

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL179

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Hilfield Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8DN
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.17	<b>Current Use</b>	Open fields
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the north, open land on either side (Patchetts Green Equestrian Centre being redeveloped for housing to the north-west)		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Site surrounded by a belt of trees and beyond that the M1 on the long boundary and the rural fringe of Patchett's Green contribute to the relatively enclosed feeling of this Green Belt site.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	Renovation of Grade II Listed farmhouse with minor external and internal alterations (Listed Building Consent) (GRANTED); TP/10/0544 Proposed lawn tennis court with 1 and 2 metre high netting, demolition of existing boiler room and masonry wall, alterations to the entrance fencing to the proposed tennis court area and the removal of existing concrete slabs to the side of the proposal to be replaced by blue limestone paving (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	38.09
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	12.74
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	4.42
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	63.2
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	63.96

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
9	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration and the parcel should not be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	Potential impact on future occupiers due to proximity of M1 motorway
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some areas of flood risk
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.46	30dph	40dph
	14	19

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:14
	Delivery in 1-5 years 14
	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:19
	Delivery in 1-5 years 19
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is located within Patchetts Green Conservation Area, close to the Camphill Village Trust and adjacent to the M1, albeit elevated from the motorway. A significant level of flood risk runs through the middle of the site.</p> <p>If this site was to be taken further, then a noise assessment would be required and the site would need to address the flood risk issue, subject to the outcome of the local authority sequential test.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment scores the site moderately overall against the Green Belt purposes score. It was not assessed as part of the Stage 2 assessment due to its distance from any urban areas.</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, due to the level of risk and location of it on site, it may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Only a rural-exceptions scale and type of housing would be suitable under the current policy framework. The area is not suitable for additional development on this scale under the current planning policy framework and up to 50 additional dwellings in a location with limited accessibility and services would raise sustainability issues including scale of trip generation.</p>
--	--

Were this to change and additional development is deemed acceptable in line with the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:14

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:19

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL199

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land at Church Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8BF
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.49	<b>Current Use</b>	Vacant scrubland
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Housing adjoins the site to the north. Nursery School to the north-west.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Southern fringe of rural village with large detached properties to the north and Radlett Road directly to the south gives the site some sense of enclosure. Open agricultural land on the adjacent side of Radlett Road.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/95/0352 Conversion of former farm buildings to 7no.2bed,3no.3bed,4no.4bed and 1no.5bed dwellings together with 15 new dwellings dwellings (Morgan Gardens and Church Farm Way) (GRANTED); TP/99/0198 Change of use of existing building and land to single dwelling with associated residential curtilage and erection of first floor rear extension (REFUSED).
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	9.31
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	5.11
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.44
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
26	Fail	0	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores strongly against purpose 3, maintaining the broadly open and rural character throughout. In particular, the east of the parcel at the edge of Radlett is particularly open. Furthermore, the parcel maintains the overall scale of the gap between Radlett and North Bushey/Watford.					

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

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

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Limited area of primarily lower surface water flood risk.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.49	30dph	40dph
	16	22

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:16</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 16</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:22</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 22</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are no significant environmental or topographical constraints affecting the entirety of the site. However, Tthe site is located within Aldenham Conservation Area.</p> <p>Due to its small size, its ability to satisfactorily accommodate development is likely to be dependent on visual impact/amenity as much as any wider Green Belt impact considerations.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment assessed the site as part of a moderately performing Green Belt parcel as part of the overall purpose score. The site was not assessed as part of a stage 2 assessment due to its distance from an urban area.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential Test, but the location of the flooding risk in the south western corner of the site is unlikely to be a constraint to any development.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:16</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:22</p>
--	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL219/252

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Pegmire Lane	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8DR
<b>Ward</b>	N/A	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.21	<b>Current Use</b>	Vacant land
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Residential area to the west. North of Pegmire Lane is mostly Green Belt open land		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	The two submissions partly overlap		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL219/HEL252 partly overlap		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/87/0637. Use of land for the keeping and schooling and training of horses and the erection of stables, storage and menage. (REFUSED). TP/92/0807. Use of land as wholesale nursery with ancillary building and car parking area. (REFUSED). TP/95/0115. Erection of replacement stable/horse shelter. (GRANTED). TP/02/0994. Erection of a replacement outbuilding. (GRANTED). TP/07/1492. Erection of a replacement outbuilding/double garage. (REFUSED).
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	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
9	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration and the parcel should not be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Close to Local Wildlife site Paddock by Summerhouse Lane.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	Yes - covenants on each building plot to say that only one dwelling can be built on it		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Close to Local Wildlife site Paddock by Summerhouse Lane.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.03	30dph	40dph
		45

