUSED); TP/08/1822 Demolition of existing and construction of new two storey clubhouse. Part demolition and refurbishment of existing driving range (GRANTED)</p> <p>15/1268/FUL Demolition of the existing equestrian complex and redevelopment of the site to comprise 14 new dwellings (APPEAL REFUSED);</p> <p>16/0157/FUL Demolition of the existing equestrian complex and redevelopment of the site to comprise 14 new dwellings (WITHDRAWN);</p>
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type

Residential, Community Facilities/public open space/primary school

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	33
Floodzone 3	15
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	10
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	5
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	20
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	25

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
13	Pass	3+	3	4	1	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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.					

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-53	Pass	5+	3	2	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
Recommended	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	Medium - High

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt, Local Wildlife Sites along the railway line (Pasture by Railway, Borehamwood and Parkfields Open Space)
Is there evidence of land contamination?	None indicated although attention is drawn to the fact that there is a man-made golf course in the centre of the site
Are there any access difficulties?	Access via existing access to Golf Club and South Medburn Farm off Watling Street – may need widening. Highway works may be required in order to improve the junction.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	The mainline railway runs up the eastern side of the site. Protection from noise and vibration would be required should the site be developed.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Some significant areas of flood risk across parts of 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?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

	and above CIL, but subject to built out rates and any phasing proposed being realistic, the site is considered to be achievable.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Some significant areas of flood risk across parts of the site
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
37.51	30dph	40dph
	1294	1725

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:1294</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 440</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 550</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1725</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 480</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 600</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>Most of the northern half of the site lies within the flood zone; residential development here will not therefore be acceptable. An electricity substation and the mainline railway running up the east side of the site are further constraints 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 forms part of a Green Belt parcel identified in the Green Belt stage 1 assessment as highly performing and as assisting in preventing sprawl, coalescence, and in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is partially located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site, excluding land in the flood zone, could be developable were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location and a re-assessment of the value of the Local Wildlife Site found development to be acceptable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:1294</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1725</p>
--	---

DRAFT

Site location / address:

Address	Maxwell Park Youth and Community Centre	Post Code	WD6 1JJ
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.17	Current Use	Community Centre
------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Office blocks, apartment blocks, nursery school, charity collection centre, hotel, leisure centre and a petrol station.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Urban edge of town centre character with mixed use and height development surrounding the site.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	30.58
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

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

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Demonstrate that existing community floorspace is not necessary in this particular location
---	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Central	Urban	High	

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.17	30dph	40dph
	24	43

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:24</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 24</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:43</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 43</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is occupied by an existing community centre. There are no environmental constraints associated with the site.</p> <p>The site is a developed urban site with no flood risk other than low probability surface water flood risk; this is unlikely to be a constraint to development. However, the site would only be deliverable if a suitable replacement facility is found unless it could be clearly demonstrated that there is no requirement for such re-provision, with sufficient accommodation available nearby which meets the requirements of the groups currently using the site.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0</p>
---	--

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1005-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land Rear of Catterick Way	Post Code	WD6 4QB
Ward	Borehamwood Brookmeadow Ward	Parish	Elstree & Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.2	Current Use	Hard Standing / Parking
------------------------	-----	--------------------	-------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential to south, north and west. Public open space to east.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located in a predominantly residential area of Borehamwood, to the rear of dwellings fronting Catterwick Way. The character consists mainly of semi-detached and terrace two storey dwellings.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (100% Affordable)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Greenbelt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Greenbelt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	23
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	6.3
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	3.5
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Possibly from previous uses
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?	No
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Potential mitigation against contamination required.
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Suburban	Medium	Medium	Urban Brownfield Houses

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.17	30dph	40dph
	12	17

Deliverability / Developability:

What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:12</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 12</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:17</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 17</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is brownfield land and is located in a residential area of Borehamwood. The site is considered acceptable under current policy framework, notwithstanding mitigation against possible contamination from a previous use.</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 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>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:12</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:17</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1006-22

Site location / address:

Address	26-30 Theobald Street Borehamwood	Post Code	WD6 5AY
Ward	Borehamwood Brookmeadow Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.19	Current Use	Commercial (Light Industry)
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-----------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Mixed: Residential, Industrial, Town Centre Uses		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Mixed two to three storey buildings of vary styles. Used mix of town centre uses, light industry, community facilities and residential.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	N/A
----------------------------------	-----

