

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL198

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                      |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land at Brickfields (adj Moses Dell) | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8BS |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward                   | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |                               |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.99 | <b>Current Use</b> | No visible uses - vacant land |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Open fields to south. Small number of houses to east, west and north. Track leading north to residential area of Radlett, including new development of 4 houses on Loom Lane north of The White House.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site is within a wooded area to the south of the built-up area of Radlett, and is separated from other built development by fields. Access is either via a private track and bridleway from Loom Lane or a bridleway from Cobden Hill. There are a few large, detached dwellings in the vicinity of the site but the area is largely in agricultural use. |  |  |
| <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> | HEL367 directly adjoins to east and HEL346 to south (small gap between these)   |  |  |

**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    | 1.21               |
| 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-42                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 3                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | No  |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

|   |   |                               |                               |  |   |  |     |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-----|
| <b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b> | <b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b> | <b>'Medium density' flats</b> | <b>'Higher density' flats</b> | <b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b> | <b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b> | <b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b> |     |
| Medium - High   | Medium - High                             | Medium - High                 | Medium - High                 | Medium - High  | High  | High   | 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 - no direct highway access. Access is currently via a bridleway, or narrow private track then a bridleway |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No  |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Trees/Woodlands across the site   |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Uncertain due to access issues  |

#### 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 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> | Resolution of vehicular access issues |
|--|---------------------------------------|

#### Estimated development potential - residential

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type                          |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| Rural     | V.Low              | Very low      | Sustainable Urban Ext/Garden Village |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.84   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 28                        | 37    |

**Deliverability / Developability:**

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

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The current access is either via a public bridleway from Cobden Hill or via a narrow private road/track from Loom Lane, which then connects to a section of bridleway which forms the access to the site. There is no direct vehicular access to a public road, and no obvious means of creating this as the fields to either side of the bridleway are owned by different parties.</p> <p>This site is within a wooded area (Moses Dell) so there is a high level of tree cover which would make sustainable development of the site and achievement of biodiversity net gain very difficult. Therefore the site is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>The area is not recommended for further consideration in the Hertsmere Green Belt Assessment Stage 2 because it meets purposes 2, 3 and 4 moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Under the current policy framework, the site is not suitable for development as it is located within the Green Belt, has a very low accessibility rating, and potentially a high biodiversity value.</p> <p>The site is available, but given the limited vehicular access into the site, it is not considered to be suitable or achievable for the quantum of housing which might otherwise be considered under the HELAA methodology.</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** HEL214

**Site location / address:**

|                |                               |                  |         |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land South of Theobald Street | <b>Post Code</b> |         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward            | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                      |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 3.16 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural pasture |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|----------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential to the north and east, railway line and tennis club with courts to the west, open fields to the south  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site is at the edge of the built up area of Radlett. The submission to the 2022 Call for Sites includes a parcel of land to the southeast for BNG or compensatory Green Belt improvements associated with residential development of the 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> | None |
|----------------------------------|------|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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                        | 1.96               |
| Floodzone 3                        | 0.11               |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 11.44              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 2.88               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 1.18               |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 6.09               |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 11.61              |

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

### Stage 2

| Sub-Area number        | 1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)  | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score | Overall Performance |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-40                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 1                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | Yes   |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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



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

#### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Land adjoining the highway is not in the applicant's ownership   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | Mast (Telecommunications) , overhead power lines across the west part of the site. The proximity of the railway may point to a need for noise/vibration mitigation |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Small areas of fluvial, surface water flood risk across parts of the site.   |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Not presently, given ownership issues relating to access   |

#### Site Availability:

|  |  |                                     |     |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|-----|
| <b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b> | Yes  | <b>Is there developer interest?</b> | Yes |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    | Yes. Ownership of verge over which access to Theobald St is required |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes, if access issue resolved  |                                     |     |

#### 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> | Resolution of access ownership |
|--|--------------------------------|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type                                      |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Rural     | V.Low              | High          | Garden<br>Suburbs/Sustainable Urban<br>Extension |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 2.37   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 128                       | 180   |

**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:128</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 18</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:180</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|---|--|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Access is from Theobald Street across highway land.</p> <p>It is understood that the design of the junction has been agreed with Hertfordshire County Council, although the issue of ownership of the access is to be resolved. The achievable area might also be impacted by any maintenance strip of the adjacent trainline.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The sub-area meets the GB purposes assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, and so the sub-area is recommended for further consideration in the Hertsmeare Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site is available and achievable for residential development, but would not be suitable as it is located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|--|--|

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:128

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:180

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL225

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                  |         |
|----------------|---|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | SE of track between Loom Lane and Brickfields | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8AB |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward                            | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |             |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.72 | <b>Current Use</b> | Vacant land |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential and green field land  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | On southern edge of Radlett; residential dwellings to the north, open land to the south |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | Not directly. Site is opposite HEL226 but separated by a track                          |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | 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>                       | 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> | 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-42                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 3                      | 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> |   |
| 0   | 0   | 0                             | 0                             | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 |

#### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Yes - accessed via a private track   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Significant tree cover and archaeological interest   |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Unlikely given presently available information. Access and environmental constraints (tree cover) may preclude development |

#### 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 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> | Resolution of access issues, and full assessment and appropriate mitigation of biodiversity value of existing tree cover |
|--|--|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type                                |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Rural     | V.Low              | Low           | Garden Suburbs/Sustainable Urban Extension |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.61   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 21                        | 28    |

**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:21</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 21</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:28</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 28</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|--|--|

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>No current vehicular access and heavy tree cover. Consideration is also needed of archaeology on the site, as it is within an archaeological site and the presence of 'Roman Pottery Kilns' is indicated on the OS map.</p> <p>Access to the site is currently via a private road/bridleway, so access to the public highway remains to be clarified. The site is entirely covered in trees, so a detailed ecological assessment would be required. This is likely to reduce the potential amount of development on the site.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>The sub-area meets the green belt purposes assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, and so the sub-area is not recommended for further consideration in the Hertsmere Green Belt Assessment. However this site is located on the very edge of the urban area, so plays a small role in the overall contribution of the wider sub-area.</p> <p>Ownership and access issues are the primary concern, and a full assessment of biodiversity value would be needed even if that is resolved given heavy tree cover across the site.</p> <p>The site is therefore available, but is not suitable for residential development as it is located within the Green Belt, and is unlikely to be suitable or achievable in light of the presently available information relating to access and trees/ecology.</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** HEL226

**Site location / address:**

|                |   |                  |         |
|----------------|---|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | NW of track between Loom Lane and Brickfields | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8AB |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward                            | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |             |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.39 | <b>Current Use</b> | Vacant land |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential and green field land   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Residential dwellings to the north of the site, mostly surrounded by Green Belt land |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | Not directly. Site is opposite HEL225 but does not directly adjoin                   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | n/a  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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> | 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-42                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 3                      | 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> |   |
| 0   | 0   | 0                             | 0                             | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0 |

#### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Yes – access is via a private track  |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Significant tree cover.  |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Unlikely given presently available information. Access and environmental constraints (tree cover) may preclude development |