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 34</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:45</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 45</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>Adjoining/overlapping sites close to the Camphill Village Trust, immediately adjacent to Conservation Areas. There are no significant physical constraints associated with this site, however, but there are understood to be covenants restricting development to one dwelling per plot and so the capacity of the site, were the policy framework to change, would be no more than 12 based on information provided by Aldenham PC.</p> <p>Additional dwellings in a location with limited accessibility and services would raise sustainability issues including scale of trip generation.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Only a rural-exceptions scale and type of housing (approximately 5 units) is likely to be suitable under the current policy framework.</p> <p>Further development would require consideration against the NPPF including the extent to which there would be coalescence between Patchetts Green and Letchmore Heath. However, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable, even if it was for less homes than the stated capacity.</p>
--	--



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

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:45

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL221

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Rabley Green	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9AW
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	83.32	<b>Current Use</b>	Residential and agriculture
----------------------------	-------	--------------------	-----------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Mainly open countryside with occasional farm and residential buildings.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Area of open undulating farmland with isolated farm and residential buildings.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No. Site is enclosed by surrounding roads. Land to the rear of Fox Hollows to the north of Rectory Lane has been promoted for development. Some overlap with land in ownership of Tyttenhanger Estate at the northern end.		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/05/0845 All weather and grass gallops (REFUSED); TP/81/0718 change of use of cottage at St Catherine's Farm to path lab.(GRANTED - personal); TP/84/0474 Demolition of existing house and erection of one 2 storey detached house (Falcon Cottage) (GRANTED).
----------------------------------	--

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)?

Constraint	Percentage of Site (estimated)
Floodzone 2	2.5
Floodzone 3	2.5
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	9
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	5
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.					

### Stage 2\*

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
Garden Village G, H and I	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored Assessed but not scored
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	The sub-areas make a limited contribution to Purpose 2, forming a less essential part of the gap between Shenley and Potters Bar, and at the eastern end (sub-area I) also between London Colney and Potters Bar. Sub-areas G and I have a strong unspoilt rural character with the area in the middle having a largely rural character. Sub-areas G and I – at either end of the site – make a strong contribution to the wider Green Belt and their release would be likely to harm the performance of the wider strategic Green Belt. Sub-area H, in the centre, plays a less fundamental role and could be considered further.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Partial					

## 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	Medium - High	High	High	Medium - High

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt. Dovers Green Lane, Packhorse Lane Pits and Shenley Chalk Pit Wildlife sites lie within the area.
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	All roads around the site are narrow country lanes. Access to B556 cannot be guaranteed.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Dovers Green Lane, Packhorse Lane Pits and Shenley Chalk Pit Wildlife sites lie within the area. Some areas of flood risk, albeit lower risk areas primarily.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes . However the site promoter is not the only owner and other owners have not indicated that their land is available

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	Yes - land in multiple ownerships with no evidence of or indication that any of the other landowners are seeking to make their sites available.		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	No		

#### Site Achievability:

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

	undertaken and the uncertainty of the availability of the whole site given the different landowners, may affect the achievability overall.
--	--

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Dovers Green Lane, Packhorse Lane Pits and Shenley Chalk Pit Wildlife sites lie within the area. Some areas of flood risk, albeit lower risk areas primarily.
--	---

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

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

#### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
41.66	30dph	40dph
	1250	1666

### Deliverability / Developability:

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:1250</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>16 years+ Remainder of scheme</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:1666</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> <p>16 years+ Remainder of scheme</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site has several wildlife sites on it as indicated above. Access into the majority of the land is currently achieved via Rectory Lane, Mimms Lane and Packhorse Lane which serve the limited number of properties within the site. It is unlikely that these narrow country lanes could support any significant increase in traffic and road traffic accidents are understood to have occurred, particularly in winter, including at the junction of Rectory Lane and the B556. The northern edge of the site, between Manor Lodge School and Southridge Animal Centre, runs parallel to the B556. However, the land within this part of the site appears not to be within the ownership of the four parties identified by the site promoter as owning the promoted land. Unless this land becomes available, access to the B556 would not be achievable. Furthermore, Land Registry searches have previously indicated that there are more than 15 land parcels in different ownerships with no indication that all of these parties would make their land available.</p> <p>The Stage 2 Assessment states that the site meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, but north-western part makes a lesser contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. North-western part is recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Given that the site is not available for development, notwithstanding the transport and highways concerns highlighted, there is not considered to be any scope for development of 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** HEL343

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land south of Letchmore Heath	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8DT
<b>Ward</b>	N/A	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	31.69	<b>Current Use</b>	Agriculture
------------------------	-------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Electricity sub station to the west, road and Bhaktivedanta Manor to the north, agriculture/fields to the south, Aldenham School to the east.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Rural mainly agricultural countryside with pockets of institutional development. Conservation Area to the north.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	No
----------------------------------	----

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

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



Location type (tick relevant box):

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

Constraints Check?

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

Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)?