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

Proposed Development Type
Mixed Use: Residential / Commercial

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

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

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Potentially from existing use.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Various light industry uses / sui generis surrounding the site.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Potential Contamination from previous use.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Potential Contamination from previous use.
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.19	30dph	40dph
	28	50

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:28</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 28</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:50</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 50</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is brownfield land and is located close to the centre of Borehamwood. The site is considered acceptable under current policy framework, notwithstanding mitigation against disturbance from neighbouring uses.</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 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>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:28</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:50</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1007-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land East of Green Street	Post Code	
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Shenley

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	2.32	Current Use	Open Field
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential / Open Fields		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Residential Detached and Semi-detached dwellings to east of site. Open countryside to north, south and east.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL347		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	N/A
----------------------------------	-----

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Possibly 100% Affordable) / Gypsy & Travellers Pitches (partial or entirely)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	3.23
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	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
Stage 1 Comment	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. 0					

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-45	Pass	5	5	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
Recommended	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	Medium - High	Medium - High	N/A

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 (under promotional agreement)	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

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

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.74	30dph	40dph
	60	80

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:60
	Delivery in 1-5 years 60
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:80
	Delivery in 1-5 years 60
Delivery in 6-10 years 20	
Delivery in 11-15 years 0	

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site forming part of a parcel identified as making a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. Stage 2 assessment states that the site meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, and is not recommended.
	The site has negligible flood risk and this 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.
	Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be considered suitable, achievable and available. 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.
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:60
Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:80	

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1008-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land at Holly Cottage, Well End Road	Post Code	WD6 5PR
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	2.11	Current Use	Open Field (Grazing) / Residential Curtilage
------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Dwellings / Open Countryside / Arboricultural Nursery		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Site part of sporadic development along Well End Road, consisting of large detached dwellings, commercial greenhouses, and open fields		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL376		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	N/A
----------------------------------	-----

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	0.17
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.06
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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-48	Pass	5	1	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Western part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	Medium - High	N/A

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?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	None
--	------

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	0.00	Other Villages

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.58	30dph	40dph
	50	66

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:50</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 50</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:66</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is located adjacent to a Listed Building, and mitigation will be required to ensure that the public benefit outweighs the harm to this heritage asset.</p> <p>The site has a 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 site does contain buildings which can be considered PDL, with a potential output of 12 dwellings within existing policy context.</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 subject to any necessary mitigation in relation to the adjacent Listed Building. 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>
---	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:50

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:66

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1009-22

Site location / address:

Address	Instalcom House, Manor Way	Post Code	WD6 1QH
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.36	Current Use	Builders Merchant
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Mix of Offices, Light industry and residential.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located on the edge of an employment area, within the Elstree Way Corridor AAP area, with commercial office and light industry units to the north. Residential units are located to the south, consisting mainly of two storey semi-detached dwellings. A public right of way also runs to the south of the site.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No.		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	N/A
----------------------------------	-----

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Flats)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	3.11
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Designated Employment Area
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Potential Contamination from existing use.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Various commercial uses
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?	No
Ownership constraints?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Potential Contamination from existing use.
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.36	30dph	40dph
	43	68

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:43</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 43</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:68</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 8</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is located within the area covered by the Elstree Way Corridor AAP close to the designated employment area but also where it adjoining a mainly residential area. Under current policy context the site is allocated for residential development. Whilst there are no clear physical issues constraining the redevelopment of the site, mitigation against disturbance from neighbouring uses will be required.</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 site is considered acceptable under current policy framework, notwithstanding mitigation against disturbance from neighbouring uses. 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>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:43</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:68</p>
--	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1014-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land east of Kailas (formerly the Marians), Barnet Lane, Elstree - Site D	Post Code	WD6 3RD
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	4.19	Current Use	Open Scrubland / Woodland
------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Open Countryside. Residential development to the south and south west.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The north and east consists mainly of open countryside, seperating the site with Elstree and Borehamwood. The south and west of two large detached dwellings or apartment buidlings, located within very spacious plots.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL-1015-22 to South West		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	TP/80/0220, Continue Tipping to complete landfill Operations, Approved, 03/07/1980
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Including Net Zero Carbon / Self-build), plus Biodiversity Net Gain