#### 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 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> | Achievability of vehicular access to an adoptable standard. |
|--|---|

## Estimated development potential - residential

### (a) Density multiplier :

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type                                      |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Rural     | V.Low              | Low           | Garden<br>Suburbs/Sustainable Urban<br>Extension |

### (b) Net capacity

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.39   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 13                        | 18    |

### 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:13</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 13</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:18</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 18</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>Access to the site is via a private road/bridleway, so access to the public highway remains to be clarified. The site is entirely covered in trees, so a detailed ecological assessment would be required, and the potential amount of development that could be achieved on the site is likely to be reduced as a result.</p> <p>The sub-area meets the GB purposes assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, and so the sub-area is not recommended for further consideration in the Hertsmere Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>However this site is located on the very edge of the urban area, so plays a small role in the overall contribution of the wider sub-area.</p> <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development.</p> <p>Ownership and access issues are the primary concern, along with Green Belt, but a full assessment of biodiversity value would be needed even if those issues were resolved, given heavy tree cover across the site.</p> <p>The site is therefore available, but is unlikely to be suitable or achievable in light of the presently available information relating to access and trees/ecology.</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** HEL358

**Site location / address:**

|                |                            |                  |         |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land south of Shenley road | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7EL |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward         | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |          |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 11.51 | <b>Current Use</b> | Farmland |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential to the west, woodland to the east and south, school to the south west.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is an edge of settlement location adjoining the edge of Radlett. The surrounding rural area is undulating in character with woodland areas in part. The southern section of the site bordering Theobald Street is a wooded area designated as a Local Wildlife site. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No  |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | n/a   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | <p>TP/02/0773 New gallop (GRANTED);</p> <p>TP/08/1167 open air manege (GRANTED)</p> <p>22/1539/OUT Erection of up to 195 new homes (40% affordable), safeguarded land for the expansion of Newberries Primary School and provision of a new medical centre, along with associated access. Outline application to include the matter of ACCESS (with the following matters reserved: APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT and SCALE). (REFUSED) (APPEAL DISMISSED)</p> |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | Yes                         |
| <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    | 4.29               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 1.3                |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 0.34               |
| 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 30                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 5                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. It does not meet purpose 4. There is however scope for sub-division in the north-west of the parcel adjoining Radlett. This area, bounded by dense wooded to the east and south, the edge of Radlett to the west and Shenley Road to the north, is relatively small in scale and makes only a limited contribution to the gap between Radlett and Shenley (purpose 2). Furthermore, it is visually more connected to the settlement edge and has a limited relationship with the wider countryside to the east. It is recommended that this subarea is considered further. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
|                        | 0  |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### Stage 2

| Sub-Area number        | 1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)  | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score | Overall Performance |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-75                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Recommended for further consideration. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | Yes   |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

| Landscape sensitivity to residential housing development/ smaller flats |                                    | Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial |                        |   | Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution |   | Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses                          | 'Medium density' mixed residential | 'Medium density' flats   | 'Higher density' flats | Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment | Large-scale commercial and office blocks                                  | Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities |   |
| Medium - High   | Medium - High                      | Medium - High  | Medium - High          | Medium - High   | High  | High  | 0   |

#### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Green Belt   |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | No   |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | Yes - narrow strip of land not in owners' possession to Shenley Road       |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | No   |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | No   |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | No   |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | If issue of strip of land not in applicants ownership can be resolved, yes |

#### Site Availability:

|   |  |                              |    |
|---|--|------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available? | Yes  | Is there developer interest? | No |
| Ownership constraints?                    | Possible ownership constraint relating to the access |                              |    |
| Is the Site available?                    | Yes  |                              |    |

#### Site Achievability:

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

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

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type                                |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| Rural     | V.Low              | Medium        | Garden Suburbs/Sustainable Urban Extension |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 6.50   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 254                       | 338   |

**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:254</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 144</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:338</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 228</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 within the Green Belt so is not suitable for residential development under the current policy framework. The very far south west of the site lies within the edge of the Local Wildlife Site (Theobald Street Wood).</p> <p>The entirety of the site is currently designated as a Regionally Important Geological Site (Radlett Field), due to the presence of Hertfordshire Puddingstone. Although a non-statutory designation, the site is designated as a RIGS in the Hertsmere Local Plan.</p> <p>A previous geoconservation assessment of the site commissioned on behalf of the site promoter concludes that it is currently in unfavourable condition, due to a lack of visibility of the feature and that it compares unfavourably to the neighbouring Radlett Plantation RIGS.</p> <p>This has been validated by the Hertfordshire RIGS Group who have indicated that the RIGS site should be delisted (it no longer appears on their website) and limited access allowed to the Radlett Plantation site in order to conserve what was deemed to be a more critical geological site.</p> <p>There is scope to create a pedestrian access through Williams Way into Radlett with vehicular access via Shenley Road. Due to the impact on the LWS, access off Theobald Street would not be supported and HCC has previously not supported vehicular access, for general traffic, from both Shenley Road and Theobald Street.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The site forms its own sub-area for the purposes of the Green Belt Assessment Stage 2, and meets the purpose assessment criteria moderately, but makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The sub-area is recommended for further consideration.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:254</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:338</p> |
|---|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference**    **HEL379**

**Site location / address:**

|                |                            |                  |          |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Kemprow Farm, Watford Road | <b>Post Code</b> | WD25 8NR |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward         | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett  |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |                   |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 35.86 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural Land |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential, agriculture  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The built up area of Radlett adjoins the site to the south of Watford Road, characterised by low-density housing. To the north, east and west the site is surrounded by open land, primarily farmland with some wooded areas. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No  |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | Yes                         |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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> | Yes |
| <b>Locally Listed Buildings within Site</b>              | No  |

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 4.5                |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 2                  |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 1                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 0                  |

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

| Parcel number          | 1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)   | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score | Overall Performance |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-38                  | Fail  | 0                      | 1                           | 5                           | 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   |  |

#### 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>       | Northern part of site may be affected by Blackbirds Farm sewage treatment works. |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | There is a Local Wildlife Site within the site boundary                          |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes  |

#### Site Availability:

|  |     |                                     |    |
|--|-----|-------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Has the owner said the site is available?</b> | Yes | <b>Is there developer interest?</b> | No |
| <b>Ownership constraints?</b>                    |     |                                     |    |
| <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> | There is a Local Wildlife Site within the site boundary |
|--|---|

#### Estimated development potential - residential

##### (a) Density multiplier :

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



|       |       |     |                           |
|-------|-------|-----|---------------------------|
| Rural | V.Low | Low | Sustainable Neighbourhood |
|-------|-------|-----|---------------------------|

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |              |
|--------|---------------------------|--------------|
| 17.93  | <b>30dph</b>              | <b>40dph</b> |
|        | 619                       | 825          |

**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:619</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 199</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:825</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 350</p> |
|--|--|