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

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
9	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel scores moderately against purposes 2 and 3. Although the villages of Patchett's Green and Letchmore Heath diminish the openness of the Green Belt slightly, the Green Belt designations maintains their rural, low density character and restricts further encroachment. There are no readily identifiable sub-areas for further consideration and the parcel should not be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt. Local Wildlife site on western boundary
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	no (except local roads are rural/narrow)
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	Electricity sub station adjoins the site.
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Land by Elstree Sub Station - local Wildlife Site is located on the western boundary of the site
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Currently not suitable under Green Belt policy but may be if the Green Belt status changed and quantum of growth deemed acceptable in terms of settlement hierarchy

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Land by Elstree Sub Station - local Wildlife Site is located on the western boundary of the site
--	--

#### Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
15.85	30dph	40dph
		665

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 114</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:665</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 245</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>A small part of the site is within Local Wildlife Site (Land by Elstree Sub Station)., a moderately diverse area of neutral grassland supporting a number of species. The site adjoins Letchmore Heath Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Bhaktivedanta Manor.</p> <p>Development is also likely to be dependent on the capacity of Aldenham Road to accommodate additional traffic movements, the impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and the sustainability of directing growth to Letchmore Heath.</p> <p>The site forms part of a moderately performing parcel in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment with a largely open character. The area has not been assessed as part of the stage 2 assessment due to its distance from an urban area. Development is also likely to be dependent on the capacity of Aldenham Road to accommodate additional traffic movements, the impact on the adjoining Conservation Area and the sustainability of directing growth to Letchmore Heath.</p> <p>The site promoter has subsequently indicated that a much smaller part of the site could be made available for development, closer to the existing village boundary.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:665

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL345

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Aldenham Glebe	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8BQ
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.17	<b>Current Use</b>	Garden centre/nursery
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-----------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the east and south east, arable farmland to the south, fields to the west, Radlett Road and playing fields to the north		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of hamlet surrounded by open countryside/farmland		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	TP/06/0219 and TP16/1608. Use for residential purposes (Application for Certificate of Lawful Development - existing use) (REFUSE); TP/08/0005. Retention of mobile home for personal residential use of applicant (GRANTED).
----------------------------------	---

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

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

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
19	Fail	0	3	5	3	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The Parcel meets Purposes 2 and 4 moderately, maintaining the historic setting of Radlett and the overall scale and openness of the gap between Radlett and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. It also plays a particularly important role in preventing encroachment into an area of particularly unspoilt countryside. There are no identified sub-areas that would score less strongly against the purposes and it is recommended that the site is not considered further.					

### Stage 2

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

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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



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

#### Officer Assessment

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

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.99	30dph	40dph
	34	46

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:34
	Delivery in 1-5 years 34
	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:46
	Delivery in 1-5 years 46
	Delivery in 6-10 years 0
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	The site is located within Roundbush Conservation Area, accessed directly off Roundbush Lane. A garden centre/nursery, there are various areas buildings, structures and areas of hardstanding including small car parks.
	Site density and layout would need to be sympathetic of the conservation area, with the principle of some development would being acceptable as PDL.
	The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.
	Roundbush is a small hamlet and development over and above what could be accommodated as 'appropriate' in the Green Belt, would also be contrary to the current policy framework including the principle of directing significant development to the most sustainable locations. Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.
	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:34

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:46

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL350x

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Harperbury Hospital revised (N) (S2A) AMENDED POST PSHE	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 9DJ
<b>Ward</b>	Shenley Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	78.75	<b>Current Use</b>	Sporting facilities, agricultural and amenity land, open fields
------------------------	-------	--------------------	---

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the north and south east, open fields to the east, open fields to the southwest, proposed residential development to the west		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The former hospital is sited within an open rural area between the M25 and Shenley village, but separate from both. The rural character extends north of the M25 up to the edge of London Colney.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes - there is additional land within and adjoining the former Harperbury hospital site, within both Hertsmere and St Albans boundaries.		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	Rest of HEL174, HEL350 and HEL389		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	(HEL174a/HEL350a). TP/89/0891 Restoration of two former mineral workings to original ground levels to enable the land to be cropped and grazed, enabling woodland improvement (GRANTED) (HEL350d)14/1341/FUL. Construction of small scale electricity generation plant. (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>	Residential, Mixed use – could include residential, health, sports facilities, possible school, although this would presumably be more likely were a larger area to be developed
----------------------------------	--

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	32.08
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	11.57
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	5.58
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.					

#### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-31	Fail	0	3	3	0	Moderate
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt, Nine Acres Local Wildlife Site
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Small part of HEL174A/HEL350A has been restored following previous mineral workings
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No - access would be through larger development incorporating land in SADC
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park golf course and Porters Park Wood lie immediately to the south. Some areas of surface water flood risk.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Yes
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	Part of HEL174A/HEL350A/HEL389A is leased to St Albans Rangers Football Club but they will be relocated		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

#### Site Achievability:

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park golf course and Porters Park Wood lie immediately to the south. Some areas of surface water flood risk.
--	---

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Very low	Sustainable Neighbourhood

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
15.86	30dph	40dph
	523	698

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 523</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 103</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:698</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 278</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are few immediate constraints associated with this site, aside from a narrow band of trees that are subject to a TPO in the west of the site. There are two Local Wildlife Sites directly to the south. Access relies on development to the west in St Albans District, but this appears to be substantially complete and there are no foreseen issues with currently.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment concludes that the site overall scores strongly for meeting the Purpose criteria. The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment carries through this judgement, with the site meeting the Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and making an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is therefore not recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of surface water flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. Due to the size of the overall site, any development could likely be located outside of any areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Following the original promotion of the site, a reduced area closer to the main residential development (within St Albans district) has been advanced as the focus for additional residential development into Hertsmere. However, the submission to the call for sites in 2022 confirmed that the entirety of HEL350 is available.</p>
--	---



Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:523

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:698

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL350y

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Harperbury Hospital revised (S) (S2B) AMENDED POST PSHE	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham East Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	12.52	<b>Current Use</b>	Sporting facilities, agricultural and amenity land, open fields
------------------------	-------	--------------------	---

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to the north and south east, open fields to the east, open fields to the southwest, proposed residential development to the west		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The former hospital is sited within an open rural area between the M25 and Shenley village, but separate from both. The rural character extends north of the M25 up to the edge of London Colney. Map doesn't correlate with description/neighbouring land uses		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes - there is additional land within and adjoining the former Harperbury hospital site, within both Hertsmere and St Albans boundaries.		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	Rest of HEL174, HEL350 and HEL390		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	(HEL174a/HEL350a). TP/89/0891 Restoration of two former mineral workings to original ground levels to enable the land to be cropped and grazed, enabling woodland improvement (GRANTED) (HEL350d)14/1341/FUL. Construction of small scale electricity generation plant. (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>	Residential, Mixed use – could include residential, health, sports facilities, possible school, although this would presumably be more likely were a larger area to be developed
----------------------------------	--

Location type (tick relevant box):

<b>Greenbelt</b>	<b>PDL</b>
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

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

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt, Nine Acres Local Wildlife Site
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Small part of HEL174A/HEL350A has been restored following previous mineral workings
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No - access would be through larger development incorporating land in SADC
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park golf course and Porters Park Wood lie immediately to the south
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	Yes	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	Yes
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	Part of HEL174A/HEL350A/HEL389A is leased to St Albans Rangers Football Club but they will be relocated		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	Yes		

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Local Wildlife Sites Porters Park golf course and Porters Park Wood lie immediately to the south
--	--

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Very low	Sustainable Neighbourhood

#### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
5.86	30dph	40dph

	176		234
--	-----	--	-----

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:176</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 66</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:234</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 124</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	---

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site is considered be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to further assessment as part of the site selection process.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt Assessment concludes that the site overall scores strongly for meeting the Purpose criteria. The Stage 2 Green Belt Assessment carries through this judgement, with the site meeting the Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and making an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is therefore not recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of surface water flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. Due to the size of the overall site, any development could likely be located outside of any areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Following the original promotion of the site, a reduced area closer to the main residential development (within St Albans district) has been advanced as the focus for additional residential development into Hertsmere. However, the submission to the call for sites in 2022 confirmed that the entirety of HEL350 is available.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:176</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:234</p>
---	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL382a/c

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Tythenhanger Estate	<b>Post Code</b>	AL4 0PG
<b>Ward</b>	N/A	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	469.10	<b>Current Use</b>	Mainly agricultural with some mineral extraction and inert landfill
----------------------------	--------	--------------------	---

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Agricultural, woodland and residential to the east. Willows Farm Park and Tythenhanger Park to the north west, M25 and B556 to the west of the site		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The area is close to the built up area of London Colney, and the A1081 and M25 are also urbanising influences. However the character of the immediate area is rural albeit with mineral workings along Coursers Road.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	There are adjoining pieces of land north and south of the M25 in the same ownership but are not in the main area being promoted		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	Rest of site HEL332/HEL382		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	HEL332A/HEL382C: TP/13/1214. Construction of farm building to enclose an existing horse riding menage (GRANTED) TP/06/1353. Extension for sand and gravel extraction (HCC Consultation) (RAISE NO OBJECTIONS); TP/08/1711 Construction and operation of an In-Vessel Composting facility, including reception building, composting tunnels and ancillary development on land at Redwell Wood Farm (Consultation from Hertfordshire County Council). (RASIED OBJECTIONS). HEL332B/HEL382A: TP/90/0674. Use of land & temporary buildings as a haulage contractors yard. (REFUSED); TP/92/0495. Use of redundant farm building as a base for the installation/repair of domestic heating systems and appliances and retention of roller shutter door. (REFUSED 18/0031/CLE Continued occupation of land and buildings as Sui Generis Building Merchant Yard (Certificate of Lawful Development Existing) ; TP/99/1033 Change of use of woodland to use for war games (REFUSED). 17/1707/FUL Erection of single storey front and rear extensions to existing building following associated external alterations to include demolition of some areas; Replacement of existing and installation of new storage racks; Alterations to open storage areas and reconfiguration of car parking circulation and spaces. (GRANTED)
----------------------------------	---