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	3.51
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1.03
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.54
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
3	Pass	3	5	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 strongly. Although the area north of Merry Hill Road feels more detached from the wider countryside, it still plays an important role in preventing further encroachment of development into the countryside and also makes a limited contribution to purpose 4. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration.					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-51	Pass	3	5	2	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the south-western part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. South-western part recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	High	High	High	High	High	0

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Potential contamination from former use.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Potential Contamination from previous use. Considerable amount of vegetation some of which may be self seeded; ecological value of the site is not known.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes, subject to ground surveys

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Potential Contamination from previous use. Considerable amount of vegetation some of which may be self seeded; ecological value of the site is not known.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
3.14	30dph	40dph
	99	132

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:99
	Delivery in 1-5 years 60
	Delivery in 6-10 years 39
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:132
	Delivery in 1-5 years 110
Delivery in 6-10 years 22	
Delivery in 11-15 years 0	

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<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>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 subject to any necessary mitigation in relation to the adjacent Archeological Site and TPOs. 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>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:99</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:132</p>
--	--

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-0197-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land North of Barnet Lane (West)	Post Code	WD6 3JE
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	3.37	Current Use	Open Field.
------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential, wild life sites, railway tracks.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located at the southern edge of the built up area of Elstree and Borehamwood. The site is a part of an undeveloped open land 'wedged' in between built areas. To the immediate north and west of the site is established residential area; to the east is a Local Wildlife Site comprising of greenfield land and vegetation. To the south beyond Barnet Lane is open land.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL-0511-22		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	23/0053/OUT Residential development of up to 74 dwellings, with associated landscaping, amenity space, Self-Build plots, sustainable urban drainage (SuDs), and associated works. (Outline Application to include Access, with all other matters Reserved) (description updated 04.04.2023). Refuse permission. Appeal In Progress
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (including Custom Build)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	11.92
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3.64
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.21
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
3	Pass	3	5	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 strongly. Although the area north of Merry Hill Road feels more detached from the wider countryside, it still plays an important role in preventing further encroachment of development into the countryside and also makes a limited contribution to purpose 4. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration.					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-49	Pass	1+	1	3	0	Moderate
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	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	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt, Contain 2 designated Local Wildlife Sites (Woodcock Hill Fields LWS and Elstree Tunnel Grassland LWS) and a registered Village Green
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Rail tunnel runs under part of the site
Are there any other environmental constraints?	The site adjoins Elstree Tunnel Grasslands wildlife 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?	No		
Is the Site available?	Yes		

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements (over and above CIL) may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
--	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	The site adjoins Elstree Tunnel Grasslands wildlife site.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.53	30dph	40dph
	91	121

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:91</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 31</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:121</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 11</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site adjoins a Local Wildlife Site (Elstree Tunnel Grasslands). The land slopes gently to the north but there are no topographical constraints and it is indicated as being accessed directly from Barnet Lane.</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>Development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework with the site identified as making a moderate contribution to the wider Green Belt in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended that the sub area within which the site is located could be considered further.</p> <p>Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, the site could be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:91</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:121</p>
---	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-0218-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land at Organ Hall Farm, Borehamwood	Post Code	WD7 7LU
Ward	Borehamwood Brookmeadow Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	9.17	Current Use	Open Field
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential to the south, offices to south east, open countryside to remaining sides. Railway line along west boundary.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Site is located on the edge of the Borehamwood built up area- urban area to south, open countryside to remaining sides. The Midlands Mainline runs to the west of the site		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	N/A		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>Erection of up to 121 dwellings, a 75-bed care home, a medical centre (Use Class E(e)), associated infrastructure, parking, landscaping, open space, earthworks and access from Theobald Street. (Outline Application to include Access, with all other matters Reserved), 22/2149/OUT, Approved subject to s106.</p> <p>Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a new office building (B1), 13 x 3 bed dwellings and an apartment block comprising 7 units, with associated access, parking & landscaping. Ref. No: 20/0525/FUL, Approved</p>
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (Up to circa 121 dwellings (C3 use), a 75-bed care home (C2 use)), medical centre (E)€

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	6.8
Floodzone 3	9.99
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	47.81
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	19.92
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	11.41
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	49.24
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	60.46

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
28	Pass	3+	5	4	1	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel meets purposes 2 and 3 strongly, preventing ribbon development in the narrow gap between Borehamwood and Radlett and preventing encroachment into the open countryside. It also contributes to preventing the outward sprawl of Borehamwood (purpose 1) and performs (albeit weakly) against purpose 4, maintaining the rural context for the historic part of Radlett.					