**Conclusion:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>There are two TPOs and a Local Wildlife Site within the site boundary, and the northern edge of the site is across the road from a sewage treatment works. The site is within the Green Belt, which makes it unsuitable for development within the current policy context, and there are two TPOs and a Local Wildlife Site within the site</p> <p>The size of the site is large enough that the TPOs and LWS could be avoided in the layout of any built development, as could the limited areas which are subject to surface water flood risk. Less than 5% is subject to the highest level of surface water flood risk; a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted and the site would be subject to the Sequential test but it is highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The site can be accessed directly from Watford Road which would be the principal points of ingress/egress. Access onto Oakridge Lane, a narrow lane which becomes a track as it runs north east towards Colney Street and Frogmore, is not currently capable of accommodating additional vehicular movements</p> <p>The southern portion of the site, in particular, is in a relatively accessible location but a new T-junction or new access roundabout is proposed for the principal access into the site.</p> <p>HCC have previously advised the applicant that modelling of the M1 Jct 5 would be required although the transport report submitted concludes the proposed site access itself can accommodate the proposed levels of traffic. However, other local junctions nearby are projected to operate above their theoretical capacity unless physical improvements are made to the junction or local network.</p> <p>It is likely that development could be situated towards the southern and eastern edges of the site, closer to the built area of Radlett, which would also be further away from the sewage treatment works.</p> |
|---|---|

Overall, the green belt sub-area plays a fundamental role with respect to the wider Parcel and surrounding sub-areas. Its release would serve to fragment a visually sensitive and open part of the strategic countryside. The site is within a sub-area that meets the Green Belt Purpose assessment criteria weakly, but makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:619

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:825

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1021-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                     |                  |          |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land north of Radlett Road, Radlett | <b>Post Code</b> | WD25 8NR |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward                  | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett  |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |      |                    |              |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 6.25 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Agricultural land (Ploughed fields). Low density residential to west at Kemprow. Fairfield Junior School is on the opposite (south-eastern) side of Radlett Road/Watford Road (B462).   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The western boundary of the site adjoins the hamlet of Kemprow, which is a short distance from the edge of the built settlement of Radlett. Fair Field Junior School is a short distance along Radlett Road to the east, and the man 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> | R1 Land north of Watford Rd   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | <p>Land Surrounding Kemprow Farm Kemprow Aldenham Hertfordshire WD25 8NR:<br/>           17/0580/FUL. Erection of multi purpose agricultural storage barn and associated hard standing.<br/>           17/1329/FUL. Erection of multi purpose agricultural storage barn. (Revised Application)<br/>           18/1254/FUL. Erection of multi purpose agricultural storage barn<br/>           20/0193/FUL. Erection of multi purpose agricultural storage barn.</p> <p>Blackbirds Barn Kemprow Aldenham:<br/>           18/2118/FUL. Restoration and conversion of the Grade II Listed East Barn, Kemprow Farm, erection of a two and a half storey extension with basement to create a new linked residential dwelling (Class C3), conversion of existing small barn for car parking, cycle parking and storage. Erection of a one and a half storey, dwelling (Class C3) with car port and storage. Demolition of buildings and structures, and landscaping. (Application for Planning Permission)</p> |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | 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> | 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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   | 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>       | Northern part of the site might be affected by proximity to sewage treatment works |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Pylons cross the site from north to west. Local wildlife site.                     |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes  |

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Is the Site achievable?</b> | In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. 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, as well as a need to avoid areas close to overhead power lines. 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> | None. There are no major constraints affecting the site. |
|--|--|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 4.68   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 183                       | 244   |

**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:183</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 73</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:244</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 134</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|---|---|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is currently in use as arable farmland, and there are no significant environmental constraints present. There is a 1.6ha area of ancient woodland (Dellfield Wood) which is designated as a wildlife site, along with a smaller 0.4ha copse nearer to Watford Road.</p> <p>The site can be accessed directly from Watford Road which would be the principal points of ingress/egress. Any access to the north west would be onto Oakridge Lane, a narrow lane which becomes a track as it runs north east towards Colney Street and Frogmore and so not currently capable of accommodating additional vehicular movements towards those settlements.</p> <p>Power lines cross part of the site, but it is considered to be large enough for these to be factored into the design. The site is within the Green Belt, which makes it unsuitable for development within the current policy context.</p> <p>The site is within a sub-area that meets the Green Belt Purpose assessment criteria weakly, but makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> |
|--|--|

Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.  
Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:183

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:244

DRAFT



**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1027-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                      |                  |          |
|----------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|
| <b>Address</b> | 38-40 Watling Street | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7NN  |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward   | <b>Parish</b>    | Aldenham |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |     |                    |  |
|----------------------------|-----|--------------------|--|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 1.8 | <b>Current Use</b> | Commercial premises, parking area and lockup garages |
|----------------------------|-----|--------------------|--|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Town centre commercial and residential uses. Immediate neighbours are a veterinary surgery and cosmetic clinic.  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Built up mixed edge of town centre residential and commercial use area within the Radlett North Conservation Area. Nearby development predominantly characterised by building heights of up to 2 storeys with the exception of two recently-built 3-storey flat blocks on Watling Street opposite the junction with Park 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> | <p>23/1454/FUL, Demolition of existing garages on Plot B, to enable the development of new three-storey residential apartment block comprising of 5 units (3 x 3 bed flats and 2 x 2 bed flats) to include basement and surface level parking, bin store, bike store, amenity space, associated landscaping and access from Park Road. Redevelopment of middle block approved under application 20/0384/FUL to create 2 x 2 bed units on Plot A. (Revised application), Awaiting Decision.</p> <p>20/0384/FUL   Redevelopment of site comprising re-use and extension of 2 semi-detached former cottages, construction of 2 detached buildings to create a further 4 x 2 bed &amp; 1 x 3 bed dwellings, Granted</p> |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

| <b>Constraint</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Listed Building within Site</b>                       | No  |
| <b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>               | Yes |
| <b>Conservation Area</b>                                 | 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    | 0.35               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 0                  |

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

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

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | No  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | Not obvious, but given the previous use, there is potential |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | No  |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | None  |
| <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>                    | None |                                     |     |
| <b>Is the Site available?</b>                    | Yes  |                                     |     |

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Potential contamination from previous use. |
|--|--|

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type            |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Central   | Medium             | High          | Urban Brownfield Mixed |

#### (b) Net capacity

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.18   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 19                        | 32    |

**Deliverability / Developability:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What is the likely timescale within which the site is capable of being developed?</b> | <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:19</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 19</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:32</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 32</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|--|--|