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

**Proposed Development Type**

Residential, Employment, Garden Village

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

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

**Constraints Check?**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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



## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0.03
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	10.8
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	2.9
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	1.6
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
42/51	Fail / Fail	0/0	3/3	4/3	0/0	Strong / Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	Parcel 42 forms a significant part of wider gap between London Colney, Potters Bar, Brookmans Park, Welham Green and Hatfield. Scale of gap is such that there is little risk of coalescence, but where overall openness is important to preserving the perceived gap between settlements. Overall parcel is open and largely consists of arable farming fields. Large wooded areas create a sense of enclosure in central parts of the parcel.					

### 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
Garden Village A/C	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored	Assessed but not scored
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Areas A and the western part of C make a significant contribution to Purpose 2 preventing the merging of London Colney with Colney Heath to the north and Shenley to the south. If a smaller part of area c is released from the Green Belt in isolation, in particular the northern and central areas, there would be more limited harm to the wider Green Belt. Locating development within the dipped topography to the southern central part of the site could help to limit visual impacts on the wider countryside and maintain separation between the garden village site and surrounding settlements.					
<b>Recommended</b>	Partial					

## 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?	Green Belt, local wildlife sites and SSSI within the site
Is there evidence of land contamination?	Yes – there are mineral workings and landfill within the site.
Are there any access difficulties?	No
Is topography a constraint?	
Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?	Mineral workings. Redwell Wood in-vessel composting facility adjacent to site and Anaerobic Digester on Courcers Road have scope to create environmental impacts, including odours arising from IVC. M25 adjoins the site and may require noise/pollution mitigation. Some areas of flood risk.
Are there any other environmental constraints?	Various Local Wildlife sites within and adjacent to site, SSSI, Ancient Woodland.
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 most of the site, as agricultural and/or sand and gravel extraction, development of a new settlement ought to be viable. However, this will ultimately depend on the extent of on and off-site infrastructure provision required, as well as site-specific mitigation; further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan. The achievability of the site will be dependent on both
-------------------------	--

	viability and build out rates/phasing being realistic, the latter being dependent, in part, on the completion of mineral extraction at the site and any EA permitting changes required.
--	---

**Overcoming Constraints**

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Numerous Local Wildlife sites within and adjacent to site, SSSI , Ancient Woodlands.
--	--

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

Area type	Prevailing density	Accessibility	Likely type
Rural	V.Low	Very Low	Garden Village

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
146.17	30dph	40dph
	4385	5847

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 4385</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 465</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 775</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:5847</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 465</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 775</p>
---	---

## Conclusion:

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>There are current permits for the quarrying and restoration of the gravel pits on site that plan for restoration up to 2035. At present, parts of the site cannot be made available to allow development to begin on one part of the site before restoration is completed on the whole site. Concerns have previously been raised by Hertfordshire County Council in relation to the impact on the surrounding infrastructure and lack of a sufficient sustainable transport strategy.</p> <p>A site of this size contains a variety of different habitats including a number of Local Wildlife Sites and Redwell Wood, an SSSI. There are a various protected species including tree sparrow colonies which have been monitored since 1999.</p> <p>The site should be large enough to enable environmental constraints to be mitigated within the site, but the permitting issue will need to be resolved. Whilst the plan period might be extended, additional information may be required to demonstrate that the delivery of 2,400 houses within the plan period can be achieved.</p> <p>Amendments or a new permit will be required through discussion with the Environment Agency to allow the development to progress in a more timely manner. A revised transport strategy with a greater focus on sustainable options to lessen the impact on the surrounding road networks will also be necessary to alleviate concerns from Hertfordshire County Council (as well as Highways England) prior to the site potentially being allocated.</p> <p>The IVC facility can generate offensive odours and would likely create an unsatisfactory environment for any residential development nearby; a solution would need to be found including, potentially, a relocation of the facility.</p> <p>There was a specific green belt assessment undertaken for the site and it was found that if part of the area in the north east of the overall site was released there would be more limited harm to the wider green belt than releasing the site as a whole. There is a level of containment provided by Coursers Road and the M25 and the topography along with strong woodland buffers in that location means that part is recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. However, due to the size of the site and the proportion being developed, this shouldn't be a significant issue.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: 4385</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:5847</p>
--	--