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-43	Pass	3+	3	3	0	Moderate
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	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	Medium - High	High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Possible contamination from vehicles on site
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Close proximity to railway line. Pylons and powerlines run across the site
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Some flood risk particularly across northern part of the site
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Part of the site not located in the flood zone could be suitable.

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable.
--	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Some flood risk particularly across northern part of the site
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
6.88	30dph	40dph
	237	317

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:237</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 127</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:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>Environmental constraints affect some of the site with Tykeswater running through the north west part of the site resulting in an area being within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Footpath 51 runs through the middle of the site as well as a pylon/overhead power lines.</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 not suitable for development under the current policy framework due to its Green Belt status. The land forms the southernmost part of a strongly performing parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment. The independent stage 2 Green Belt assessment recommended the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional housing in this location, the remaining part of the site not affected by being within the Flood Zone could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>It should be noted that planning permission for development of the site was granted in November 2023, subject to s106, linked to the on-site provision of a new health centre. As the HELAA has a cut-off date of April 2023, the site has not been included in the commitments category.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:237</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:317</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-0369-22

Site location / address:

Address	Well End Lodge, Well End Road	Post Code	WD6 5PR
Ward	Shenley Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.53	Current Use	Residential
------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	A variety of land uses surround the site, including a scout hut / nursery to the north, as well as a currently vacant farm house/stables and a commercial plant nursery opposite. Single residential properties are also located along further along Well End R		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site is located within an area of ribbon development north of Borehamwood, with open countryside beyond. Properties consist of the main detached buildings, with associated outbuildings. The site is located in a rural area comprising fields with hedge/tree boundaries, and is separated from the nearby edge of urban area of Borehamwood by land in agricultural use.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL-0347		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None.
----------------------------------	-------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential

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	Yes
Archaeological Sites	No	Drinking Water Safeguard Area	Yes
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	Yes

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

Constraint	
Listed Building within Site	No
Listed Building within 750m of Site	Yes
Conservation Area	No
Conservation Area within 750m of Site	No
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	Yes

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	4.17
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	2.73
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	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-46	Pass	3	1	3	0	Moderate
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but southern part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Southern part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	Medium - High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Materials on site / abandoned vehicles.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	None
Are there any other environmental constraints?	No
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Yes

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Materials on site / abandoned vehicles.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.45	30dph	40dph
	15	20

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:15</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 15</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:20</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 20</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The main dwelling is locally listed. The site itself is detached from the built up area of Borehamwood although it adjoins HEL347 (Land at Cowley Hill).</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 site is located in a parcel identified in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment as strongly performing. However the independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did rerecommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>Given the limited amount of existing development within the site, beyond the existing locally listed dwelling, the scope to carry out further development is limited under the NPPF due to its Green Belt designation.</p> <p>The site does contain buildings which can be considered PDL, with a potential output of 3 dwellings within existing policy context.</p> <p>Beyond this, development would not be suitable under the current planning policy framework. Although it is recognised that there may be some potential for the site to join</p>
---	--

with HEL347, it is unlikely to change to the extent that development would be permitted in isolation on small non-PDL land sites unable to deliver wider sustainability benefits.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:15

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:20

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-0393-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land South of Allum Lane, Elstree	Post Code	WD6 3LZ
Ward	Elstree Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	10.41	Current Use	Open fields / horse grazing
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	-----------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Elle Dani equestrian centre and fields, Civic amenities site and cemetery to the west, open fields to the south, residential to the east, Allum Lane to the north.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	The site lies in the gap between the built up areas of Elstree and Elstree village to east and west, with open countryside to north and south.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL-1014-22		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>TP/89/0966 Change of use from former mobile home site to tree contractors depot and erection of temporary office/equipment store;</p> <p>19/0263/FUL Demolition of existing 2 semi-detached dwellings and construction of 4 detached dwellings (WITHDRAWN) (THIS IS SITE E PROMOTED UNDER THIS SUBMISSION)</p> <p>23/1525/EI1. Request for screening opinion (Environmental Impact Assessment - Screening). EIA not required.</p>
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential / Retirement Living / GP Surgery