**Conclusion:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is brownfield land and is located close to the centre of Radlett. The site is considered acceptable under current policy framework, notwithstanding mitigation against potential contamination.</p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for 7 units on the site, and a revised application is currently in the process of being determined (submitted 12/10/2023) for the same number of units.</p> <p>The site is within the Radlett North Conservation Area. The site is constrained by its location to the rear of the main frontage with Watling Street, and the surrounding buildings are predominantly 2-storey with some newer 3-storey (Including roof level) buildings on the opposite side of Watling Street.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The site is considered 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:19</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:32</p> |
|--|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1028-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Porters Park Golf Club, Site 1 | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7AZ |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward             | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                                       |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 0.56 | <b>Current Use</b> | Golf Course and associated facilities |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Site adjoins residential area to north and west, and the golf course to the east. Surrounding area comprises settlement fringe low density housing, wooded areas associated with the golf course and open agricultural fields                 |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Site on the western edge of the golf course, bordering Radlett Village and open countryside. Surrounding area is comprises of settlement fringe low density housing, wooded areas associated with the golf club and open agricultural fields. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No  |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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                        | 1.33               |
| Floodzone 3                        | 11.18              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 49.6               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 16.88              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 10.84              |
| 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 30                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 5                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. It does not meet purpose 4. There is however scope for sub-division in the north-west of the parcel adjoining Radlett. This area, bounded by dense wooded to the east and south, the edge of Radlett to the west and Shenley Road to the north, is relatively small in scale and makes only a limited contribution to the gap between Radlett and Shenley (purpose 2). Furthermore, it is visually more connected to the settlement edge and has a limited relationship with the wider countryside to the east. It is recommended that this subarea is considered further. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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-35                  | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 2                           | 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 | Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial | Landscape Sensitivity to large scale | Landscape sensitivity |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|  |  |                                      |                       |



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

#### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Green Belt. Wildlife Site  |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | No   |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | The site currently has no direct vehicular access. Several access options are being explored by the site promoter.   |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | The majority of the site slopes gently down towards the northeast, but a more severe incline towards the corner of the site closest to the edge of Radlett may constrain development on that part of the site. |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | No   |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | Significant areas of fluvial and surface water flood risk  |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | Yes  |

#### Site Availability:

|   |   |                              |    |
|---|---|------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available? | Yes   | Is there developer interest? | No |
| Ownership constraints?                    | Access would need to be resolved, as well as full consideration of the Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course), and the presence of Floodzone 2 and 3 on part of the site. |                              |    |
| Is the Site available?                    | Yes   |                              |    |

#### Site Achievability:

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable? | In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of a small 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> | Sequential and potentially exceptions test for flood risk |
|--|---|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.48   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 19                        | 25    |

**Deliverability / Developability:**

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

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>There is currently no direct means of vehicular access to the site. This will need to be resolved before the site can be considered to be achievable, and the site promoter is currently exploring options.</p> <p>The whole of the golf course forms Porters Park Golf Course Local Wildlife Site, and so a detailed ecological assessment work will be required in order to fully assess the impact of any proposals on biodiversity.</p> <p>The site has a significant level of flood risk and is unlikely to pass the Sequential and Exception Tests without mitigating circumstances in their favour. Sites at the upper end of the range are unlikely to be suitable for development.</p> <p>The Hertsmere Green Belt Review assessed the site as part of a wider sub-area which meets the Green Belt purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration in the independent Stage 2 Green Belt review.</p> <p>The site is therefore available but may not be suitable or achievable based on the current information.</p> |
|--|--|

Capacity following any Green Belt review, resolution of access requirements and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline: ~~019~~

Capacity following any Green Belt review, resolution of access requirements and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers: ~~025~~

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1029-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Porters Park Golf Club, Site 2 | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7AZ |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward             | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                        |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 1.05 | <b>Current Use</b> | Golf Course club house |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Site consists of the club house and car park associated with Porters Park Golf Club, located to the south west of the golf course. Housing lies to the south and west, on the fringe of Radlett |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Site is adjacent to residential area to the south and west, and the remainder of the golf course to the east and north. The site is partially enclosed by wooded area on the boundaries.        |  |  |
| <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> | A number of applications related to the existing use as a golf club. |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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    | 1.66               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 1.32               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 1.19               |
| 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 30                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 5                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. It does not meet purpose 4. There is however scope for sub-division in the north-west of the parcel adjoining Radlett. This area, bounded by dense wooded to the east and south, the edge of Radlett to the west and Shenley Road to the north, is relatively small in scale and makes only a limited contribution to the gap between Radlett and Shenley (purpose 2). Furthermore, it is visually more connected to the settlement edge and has a limited relationship with the wider countryside to the east. It is recommended that this subarea is considered further. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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-35                  | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 2                           | 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 | Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial | Landscape Sensitivity to large scale | Landscape sensitivity |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|  |  |                                      |                       |

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

#### Officer Assessment

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

#### Site Availability:

|   |  |                              |    |
|---|--|------------------------------|----|
| Has the owner said the site is available? | Yes  | Is there developer interest? | No |
| Ownership constraints?                    | Redevelopment for housing depends on a new site for the clubhouse to be finalised so not immediately available, but should be within 5 years |                              |    |
| Is the Site available?                    | Yes  |                              |    |

#### Site Achievability:

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable? | In an area of high housing demand and as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the site is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs will primarily be covered by CIL, with low BNG requirements due to the previously developed status of the site, although any significant site-specific infrastructure requirements may require additional viability work to be undertaken. The site promoter has indicated that there would be a need to relocate the existing clubhouse on the site before redevelopment could take place, which has the potential to impact on the viability of the site for development. |
|-------------------------|---|

**Overcoming Constraints**

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

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.89   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 39                        | 52    |

**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:39</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 39</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:52</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 52</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|---|--|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Site is available subject to permission from owners and relocation of current clubhouse to vacate this part of the golf course. Any replacement clubhouse would likely need to be significantly smaller in order to secure planning permission. A site has been put forward for a replacement club house. This is the Sand Plantation site at the far eastern edge of the golf course which is outside of the Local Wildlife Site but within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The site has negligible flood risk and therefore is not expected to be a constraint to development. Sites with a low level of flood risk will be subject to the Sequential Test, but they are highly likely to pass at this level of risk.</p> <p>The sub-area meets the green belt purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. However this site consists primarily of previously developed land, so the majority of it is suitable, available and achievable within the current policy context.</p> <p>Under paragraph 154 of the NPPF, 28 units could potentially be brought forward under the current policy framework as not inappropriate development. However, the timescales associated with delivering a new club house before any residential development could commence mean that it is more likely that development would occur within years 6-10.</p> |
|--|--|



Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:39

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:52

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1030-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Porters Park Golf Club, Site 3 | <b>Post Code</b> |         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward             | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                                       |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 1.07 | <b>Current Use</b> | Golf Course and associated facilities |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Site is a small part of the Porters Park Golf Club, located to the south of the golf course. Outside of the golf course, it is beyond the eastern limits of Radlett and is predominantly forested on the opposite side of Radlett Lane                     |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | To the north (the golf course) is mostly open land with mature vegetation. To the south, separated from the site by Shenley Road, is a dense woodland, a Local Wildlife Site and Local Nature Reserve site. Rural outlook with little visible development. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A  |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | No                          |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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    | 7.8                |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 2.4                |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 2                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 0                  |

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

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

### 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-35                  | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 2                           | 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 | Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial | Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution | Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |   |   |