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL509

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Little Simpsons, Letchmore	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8EE
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.40	<b>Current Use</b>	Previous orchard, now unused
----------------------------	------	--------------------	------------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential to south east, south west, barns to north west (one with pp for office, one residential), agricultural fields to north		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Edge of washed over village of Letchmore Heath. Rural character		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	14/0138/PD560 Change of use of Agricultural barn to a flexible use ( A1, A2, A3, B1, B8, C1 or D2)14/1929/FUL Alterations to external fenestration of existing building; Replacement of corrugated sheeting on roof with natural slate; Erection of single storey side extension with pitched roof and new entrance porch. (GRANTED) (The Apple Store); 15/2006/FUL Change of use from agricultural barn to residential dwelling house (GRANTED) (The Apple Store) Applications relate to the rear of HEL509
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	No

**Constraints Check**

Constraint	Within Site Boundary	Constraint	Within Site Boundary
AQMA	No	HSE Consultation Zone	No
Ancient Woodland	No	Local Geological Site	No
Local Nature Reserve	No	TPO	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	Yes
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	0
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Very good
-----------------------	-----------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
19	Fail	0	3	5	3	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The Parcel meets Purposes 2 and 4 moderately, maintaining the historic setting of Radlett and the overall scale and openness of the gap between Radlett and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. It also plays a particularly important role in preventing encroachment into an area of particularly unspoilt countryside. There are no identified sub-areas that would score less strongly against the purposes and it is recommended that the site is not considered further.					

### Stage 2

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

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No. Access would be onto Common Lane which together with other nearby roads, are narrow rural lanes unsuitable for heavy traffic.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	No
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	No
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

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

#### Estimated development potential - residential

(a) Density multiplier :



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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
1.56	30dph	40dph
	52	69

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:52</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 52</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: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>
--	--

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site lies within the Letchmore Heath Conservation Area, at the edge of the small rural settlement of Letchmore Heath. There are no significant constraints to developing the site itself although it is only accessed via narrow rural lanes.</p> <p>In terms of the Green Belt Stage 1 Assessment, the site forms part of a moderately performing parcel against the 5 Purposes. It was not assessed as part of the stage 2.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:52</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:69</p>
---	---

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1010-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Ham Farm, Hogg Lane, Elstree	<b>Post Code</b>	WD6 3AN
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	4.96	<b>Current Use</b>	Unknown (Undeveloped)
----------------------------	------	--------------------	-----------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Mix of uses including education to the north and north east parkland to the south and south east, agricultural land to the south west and north, (including a small number of residential) and a small airfield to the west and north west (Elstree Aerodrome).		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site lies outside of any recognised settlement boundary, but due to the numerous different uses surrounding the site, it could be described as semi-rural, dominated by the aerodrome and large boys and girls schools.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	Possible with a site across Hogg Lane to the west, but that is promoted for employment		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (estimated)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	15
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	5
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	3
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	Yes, Elstree Aerodrome
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Contamination possible - made ground in parts. Some areas of flood risk.
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Contamination possible - made ground in parts. Some areas of flood risk.
--	--

**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)	
3.72	30dph	40dph
	123	164

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:123</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 13</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:164</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 54</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
---	--

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site is mainly low level scrubland with some evidence of imported material in the form of rubble and other aggregates.</p> <p>The site lies within a parcel assessed as moderately performing against the overall Purpose score in the Stage 1 assessment. The site has not been assessed as part of the stage 2 work due to its distacne from urban areas.</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 as it is located within the Green Belt. The site is also in an isolated location in the countryside, not immediately adjacent to an existing settlement, so it is unlikely that this site will be seen as favourable. However, were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location the site could be suitable for development.</p>
--	---

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:123

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:164

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1026-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Land west of Watling Street	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham East Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.00	<b>Current Use</b>	Agricultural fields
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Agricultural fields, isolated residential		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is outside of the built area of Radlett, and separated from it by agricultural fields and pockets of woodland to the north. Watling Street/Cobden Hill bounds the site to the east, and to the east of the road lies an area of managed grassland and The area becomes more rural to the south along Cobden Hill, with a predominance of agriculture and some isolated rural businesses and schools.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	No		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential



Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	18.8
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	10.12
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	6.46
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

<b>Classification</b>	Very good
-----------------------	-----------

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
19	Fail	0	3	5	3	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The Parcel meets Purposes 2 and 4 moderately, maintaining the historic setting of Radlett and the overall scale and openness of the gap between Radlett and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. It also plays a particularly important role in preventing encroachment into an area of particularly unspoilt countryside. There are no identified sub-areas that would score less strongly against the purposes and it is recommended that the site is not considered further.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-36	Fail	0	1	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Surface water flood risk
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Surface water flood risk
--	--------------------------

#### Estimated development potential - residential

##### (a) Density multiplier :

<b>Area type</b>	<b>Prevailing density</b>	<b>Accessibility</b>	<b>Likely type</b>
------------------	---------------------------	----------------------	--------------------