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5.05
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.89
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.54
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
8	Pass	3+	5	3	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	Although the parcel scores strongly against purpose 2, there are two identified areas which might score less strongly if considered alone:					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-52	Pass	3	5	2	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but the north-eastern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-eastern part is recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	Split Site					

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	High	High	High	High	High	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Possibly. Proximity of cemetery and household waste recycling centre.
Are there any access difficulties?	No. Access to the whole site can be obtained from Allum Lane.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Yes, the Allum Lane household recycling centre.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Household waste recycling centre and cemetery adjoin. Telecommunications mast adjoins. Flood risk across part of the site.
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	Part of the site may be suitable depending on proximity to household waste recycling centre.

Site Availability:

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

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and 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. There may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL, but subject to built out rates and any phasing proposed being realistic, the site is considered to be achievable.
-------------------------	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Household waste recycling centre and cemetery adjoin. Telecommunications mast adjoins. Flood risk across part of the site.
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
6.77	30dph	40dph
	264	352

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:264</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 154</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:352</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 242</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>There are no significant topographical constraints although the site slopes down from west to east. There are a number of environmental constraints at the perimeter of the proposed residential site, namely TPO trees, archaeological sites, some localised flood risk and listed buildings.</p> <p>In addition, the site adjoins the household waste recycling centre. Hertfordshire County Council have previously objected to development within the part of the site immediately to the east of the HWRC due to concerns the incompatibility of the two land uses and the likelihood that complaints from future residents would impact on the operation of the HWRC.</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 promoter has previously submitted technical reports but surface water flooding matters still need to be addressed including any on/off-site betterment, to satisfy the LLFA.</p>
--	--

The site was part of a highly performing parcel under the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, However, the side of the green belt parcel to the east of the household waste recycling centre, was identified as being of less importance and recommended for further consideration.

The Stage 2 Green assessment recommended that part of the sub-area within which the site is located could be considered further. However, that part of the site is closer to the HWRC and previously HCC have raised objections to development in the northern part of the site given that it considered new housing could not comply with the agent of change principle.

Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location in line with the NPPF and subject to more detailed technical assessments, part of the site could be suitable, available and achievable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:264

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:352

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-0511-22

Site location / address:

Address	Land West of Vale Avenue, Borehamwood	Post Code	WD6 2BD
Ward	Borehamwood Hillside Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	3.44	Current Use	Open fields, wildlife site
----------------------------	------	--------------------	----------------------------

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Residential, open fields/ grazing land, wildlife sites, railway tracks.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Site at the southern edge of the built up area of Borehamwood. The open land runs right up to the edge of built up area at Vale Avenue and Byron Avenue. To the south of the A411 residential properties are larger detached with extensive gardens. Woodcock Hill Farm lies opposite the site. The site contributes to a rural break between the residential areas of Elstree and Borehamwood. Although Barnet Lane is an urbanising influence the open fields and mature trees contribute to a rural feel.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	HEL-0197-22		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential / 10% Biodiversity Net Gain

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	8.6
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.68
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0.07
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
3	Pass	3	5	4	0	Strong
Stage 1 Comment	The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 strongly. Although the area north of Merry Hill Road feels more detached from the wider countryside, it still plays an important role in preventing further encroachment of development into the countryside and also makes a limited contribution to purpose 4. The parcel is not recommended for further consideration.					

Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-50	Pass	1	1	4	0	Strong
Stage 2 Comment	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration.					
Recommended	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	N/A

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	Green Belt, contain 2 designated Local Wildlife Sites (Woodcock Hill Fields LWS and Elstree Tunnel Grassland LWS) and a registered Village Green.
Is there evidence of land contamination?	No
Are there any access difficulties?	The masterplan proposes vehicular access through the adjoining residential area via Vale Avenue.
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Rail tunnel runs under part of the site
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Designated Village Green
Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?	No, the status of the part of the site on which development is proposed remains uncertain. The decision to de-register part of the village green and re-provide it elsewhere is currently subject to a judicial review

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes (not known in respect of rear garden to Little Orchard HEL227)	Is there developer interest?	Yes
Ownership constraints?	Part of the site has been a registered Village Green, notwithstanding that it is in private ownership		
Is the Site available?	Dependent on outcome of judicial review process		

Site Achievability:

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

	requirements (over and above CIL) may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
--	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Designated Village Green
--	--------------------------

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural/suburban	Low	Low	Key Villages

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.58	30dph	40dph
	101	134

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:101</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 101</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:134</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 24</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>It remains uncertain as to whether the site will be de-designated and exchanged following the decision to allow the judicial review to proceed. As such, it is presently not considered suitable, achievable or available, and will not progress to site selection stage. The indicative capacity figures shown above are based on the HELAA methodology for calculating the potential yield from a site rather than whether the site is capable of being brought forward for development.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:0</p>
--	--

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1100-22

Site location / address:

Address	EWC Elstree Way North	Post Code	WD6 1JX
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.60	Current Use	Healthcare clinic/Nursery / Community Use
------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Civic Centre, fire station, car park, charity collection building		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Urbanised, edge of town centre mixed use development, generally surrounded by taller buildings, aside from the neighbouring charity building.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	Neighbouring Elstree Corridor Sites.		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None relevant
----------------------------------	---------------

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

Proposed Development Type
C3 dwellings

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	No	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	55
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	25
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	10
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	

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						

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

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

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	No	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	Site owned by 2 different public bodies that need to agree a strategy for moving the site forward		
Is the Site available?	No		

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The landowners have not indicated that there are any abnormal or other costs associated with the site which would have the potential to impact on its viability for development, although it remains possible that health/emergency services facilities might need to be intergraded into a mixed use scheme. As such, any significant site-specific mitigation or infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
-------------------------	--

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	A clear partnership approach between the different landowners is needed to bring these sites forward together given the relatively small size of the site which would preclude different parts of it from being brought forward separately from each other
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.51	30dph	40dph
	83	155

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:83</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 23</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:155</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 45</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is currently occupied by three flat roofed single storey buildings predominantly surrounded by hardstanding and car parking. There are no obvious environmental constraints to development. However, the fact that there are different public body owners on a relatively small site with the three buildings tightly packed together, presents some challenges.</p> <p>This means that a partnership approach will need to be taken by the relevant public sector land owners to move the site forward, as the site does not lend itself to being developed in stages.</p> <p>The site itself has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour.</p> <p>However, the site is, in principle, suitable for the proposed development given that it forms part of the Elstree Way Corridor AAP. There has been engagement with the two land owners regarding bringing this site forward previously and there remains a willingness to do so. However, it is not available for development at this point in time as there has not been any formal progression towards a scheme.</p> <p>The site could potentially be suitable for other uses, as part of a mixed use scheme enabling, the retention or relocation of facilities in the Elstree Way Corridor including health and emergency services accommodation.</p>
--	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:83

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:155

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1101-22

Site location / address:

Address	EWC Elstree Way South	Post Code	WD6 1JP
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.34	Current Use	
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Office blocks, apartment blocks, nursery school, charity collection centre, hotel, leisure centre and a petrol station.		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Urban edge of town centre character with mixed use and height development surrounding the site.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable			

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	20/0057/OUT Demolition of the former police station and construction of 1 seven storey and 1 eight storey building containing 96 flats, with associated bin and bike storage, car parking. (Outline Application to include access, appearance, layout & scale, with landscaping matters reserved.) (Permission granted)
----------------------------------	---

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

Proposed Development Type
C3 Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	12
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

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

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes	Is there developer interest?	Partly
Ownership constraints?	There are at least 3 separate owners of the remaining parts of Site 5, both public and private.		
Is the Site available?	Partially		

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	The site has been promoted for commercial development on the basis that this would be achievable. The land owners have 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, including the re-provision/relocation of existing emergency services accommodation, may require additional viability work to be undertaken as well as effective joint working between the different public sector and other landowners within the Elstree Way Corridor.
-------------------------	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	A clear partnership approach between the different landowners is needed to bring these sites forward together given the relatively small area of land involved and the different civic/public sector land uses.
--	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.14	30dph	40dph
	185	346