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

#### Officer Assessment

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Green Belt  |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | No  |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | No specific access has been proposed, but the site adjoins Shenley Road |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | No  |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | No  |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course)                          |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | Yes   |

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable? | In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable 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> | Acceptable site access.Appropriate assessment of onsite habitats, and mitigation of ecological impacts. |
|--|---|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type    |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural     | Low                | Very Low      | Other Villages |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.91   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 30                        | 40    |

**Deliverability / Developability:**

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

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development. The majority of the golf course forms Porters Park Golf Course Local Wildlife Site, and so a detailed ecological assessment work will be required in order to fully assess the impact of any proposals on biodiversity.</p> <p>The Hertsmere Green Belt Review assessed the site as part of a wider sub-area which meets the Green Belt purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration in the independent Stage 2 Green Belt review.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site is available and achievable for residential development, but would not be suitable as it is located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> |
|---|--|

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

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

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1031-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                                |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Porters Park Golf Club, Site 4 | <b>Post Code</b> |         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Shenley Ward                   | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                                       |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 1.37 | <b>Current Use</b> | Golf Course and associated facilities |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Site is a small part of the Porters Park Golf Club, located to the south east of the golf course adjacent to the golf course across Radlett Lane are open fields/countryside                             |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | To the north (the golf course) is mostly open land with mature vegetation. To the south are open fields/agriculture, although the high hedgerows on either side of Radlett Lane mainly screen this view. |  |  |
| <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 or Golf Clubhouse    |



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    | 11.5               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 0.13               |
| 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 |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 30                     | Pass   | 3+                     | 3                           | 5                           | 0                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel meets purposes 1 and 2 and meets purpose 3 strongly. It does not meet purpose 4. There is however scope for sub-division in the north-west of the parcel adjoining Radlett. This area, bounded by dense wooded to the east and south, the edge of Radlett to the west and Shenley Road to the north, is relatively small in scale and makes only a limited contribution to the gap between Radlett and Shenley (purpose 2). Furthermore, it is visually more connected to the settlement edge and has a limited relationship with the wider countryside to the east. It is recommended that this subarea is considered further. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### 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-35                  | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 2                           | 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 | Landscape sensitivity to residential flats/ small scale commercial | Landscape Sensitivity to large scale commercial/ industrial/ distribution | Landscape sensitivity to a new settlement |
|--|--|---|---|
|  |  |   |   |

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

#### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Green Belt                                     |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | No   |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | No, although may need an upgrade               |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | No   |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | No   |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | Local Wildlife Site (Porters Park Golf Course) |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | Yes  |

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Is the Site achievable? | In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable 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> | Acceptable site access.Appropriate assessment of onsite habitats, and mitigation of ecological impacts. |
|--|---|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type    |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Rural     | Very Low           | Very Low      | Other Villages |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 1.16   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 37                        | 49    |

**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:37</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 37</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:49</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 49</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 0</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|--|--|

**Conclusion:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The site has no flood risk and so this is not a constraint to development. The majority of the golf course forms Porters Park Golf Course Local Wildlife Site, and so a detailed ecological assessment work will be required in order to fully assess the impact of any proposals on biodiversity.</p> <p>The Hertsmere Green Belt Review assessed the site as part of a wider sub-area which meets the Green Belt purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration in the independent Stage 2 Green Belt review.</p> <p>Under the current policy framework, the site is available and achievable for residential development, but would not be suitable as it is located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering additional homes in this location, the site could potentially be suitable, available and achievable.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:37</p> |
|---|--|

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:49

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1032-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                             |                  |         |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land at Battlers Green Farm | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8PQ |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward          | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |              |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 19.72 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agricultural |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | South-western edge of Radlett's residential area to the north east, Battler's Green Farm to the south east and Kemprow hamlet to the north west, agricultural land forms the remaining boundary, predominantly to the south and south west of the site.                         |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Urban fringe/semi rural with mainly medium density semi-detached dwellings the opposite side of New Road and large agricultural open fields., Battlers Green Farm and associated businesses and Kemprow provide the site with some enclosure on the eastern and northern edges. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No  |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

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

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | No                          |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | 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>                       | 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    | 0.81               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 0.25               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 0.2                |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 0                  |

## Agricultural Land Classification

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

## Green Belt purposes

### Stage 1

| Parcel number          | 1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)  | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score | Overall Performance |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 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-37                  | Fail  | 0                      | 1                           | 3                           | 0                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | No  |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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



|   |   |                               |                               |  |   |  |     |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-----|
| <b>'Low-density' two/two and a half-storey houses</b> | <b>'Medium density' mixed residential</b> | <b>'Medium density' flats</b> | <b>'Higher density' flats</b> | <b>Smaller-scale commercial/ industrial use and employment</b> | <b>Large-scale commercial and office blocks</b> | <b>Large-scale warehouse distribution facilities</b> |     |
| Medium - High   | Medium - High                             | Medium - High                 | Medium - High                 | Medium - High  | High  | High   | 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> | Archeological site within site boundary. Power lines cross the north-west portion of the site. |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes  |

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

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

#### Overcoming Constraints

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | There are no specific environmental constraints that are likely to limit development. |
|--|---|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 12.82  | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 558                       | 743   |

**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:558</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 138</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:743</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 323</p> |
|---|--|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is within the Green Belt and the north-west portion of the site is bisected by overhead wires, including an electricity pylon.</p> <p>The site is large enough that development could be concentrated towards the south-eastern end of the site in order to accommodate the pylon and overhead wires, with the north-western part being used for open space, green infrastructure and/or BNG. However, this would potentially be best accessed directly from New Road and/or Loom Lane. Both roads are relatively narrow and no technical assessments have been submitted; it is unclear what quantum of development the local road network could accommodate.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The site meets GB Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for release from the Green Belt in the Green Belt Review in the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>The site is available and achievable, but not considered to be suitable within the current policy context. It may be considered suitable if the Green Belt boundary were amended through a review of the Local Plan and technical issues, including highway capacity, can be addressed.</p> |
|--|--|

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:558

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:743

DRAFT

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1052-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |  |                  |         |
|----------------|--|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land at Hill Farm, West of Watling Street, | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7HP |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward                         | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                        |       |                    |             |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 13.49 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agriculture |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Arable fields and grassland to the north and west, residential to south. Watling Street and industrial uses to the east.   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site adjoins the rear gardens of detached houses in Watling Knoll, The Close, Brook Drive and Oakridge Avenue on the edge of the built-up area of Radlett. There are a number of industrial/open storage uses on a site on the opposite side of Watling Street to the east (within St Albans District) but these are not visible from the site as they are separated from the road by a belt of trees. |  |  |
| <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/06/0511 Building for dual use; for agriculture and domestic outbuilding. Grant permission. |
|----------------------------------|---|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 1.53               |
| Floodzone 3                        | 9.3                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 11.93              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 8.03               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 3.67               |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 13.54              |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 17.98              |

## 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-34                  | Fail  | 0                      | 5                           | 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   | N/A |