Rural	Low	V. Low	Other Villages
-------	-----	--------	----------------

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
3.45	30dph	40dph
	114	152

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<p><b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b></p>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: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> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:152</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 42</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p>
--	---

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt. The site is within a sub-area which meets Purpose 3 assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration within the Hertsmere Green Belt Assessment Stage 2.</p> <p>The owner of the site has confirmed that the site is available, could be brought forward within 3 years, and can be considered for further assessment as part of the site selection process. Realistically, the site could only come forward if land to the north (HEL367) were also allocated for development, as HEL367 adjoins the southern fringes of Radlett.</p> <p>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 the application of the flood risk sequential test, and, if necessary, the exception test and engineering solutions.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:114</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:152</p>
---	---

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1018-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Oxhey Option 2: Land at Paddock Road Allotments, Watford	<b>Post Code</b>	
<b>Ward</b>	Bushey St James Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	9.36	<b>Current Use</b>	Allotments
------------------------	------	--------------------	------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential (west), Agricultural (Grazing) and Public Open Space (remaining)		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Mainly agricultural land used as public open space (Attenborough Fields) surrounding the site with Low density residential housing to the West across the borough boundary in Watford BC.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (C3), plus BNG and Allotments

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	1.74
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0.08
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
1	Pass	5+	5	3	1	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>						
<b>Recommended</b>						

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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



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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	Potentially. Access is required through land within Watford borough; part of the development area, including the means of access, is within Watford.
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	None
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

<b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b>	No	<b>Is there developer interest?</b>	No
<b>Ownership constraints?</b>	The site is owned by Watford Borough Council		
<b>Is the Site available?</b>	No		

#### Site Achievability:

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

## Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	An agreement/discussions to take place to establish willingness to make land available and acceptance of an alternative site.
--	---

## Estimated development potential - residential

### (a) Density multiplier :

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

### (b) Net capacity

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
7.02	30dph	40dph
	305	407

## Deliverability / Developability:

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	<p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:305</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 195</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:407</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 22</p>
---	---

## Conclusion:

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The site has few constraints associated with it; it is predominantly used as allotments with adjacent open fields. However, at this point, it is unknown whether the site is available, as the promoters does not own the land in question which is owned by Watford Borough Council. The site promoters own a site suggested as allotment replacement land.</p> <p>Part of the site is within Watford Borough Council and that part of the site was identified in the joint WBC/TRDC Green Belt Assessment with moderate-high to Green Belt purposes of releasing this parcel. The site was not allocated in the Watford Local Plan. This essentially precludes access from being achieved into the site into Hertsmere.</p> <p>The itself site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site would not be suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt. Were exceptional circumstances to exist which could justify amending the Green Belt boundary in this location the site could be suitable for development. However, there is no indication at this stage that the site is available and achievable.</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** HEL-1020-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	The Fields, Theobald St	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 7LS
<b>Ward</b>	Borehamwood Brookmeadow Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.39	<b>Current Use</b>	Residential
------------------------	------	--------------------	-------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Agricultural. Single Dwellings.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Surrounding land consists mainly of open countryside, with single isolated dwellings located speradically along Theobald Street.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	No		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

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

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential

Location type (tick relevant box):

Green Belt	PDL
Yes	Partial

#### 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	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 (estimated)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	20
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	0
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
18	Pass	3+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The parcel overall meets purposes 1 and 2 moderately and purpose 3 strongly. However, the west of the parcel at Shenley village is more densely developed and plays a limited role in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside, and to ensure consistency with the area of the village to the north of Radlett Lane this area should be considered further.					

### Stage 2

Sub-Area number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
SA-44	Pass	5+	3	4	0	Strong
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	No
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	Some areas of flood risk albeit mainly areas of lowest risk
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

<b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b>	Some areas of flood risk albeit mainly areas of lowest 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)	
0.39	30dph	40dph
	12	16

**Deliverability / Developability:**

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

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>The site consists of a large detached dwelling and curtilage and is free from environmental constraints, aside from having a relatively high level of surface water flood risk associated with it.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Green Belt assessment meets overall Purposes strongly. In the Stage 2 assessment, the Purpose assessment criteria were also met strongly, and the parcel makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, only development on previously developed land would be acceptable. Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable</p> <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:16</p>
---	--



:

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1063-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Former Walled Garden / Tennis Courtst, Kendall Hall Farm, Radlett	<b>Post Code</b>	WD7 7LH
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham East Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	1.81	<b>Current Use</b>	Vacant Leisure Facilities
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---------------------------

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Primary School, Residential, Light industrial, Telecommunications, Agricultural		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	Largely open area to the north of Borehamwood. Western boundary consists of some ribbon development along Watling Street. Midland Mainline located to the east of the site with residential, then open fields, beyond.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	N/A		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	19/1122/OUT, Demolition of existing buildings and structures and erection of 2 x 4-bed detached dwellings with carports/refuse stores and associated landscaping. (Outline Application to include Access, all other matters reserved, Approved
----------------------------------	--