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:185</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 96</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 89</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:346</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 96</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 250</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years</p>
---	---

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The land is suitable for the proposed use in the EWCAAP, namely 5-6 storey residential buildings, possibly increasing on the corner of Maxwell Way and Elstree Way.</p> <p>It does not have any obvious environmental constraints, although it is possible that a limited amount of pollution may arise from emergency service vehicles which have used or serviced on the sites, or from the neighbouring petrol filling station. The main potential constraint is considered to arise from the site being in multiple ownership and the co-ordination required to achieve development on the western part of the site.</p> <p>The land 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 police station site to the east of the new flats currently has permission for 96 flats in two blocks of 7 and 8 storeys, showing that a significant quantum of development is capable of being accommodated. Development of comparable blocks have taken place on part of site 5 already, further evidencing the site deliverability.</p> <p>The remaining area to the east is not available and achievable at the present time, which is reflected in the delivery timescales.</p>
--	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:185

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:346

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1102-22

Site location / address:

Address	EWC Civic Car Park	Post Code	WD6 1WA
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	1.20	Current Use	
----------------------------	------	--------------------	--

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Blocks of flats and terraced and semi-detached properties, leisure centre, a hotel, charity collection centre, and primary school/day nursery		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	This large car park is more or less enclosed by built development of various height and form in this urbanised edge of town centre location		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	Neighbouring Elstree Way Corridor Sites		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	None
----------------------------------	------

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	Yes

Constraints Check

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	10
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	3
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

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

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

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

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	Yes, previously	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	None		
Is the Site available?	Not immediately available as public car remains in use with a number of agreements in place to provide car parking for neighbouring sites (e.g. Venue, Ibis Hotel)		

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the site is likely to be viable and achievable subject to any required provision or re-provision of public car parking being agreed. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site.
-------------------------	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Establishing requirements for public car parking in the area
---	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.02	30dph	40dph
	165	310

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:165</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 55</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:310</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 200</p>
--	---

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is currently the Civic Car Park. There are no major environmental constraints associated with its use, although there may be limited oil/petrol ground pollution associated with its current use.</p> <p>There are no constraints in terms of the site ownership, being in sole ownership, but no decision has been taken on the use of the site and the quantum of public car parking which is required on the site. Regardless of the quantum, decked parking would enable more efficient use of the site and allow for residential development on at least part of the car park.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. However this site is towards the lower end of coverage and is concentrated in the low part in the south west corner, so will have little impact on the site as a whole.</p> <p>The site is suitable for the stated use in the EWC, although some taller buildings may be permissible, depending on the part of the site developed for housing and their proximity to existing housing nearby, including the recently developed Bellway scheme on the site of the former Hertswood Upper School.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:165</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:310</p>
---	--

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1103-22

Site location / address:

Address	EWC Elstree Way / Bullhead Road	Post Code	WD6 1LB
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	0.38	Current Use	Petrol Station and Vehicle Tyre and Repair Garage
------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Semi-detached dwellings and blocks of flats, leisure centre and large derelict building		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Urbanised edge of town centre location, characterised as such by a mix of uses and differing density housing development.		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	Yes		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable	Elstree Way South		

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	<p>23/0576/FUL: Installation of 10 EV charging bays, canopy, GRP cabinet, substation, inverter compound and associated works. (GRANTED)</p> <p>TP/99/0758: Redevelopment of site for Class B1 (office) use in a part 2/part 3 storey building with associated ground and basement parking and alterations to existing vehicular access. (Outline application)</p> <p>TP/98/0185 Erection of new enclosed car wash building and provision of new jet wash area with 2.5m high glass screen and new vacuum unit (REFUSED)</p> <p>TP/96/0204: New and replacement garage, forecourt and kiosk signage (GRANTED)</p> <p>TP/01/0809 Demolition of existing pump islands forecourt canopy, shop and construction of three pump islands, forecourt canopy, shop (200sq m sales area), vacuum air/water facility, car wash and customer car parking. (Granted)</p>
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential (C3)

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	50
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	25
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	No
----------------	----

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

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

Site Availability:

Has the owner said the site is available?	No	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	Lease until early 2030s means unlikely to be available in the next 5 years and potentially at least 10 years until development begins		
Is the Site available?	No		