### Officer Assessment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Access to the fields is currently from the Hill Farm access road, which is a private, gated track, itself accessed from Watling Street (close to the junction with Harper Lane) and from Oakridge Lane, which is a narrow, rural lane. |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Parts of the site are subject to fluvial, surface water and reservoir flood risk. A watercourse (The Brook) bisects the site.  |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | Yes  |

### Site Availability:

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

### Site Achievability:

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

### Overcoming Constraints



|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Parts of the site are subject to fluvial, surface water and reservoir flood risk, including Floodzone 3, so the site would be subject to the Sequential and Exception tests. It is bisected by a watercourse, so a design solution to enable safe access to all parts of the site would be required. |
|--|--|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 8.77   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 329                       | 439   |

**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:329</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 193</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:439</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 275</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 18</p> |
|---|---|

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>The site is in the Green Belt and has a measurable level of flood risk. Radlett Brook/Tykeswater bisects the site, and a portion of the centre of the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. The Brook and its floodplain bisect the site, and there is no obvious point of vehicular access to the western portion of the site (Oakridge Lane to the west is a narrow private track). This may reduce the developable area of the site in order to permit dry access to all areas of the site, however a design solution may be achievable.</p> <p>Vehicular access may be an additional constraint. The site is currently accessed via a private track from Watling Street which runs to the north of the site boundary, or via another track from Oakridge Lane to the west. Access from Watling Street may be possible but further work would be required to demonstrate how this might be achieved.</p> <p>The site is within a sub-area that meets the Green Belt purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. It is not recommended for further consideration in the independent Stage 2 Green Belt Review.</p> |
|--|--|

The site is available, but further work is required around the flood risk sequential and exception tests and vehicular access to determine whether it is suitable and achievable. In any case, it would only be suitable and achievable within a policy context in which it was considered there were exceptional circumstances for redrawing the green belt boundary in this location.

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:329

Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:439

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-1055-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                    |                  |         |
|----------------|--------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Home Farm, Radlett | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8PU |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |             |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 45.24 | <b>Current Use</b> | Agriculture |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Agriculture / fields and some isolated dwellings   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The north of the site adjoins the settlement edge of Radlett, which consists of detached dwellings with large rear gardens. The site is surrounded on all other sides by a rural landscape, primarily in agricultural use. |  |  |
| <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> | HEL902 and smaller sites HEL198, HEL136 and HEL213 adjoin to the north.<br><br>Smaller site HEL-1026-22 is within the site boundary<br>HEL367, HEL-1016-22 also adjoin   |  |  |

**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>                              | 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>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    | 7.47               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 2.59               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 1.68               |
| 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>      | Yes  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | The current access from Cobden Hill is via narrow bridleway. The suitability of any more significant vehicular access onto Cobden Hill remains to be determined. |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | A small but measurable area of the site is subject to 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> | In an area of high housing demand and given the low existing use value of a greenfield site, it is anticipated development of the site would be viable. This has been evidenced in the applications submitted to the Council on greenfield sites over the past 12 months where viability has not been presented as a barrier to delivering policy-compliant (other than green belt) development on larger sites. Further viability work will be required should the site be taken forward in the plan and there may be some site-specific infrastructure requirements, over and above CIL. However, subject to viability and build out rates/phasing proposed being realistic, the site is capable of being achievable. |
|--------------------------------|---|

#### Overcoming Constraints

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | A small but measurable area of the site is subject to surface water flood risk, so would be subject to the sequential and exception tests. |
|--|--|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 22.62  | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 746                       | 995   |

**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:746</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 259</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:995</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 70</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 350</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 350</p> <p>Delivery 16+ years 225</p> |
|---|--|

**Conclusion:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The site comprises a large and generally flat area of open countryside to the south west of Radlett. Access via Common Lane is currently (1) via footpath 17 which runs between the main house at Home Farm and the complex of listed buildings at Battlers Green House and (2) via footpath 71 which currently has limited vehicular use via either landowner permission or private access rights.</p> <p>The site boundary abuts Cobden Hill to the east, and current access is via a bridleway running parallel to Cobden Hill Dell, an area of woodland adjacent to Watling Street which is a Local Wildlife Site and covered by a Woodland TPO. This piece of land is within the 'red line' submitted for the site but was previously understood to be in a separate ownership, potentially restricting the ability to create a new access on the east side of the site.</p> <p>The site is within a wider parcel identified as performing strongly in the Stage 1 Green Belt assessment, with regard to its role in maintaining the historic setting of Radlett, preventing coalescence of settlements (Radlett, Bushey and Elstree) and in particular, preventing encroachment into the countryside. The independent Stage 2 Green Belt assessment did not recommend the sub-area within which the site is located for further consideration.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk, so 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. This site is at the lower end of this range, and around 7% of the site area is at high risk of surface water flooding, so it is considered likely that this could be avoided through masterplanning if the Sequential Test were passed.</p> <p>The site is not suitable for development under the current policy framework due to its Green Belt status; were the impact on the Green Belt considered to be outweighed by the wider sustainability benefits of delivering a significant quantum of growth in this location and issues around flood risk and access into the site were satisfactorily resolved, the site is potentially suitable, available and achievable for development.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:746</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:995</p> |
|---|---|



Site location / address:

|                |                           |                  |         |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | 5-23 Cobden Hill, Radlett | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 7JL |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward        | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

Site size / use:

|                        |      |                    |             |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|
| <b>Size (ha) Gross</b> | 0.39 | <b>Current Use</b> | Garden land |
|------------------------|------|--------------------|-------------|

Surrounding area:

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential to north, west and south. Open land and playing fields to the east, running up to the railway line  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | Edge of Radlett location. The site is largely contained within the existing ribbon development along Cobden Hill to the south of Radlett. It immediately adjoins a recent backland development at The Mews to the south, and more open land to the east, which includes Radlett Tennis Club and King Georg V Playing Fields. It is bounded by the railway line to the east and Cobden Hill to the west. |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | No  |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | N/A   |  |  |

Planning status:

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | TP/92/0009, Construction of 6 no.two bedroom houses and 5 no.three bedroom houses with access road and parking spaces (Outline application), REFUSED.<br><br>20/0616/FUL. Alterations to No 15 Cobden Hill; erection of 8 dwellings with garages and parking spaces; new vehicular and pedestrian access drive; landscaping and ancillary works; and widening improvement works to the adjacent public right of way/footpath. REFUSED. |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

| Proposed Development Type |
|---------------------------|
| Residential               |

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>Constraint</b>  |     |
| <b>Listed Building within Site</b>                       | No  |
| <b>Listed Building within 750m of Site</b>               | Yes |
| <b>Conservation Area</b>                                 | 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>              | Yes |

## Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 9.4                |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 0.05               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 0                  |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 0.79               |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 9.77               |

## 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 |
|------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 13                     | Pass  | 3+                     | 3                           | 4                           | 1                      | Strong              |
| <b>Stage 1 Comment</b> | The parcel performs moderately against purposes 1 and 2, and strongly against purpose 3. It makes a weak contribution to purpose 4 due to the limited linkages between the Green Belt and Radlett's historic core. However, there are no readily recognisable sub-areas which could be recommended for further consideration. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