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Retirement Village (including 60 Bedroom Care Home and 50 Extra Care Units)

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

Constraint	Percentage of Site (estimated)
Floodzone 2	0
Floodzone 3	0
Surface Water Flooding Low Risk	5
Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk	1
Surface Water Flooding High Risk	0
Reservoir Flooding Dry Day	0
Reservoir Flooding Wet Day	0

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

**Officer Assessment**

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	Potentially from existing use
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	No
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	No
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	None
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

**Site Availability:**

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

**Site Achievability:**

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**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)	
1.54	30dph	40dph
	49	65

**Deliverability / Developability:**

<b>If the site was considered suitable for development, what is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being delivered?</b>	Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:49
	Delivery in 1-5 years 49
	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:65
	Delivery in 1-5 years 60
	Delivery in 6-10 years 5
	Delivery in 11-15 years 0

**Conclusion:**

<b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b>	<p>The eastern part of the site appears to be under construction in line with the above permission. The other part of the site appears to relate to commercial or agricultural uses. There may be potential for contamination given previous/present uses on the western part of the site.</p> <p>The site sits within a parcel of strongly performing Green Belt as assessed by the Stage 1 Assessment. The area that the site is part of has not been subject to a the Stage 2 Assessment due to its distance from an urban area.</p> <p>The site has a negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, development on previously developed part of the land would be acceptable, aside from agricultural buildings. Previously demolished structures will also not count towards this.</p> <p>For any undeveloped parts or cleared parts of the site, were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes, notwithstanding its isolated location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable</p>
--	--

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:49

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:65

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0180-22

**Site location / address:**

<b>Address</b>	Kemprow, Radlett Road, Aldenham	<b>Post Code</b>	WD25 8BP
<b>Ward</b>	Aldenham West Ward	<b>Parish</b>	Other

**Site size / use:**

<b>Size (ha) Gross</b>	0.71	<b>Current Use</b>	Vacant (previously agriculture/residential garden)
----------------------------	------	--------------------	---

**Surrounding area:**

<b>Neighbouring land uses</b>	Residential dwellings at Kemprow, agricultural field to the north-east, and Radlett Road to the south-east.		
<b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>	The site is adjacent to the hamlet of Kemprow, which is a short distance from the western extent of the built area of Radlett. Fair Field Junior School is a short distance along Radlett Road to the east, and the main residential area of Radlett extends to the east of the school.		
<b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>	Yes		
<b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b>	HEL-1021-22 adjoins the north-east edge of the site.		

**Planning status:**

<b>Relevant Planning history</b>	13/1953/FUL - Demolition of existing storage building & erection of new replacement storage building & reinstatement/retention of track, 16/2406/FUL - Demolition of existing sheds and construction of detached 2 storey, 4 bed dwelling utilising existing access. (Revised Application).
----------------------------------	---

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

<b>Proposed Development Type</b>
Residential (15 Units)

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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



## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

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

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

Parcel number	1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)	1 Prevent sprawl score	2 Prevent coalescence score	3 Protect countryside score	4 Historic towns score	Overall Performance
19	Fail	0	3	5	3	Strong
<b>Stage 1 Comment</b>	The Parcel meets Purposes 2 and 4 moderately, maintaining the historic setting of Radlett and the overall scale and openness of the gap between Radlett and Bushey Heath/Bushey Village and Elstree. It also plays a particularly important role in preventing encroachment into an area of particularly unspoilt countryside. There are no identified sub-areas that would score less strongly against the purposes and it is recommended that the site is not considered further. 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-39	Fail	0	1	2	0	Weak
<b>Stage 2 Comment</b>	Meets Purpose assessment criteria weakly, but makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended.					
<b>Recommended</b>	No					

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

<b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>	Green Belt
<b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>	None
<b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>	
<b>Is topography a constraint?</b>	
<b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>	None
<b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b>	None
<b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>	Yes

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

Net Ha	Net capacity: (no. units)	
0.60	30dph	40dph
	20	27

**Deliverability / Developability:**

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

**Conclusion:**

<p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p>	<p>Kemprow is a small hamlet within 400m of the edge of Radlett. It is primarily centred on High Cross with Adelaide Lodge physically and visually detached from Kemprow. Planning permission was granted for 1 house on the site adjacent to White House, maintaining gap from Adelaide Lodge. There are no environmental constraints and so the site can be considered deliverable and achievable.</p> <p>The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration. The site is not suitable under the current planning policy framework due to its location in the Green Belt and position in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Were this to change and additional development in the Green Belt in this location deemed acceptable in line with paragraph 138 of the NPPF, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable for residential development. However, currently the site can only be recorded in the category of sites as not currently acceptable.</p> <p>The site is considered to be potentially suitable, available and achievable subject to 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:20</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:27</p>
---	--

DRAFT