Site Achievability:

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

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Remediation given the long-standing petrol station and adjacent car garage.
---	---

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.38	30dph	40dph
	62	116

Deliverability / Developability:

<p>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:62</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 62</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:116</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 116</p>
--	--

Conclusion:

<p>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</p>	<p>The site is currently occupied by the Shell garage and Kwik Fit; subsequently, there is likely to be a level of contaminated land, particularly from the petrol station. There are no other obvious constraints associated with the site, environmental or otherwise.</p> <p>The site will need a ground investigation report at the appropriate time, to assess the level of contamination present.</p> <p>The land 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 (such as this site) may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. This would be difficult on a small site, so other mitigation may be required.</p> <p>The site is suitable, in principle, for the proposed use in the EWC. However, there is a long lease on it until the early 2030s, and therefore the assumption is that it is not available currently. However, this is reflected in the indicated timescales for development in years 11-15.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:62</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:116</p>
---	--

**HELAA 2024
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

Site reference HEL-1104-22

Site location / address:

Address	EWC Manor Way	Post Code	WD6 1QQ
Ward	Borehamwood Kenilworth Ward	Parish	Elstree and Borehamwood

Site size / use:

Size (ha) Gross	2.85	Current Use	Mixed office and warehouse/factory uses
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---

Surrounding area:

Neighbouring land uses	Semi-detached dwellings and offices/warehouses in employment area		
Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape	Urban character amongst mixed uses between employment area and a road of semi-detached dwellings		
Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?	No		
If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable			

Planning status:

Relevant Planning history	
----------------------------------	--

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

Proposed Development Type
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
No	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
Heathrow Airport Safeguarding Area	Yes	Green Belt	No

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (approximate)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	9
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	7
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	3
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

Agricultural Land Classification

Classification	
----------------	--

Green Belt purposes

Stage 1

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

Stage 2

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

Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

Officer Assessment

Is there a conflict with existing policy?	No
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Possible contamination from existing industrial units
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	No
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	The site is in multiple ownerships and uses; as and when residential schemes come forward, the relationship with neighbouring commercial activities within the remainder of the site (and the employment area opposite) would need to be considered.
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?	Partially	Is there developer interest?	No
Ownership constraints?	Multiple owners of the overall opportunity area at different stages in terms of availability. As such, it lends itself to being redeveloped in several stages		
Is the Site available?	Partially (the two industrial units at the southern end of the site have been promoted separately as being available).		

Site Achievability:

Is the Site achievable?	As the site is unlikely to come forward as a whole, costs might vary across the whole opportunity area. Subsequently, achievability may vary, given also the different stages of readiness for redevelopment. However, in an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the site is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs will primarily be covered by CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site, although any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken.
-------------------------	---

Overcoming Constraints

What would be needed to overcome constraints?	Where necessary, landowners will need to work together to produce a coherent development strategy, but this will not be necessary to bring all the different sites within HEL-1103-22 forward for development.
--	--

Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier (baseline 40dph):

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

(b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
2.14	30dph	40dph
	346	650

Deliverability / Developability:

If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:346</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 236</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:650</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 150</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 120</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 380</p>
---	--

Conclusion:

Is the site suitable, achievable and available?	<p>The site is located within the EWC AAP and has therefore been earmarked as a potential, long-term residential development location. It is currently occupied by various employment uses, including offices, leisure (trampolining) and warehouse/industrial uses. There are no obvious environmental issues, although there might be potential for pollution from the units to the north and south of the site.</p> <p>Given the existing multiple uses, buildings and likely landowners in this area, there would need to be a co-ordinated plan to bring parts of the site forward, if delivery of the whole area was not possible.</p> <p>The land 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>However, aside from Instalcom House which has been promoted for housing, the site is not currently available or achievable, as the majority of the units are still in operation and there is currently no co-ordinated plan to bring forward a holistic new development.</p> <p>However, aside from Instalcom House and Manor Place which have been promoted for housing, the site is not currently available or achievable, with the majority of the units are still in operation and currently no co-ordinated plan to bring forward a co-ordinated development scheme across part or the entirety of the remainder of the site.</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:346

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:650

DRAFT



DRAFT