### Stage 2

| Sub-Area number        | 1 Prevent sprawl (Pass / Fail)   | 1 Prevent sprawl score | 2 Prevent coalescence score | 3 Protect countryside score | 4 Historic towns score | Overall Performance |
|------------------------|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| SA-41                  | Fail   | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 1                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, but the northern part makes a less important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Northern part is recommended for further consideration. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | Split Site   |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

|   |   |                               |                               |  |   |  |   |
|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| <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>      | None   |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | None   |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Potentially - access would probably be through the existing driveway to no.5, or require alterations/demolition of no.15; both are locally listed buildings. |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No   |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | Railway close by a reason for refusal on recent applications   |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | Small but measurable level of surface water and reservoir 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 as evidenced by recent planning applications determined locally, the small size of the site mean it is likely to be viable and achievable. Infrastructure costs likely are to be limited to CIL. |
|--------------------------------|--|

#### Overcoming Constraints

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>What would be needed to overcome constraints?</b> | Sequential and exception tests for flood risk, provision of an acceptable access, adequate mitigation against the impact of the railway and a design and layout sympathetic towards the conservation area setting and the undesignated heritage assets on-site |
|--|--|

#### Estimated development potential - residential

**(a) Density multiplier :**

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

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.39   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 15                        | 20    |

**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:15                                    |
|   | Delivery in 1-5 years 15  |
|   | 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:20 |
|   | Delivery in 1-5 years 20  |
|   | Delivery in 6-10 years 0  |
|   | Delivery in 11-15 years 0   |

**Conclusion:**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b> | <p>Heritage considerations and vehicular access are the key considerations when determining the suitability of the site. The site is within the Radlett South Conservation Area and there are locally listed buildings within and adjoining the site (Nos 5-15 and 17-23 Cobden Hill).</p> <p>A proposal for 8x 3-bed dwellings (houses and flats) was dismissed at appeal in August 2023, largely on heritage and design grounds. However, the site is likely to be capable of accommodating a quantum of development, having been removed from the green belt through a minor alteration to the boundary in a previous Local Plan review.</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>Subject to the sequential and exception tests for flood risk, provision of an acceptable access, adequate mitigation against the impact of the railway on future occupants of the site, and a design and layout sympathetic towards the conservation area setting and the undesignated heritage assets on-site, the site is considered to be available, achievable and suitable for a limited amount of residential development under the current policy framework.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:15</p> |
|--|--|

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

DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0403-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                             |                  |         |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Newberries Carpark, Radlett | <b>Post Code</b> |         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward          | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                 |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 0.91 | <b>Current Use</b> | Public Car Park |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|-----------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Railway to east, Theobald Street to south, residential and town centre commercial to west, garages and station to north  |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | The site is an existing public car park on the edge of Radlett district centre. It is located between the rear of a parade of shops on Watling Street to the west and the railway line to the east.<br>The Radlett Brook/Tykeswater main river runs through the site at its western edge. On the opposite of the railway line is a belt of trees, and 3 storey flats at Craig Mount. |  |  |
| <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/97/0244. Construction of pedestrian footpath and footbridge from Newberries Car Park to Newberries Parade. Permitted. |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

|                                  |
|----------------------------------|
| <b>Proposed Development Type</b> |
| Residential / Other              |

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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



### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 8.75               |
| Floodzone 3                        | 81.12              |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 92.17              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 86.85              |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 85.04              |
| Reservoir Flooding Dry Day         | 90.66              |
| Reservoir Flooding Wet Day         | 94.24              |

### Agricultural Land Classification

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

### Green Belt purposes

#### Stage 1

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

#### Stage 2

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

### Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

#### Officer Assessment

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Is there a conflict with existing policy?      | Parts of site in Floodzone 3b.   |
| Is there evidence of land contamination?       | Unknwon, but there is an underground water storage facility  |
| Are there any access difficulties?             | Access is from Watling Street via a steep ramp   |
| Is topography a constraint?                    | Potentially, as the site falls away steeply from Watling Street towards the railway line, and is at a significantly lower level than the adjoining parade of shops that fronts Watling Street. |
| Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?       | Railway line to east.  |
| Are there any other environmental constraints? | The majority of the site is within the flood plain, as well as being subject to surface water and reservoir flood risk   |
| Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?     | No   |

#### Site Availability:

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

#### Site Achievability:

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Is the Site achievable? | The achievability of the site is dependent, in particular, on addressing flood risk issues which would likely impact on viability. |
|-------------------------|--|

#### Overcoming Constraints

|   |   |
|---|---|
| What would be needed to overcome constraints? | <p>Overcoming the flood risk constraint will not be possible unless the site were brought forward for water compatible development. Residential and commercial development are unlikely to be compatible with the extent and type of flood risk on the site.</p> <p>The small area of the site that is not in Floodzone 3b would be subject to the sequential and exception tests if brought forward alone (for commercial uses only), and this section is likely to be unachievable in isolation, even if those tests were passed.</p> |
|---|---|

## Estimated development potential - residential

### (a) Density multiplier :

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

### (b) Net capacity

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 0.77   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 66                        | 114   |

### 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:66</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 6</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:114</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 100</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 14</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|--|---|

### Conclusion:

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>Flood risk is the primary constraint affecting the site, which lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with a substantial area within Flood Zone 3b (functional floodplain) where residential and commercial development are not permitted.</p> <p>A main river runs through the site, and 81% of the site area lies within Flood Zone 3, with around half of this within Flood Zone 3b (functional flood plain). The site is also subject to large areas of surface water and reservoir flood risk. This makes the majority of it unsuitable for residential development. The site is highly unlikely to pass the Sequential Test as other sites are available within the area which are not in areas of flood risk.</p> <p>The area outside of Flood Zone 3b is suitable for commercial development only without the need for the Exception Test to be applied. However, this is an awkwardly-shaped strip alongside the railway line, accessible only through the flood plain, so it would be difficult to achieve an acceptable form of commercial development.</p> <p>Part of the site is potentially suitable for less vulnerable uses, including its existing use as a car park, and the whole of the site is suitable for water compatible uses such as amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, and natural flood risk management. The site has not been promoted for these uses.</p> <p>Capacity at 30dph baseline:0</p> <p>Capacity at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers: 0</p> |
|---|---|

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0231-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                              |                  |         |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Starveacres, 16 Watford Road | <b>Post Code</b> | WD7 8EJ |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham West Ward           | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |      |                    |                  |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 2.96 | <b>Current Use</b> | Single Residence |
|----------------------------|------|--------------------|------------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | Residential and green field agricultural land   |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is an edge of built up area location. To the north/west is open countryside. The land to east is mostly residential. |  |  |
| <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/92/0511 Installation of outdoor riding manege and erection of block of two stables. Relocation of existing outbuildings Grant Permission<br>TP/01/1067 Single storey side extension. Grant Permission<br>TP/04/0511 Single storey side extension (to replace existing) and conservatory. Grant Permission |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Designated & Undesignated Heritage Assets**

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

### Flooding Risk (Surface & Ground Water)

| Constraint                         | Percentage of Site |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 0                  |
| Floodzone 3                        | 0                  |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 10.54              |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 4.05               |
| Surface Water Flooding High Risk   | 2.15               |
| 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> |                                |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <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 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| '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             | High | High | 0 |

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | No  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No  |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | 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> | Areas of the site are subject to 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> |  |
| <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> | Areas of the site are subject to surface water flood risk |
|--|---|

**Estimated development potential - residential**

**(a) Density multiplier :**

| Area type | Prevailing density | Accessibility | Likely type  |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Rural     | Low                | Very Low      | Key Villages |

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 2.22   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 77                        | 102   |

**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:77</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 60</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 17</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:102</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 102</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>More than 5% of the site area is in an area at low risk of surface water flooding. A TPO covers the part of the site closest to Watford Road, which would be needed for access. Vehicular access is potentially a constraint for higher density development.</p> <p>Since the site was safeguarded for housing, in the current Local Plan (and the 2003 Local Plan), national planning policy in respect of flood risk has been updated and now requires other sources of non-fluvial flood risk to be considered. As a small part of this site is subject to surface water flood risk, the site would need to be subject to sequential test.</p> <p>The TPO covers all trees within an area of mixed woodland, and could likely be addressed through the design of the development. The site promoter has undertaken pre-application discussions with HCC Highways which have concluded that the proposed access arrangements would be acceptable for up to 100 dwellings.</p> <p>The site is considered to be suitable, available and achievable for residential development 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:77</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:102</p> |
|---|--|



DRAFT

**HELAA 2024  
SITE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**Site reference** HEL-0033-22

**Site location / address:**

|                |                             |                  |         |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------|
| <b>Address</b> | Land Rear of 18 Cobden Hill | <b>Post Code</b> |         |
| <b>Ward</b>    | Aldenham East Ward          | <b>Parish</b>    | Radlett |

**Site size / use:**

|                            |       |                    |                 |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Size (ha)<br/>Gross</b> | 11.58 | <b>Current Use</b> | Arable Farmland |
|----------------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|

**Surrounding area:**

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <b>Neighbouring land uses</b>  | The site is surrounded by fields and areas of woodland, albeit that it is close to the southern (residential) boundary of Radlett |  |  |
| <b>Character of surrounding area – landscape, townscape</b>                          | This is an edge of settlement location between the built area of Radlett and open countryside                                     |  |  |
| <b>Could this site be joined to another to form a larger site?</b>                   | Yes   |  |  |
| <b>If yes, give details of adjoining site including site reference if applicable</b> | HEL-1055-22 to the south and HEL225 to the north.   |  |  |

**Planning status:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Relevant Planning history</b> | 16/0340/FUL Provision of new sports facilities (application withdrawn) |
|----------------------------------|--|

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

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

Location type (tick relevant box):

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

**Constraints Check**

| <b>Constraint</b>                         | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> | <b>Constraint</b>                       | <b>Within Site Boundary</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| <b>AQMA</b>                               | No                          | <b>HSE Consultation Zone</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Ancient Woodland</b>                   | No                          | <b>Local Geological Site</b>            | No                          |
| <b>Local Nature Reserve</b>               | No                          | <b>TPO</b>                              | Yes                         |
| <b>SSSI</b>                               | No                          | <b>Sand &amp; Gravel Safeguard Area</b> | Yes                         |
| <b>Archaeological Sites</b>               | No                          | <b>Drinking Water Safeguard Area</b>    | 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 (approximate) |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Floodzone 2                        | 0                                |
| Floodzone 3                        | 0                                |
| Surface Water Flooding Low Risk    | 10                               |
| Surface Water Flooding Medium Risk | 5                                |
| 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.<br>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-42                  | Fail  | 0                      | 3                           | 3                           | 3                      | Moderate            |
| <b>Stage 2 Comment</b> | Meets Purpose assessment criteria moderately, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt. Not recommended. |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |
| <b>Recommended</b>     | No  |                        |                             |                             |                        |                     |

## Landscape Sensitivity Assessment

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

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

### Officer Assessment

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Is there a conflict with existing policy?</b>      | Green Belt  |
| <b>Is there evidence of land contamination?</b>       | No  |
| <b>Are there any access difficulties?</b>             | Yes. Access to Watling Street would be through Local Wildlife Site and TPO.   |
| <b>Is topography a constraint?</b>                    | No  |
| <b>Are there any existing 'bad neighbours'?</b>       | No  |
| <b>Are there any other environmental constraints?</b> | The site adjoins Local Wildlife Site Cobdenhill Dell. TPO 18/2008 lies across the area through which access to Watling Street would need to be taken. There is a measurable level of flood risk on the site, and so there is a need for the Sequential Test to be undertaken. |
| <b>Is the Site suitable for the proposed use?</b>     | With current access constraints, no.  |

### 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> | The site adjoins Local Wildlife Site Cobdenhill Dell. TPO 18/2008 lies across the area through which access to Watling Street would need to be taken. There is a measurable level of flood risk on the site, and so there is a need for the Sequential Test to be undertaken. |
|--|---|

### Estimated development potential - residential

#### (a) Density multiplier :

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

|       |   |        |   |
|-------|---|--------|---|
| Rural | 0 | V. Low | Sustainable Neighbourhood (urban extension) |
|-------|---|--------|---|

**(b) Net capacity**

| Net Ha | Net capacity: (no. units) |       |
|--------|---------------------------|-------|
| 7.48   | 30dph                     | 40dph |
|        | 247                       | 329   |

**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:247</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 137</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:329</p> <p>Delivery in 1-5 years 110</p> <p>Delivery in 6-10 years 219</p> <p>Delivery in 11-15 years 0</p> |
|--|--|

**Conclusion:**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Is the site suitable, achievable and available?</b></p> | <p>The only current means of access is a public bridleway to the south of the site boundary, and other potential access options onto Cobden Hill would pass through a local Wildlife Site (possible ancient woodland at Cobdenhill Dell) and a woodland TPO (Cobdenhill Dell). There is currently no clear resolution to these access constraints.</p> <p>The site has a measurable level of flood risk and will be subject to the Sequential and possibly the Exception Test. If passed, sites at the higher end of the range may require any layouts to be amended and the site capacity reduced to avoid areas of flood risk. There is an area at high risk of surface water flooding across the proposed access point.</p> <p>The independent Outline Landscape Appraisal shows that the landscape has a medium-high level of sensitivity to all forms of built development.</p> <p>The site meets the purpose assessment criteria strongly, and makes an important contribution to the wider strategic Green Belt, so is not recommended for further consideration for development as part of the independent Green Belt Review.</p> <p>The site is available, but there is currently no resolution to the access issue, and the site is within the Green Belt so it is not suitable or achievable for development at this stage.</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 30dph baseline:247</p> <p>Capacity following any Green Belt review and change to policy framework at 40dph baseline with increased density multipliers:329</p> |
|---|---|

DRAFT